

ÉIRE ÓZ MÓR FÉAL

VOTE
FOR
OUR
CANDIDATES.

Vol. 4. No. 49. [New Series (a)]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1920.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

Current Comments

On his return to New York recently, after his record-breaking tour of the United States, Mr. De Valera was enthusiastically welcomed by an assembly which was only surpassed in numbers by the monster gathering which had filled Madison Square Gardens to hear him previous to his departure on his long journey. Although only a few hours' notice of his coming had been received, thousands of cheering people, carrying the Irish and American flags, thronged the Pennsylvania station to greet Ireland's representative. Another magnificent welcome was given to Mr. De Valera at the New York State Convention of the Friends of Irish Freedom, which was held on the following day. "More than a thousand delegates from all parts of the country cheered themselves hoarse for twenty minutes before they gave him a chance to speak," says an American exchange.

Judge Colahan, in a speech to the Convention, said in part: "What consummate masters of hypocrisy are the British governing classes! They have deceived the world for generations, and because of their success in the past they hope to be able to continue to deceive the world. Yesterday Lord Curzon struck the latest variation of English Imperialism, which he declared that England remains in Egypt, forsooth, because the Egyptians are not capable of maintaining a stable government among themselves, or a government that would withstand aggression from without. The same thing has been said about India, about Ireland, and much of mankind, because of the constant repetition of these statements, has come to regard British Imperialism as almost an essential condition of world-peace, instead of which it is one of the few remaining causes of further wars." Continuing, Judge Colahan pointed out that England had no right in Egypt, nor in India, nor in Ireland, and declared that before final peace came to the world England would be compelled to retire from the Egyptian Suez, and leave them to be governed by their own people in their own way.

"We have just broken down militarism after four years of dread, in which millions of people have gone down to their death and billions of treasure have been squandered. We are now sitting idly by and permitting England to strengthen and extend her system of navalism, which is a greater menace to the liberties of mankind than militarism in its palmiest days. By reason of the extraordinary growth of our industrial system, we produce in 8 months all that we can consume in a year, and are therefore dependent upon the markets of the world for 4 months of every year in order to keep our industries going and our people employed," he added. "To reach these markets it is necessary to cross the seas, and England is every day increasing her power upon the seas, so that she may, at any time that she sees her interest or suits the temper of her governing classes, be able to say to us that we cannot use the seas and must confine American business and American commerce to our own country."

The Irish Leader, Dr. MacCarthy, representative for King's County, and Mr. Burke-Cockran also addressed the Convention.

During his recent tour Mr. De Valera visited Medford, where he was enthusiastically received. A belated report of his visit to that city records that under the auspices of the Rev. John Powers, who travelled with him, the Irish Leader arrived at Medford, and was greeted by a large number of people. In response to the cordial invitation of the Rev. John Powers, Mr. De Valera agreed to visit Medford. On his arrival he was met by Miss Gates, Colonel George Mims, and other distinguished citizens. After a brief stay in the city, the Committee invited Mr. De Valera to visit Ashland,

as the Irish Leader was timed to reach San Francisco the next day he said he would not be able to accept the invitation. Mayor Gates assured him that there was no danger of his being late, and good humouredly promised to procure, if need be, an aeroplane to ensure Mr. De Valera's timely arrival in San Francisco. In the circumstances Mr. De Valera consented to motor to Ashland, Mayor Gates acting as chauffeur. The Most Rev. Archbishop A. Christie, who was in Ashland administering Confirmation on the day in question, Father Lane, Father Conaty, and Father Meagher went to the station to bid farewell and God-speed to the Irish Leader as he embarked for San Francisco.

When the Anti-Irish Mission, led by Mr. Coote, arrived in America the representative of Ireland greeted it with a friendly challenge to debate the case of Ireland before an American audience. Although we may assume that Mr. Coote and his colleagues did not travel thousands of miles without putting their heads together and drafting a case, if indeed they had not been supplied with one by their legal advisers before they embarked, they have so far refrained from accepting the challenge made by Mr. De Valera. The Irish Leader suggested that a wholly Protestant American Commission be appointed to investigate and report on the truth or otherwise of Ireland's claims, but as Mr. Coote and his colleagues had evidently been "instructed" to stick to the well-beaten tracks of the English propagandists, they contented themselves with serving out the usual anti-Irish jargon to the American Press.

In reply to the repeated statements issued by the Anti-Irish Mission, Mr. De Valera issued a declaration which, as far as an Irish paper published in Ireland may reproduce it, reads:—

"The morning papers report the arrival of the members of the Ulster Unionist Council. They are the representatives of a political party in Ireland which, at the General Elections held a year ago under British supervision, and according to British ballot law, secured only 308,713 votes out of a total of 1,516,773 votes cast, i.e., they are the representatives of a minority political party that secured the votes of only some 23 per cent. of the Irish electors. They say they are come to America 'in the interests of law and order, of truth and honesty, of fair play and principle.' Nothing could be better; we, too, are here in the interest of these self-same principles, so that we start on common ground. We are certain the American public will judge between us on these as a basis. Let the question at issue between us then be argued out logically and calmly on a basis of facts, without the introduction of epithets which are simply abusive, or assertions which are without foundation. . . ."

The declaration goes on to propound nine questions, which Mr. De Valera says "it would be well if the delegation would answer" for the American public. We set out these questions in part:—

- "1. What right has the British Government to rule in Ireland?"
- "2. How does it maintain its rule there to-day? How has it maintained it in the past?"
- "3. Why should not the majority of the people of the Irish Nation determine the government of Ireland, as is done in all free national states?"
- "4. Is the Irish question not in truth a very simple one, very easy to understand, and very easy to find a solution for? Is it not simply a question of domination of one nation by another, militarily the stronger, and the unwillingness of that stronger nation, by reason of its selfish interest, to allow the weaker 'to choose its own way of life and obedience'?"
- "5. Is it not true that Irishmen and Irishwomen who are striving to secure for their country the same inde-

pendence that Washington and Jefferson and their comrades secured for the United States are persecuted by the Government that wishes to keep their country in dependence and servitude, and that the people of Ireland are suffering to-day practically from all the grievances against which the United Colonies revolted here in 1776?"

"6. Is it not a fact that British rule in Ireland is at present a military regime, a regime of an army of occupation comparable to the German regime in Belgium when the Germans entered into effective control of Belgian territory?"

"7. Is it not a fact that Ireland is suffering from the consequences that naturally follow in the train of the military occupation of any country—denial of the right of public assembly; suppression of free speech on platform and in the press; imprisonment of the people's Parliamentary representatives; denial of the right of trial by jury, and of the other safeguards to individual liberty which customarily obtain in civilised communities; violent acts of aggression?"

"8. Is it not a fact that history shows that whenever nations were struggling for their freedom against the rule of the foreigner there was always a section of the people who supported the foreigner—for example, the Loyalists and Tories in Washington's day? Is it right that such a minority section should impose its veto on the will of the majority?"

"9. Is it not a fact that the movement for Irish Independence has led for its most distinguished leaders during the past century, and a full Irishman who were not of the Catholic faith—for example, Grattan and Flood, Wolfe Tone, the father of the present republican movement; Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Robert Emmet, Mitchel, Davis, Smith O'Brien, Butt and Parnell? Almost conclusively evidence in itself that the sectional division in Ireland is not on the basis of religious belief."

"These questions can all be readily answered," concluded Mr. De Valera. "They are questions to which the American people need to be enlightened on these facts if they are to come to a true judgment. If there is any difference of opinion between us as to facts we can arrange a commission of investigation. . . . we are ready to support and to give every possible facility for such a commission. It could be composed, say, of two clergymen nominated by us, two nominated by the Ulster Unionist delegation, and a chairman on whom we could mutually agree, all to be Americans and Protestants. This commission could report to the American people with authority. Meanwhile we trust that the delegation will debate this question with us freely and frankly before the American public. We are ready to meet them anywhere on any common platform."

The following letter was also sent to Mr. Coote and his colleagues:—

"Gentlemen,—Noting your arrival in America, we, the Protestant Friends of Ireland, gladly welcome you. The Irish issue is one which must be solved, and the interests of fair play and of humanity demand that all who have information be heard. A question which cannot stand upon discussion is one which is basically wrong, and so we desire to co-operate with you in every effort to bring your message before the people of America in the best possible way. We hereby extend to you an invitation to be our guests at a public meeting in the Carnegie Hall, where the entire question may be fairly presented. We are sure you will agree with us that it is highly desirable that this political question be not made a matter of bitter religious controversy. Your acceptance of this invitation will help to assure the public that the

time is past when a question of political self-determination can be made dependent on religious faith. You will, of course, understand that in the meeting we propose we desire opportunity to express our own point of view as well as to afford your representatives ample opportunity to express the message which has brought them to America. All arrangements as to chairman, date, and conduct of the meeting we should desire to determine in conference with you.—We are fraternally yours.

"The Protestant Friends of Ireland."
(Rev.) James Gratian Mythen
Chairman of Executive Committee.

Mr. Frank P. Walsh, Chairman of the American Commission on Irish Independence, sent a cable to Lord French on the 6th of December, in which he pointed out that Mr. William Coote, of the Anti-Irish Mission to America, had given a typewritten statement to the American Press containing "the direct implication that the report of former Governor Dunne of Illinois and myself on British atrocities in Ireland, made to the President and Congress of the United States under date June 3rd, 1919, insofar as it made charges against the British Government as to brutality, domination, and subjection of and towards the people of Ireland, was false." Mr. Walsh declares that the charges of brutality, domination, and subjection contained in the report were direct and specific, and contends that, if these charges should turn out to be false, he has "atrociously libelled" Lord French. However, Mr. Walsh is prepared to take the consequences of an untrue statement. This is to notify you. He writes to the person whom, if the charges are unfounded, has been atrociously libelled, "that I am personally responsible for the charges made against yourself and your Government in this report, and am financially able to respond to any judgment for damages which might be rendered against me. I now offer to enter my appearance in any libel suit you may desire to bring in any court of competent jurisdiction in Dublin, New York, or London, with the understanding that a commission be forthwith issued by said court for the taking of testimony, and that I be permitted in person or by counsel to take the testimony of the witnesses, so that the charges may be proven or disproven with all possible speed; it being, of course, understood that you shall have the full right of cross-examination and privilege to introduce any testimony you may have to refute the charges."

A similar message was sent to Mr. Ian Macpherson. We doubt, however, if the individuals in question will be overjoyed to recognise a court constituted as Mr. Walsh suggests.

On the same day Mr. Walsh sent a letter to Mr. William Coote informing that gentleman of the inaccuracies contained in the written statement which he had supplied to the American Press, and advising him that any charge of falsehood imputed to Governor Dunne or himself with respect to the acts of brutality mentioned in the American Commission on Irish Independence would be considered slanderous in their nature, and after that notification had been taken, if thereafter made, as uttered with express malice. The Irish people await with interest the further antics of the Anti-Irish Mission, led by the arch-bigot Coote.

When Sir Edward Carson first learned that Eamonn De Valera had reached America he knew that the truth about Ireland would be brought home to the people of this country. He says as much in the following letter to the triumphant tour of De Valera and the tremendous ovations tendered to him throughout the United States was a bitter dose to Carson, the mouthpiece of the British Government. At the outset Carson announced that he would

come to the States himself, to tell the liberty-loving people of this great Republic why the people of Ireland should remain in slavery. Upon other second thought, however, Carson changed his mind. Instead he sent over a delegation of Ulster Presbyterians with instructions to create a religious war in America if possible, in order to blind the people to the real issue in Ireland."

"Prior to the departure of this delegation," continued the paper, "the mayors of the leading cities in the United States received a bundle of clippings from English newspapers, enclosed in a neat envelope of English manufacture, addressed to 'His Honor the Mayor.' These clippings, thus mailed anonymously from Belfast, consisted of a choice selection of British propaganda in which the members of the Sinn Féin organisation and the vast majority of the people of Ireland who had declared themselves in favour of the Republic were branded as murderers, ruffians, and highwaymen. This material was the advance notice of the Ulster guard. Most of it was consigned to the waste paper basket, together with the usual scurrilous communications that reach public officials unopened, and a great many were sent to this office."

As already stated in these columns, the "Los Angeles Times" is a notoriously pro-English sheet. For days previous to his arrival in Los Angeles it carried on a violent campaign of vituperation against the Irish Leader. The day after Mr. De Valera had addressed the mighty gathering of 25,000 at the Ball Park, the "Times" admitted the failure of its campaign in a manner worthy of its Irish namesake. "Mr. De Valera's reception was entirely partisan, and was not marred by any open expression of unfriendliness," he spoke from a stand erected between home plate and second base, facing the grand stand. His voice was carried to every part of the Ball Park by an electrically operated mechanism that magnified it manifold. The speaker's stand was draped in red, white and blue bunting and flags, and had a sack of the green, white and orange of the Irish Republic. There was a band composed of uniformed men, who played national airs and Irish melodies, and the meeting was opened and closed with the playing of the "Star-Spangled Banner." The uniformed escort, made up of men in soldiers' and sailors' uniforms, carried Mr. De Valera on their shoulders from the limousine to the stand. The crowd was in a happy mood, and the 100 policemen, under the command of Captain Heath of the University Station, and the carload of detectives had an easy afternoon."

"Everything English in America is now hired for English propaganda," said an American visitor to us this week—"actors, prize-fighters, dancers, preachers—every single thing." But we observe that Lord Dunsany has quitted and gone to Canada, and that Viscount Grey has booked his passage home to England.

Mr. P. W. Wilson, who fills the dual role of English propagandist and London "Daily News" man, "The Friend of Ireland"—correspondent in New York, has cabled to that paper his charming opinion that if England only puts into operation some kind of Home Rule, America wouldn't mind her continuing to coerce Ireland—it is coercion without Home Rule, and Wilson—who is opposed to it. And "The Friend of Ireland" prints it—a revelation of its own mind as well as of its correspondent's malignant stupidity.

The veritable words of the "Daily News's" own correspondent deserve record. They are: "If Parliaments are established, any further coercion will more easily be deflected here. It is coercion without Home Rule that Americans dislike."

Our thoroughly English contemporary's comment on the slaying of an in-offensive civilian by English soldiers in the Phoenix Park last week is up to its best standard. These soldiers admitted that after they shot down the man they shot him again when he attempted to crawl to the wall and then again shot him—although undoubtedly the unfortunate man was dead—just before the arrival of the ambulance. Hearken to the organ of English Liberalism: "No fair-minded man will condemn the soldiers with undue severity. The men were frightened and not responsible for their actions." So fright excuses all things in the English soldier. But let us contemplate "German atrocities."

Speaking recently at Middle Brighton, Australia, the Most Rev. Dr. Mannix dealt with the reports of crime in Ireland which have been cabled to the Australian Press as part of the English propaganda campaign against the Irish Nation. He referred to a question asked in the English House of Commons by an English representative as to what action his Government proposed to take regarding a murder, alleged to be political, in Ireland, and to a supplementary question put by an Irish member of that House as to what action the English Government would take in connection with the 27 murders committed in England in the previous month. The English Minister's reply, said Dr. Mannix, was that there was no parallel between the two cases—that the murders in England were of quite a different character! That luminous reply, continued Dr. Mannix, accounts for the fact that the one deplorable murder in Ireland was attributed to Australia, while they never could have heard of the 27 murders in England if he had not told them of them.

"The hour is high when the final clash will be produced, wherever the word of Christ is despised, between transitory Force and eternal Justice," writes Mr. Georges Chaurancé in "La Gazette Franco-Britannique." "The spectacles of Germany conquered, but not sufficiently punished, should inspire with wholesome reflections the masters of a distracted world, where far too many victims await their revenge by a rebellion against iniquitous laws imposed on them by fire and sword. It is necessary to be reconciled to and respect divine law, which is the foundation of concord and relative happiness on this earth, soaked in blood as it is by the folly of tyrants of every description and of every race. A few weeks ago De Valera and the King of the Belgians, the President of the United States of America, met at Minneapolis. The valiant chief of the Irish and the noble sovereign of Belgium were received like heroes of their respective countries. But the affection of America went out to De Valera. The crowd, in a frenzied frenzy, carried in triumph the champion of Irish Liberty, which is trampled under foot by England. Unprecedented manifestations took the town by storm. All the newspapers were printed in green, the Irish national colour, and the Irish flag flew from the country of Justice and Liberty treats the martyrs of Force and Iniquity! England, our friend and ally, is riding for a fall. Does she realise the danger that is undermining her?"

The appointment of the Rev. Dr. O'Hagan as Rector of the Irish College at Rome, in succession to the late Monsignor O'Riordan, will gratify patriotic Irishmen and Irishwomen of all creeds. No Irishman in Rome has worked harder for the cause of his country, and with more brilliant success, than Dr. O'Hagan. He met and countered the full force of English propaganda against Ireland at the Vatican, dragged it into the light, and overthrew it. Since the Rectorship of the Irish College became vacant the full force of English intrigue was directed to prevent the appointment of Dr. O'Hagan. Once again it has been defeated, and Ireland has triumphed.

Wicklow can proudly claim Dr. O'Hagan. He was born in Oveoa, ordained at Rome, and served as a curate in Maynooth, Ballymore, and North Anne Street, Dublin, before his appointment, on the recommendation of the Irish Catholic Bishops, as Rector of the Irish College in 1904. Dr. O'Hagan is a profound writer on theological subjects, and one of the most brilliant intellects in the Catholic Church. The service he rendered to his country in Rome will ever endear him to its memory.

Speaking after his consecration at Sydney Cathedral as Coadjutor-Archbishop of Hobart, Most Rev. Dr. Barry, said there never was a time when Ireland more urgently needed the moral

support of her sons than to-day, for while the dawn of a new freedom was being celebrated all over the world, Ireland was encompassed in injustice. These outrages on Ireland and on the public opinion of the world will not continue, and then Ireland, the last to be redeemed of the nations of the world, would salute the new dawn of her ancient greatness and glory.

The writings of the patriots who fought and won the revolutionary war and contributed mainly to the establishment of the United States of America, says an American Exchange, are being brought to present-day attention by the scholars and public men who have taken upon themselves the reading of memoirs, correspondence, and other data pertaining to the activities and views of those who worked with Washington to free America from British control. The following is a letter written by General John Stark, of New Hampshire, under date of January 21, 1810, and addressed to President James Madison:—

Derryfield, Jan. 21, 1810.
Sir,—I had the pleasure yesterday of receiving an address from the First Magistrate of the only Republic on earth. This letter compliments me highly on my services as a soldier and praises my patriotism. It is true, I love the country of my birth; for it is not only my land which I would choose before all others, but it is the only spot where I could wear out the remnant of my days with any satisfaction.

Twice has my country been invaded by foreign enemies, and twice I went out with her citizens to obtain a peace; when that object was attained I returned to my farm, and my original occupation. I have ever valued peace so highly that I would not sacrifice it for anything but freedom, yet submission to insult I never thought the way to obtain or support either.

I was pleased with your dismissal of the man sent by England to insult us, because she will ascertain by the experiment that we are the same nation to be treacherous and stronger by age, and having gained wisdom by experience. If the enmity of the British is to be feared, their allegiance is still more dangerous. I have fought by their side (7 years' war) and against them, and have found them to be treacherous and ungenerous as friends and dishonourable as enemies. I have also tried the French, first as enemies and since as friends, and although all the strong prejudices of my youth were against them, still I have formed a more favourable opinion of them than of the English. Let us watch even them. But of all the dangers from which I apprehend the most serious evil to my country and our Republican institutions, none requires a more careful eye than our internal British Faction.

If the communication of the result of my experience can be of service in the approaching storm, or if any benefit can be derived from any example of wisdom, my strongest wish will be gratified.

The few days or weeks of the remainder of my life will be in friendship with James Madison.
(Signed) John Stark.
To James Madison,
President of the United States.

The following is a quotation from a letter written by General John Stark in reply to an invitation to attend the 1809 celebration of the Battle of Bennington. The invitation was signed by Oliver Olin, Jonathan Robinson, and David Fay:—

At my Quarters (then Derryfield—now Manchester, N.H.)
Derryfield, 31st July, 1807
(1809).

My Friend and Fellow Soldiers,
I received yours of the 23rd inst. . . . In case of my not being able to attend, you wish my sentiments. These you shall have as free as the air we breathe. As I was then I am now, the friend of the civil rights of man, of representative democracy, of republicanism, and the Declaration of Independence, the great charter of our national rights, and, of course, a friend to the indissoluble union and the constitution of the States. I am the enemy of all foreign influence, of all foreign interference is the influence of tyrants. This is the only chosen spot of Liberty, this is the only Republic on earth. You know well, gentlemen, that at the time of the event you celebrate, there was a powerful British faction in this country (called Tories), a

material part of the force we contended with. This faction was ranking in our councils, till it had laid a foundation for the subversion of our liberties. But by having good success at our outposts, and the appearance of our O'Connell, the sons of freedom beat the alarm, and as at Bennington, they came, they saw, they conquered.

These are my orders now, and will be my last orders to all my volunteers, to look out for the enemy; for there is a dangerous British party in the country lurking in their hiding places more dangerous than all our foreign enemies; and whenever they shall openly appear, let them render the same account of them as was given at Bennington, let them assume what name they will.
(Signed) John Stark.

The Co-operative Fishing Society in Dingle opened the organising campaign on Sunday week. A large and representative meeting of the fishermen, presided over by Rev. J. Griffin, P.P., took place after first Mass in Ballycotton. After a long and interesting discussion of the large amount already subscribed by the fishermen of Dingle, Mr. Frank Fahy, T.D.; Mr. C. C. Riddell, N.O'Brien, L.A.O.S., and Muiris O Cathain addressed the meeting. Another meeting was held at the chapel at Carrig, presided over by Rev. Fr. McGrath, C.C., and was addressed by the same speakers. In the evening the speakers again addressed a meeting in Dingle, at which Rev. Fr. Maher, C.C., strongly approved of the charter of the Co-operative Fishing Society, pointing out that unless this method is adopted, they can never expect to be independent. A very large number of shares were taken after each meeting, and a committee was elected at each fishing port to carry on the organisation. Muiris O Cathain was appointed organiser to collect the shares from the different centres. It was decided to name the society the West Kerry Co-operative Fishing Society, and make Dingle its headquarters. At the closing of the meeting, Muiris O Cathain, the Secretary, informed the meeting that he had received private communications from different sources, and expected strong financial aid. Anyone wishing to invest shares in West Kerry Fishing Co-operative Society can now do so through Muiris O Cathain or Eoghan O'Suilleabhain, Fishing Co-op., Dingle.

Messrs. Dowdall, O'Mahoney and Co., Ltd., of Union Quay, Cork, have been appointed agents for the Moore, McCormack and Co. steamer, "Delco" (tonnage 6,000) with a general cargo for Dublin, Belfast, and Cork. The other agents who have already been appointed are Messrs. John Weatherill and Sons, Ltd., of Oliver St., Dublin, and Messrs. John Burke and Co., Corporation St., Belfast. Applications for space and freight rates should be made to the agents, who have been authorised to book return general cargo.

So far as shipping services are concerned, the one direct line of direct trade between America and Ireland may now be said to have entered its first stage. There is at all times a flow of traffic from Ireland to the United States. The dimensions of this traffic could not be ascertained with accuracy, as much of it was consigned to British ports. There is also a quantity of Irish goods sold to British merchants and subsequently re-sold to the United States. It is of interest to Irish exporters to have their goods in future tendered to the agents of the Moore, McCormack Line, and to get into direct touch with buyers in the United States. Importers from New York would do well to contract for delivery of their goods f.o.b. Moore, McCormack vessel, New York, or c.i.f. Dublin Quay. This will mean the payment of double freight, double customs duties, cartage, and double handling charges.

News has arrived from New York that Messrs. Moore and McCormack have loaded the ship "Delco" with a general cargo for Dublin, Belfast, and Cork. The "Delco" was due to leave New York on Dec. 23, and will arrive next week. This marks the inauguration of a full direct service both ways between Ireland and America. Hitherto no Irish cargo has been shipped on account of various unexpected difficulties. The "Lake Gretin" and the "Lake Grafston" have in practice not been able to take cargo back from Ireland. They are coal-burning vessels that had to bunk at a Welsh port. They have been loaded there with coal for South European ports. These vessels are owned by the American Shipping Board, and appear to be worked under the directions of the American marine representative in London. Oil-burning vessels, however, will not be under compulsion

to English coal exporters for the provision of bunker, and accordingly will be free to load return cargo at Irish ports. Two other vessels, the ss. "Castle Point" and the ss. "Callahoney" are now loading at New York for Ireland, and it is hoped that they, too, will be available to take return cargo.

The Port and Docks Board elections are now taking place. There are, we believe, only six candidates: The commercial public takes no interest in this vital matter, because it has a system so complicated that nobody except a constitutional lawyer can understand it. There are, we believe, six hundred electors empanelled under a system which may be called unproportional voting. There is a special franchise provided for shipping agents and managers of shipping companies not registered at the port. This enables the English ship grabbers to practically grab the port. The voting for the trading section is cumulative and plural, and so arranged that the English heavy articles like coal and timber and grain can aid the foreigners in keeping the port for their benefit. The only public representatives are those appointed by the Corporation. The municipal section has done its best to promote the development of the port, but it constitutes a minority. It is surprising that England's Local Government Board in Ireland has not developed a passion for the application of its model proportional representation system to the Port and Docks Board. The single transferable vote would be most useful in finding out the preference for members suitable for ruling our port and fostering its trade. At present this Public Trust is nearly a self-constituted and self-elected Board. Foreign shipping agents and importers are all for ever at determination on the Harbour Board.

The recent discussion on the attempt of those who hold Irish political prisoners in custody to divert themselves of responsibility for their deaths, if they occur through hunger-strike or otherwise, has caused an Irish lawyer to send us the following note on the English law governing the responsibility of prison governors and others:—

Leigh v. Gladstone and Others (26 T.L.R. 139). Before Lord Alverstone, Chief Justice, and Special Jury. Action—Trespass to Person: Forcible Feeding of Prisoner. Head Note—It is the duty of prison officials to preserve the health of prisoners in custody and a fortiori to preserve their lives. It is for the jury to say whether the means adopted by those officials—for example, the feeding of a prisoner by force—are necessary for that purpose. This was an action of damages for assault and battery and for an injunction to restrain a repetition of the acts complained of. Defence—That the acts complained of were necessary in order to save the plaintiff's life, and that the minimum of force necessary was used. Held, that the acts were justified, and that the plaintiff was not entitled to an injunction to restrain a repetition of the acts complained of. Evidence produced for plaintiff and defendant. Lord Chief Justice said (during the hearing of the evidence) that he should rule, as a matter of law, that the duty of the prison officials to preserve the health of the prisoners and a fortiori to preserve their lives, and that he should ask the jury whether the means adopted were proper for this purpose. Lord Chief Justice (summing up): They (the jury) must take the law from him. It was the duty, both under the rules (prison) and apart from the rules, of the officials to preserve the health and lives of the prisoners who were in the custody of the Crown. If they forcibly fed the plaintiff when it was not necessary, the defendant ought to pay damages. The plaintiff did not complain—and it did her credit—of any undue violence being used towards her. The medical evidence was that at the time she was first fed it had become dangerous to allow her to abstain from food any longer. His Lordship then directed the jury in detail. If Dr. Helby had allowed the plaintiff to fast for a few days longer, and she had died in consequence, what answer could he have made? It was said that the treatment had failed. That had nothing to do with the case, for there was evidence that it had been successfully continued in some cases for 24 years, and they had heard that two other ladies who were also guilty of this wicked folly had completed their full sentence, although fed for years. If they thought this poor woman had been improperly treated, in the interests of justice they must not hesitate to say so. Verdict for defendant. The position is thus: If a prisoner is permitted to die in consequence of hunger-strike, the prison authorities are liable—owing to neglect

of duty. If prisoner dies owing to being forcibly fed (the evidence in the Ashe case showed this possibility), the authorities might be liable—the facts in the specific case would determine that issue.

English Propaganda in America

In an effort to mislead the American public into the belief that British propaganda in this country is about to be discontinued, announcement was made a few days ago in many of the daily papers that the British Bureau of Information was packing up its books, papers, and photographs, and that it was described as a sign that the bureau was about to "close down" (says an American paper).

As a matter of fact, new batches of British propagandists are arriving on every ship which reaches the port of New York. The British Government is in a desperate situation. Although it scored a diplomatic triumph at the Peace Conference, where its representatives succeeded in grabbing nearly everything worth taking, still the difficulty of holding the old and the new British possessions without outside help, coupled with the dangerous condition of British Government finance, makes the position of British Ministers desperate.

If the League of Nations could only be started working, with the United States in the League, pledged to preserve the territorial integrity of the British Empire and give England and the other Entente Allies the financial and military support which would enable them to regain their equilibrium, shrewd British statesmen realise that English domination of the world would be ensured.

The aim of British propagandists, therefore, is to mould public opinion in the United States in favour of a coalition with the so-called "Mother Country," either through partnership in the Godless League of Nations or in an open alliance between the two countries. If America could be enticed into a combination of Powers which would result in a Super-Government being placed over the Government established by Washington and saved by Lincoln, the British Empire would be secure and the United States would, to all intents and purposes, become re-united to England, in a union such as Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie planned to accomplish. The "Reunited States of the British-American Union," Carnegie's title for reconquered America, would not at first be as closely bound to England as her other colonies, but the bonds would be tightened gradually, and American liberty suppressed by degrees.

In addition to the attempt to undermine American independence, the British propagandists are busy trying to dispute or disprove Ireland's claims to Nationality. They realise the Irish question has become an international question, in spite of British efforts to beloud the issue and outlaw Ireland's case.

Standing on the brink of financial ruin—and nobody knows so well as British statesmen that the British Empire's political existence depends upon the maintenance of British credit—the invading army of British propagandists are playing a desperate game, and playing it with a cunning born of long experience in the arts of double-dealing and organised chicanery.

In short, then, the purpose of British propaganda in the United States is to create conditions here which would make possible the use of the United States in the furtherance of the schemes of British Imperial Despotism, and to prevent any realisation of the Irish question, in spite of British efforts to beloud the issue and outlaw Ireland's case.

The British propagandists are the most cunning disseminators of coloured information on earth, but occasionally one of their own admissions—such as which reveal part of their schemes. Before the United States entered the war there was a big array of those unscrupulous agents here violating American neutrality and plotting to drag the United States into the great world conflict.

Sir Gilbert Parker, who was for some time in charge of the British Battalion of Falschold, was so elated when America entered the war that he boasted in an article in "Harper's Magazine" of March, 1918, of the methods adopted by himself and his co-conspirators.

Not since the publication of Parker's boastful admissions has any statement been given out by British agents in this country to compare in interest with the interview with Louis Tracy, the British novelist, published in the New

York "Evening Sun" of November 10. Tracy was about to go back to England, and he could not resist the temptation to get some free personal advertising and toss some nice verbal bouquets to himself, via the columns of the "Sun."

One outstanding feature of the British propaganda in the United States is the selection of fiction writers for the job of publicity stimulants—and it is not necessary to remind those who have studied the activities of these men who have stood ready to prostitute their talents that they continued to write fiction and send it out disguised in the garb of fact to further the interests of British Imperial Autocracy.

One admission by Tracy corroborates certain statements made by Sir Gilbert Parker in his article in "Harper's Magazine" of March, 1918. Tracy states in his interview that Americans were used extensively in British propaganda, before the United States entered the war. Tracy says, boastfully:

"One thing most Americans did not realise is that the British Bureau of Information was not from England and the front, before this country came into the war, as many, if not more, Americans than the English who came over here."

Tracy says the Bureau never bothered with the news. British propaganda and British censorship on the other side of the Atlantic presumably took care of that.

The "Evening Sun," in its introduction to the interview with the British Director of Propaganda, explains that he (Tracy) has been in the press section of the British Bureau of Information from the beginning, and head of the entire Bureau for the past year.

The office of the Bureau, the "Sun" says, used to be down, at 511 Fifth Avenue; but in the course of the past summer it was moved to 105 West Fifty-fourth Street, where it was installed in the very English study of Mr. Tracy's apartment. There are letter files against every wall, and hanging on them several pictures of Lord Northcliffe and the prints of familiar British war posters; all the tools and the instruments of the job of information. But it took more than mere posters and exhibits and typewriters to maintain the Bureau as a truly serviceable institution.

The manifold queries and demands that came into the Bureau of Information during Mr. Tracy's directorship did not confine themselves solely to matters that went on at the front. "From the very first day upon which this Bureau started to diffuse information," said Mr. Tracy to a representative of the "Evening Sun," "I made it a tenet of our policy that we should never turn anyone away unworked or undirected."

The great part of my work, of course, was the Press. We began that during the first winter of the war, and it covered every piece of magazine and newspaper publication that we could get to cover any series of newspapers regularly, or to issue any stated news service; rather we tried to organise this Bureau as a smoothly functioning office where a writer or a journalist might obtain the facts and figures that were any phase of the British campaign. We never bothered with news, because the wire services naturally took better care of that than we ever could; but we had at our disposal the services of writers and scholars who made it possible for us to find out, at any particular moment or crisis, special informational articles about any event, place, or person. That perhaps was the best and most comprehensive and steadiest service we were able to render."

The growth of the work of the British Bureau of Information may be estimated by the fact that the working force grew from a mere nine at the time of Mr. Balfour's installation of the office to fifty-four at the time of Mr. Tracy's arrival. There was nothing that we did that we didn't become accustomed to doing," said Mr. Tracy. "And it probably is harder on me as the director. I haven't written a story or a novel since the war began; but in such a position there were much about it. I haven't written by the column. And in such a position you are called upon to do almost anything; I dropped everything one Fourth of July, when you New Yorkers put on a big patriotic parade, to prepare the words for the British representation. I never thought I should find myself getting up a section of a parade, but I did it, and everyone says very well. That was but one small venture; there were the exhibits of war posters which went all over the country, and which are still going; there were the writers, the journalists, and the authors, the dramatists and poets, who turned over to us special articles or descriptions or pieces of art."

to be relayed to the periodicals. And there was also, perhaps most in the public eye, the almost endless chain of Englishmen and women who came over during the war to speak under the auspices of the British Government upon different aspects of the war. These did not include the speakers and writers who came over here upon their own initiative and for pecuniary profit. We were not responsible for them. But we did look after and make arrangements for all the speakers who were sent over by the Government. And they were legion.

"One thing most Americans did not realise is that the British Bureau of Information sent over from England and the front—before this country came into the war—as many, if not more, Americans than the English who came over here. There was, therefore, before you came in, and before your own Committee of Public Information in Washington took over these activities for you, a great many people, journalists, men of business and finance, chosen from every section of the States, and business and professional group, who had seen the war and realised what the Allies were up against. That sort of interpretation and revelation was necessary if these two eventually co-operating Allies were to know each other as they were competing for and against."

The extracts which follow, taken from an article by Sir Gilbert Parker in "Harper's Magazine" for March, 1918, will give some idea of the extent of British propaganda conducted for the purpose of inveigling the United States into the war. Parker's statement is an article by Sir Gilbert Parker in "Harper's Magazine" for March, 1918, will give some idea of the extent of British propaganda conducted for the purpose of inveigling the United States into the war. Parker's statement is an article by Sir Gilbert Parker in "Harper's Magazine" for March, 1918, will give some idea of the extent of British propaganda conducted for the purpose of inveigling the United States into the war.

Describing his work as chief British propagandist in the United States, before this country entered the war, Parker wrote—

"Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work at the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day that our Empire broke England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men, and delegates to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George (the present Prime Minister), Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Bunciman (the Lord Chancellor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John B. Leonard, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and fully a hundred others."

"Among other things, we supplied three hundred and sixty newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the army and navy, as well as through letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighbouring States."

"We also established a stimulated many people to write articles; we utilised the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established associations with persons of the people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranks of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y.M.C.A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers."

Another Secret Agreement?

[We reprint the following article from "New Europe," an English review. It gives a measure of the truth of English Ministers' statements and pledges.]

There must be many readers of "The New Europe" who, like the present writer, were astonished to read in the "Times" of 18th December a telegram from their own correspondent in Paris disclosing, for the first time, the existence of a pledge given by Great Britain to France with regard to economic policy after the war. I give the telegram in its entirety—

The visit of M. Clemenceau to London has, as we all know by now, had favourable results for both France and Great Britain, although the exact decisions of our Prime Minister on the great questions of economic importance are not yet public information. Certain circles here wonder if the principal question before them has not been the interpretation of the letter addressed by the French Government to the French Government, dated 28th May, 1918. This letter, which has never been published, runs roughly as follows—

"The British Government begs to assure the French Government that, when once the needs of Great Britain have been met, the resources in raw materials of the British Empire will be placed at the disposal of France and Great Britain's other Allies. Only after the Allies have obtained what they require for their economic development will the resources of our Empire be offered to the Central Powers, and, lastly, to the countries with whom we are at war."

The very wide terms in which the pledge is drawn will be noted. Great Britain is first to satisfy her own "needs"; the Allies are then to obtain "what they require for their economic development," and only then will neutral and enemy Powers be enabled to draw upon the raw material resources of the British Empire. Strictly or narrowly interpreted, the pledge may be taken to bind us, first to economic bloc, to the practical exclusion of the rest of the world. It is, in fact, a re-affirmation of the policy of the Paris Resolutions without their limiting preamble, which, as Mr. Asquith has lately reminded us, was expressly inserted to make it clear that the Resolutions were designed to be contingent upon the continuance of an aggressive economic policy by the "Central Empires."

Two questions arise with regard to this pledge, on both of which, in the interests of the democratic control of foreign policy, further enlightenment is required. First: What is the significance of the word "needs"? What is its significance in May, 1918?

Our existing commitments in regard to economic policy are a tangled web of tradition, and of the newly disclosed pledge is only a last and most extreme example.

We were committed during the war to the Paris Resolutions of June, 1916; but, on the collapse of the Mitteleuropa scheme and the acceptance by Germany of the Fourteen Points, the Paris Resolutions automatically lapsed.

Our next commitment was the acceptance by the British and other Allied Governments of the Fourteen Points (minus two reservations) as the basis of the peace with Germany. This was communicated by the President in Washington, to the German Government in a letter dated 5th November, 1918, and formed the basis of the solemn contract under which the Germans accepted the armistice and the peace terms. Among the Fourteen Points was one dealing with economic policy, on which the Germans laid great stress: "The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers, and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

The Allies also specifically defined the limits within which reparation might be claimed in the following terms: "By it (reparation) they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and to their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air."

The Allies therefore pledged themselves to do their best to provide equality of trade conditions to the enemy, and a fortiori to the neutrals, subject to the provision by Germany of compensation for damage done, which Mr. J. M. Keynes, a high authority, in his recent book ("The Economic Consequences of the War") estimates at £2,120,000,000.

This solemn contract runs counter to the pledge now disclosed, and might well be held to annul it. No doubt the French Government would claim that a pledge can only be annulled by consent on both sides. But the French Government was equally with the British Government, a party to the agreement communicated to Germany on 5th November, 1918, in which previous commitments incompatible with its loyal observance were implicitly overridden. It will, indeed, remain one of the mysteries of history why President Wilson, having secured the assent of the principal Allies to the Fourteen Points, did not drive his policy home by pointing out the implications of their action, and challenging them to dispute his reading of it. Had he done so, many of the detailed disputes which wasted his strength and undermined his policy during the Paris Conference would have been avoided, and the Allied public would have learned in November, rather than in the spring, that, alone among the Allies, Italy had placed on record a reservation against the whole Wilson policy as unacceptable to her needs in the treaty with Austria. This Italian action, it should be stated, was strictly in order, although why it was not made public at the same time as the other reservations has never been made clear.

In any case, the agreement of 5th November, 1918, still stands. It is clear that, in the opinion of everyone but President Wilson, it has subsequently been violated in many particulars, especially in the economic sphere, and that "equality of trade conditions" and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first published, are a monument at once of folly and of bad faith, affords no reason why the November agreement should be violated in any of its particulars. Having appended our national signature to the Treaty of Versailles, we must honour its provisions, however odious we may regard them. We can in no way escape from this obligation, and the agreed definition of reparation, as Mr. Keynes points out in detail, are to be discovered in the voluminous economic details of the Treaty of Versailles. But the fact that the economic provisions of the Treaty of Versailles was pointed out in this journal when the summary of its draft terms was first

welding of all classes of men and wo-

Recent political events in Ireland have induced the Continental press to vigorously condemn the methods employed by the British authorities in their efforts to exasperate the Irish people. Deportations, suppression of the press, and other measures unbecoming by the outside world.

Amongst the many French journalists who write intelligently and sympathetically on the Irish question, M. Paul Louis takes the lead. His articles in *L'Humanité*, *"Le Peuple"* and *"Le Travail"* are a master of the intricacies of this subject which is sometimes rather evasive for the average foreigner. "Before England," states M. Louis in last Sunday's *"Humanité"*, "the French Government and the nations have learned that oppression breeds and develops the idea of Freedom. The British Empire interested itself in the Czechs, the Poles, the Armenians, the Turkish Armenians, the Armenians, the Jews, but it did not perceive that near at hand it was accomplishing the crimes with which it reproached Austria, Hungary and the German and Turkish Empires. The English have oppressed the peoples who were promised the right of self-determination, and still enslaved. Home Rule is altogether an inadequate measure, and if the Irish problem presents itself brutally to-day the English people have only their statement and their political action to thank for it."

The embargo placed on cargoes of coal destined for France and Italy by the British authorities last week has aroused much adverse criticism in this country. The embargo, which has already become so acute here that several factories have been closed down whilst others work only a few hours daily. A number of passenger trains have been cancelled and even the electric railway and tram services have been suspended. The Government has suspensions for want of motive force. As a consequence trade suffers severely and the industrial uplifting of France is very much hampered. Many workmen are idle and the Government is faced with the task in the near future so that the egotistical Englishman may have a comfortable fire and a well lined stomach during the Christmas holidays. Why these countries have been marked out for this treatment is not so easily comprehensible to erstwhile allies.

Last Friday at a banquet given by L'Union des Associations des Anciens Elèves des Ecoles Supérieures de Commerce, at the Metropolitan Club which was presided over by Mr. Delorme, Minister of Commerce, M. le Professeur Goblet delivered a very interesting lecture on "The possibilities of Franco-Irish Commerce." M. Adolphe Lémieux, formerly Canadian Minister of Commerce, Mr. Mahony, and M. MacWhite, President and Hon. Secretary of La Société Franco-Irlandaise, were amongst the guests of honour. M. Lémieux, who is a French Canadian, paid glowing tribute to the Irish people who rose to the highest rank in social and political life in every country but their own, and as long as the latter was dominated by England there would be no peace in the world and there could be no hope for the future.

"Many French people ask why the United States withhold its signature from the Peace Treaty but," said M. Lémieux, "I will tell you it is because the Irish question is yet unsettled and that a Canadian, who is a French Canadian, that after five years of war for the rights of peoples the streets of Cork and Dublin should be converted into a permanent ex-

hibition of tanks, armoured cars and cannon and the suppression of a nation whose sons fought so gallantly and sacrificed so many of their lives for the liberty of others."

M. Goblet after paying a tribute to M. Blanche, the French Consul in Dublin, for his untiring efforts in the development of Franco-Irish trade, outlined a course of action for French commercial men giving details of the various articles of French manufacture which find a ready sale in Ireland, and of Irish goods, are still scarce in this country. It is expected that steps will be taken by the various industrial bodies in Ireland to ensure the success of the French shipping company that is destined to break down the economic barrier that separates France from Ireland.

M.M.

The Irish Legion in Venezuela.

II.

The part played by the Irish Legion and its officers with Bolívar recalls the thrilling episodes of a century ago on the Spanish Main. The history of Empires is similar. The decline and fall of the Spanish power in the great South American Continent contains valuable lessons for all nations. It was accompanied by scenes of despotism and cruelty, and an unrelenting war of empire and was heightened by many Irishmen of military rank who had fought in the Rebellion of '98 or in the wars of Napoleon. Amongst these the name of General Devereux stands out prominently as the organizer of the Legion which bears his name.

Miles Byrne in his Memoirs (II., 228, ed. 1896) gives us an authoritative account of this patriot—

"I met John Devereux of Taghmon, Co. Wexford, at Paris in the month of March, 1812. He had to escape to the United States of America after the insurrection of 1798, and becoming a citizen of that great Republic, was sent on a mission to claim from the French Government American property in vessels which had been seized at Naples. Our common friend, Thomas Markey, at that time aide-de-camp to the Duke of Feltre, did all in his power to forward Mr. Devereux's mission. The Emperor being away from Paris with his army, Mr. Devereux could get no satisfactory answer to send to his Government at Washington, and he had to wait with patience the diplomatic decisions of Mr. Devereux, though very young, took an active part with Bagenal Harvey at the Battle of New Ross, on the 5th June, 1798, when he distinguished himself by his courage and bravery; and had Ireland succeeded in her independence he would have been one of the first to whom a civic crown would have been offered.

"Although John Devereux had not the happiness to see his native country free, as he ought to be, he had at least the glory, as one of President Bolívar's generals, to aid and assist that great man in giving the final blow for the independence of Spanish America, and one that that great country had her freedom assured she was not ungrateful. On General Bolívar's recommendation, she granted a tract of land to be made over for ever to General Devereux, as a mark of the country's esteem, and an acknowledgment of the great service he had rendered during the war, both physically and morally."

"General Devereux recruiting, organizing, and parading publicly his battalions in Ireland, previous to their being embarked for Spanish America, had a great moral effect. It gave people everywhere an opportunity of sympathizing with him in the sacred cause of liberty and humanity in which he was engaged; and it proved that the recognition of the European Powers might soon be expected to this glorious enterprise." This narrative throws a light on the rather tangled history of Venezuela, England at this time, and Ireland, and during the whole of the long struggle, lasting from 1811 to 1823, there was no official action taken by the English in favour of the Venezuelan patriots. On the other hand, there was no great effort made to prevent their great activity, and there was more than a thinly veiled connivance at the despatch of the Irish Legion. The English Government was as usual playing a double game, from which it derived great commercial advantage.

The actual conditions of service in Venezuela were terrible. There were several expeditions landed from England, but most of the soldiers left the service, disgusted with ill-treatment; the remainder, says General Holstein,

in his Memoirs of Bolívar (II., 32), perished miserably for want of food, fell victims to the climate. The following account of the Legion is given by this General, who was chief of Bolívar's staff—"The third legion was called the Irish Legion, because it was composed chiefly of Irishmen, and commanded by General Devereux, a native of Ireland. Young and enthusiastic, he departed for Buenos Ayres, where he offered his services in that new Republic. Not finding what he expected, he did not remain long, but came, in 1818, and offered his services to General Bolívar, with a certain quantity of arms, ammunition, and warlike stores, upon advantageous conditions and long terms of payment, as he was authorised to do by his friends in Ireland and England. The Supreme Chief accepted his offers, and this encouraged Devereux to go farther, and propose the formation of a legion in his native country, to be brought here to serve under his orders. He had the good fortune to please the Supreme Chief, who authorised him to raise such a legion, consisting of 5,000 men."

Such is the origin of the Irish Brigade formed a century ago to aid the liberation of the Spanish Colonies of Venezuela and New Granada, the latter now known as the State of Colombia. Bolívar told Devereux frankly, says Holstein, that he had no money at his disposal. Devereux replied that he wanted only a simple commission from him to act with full powers, and according to circumstances, for the benefit of Venezuela, with Bolívar's promise to approve his transactions in Great Britain, where he could obtain what he desired. This commission is very important, as it shows that the expedition was financed by General Devereux and his friends, and it gives the lie to the assertions of the English writers who pretend that he was an adventurer. It proves that Ireland helped Venezuela and Colombia with cash as well as men.

The Annual Register contains an entry under date 1819, mentioning that the summer of that year Marino with 2,000 men remained posted at Maturín in Cumana ready to co-operate with 1,500 Irish troops of General Devereux's Legion, which Bermúdez was organising in Margarita (an island off the coast of Venezuela).

The following is Holstein's account of the enrolment of the Irish Legion—

"Devereux arrived in Ireland with the necessary papers. Such was the state of the people that, by the aid of his friends, he was able to improve their condition and by means of his splendid representations and promises, numbers of his countrymen readily consented to take service in Venezuela: there have been various statements as to the number, but the manner in which he succeeded in doing so is beyond dispute. He sent, at different times, about 5,000 men to Angostura and Margarita, the greater part of whom had served before. He went to London and succeeded there also. Among his officers were many who had been apprised by their friends in St. Thomas and Jamaica of the miserable conditions of service on the Main, forced to embark; the number of these increased daily, and it has been reported that many of them were ready to give up their commissions and get back the money they had paid for them, but that Devereux, apprised of their intentions, kept out of their way, and hastened the departure of the remainder."

"He embarked at Liverpool in the English brig Ariel, with two aides-de-camp, one colonel, one major, one surgeon, one chaplain, and twenty-two privates. The General had chartered this brig under the command of a captain, and his company, to transport him and his companions to their native country, he purporting to be a merchant who had been shipwrecked.

"After sailing about a fortnight, having taken his measures well beforehand, he informed the captain and crew that he was the patriotic General Devereux, and ordered the master to take him to Margarita; on learning that he found neither his people nor the promised provisions. Being told that Brion and Montilla were gone with part of his men to Rio Hacha, he determined to join them. On arriving before this port, the Spanish colours hoisted, and his signal was not answered; he therefore cruised for some days, and not learning where Admiral Brion was, he sailed to Jamaica to obtain information. As soon as the news reached in Port Royal, a guard of marine troops, by order of the governor, to remain on board the brig until the Duke of Manchester should determine what was to be done with her. General Devereux asked leave from Commodore Hus-

kisson to go on shore with one of his aides, (who could obtain permission only for himself. During the passage the ship's crew had revolted three times, and generally had behaved very ill."

"General Devereux left Port Royal in July. He was well received at Savannah by Admiral Brion, but very coldly by Colonel Montilla. Caraguins are generally of a jealous temper, particularly with regard to their own interests. Montilla's aversion to them is notorious. The people of Cartagena (where he is now, by Bolívar's appointment, intendant and commander-in-chief of three departments) generally complain of his harsh manners, which, he confesses, struck me when I first met him, but upon further acquaintance I found him attentive, polite, and kind. He commended part of General Devereux's proposals, which, and embodied with him (Mr. Margarita). He feared that, by the superior rank of the General, he should fall under his command, and refused to submit to his orders. Some provocation passed between them, but no duel was fought. General Devereux being urged by his friends to take no steps against Montilla, but to absent himself for a while from the province of Cartagena, which he did. They then proceeded onward, and after the difference with Montilla General Devereux departed for Congress, which was then sitting at Cucuta, and of which General Antonio Nariño was Vice-President. Though Bolívar conferred upon him the rank of brigadier-general, before his departure for Great Britain, he had never served otherwise than as aide-de-camp to his father, and was not a military man. But being a landsman and fine-looking man, of great address, wit, intrigue, and discernment, he easily perceived the character of the Supreme Chief, and flattered him so adroitly as to gain his full confidence and to obtain from him full power, with the rank above mentioned. I have been assured that he never actually commanded his legion; for joined it, and he never has had any command since he has been in the service of Colombia. He remained at Cucuta as a brigadier-general."

Such is the interesting account of General Devereux, a Napoleonic officer who entered the service of Bolívar and retired to New York, where those Memoirs of Bolívar, published in the years 1824-9. The Army Roll of New Granada, under date 15th March, 1842, gives the following summary of his services—

"General John Devereux, having received orders from General Bolívar in January, 1819, to go to Ireland and set up an Irish Legion, was made a General of Division on December 14th of the same year, and landed with his Legion in January, 1820, when he at once entered on the campaign. He arrived on the Magdalena, was so anxious that he contracted a dangerous illness, which afflicted him with blindness in the closing years of his life."

"He handed over the command of the Legion to General Estigarribia on October 21, 1821, and was appointed on special military commissions till December, 1823, when he was appointed Colombian Envoy Extraordinary to the various European Courts, and sailed from Cartagena for England."

A Nation-Building

II.

[We continue from last week the sketch of Count Széchenyi, the pioneer of Hungary's independence, which was written by an Englishman, John Paget in 1838].

"Of the petty opposition which Count Széchenyi had to contend with, and the means by which he overcame it, I cannot speak here. I did not believe that any man possessed the indefatigable energy and perseverance necessary for the task. It requires a truly patriotic spirit to endure those miserable checks which arise from the selfish and interested meanness of the very persons one is labouring to benefit. The corporation of Pest did not think they were justified in giving up the town which the present world-bringer brought them in; the proprietors of land would not sell for such a purpose; the owners of houses here, feared the new bridge would be there, because they knew it would be better there; the very toll-keepers, and their friends and supporters, whose opposition, at times, made even a Széchenyi doubt of success."

One of the greatest of Széchenyi's achievements is the steam navigation of the Danube. This is his grand idea, and in accomplishment. It is now about six years since he first undertook the voyage from Pest to the Black Sea. A comfortable decked post, a good cook, and a pleasant

companion, with the means and apparatus for shooting, fishing, sketching and rowing, were not bad preparations against the fatigues and dangers to which he expected to be exposed. The comparative ease and safety of the navigation, the magnificence of the scenery, the size and importance of the tributary streams which poured their waters into the Danube, and the richness of the country on its banks, were secrets revealed to a mind which felt their full force, and had happily known how to employ them. Of course, the timid set him down as mad for undertaking such a journey; but when he returned, and ventured to whisper the possibility of steam navigation, even his boldest friends shook their heads. "Steam in Hungary! yes, indeed, in another century!" said those who never think the present the time for action. "Steam, indeed, in the shallows and rapids of the Danube! No; if we must have steam, why not take the plains? Nature has laid them out for rail-roads," said others, who oppose everything practicable by proposing something impracticable. Széchenyi let the first wait their time to the second, he recommended a speedy commencement of the rail-road, that the country might derive advantage from one, if not from both of their schemes.

In pursuance of his own plan, Széchenyi never again left England, studied carefully the principles of steam navigation; brought over English engineers; and, when at last certain of the practicability of the scheme, formed a company and purchased a steam-boat. It was in October 1830 that the first steam-boat started from Semlin and Pest; the communication is now complete from Vienna, and will soon be so from Retzbach to Smyrna. Thirteen vessels are employed, and a number more are building."

To detail the advantages of this undertaking in extending commerce, in developing the resources of the country, or in opening the road to civilisation by the spread of intelligence, were only to narrate what everyone knows, and steam navigation has effected, and will effect, wherever it is introduced; but in Hungary it has done more, it has engaged one of the proudest and richest aristocracies of Europe in a profitable commercial speculation. We shall show elsewhere that it is the exclusive privileges of this aristocracy that Hungary must impute, in a great degree, her want of commerce; how great a point has thus been gained may therefore be easily understood."

At first some of those whose hearts were better than their heads—and Hungary possesses a great number of that kind—would not hear of profitable speculation. "If it would become a national land, no other consideration was required; it would be degrading so noble an object to mix it up with such tradesman-like calculations." Széchenyi thought otherwise; and he felt assured that a profitable patriotism was the one by far the most likely to endure."

Count Széchenyi's first object was to make the undertaking answer as a commercial speculation. This is a favourite theme in his writings. He testifies by it of a nature to which it can be properly applied, for no one knows better how to sacrifice all pecuniary interest when he needs to do so, than Count Széchenyi; he knows that interest will back him, and he can then clinch his full purse in his opponents' faces, and laugh them out of their prejudices. Of all he has done for Hungary, I know of nothing more useful than this demonstration of co-existence and other necessary connection of public and private interest."

During the earlier part of the last Diet, a strong opposition was formed in the Upper Chamber, chiefly under the guidance of Széchenyi, which contained many of the most wealthy and talented of the rising generation. From their moderation, their union, and their knowledge of business, this party, though small in number, was acquiring so great an influence that the power of the Court was employed to break it up. The Transylvanian Magnates were called away by the opening of their own Diet. Those in Government employ were hastily recalled to Széchenyi kept in, and received a place or pension; another desired a decoration, and hung dishonour at his button-hole; and a third was too high for such poor bribery, he was recommended to travel, and accepted a passport to convey him from the sphere of his duty. Széchenyi, though deserted, was more difficult to dispose of, but that every man has his price" is always the belief of an immoral Government; and they found he was justified in giving up the town which the present world-bringer brought them in; the proprietors of land would not sell for such a purpose; the owners of houses here, feared the new bridge would be there, because they knew it would be better there; the very toll-keepers, and their friends and supporters, whose opposition, at times, made even a Széchenyi doubt of success."

One of the greatest of Széchenyi's achievements is the steam navigation of the Danube. This is his grand idea, and in accomplishment. It is now about six years since he first undertook the voyage from Pest to the Black Sea. A comfortable decked post, a good cook, and a pleasant

Whatever may be the difference in opinion as to the means, no one can doubt the reality of Széchenyi's object. It cannot be denied that the support of high moral principles, the unflinching advocacy of just rights, and the unyielding defence of the injured and oppressed, are yet more important to the well-being of mankind than the mere improvement of their material existence, but few in the Hungarian Diet have fulfilled these duties better than Széchenyi, while the other objects at which he has so industriously laboured, the defectors of his fame have entirely neglected."

Those who read Széchenyi's works, and know the reception which they met with—who are acquainted with the excessive national susceptibility of the Hungarians, and who recollect how just, and therefore how bitter, was the satire he directed against them—will not suspect him of seeking popularity, except so far as it is necessary to the furtherance of his objects. But Széchenyi's objects and hopes are best described by himself in concluding the "Hitel."

"The contents of my work will prove to all that I have all extremes, and all excesses; that I am a friend of moderation and harmony. Gladly would I see parties unite; and much more willingly would I sustain, by a middle path, the possible good, than vainly strive after that imaginary bliss, which we may probably never know but in a better world. I cannot, like many of my countrymen, please myself with contemplating what is past; I must look forward. It troubles me but little to know what we have done, but it interests me to know what with time, and what we probably shall become. The past is beyond our control; the future is still within our grasp. Away, then, with fruitless reminiscences! It is time that we bestir ourselves, and open our eyes to the future to our father-land. Many contend that Hungary has been; I love to think she yet will be."

The Limitations of the Language Movement

The recent lecture by Father Yorkie (delivered in Dublin, 6th September, 1899), has raised issues that need discussion, instant but calm, for the progress of the language movement has reached so far that something less academic than the mere reading and writing of Irish has become necessary.

"The movement," as one of its advocates has aptly put it, "is no longer in leading strings." It has a party behind it, and needs a public policy and an active membership to make it a permanent power. In six short years it has wrought an all but incredible change in the people, it has rehabilitated the old things in their minds and restored reverence to matters long looked upon with indifference, but it is long way from its goal—the de-Anglicisation of Ireland."

It may seem judicious for the members of the journalistic profession to endeavour to deepen and widen whatever gulf may exist between the educational and political movements in this country, but it is not so. We should see the justification. If, as both parties, they seek the same goal, though by different means, surely there is no reason why they cannot support each other, why they cannot become one great movement, and advance along the same broad road. If the language represents, and it certainly does, the incarnation of the highest ideal of National individuality, surely the language worker must regard with respect and friendship anything tending to foster this ideal. If an Irish-speaking Ireland is a desideratum, surely a Free Ireland is not less so seeing that it betokens all that by any possibility the other can bestow on us. I am not one of those who believe that it is desirable to leave off the pursuit of an Irish-speaking Ireland until we have obtained independence, but I am of the view that we should not sacrifice one iota of our prospects of freedom to secure the speaking of Gaelic. The irreconcilable between these two movements are entirely artificial. They are the product of fear on one side and ignorance on the other, and we need to rid ourselves of both ignorance and fear if we are determined to go on to the goal. The language movement as it is now, is a par with some Castle-bred plan for forcing Irish industries, or the brilliant idea of some noble "Irish" peer for pushing home the cause of the Gael. They have mistaken it; whatever its original raison d'être, it has become, and is daily becoming, an agent for the subversion of the false thing that has for so long masqueraded as Irish opinion. Insensibly, within the last few years,

"This was written by William Rooney in 1900—20 years ago."

we have all been affected by it; and as the years go on we shall be influenced still more. It is the force of the coming century, the new bond provided to re-unite a people weary of the squabbles and squalor of committee rooms and registration associations.

The Gaelic League has, up to the present, eschewed politics. Now, no politics is a very proper condition in an organisation for the promotion of a charity, or some such work, but it is a mistake in an organisation that has charged itself with the promotion of Irish Nationality. Besides, politics can be construed into anything bearing on the relations between us and Britain, and the Gaelic League, carrying out this view by refusing to take part in the commemoration of the anniversary of '89, took up a position occupied by every anti-Irish and anti-British individual in the country. Politics in Ireland are in no sense to be compared with politics elsewhere. In France or Germany every group of politicians is Nationalist before anything else, in England it is the same; but in Ireland the lines may roughly be divided between those who believe in an Irish Nation and those who do not. From the former will come the bulk of support for anything National, a few thinking individuals on the other side may, while denying the necessity for separate existence, favour the development of National characteristics, but the bulk of their company will always follow the broad cart. Among other matters, over which the popular conception is somewhat clouded, is this question of politics, for with most of us politics has begun and ended with Parliamentarianism, but it surely needs but a little reflection to see that "politics" even in Ireland, is broader than its supposed synonym—yet the projectors of the language movement refuse to allow the branches of their organisation to take part in any public Nationalist propaganda. They see this actually betraying to the hands of those people who have led, and still seek to lead, people to believe that the question of the language is a mere academic affair, a sentimental business, suitable enough for a free people to bother their heads about, but for us a *deus ex machina* designed to attract attention from the bulk of the question. The present position of the language is primarily due to two things—its discouragement at one time by the Catholic Episcopate and its discarding by the Parliamentary politicians. It had been a double sense; its natural protectors contemned it, and those who sought to spread it were interested in it only as a means of proselytising. Such organisations as Theophilus O'Flanagan's "Gaelic Society," Edward O'Reilly's "Hiberno-Celtic Society," and the Gaelic League, which never appealed to the people; their concern was the literature of the Gael, and they affected the most arcaic specimens they could find. It is a fact that the first attempt made to teach the Irish masses to read and write was made by the Irish Church Mission Society, through the books specially written for the purpose by Tadhg Connellan and Dr. Neilson. They were intended to pervert the people. They failed, for the people refused to meet with the proselytising of the Catholic leaders, clerical and lay, took no steps to meet them on their own ground. Emancipation came, the baneful "National Schools" followed, Dr. Mac Hale alone protesting against them. No effort was made to teach the tongue of five-sixths of the population taught in these schools; the fact being that there was no Catholic on the Board sufficiently astute for "Shovel-Hat." Whately. The Penal Code having crushed the spirit out of the Catholic Party they were glad to accept anything; and the evil fruit of compromise is now only too apparent. The famine furthered the ruin, and fifty years of indifference has all but wrought the consummation. I say fifty years of indifference, not use as that during that time O'Curry, O'Donovan, Hennessy, Stokes, Standish O'Grady, O'Daly, and all the great Continentalist Celts laboured; but their work appeared not to the Nation they were preoccupied with the dry bones, not perpetuating the living soul of the language. Anything done of a popular nature was done by politicians—not Parliamentary politicians merely, but such thinkers on public affairs as Davis, Michael, J. J. O'Connell, John O'Mahony, and O'Donovan Rossa. I dealt some time ago with the reasons which persuaded Young Ireland to write for Ireland in English. No reader of the "Spirit of the Nation" can fail to be convinced that the men who gave us this inspiring paper loved the Irish tongue; every page is eloquent of the fact. Similarly, John

O'Mahony's translation of Keating, his chattering of the revolutionary organisation, his whole life, are testimony of his interest in, and advocacy of, the old Gaelic. O'Donovan Rossa's life and actions are equally proof of his attachment to the language, for he has never lost an opportunity of using Irish wherever it was possible to use it effectively. The present uprise of interest in the matter is the first great general move for its renaissance. It came to the people at a favourable time—when their eyes had been opened, more or less, to the chasm whither a union with British ideas was leading them. They were halted, almost on the brink, and they have considerably retraced their steps toward the proper path. The men who sought to lead them back from that path in the past were merely men uninterested in the pressing questions of the hour, men who revered the past for its majesty, but despaired of ever emulating it in the future. The Gaelic League also reverences the past, but we must not live wholly on its reputation or lose ourselves entirely in the contemplation of it. If Gaelic is to become the power of the Ireland of tomorrow, it is to take, even moderately, the place of English, we must make Gaelic the medium for the discussion of all the questions of the day. We must not make it the language of the peasantry, else it will only fill the place of the ornamental, where its natural position should be the necessary. This will mean such an agitation as in Buda-Pesth has secured a state of affairs deeply abhorred by Professor Mahaffy; but agitation means politics, more or less, and we must not have to face it, if it is not to come to a standstill.

Let us examine the arguments against such a scheme. If we take part in public affairs we may, not unlikely, sacrifice the assistance of all who are on the other side; for we shall have to assail the system of education, and that being a Government creation, subsidised by all loyal subjects. We shall lose the help of all those enjoying Government positions; we shall possibly be regarded as incendiaries by a section of the clergy, and without a doubt the whole little support is already accorded us by the Press. Yet we can never force this question to its conclusion by meetings however monster or classes however earnest. "The evil system must be reformed and disrupted. The shame of knowing Irish has, to a great extent, become a thing of the past, but the pride of knowing English and perpetually showing it, is as strong as ever. Something more convincing than night-schools, more drastic than resolutions, will be necessary to make shopkeepers of the various towns do their duty by the language. Most of us remember how obsequious to the landlord and his agents were our merchants twenty-five years ago. Though the Land League was not immaculate, it did one fine thing in scotching shoneism. Something of the same nature is needed again; for the country people take their manners, in great measure, from the townspeople and villagers, and we must make these as Irish as possible if we would properly affect the country people. This will be no easy task, for our ordinary "merchant" cares very little for anything unless he sees a "return" in it for the energy he expends. He has no time, he will tell you, to bother about reading or writing Irish. We must force him, and we cannot do that by allowing the movement to remain a question merely for the young and the enthusiastic. We must lay bare the inconsistency of affecting an interest in Irish, and speaking nothing but English. We must, in short, take off our coats and prove that this is a movement that moves; that it has come to stay, and come to carry the indifferent along, whether they like it or not.

To do this needs resolve, determination, a fearless appeal to the people on the broad grounds of Ireland versus England. The people will rise to such a programme, and the Gaelic League will be well advised to consider it.

Luke Burke

PATRICK STREET, CORK

FOR GENTS' SHIRTS, UNDERWEAR,

SOCKS, etc.,

At specially keen prices.

Patsy Patrick on America and Ireland

"This is a great country," said Terry. "Tis," replied Patsy, "Tis a great country 'n' is a great time in a great country. America is now the world's master. I'm thinkin' there are many Americans who love to say the by-and-bye an' are now beginnin' to see that they owe the true perspective o' their country's greatness to the hyphenated Irish. They'll agree the Irish have some eye for national dignity. O' course anyone with a glimmer could see that America was the hoga o' the world—the one o' any internal abler, the hyphenated o' the earth's scales o' justice. I'm sorry for the man that handled the weights for the mighty liberty loving country. He looked the business. He filled the bill. He knew the weights, an' showed us the fourteen points that he could amend the rules so as to give us a perfect balance o' the beam o' justice."

"An' what happened then?" interrupted Terry. "He got tricked," replied Patsy. "As they say over there they got his number. I know an old Englishman came to the Macore county where the Macore came in for all the world like the seagulls do out in a storm, an' he got in as a dairyman in Mogue Milligan's dove at the Bawn. He'd the quard way with him, an' ye couldn't b' lieve the state o' the weather out in his month, not but the people were a long time findin' out that same, when he'd forgot he'd borrowed this thing o' that an' think 'twas his own. 'Twas at the scales they found him out. He used to sell a firkin o' butter now an' then, an' a sack iv oats an' the like, an' the people remarked that he didn't seem to care a dinkers dam about the way the beam o' the scales was balanced, or give a bawnoogee there about the weights. 'Twas after a bit when 'twas found out that there was a big craugh o' salt in the middle o' the firkin o' butter an' a few big ones in the middle o' the sack iv oats, that the neighbours got to know the meanin' iv the Englishman's disdain iv the balance o' the weights. Then they got wise to it as they say in this country."

"What's that got to do with the Peace Conference?" asked Terry. "Everything," returned Patsy. "The weigh master was beaten 'cause he didn't get wise to the craugh o' salt in the roll o' butter. He trusted Lied George. I've thought iv a point or two iv the fourteen an' hinted that the bulk iv the butter looked small for the weight Lied George would say he'd a secret treaty wid the cork that gave the milk that made the cream that made the butter, an' that iv he'd cut the roll it meant a scrap o' paper, an' the master of the scales is high an' go on watchin' the weights an' the beam o' the scales. I felt sorry for Winton. He'd the greatest chance iv any man for centuries to write his name large on the table o' the world's history. He'd his countrymen with him—he'd every honest man with him he was, I told you the world's weigh-master. He failed. I felt sorry for him, but far more so for his country, for the young crusaders who went in an' with valour won the war for the principles iv the correct beam an' scales. They didn't win the war, but they had a craugh o' salt in the roll o' butter or pavin' stones in the sack iv oats. They were as they say themselves, badly stung."

"They'll right themselves," said Terry. "Sure," replied Patsy, "they've already righted themselves, an' I'm thinkin' Edward Grey 'll tell them that when he gets back. England can put her Ceiled League o' Nations on the top shelf o' the British Museum. She can put Beckett's boxer gloves on Lied George an' challenge Amnias. I take it England will keep on the game for a while longer. Lied George 'll spell bind the English democracy. It's a democracy that reads 'John Bull' an' the 'Daily Mail' an' 'll swallow an' Imperialist war whoop as ready as a hungry con man. I take it they'll be warring for days in the separate cell o' England won't play that game on the common people iv America. She may an' is tryin' to get a home run with the like o' Fox of Red Mick Hyland, but she won't do America by givin' her people the like o' Lied George an' an 'sheddin' mudlin' rains singin' 'An' in Lang Syne. She can't an' that De Valera has cooked her goose."

"He's a wonderful man," remarked Terry.

"A man o' destiny," rejoined Patsy. "He's a great being 'cause he's an honest man an' he stands for truth an' right. So America has taken him to her heart. America listens an' applauds an' appreciates. For why? Because America recognises in the man the voice o' the Evangel o' Irish nationality. England may try her Foxes, her Flynn's, her Jey's or her Red Mick, but America will just say 'nuthin' doin'." No Terry, England may have many a man on the run in Ireland, but she'll never see England fairly well on the run in America. As John said to me 'th' other da' the defeat o' the League o' Nations is the greatest England has suffered in America since Washington drove them to the sea.

"Ireland 'll win," said Terry. "Ireland will win," replied Patsy.

"because her people at home will stick true to the grey cause. It is in Ireland they hold the key to open the flood gates of the world deluge that will submerge tyranny." "The key is safe enough," said Terry. "An' is a master key," rejoined Patsy.

Ireland and the Cinematograph Industry

The Film Company of Ireland commenced its career in the stirring year of 1916. Since then it has produced from time to time some fifteen films illustrating the episodes of Irish life, and a score of Irish scenes. The company was promoted by the late Mrs. James Mark Sullivan, with Mr. James M. Sullivan as Managing Director, and Mr. Sean MacDonagh as Producer. The establishment of an Irish film company was a task of great labour and difficulty. Conditions in Ireland, rich as they are in events of historic drama, did not lend themselves to the peaceful pursuits of the camera. A country in the re-making is not easy ground for productive enterprises. But the Film Company has survived many vicissitudes, and is now steadily adding to its repertoire a remarkable series of pictures of the past social life of our country.

It is too early yet to judge the work of the Film Company of Ireland. It has not yet secured a site for a permanent studio, and its work has been done in the open or in foreign studios. It has not yet had a fair chance to develop its art to the full extent of the resources of our country. Much technical detail of its equipment, and much practical knowledge has yet to be added before the period of development is completed. The picture business in Ireland has developed rapidly from a commercial point of view, but the production of Irish films is but commencing its career in the studio.

The difficulties and uncertainties of working in the open in our climate are not always considered favourable for the purposes of picture-making. Nevertheless the Film Company has produced a number of interesting and successful pictures, notably "Knocknagow," which is having a great run in the United States. It has recently concluded a story from one of William Carleton's tales, founded on fact, and giving a vivid picture of social life in the Ireland of the 18th century. This is the first of Carleton's tales to be dramatised for the pictures, and it is the beginning of a new effort, the bringing of a new ground, which will bring to flowering and fruit the romances of the past—with lessons for the present. G. T.

M. ROCHE

Watchmaker, Jeweller, Silversmith and Optician,
60 PATRICK STREET, CORK.

Engagement and Wedding Rings, Watches, Jewellery, Clocks, Wedding Presents, Sports Prizes, Watch and Jewellery Repairs a Specialty.

A. S. CLARKIN

FOR BEST HOUSE COALS.
204 GT. BRUNSWICK STREET, DUBLIN.
Telephone 2716.

AN SIODA JAEOEALAC

1 SCORCAIS.

LATEST BOOKS.

"When we were Boys" by William O'Brien, 1/6
"Glimmer of Cork," D. L. Kay, 2/6
"Cork's Own Town," D. L. Kay, 1/-

Postage Extra.
Largest stock of Irish-Ireland Publications in the South of Ireland.

"FOUNTAIN BOOK SHOP," CORK.

INCOME TAX AND DEATH DUTIES

TAXPAYERS, PLEASE NOTE.
Income Tax recovered. Exemptions and reductions obtained. Returns filled up. Accounts prepared for the Estate Duty Office. Estates, Legacy and Succession Duty. Up-to-date expert knowledge. Inside official experience.

FRIEL AND DUGGAN,

Income Tax Experts and Death Duty Accountants.
22 NABBAU STREET, DUBLIN.
M. J. Friel, B.A., (Late Examiners of Accounts and Affidavits, Estate Duty Office, Dublin.)
E. Duggan, (Do.)

RESULT OF DRAWING FOR DESERVING OBJECT.

1st Prize.....£1300 (W. Walsh).
2nd Prize.....£1691 (S. O'Connell).
3rd Prize.....£175 (Dora Kelly).
Prizes to be called for at 117 Donore Terrace up to 8 p.m. on Friday, 22nd January, 1920.
Late for last issue owing to early publication.

THE IRISH TWEED HOUSE

We have the largest variety of Indian Blue Sergees, Irish Tweeds, and Irish Dressings in Ireland. Suits made to Order from Irish tweeds by expert cutters and Irish Labour exclusively. Patterns and self-measurement forms sent anywhere.

4 CAPEL ST., DUBLIN (In Grafton Bridge) & Kingstown.
John Nelligan, PROPRIETOR.

Terms—Cash.

BOWLER'S
FOR HIGH-CLASS TAILORING.
PERFECTION IN FIT AND
STYLE GUARANTEED.
Irish Material only Stocked.
1 LR. ORMOND QT., DUBLIN.

WARPIPES

You cannot get better than the best. Our Warpipes are Irish. Manufactured through-out in our own workshops by skilled craftsmen. They are used by nearly all the Pipes' Bands in Ireland. They have pleased them—they will please you. We are making new arrangements to increase our output, so send us your orders.

Large and varied stock of Drums, Flutes, Practice Chanters, and all Band Instruments and Accessories.

SEND FOR OUR NEW PRICE LIST.

PIANOS

Our Showrooms are always stocked with instruments by all the best makers. We have also a magnificent range of Secondhand and Shop-soiled Pianos—German and English make—at all prices. We will gladly send you a list of these on request.

D. McCullough

8 Howard Street, Belfast

N.B.—Our friends and customers will be glad to learn that we are opening new Show Rooms at 28 Parliament Street, Dublin.

Seasonable Presents.

Our Stocks are selected with infants care. All pieces of Quality & Value. That Please.

Presents for Ladies and Gentlemen in Jewellery and Solid Silver at Moderate Prices.

SILVER FACTORY
W. Egan & Sons
WATCHMAKERS & JEWELLERS
32 PATRICK ST. CORK

A TIMELY REMINDER TO ALL DRAPERS

INTERESTED IN IRISH GOODS.

Special Stock of Winter Hosiery Socks, Stockings, Gloves, Etc.

All made at St. Ita's Knitting Industry, CONVENT OF MERCY, Ennis, Co. Clare.

Dublin Agents: Mr. F. J. H. O'DONNELL, 18 Hume Street.

It's Irish!

Edwards' Desiccated Soup is an Irish product that is used all over the world.

Keep a packet of E.D.S. handy and turn your larder odds and ends into savoury appetising stews.

EDWARDS' DESICCATED SOUPS

Costs only 1 1/2d. per packet. Also in Cans 1/2d. 1/- and 2/- E.D.S. is made in Ireland.

Maynooth Mission to China

The Irish National Mission to China has its College at Dalgan Park, Galway. Three hundred Students have applied for admission to the College but we have been obliged to refuse them for want of accommodation. With the greatest difficulty and inconvenience we have provided room for 42 Students. We are forced to extend our living space very considerably, and we rely on the Catholic people of Ireland to assist us. We depend altogether on their charity.

HOW CAN YOU ASSIST?

The best way for you and for the Mission to China are:—

- 1.—Become Promoters for the Irish Mission League.
- 2.—Get and read the "Far East," our Monthly Magazine.

Write immediately for all particulars to:
REV. JOHN BLOWICK,
St. Columban's College,
Dalgan Park,
Galway.

By assisting in this work you obtain the following advantages:—

- 1.—You get the Apostolic Blessing of Our Holy Father the Pope.
- 2.—You share in 1,500 Masses every year.
- 3.—Mass is offered every morning in St. Columban's for your intentions.
- 4.—Solemn Requiem Mass is offered each year on the 2nd of November for all deceased benefactors of the Mission.
- 5.—The Office for the Dead is said once a month for all deceased benefactors.
- 6.—Special public prayers are said each day for you.

Write for particulars and information at once. Your aid is urgently needed!

DARK DAYS AHEAD

There may be dark days ahead, but those who use our

IRISH MANUFACTURED CARBIDE of CALCIUM

are assured of the maximum light in their houses and establishments at night.

PROMPT DELIVERIES. PRICES ON APPLICATION.
ACETYLENE & CARBIDE Ltd., 143 Royal Ave., Belfast
and at 11 BURGESS QUAY, DUBLIN. Factory at COLLOONEY.

The Roy Chocolate and Sweet Works.

A Model Factory Equipped with Modern Machinery.

MILLIONS OF MONEY LEAVE IRELAND FOR FOREIGN SWEETS. THINK OF THE EMPLOYMENT WE COULD GIVE AND THE MANY HOMES IT WOULD GLADLY IF THIS MONEY CAME TO US.

Every Irish Child should be taught to ask for Irish Sweets.

EVERY IRISH SWEET BOUGHT IS A LITTLE PEBBLE IN THE BUILDING UP OF A PROSPEROUS COUNTRY.

"True worth is in being, not seeming,
In doing each day that goes by
Some little act—not in dreaming
Of great things to do by and by."

MILROY BROS.,

CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN.

Telephone 1089.

Telegrams—"Chocolate."

John Clarke

THE ONLY REPUBLICAN WHOLESALE BUTTER, CHEESE, MARGARINE, AND EGG MERCHANT IN DUBLIN.

We do not trade in sentiment, but our opponents have published the fact to injure us in our business, and to improve their own.

Note Address . . .

28 St. Richmond St.

W. K. CAHILL

(Late of Cahill, Opposed to the House of the Poor.)



22 Dawson Street, Dublin.

Repairs and Post Orders a Speciality.

O'NEILL'S

For Value in

IRISH BUTTER, BACON AND HAMS

Note . . .

60 UPPER DORSET STREET, DUBLIN.

McD.A.A.

BOLANDS, LTD.

BREAD, FLOUR, CONFECTIONERY.

RICH CAKES, PLAIN AND ORNAMENTED.

Bakeries . . .

GRAND CANAL QUAY, AND CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN.

MODEL BAKERY, KINGSTOWN.

Mills . . .

RINGBEND ROAD, DUBLIN.

SUPPORT IRISH MILLING.

STOP PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX.

Until we have reduced your Income Tax Demands to your correct liability. Claim repayment now if you have overpaid during the past three years. Consult us. Write or call. I have official knowledge at the disposal of our clients.

THE PROVINCIAL INCOME TAX RECOVERY AGENCY.

Proprietors: Sean Nolan and S. J. Moynihan (Late of Income Tax Department).

AN SAEARAL COMPAIGN CAIGHE UM SHARADH NAIRINDE, GEORANTA

The Irish National Assurance Company, Limited

THE ONLY IRISH LIFE AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

TRADING CAPITAL: £1,000,000. Public Guarantees, Accidents, Sickness, Motor Car, Fire, Ship, and other Insurances.

£25,000 invested in Irish Trustee Stocks as Security for the Life Policy Holders.

£5,000,000 in dividend of Ireland yearly in Assurance Dividends. You can, by investing with the Irish National, help to retain this huge sum in Ireland for the upbuilding of the Irish Nation. We guarantee that all our funds will be invested in Ireland, and used in Irish Enterprise.

An Agency with the IRISH NATIONAL pays and makes openings for some good workers.

LAWRENCE CASEY, General Manager.

TO OUR EXILES IN GLASGOW: Sean Henry, 411 Gallowgate, is our Representative in your City. Help him to build up a great Irish Enterprise.

Gramophones. Records.

LARGEST STOCKS IN IRELAND.

IMMEDIATE DELIVERY.

H.M.V., COLUMBIA & ZONOPHONE.

JOHN O'NEILL,

SOUTH KING STREET, DUBLIN.

Phones, 3726 & 3717.

GRAMOPHONES

HORN and HORNLESS MODELS.

From £5 10s. 0d. to £12 (Cash).

Records from 3/6.

Including: Silhouette, O'Donnell Abu, West & Ayns, Boys of Westford, "G.S.", A Nation Once, Eileen Aghamah, Kathleen Maroun, and

Needles—200 for 1/6.

T. NEESON, 184 North King Street, Dublin.

L. J. Berney

Dental Surgery, 33 Westmoreland St., Dublin.

IRISH MADE CIGARETTES

For Men's Shirts, Hosiery, Caps, &c.

ΠΑΡΟΙΣ 6 χαλμυράν

ΒΡΑΙΟ ΛΙΑΜ 10, ΛΙΜΜΕΑΚ.

LOOK AFTER YOUR BIKES.

Repairs to all Makes. First Class Work. MODERATE CHARGES.

HERON'S,

7 Upper Baggot Street, Dublin.

McDowell

BROTHERS. Established 1845

Lucky . . . Engagement and Wedding Rings.

27 HENRY STREET and 10 ST. GEORGE'S ST., DUBLIN.

DOWLING & M'GUINNESS

1 North Frederick Street, DUBLIN.

BOOKSELLERS and BUYERS. STATIONERS and TOBACCONISTS.

Wholesale and Retail Agents for the European Edition of the "Chicago Tribune." Comes daily from Paris, price 3d. Republican Christmas Cards, enormous stock. Wire name brochures wholesale and retail.

John Kivlehan

20 CONNELL ST., LIMERICK

ΣΙΟΡΑ ΝΑ ΝΣΑΕΘΕΑΛ

A few of our specialties:—Football (Irish made), 10/6, 18/6, 21/6, 24/6. Football (Irish made), 10/6 and 23/6. Jersey, 5/6 and 6/6. Knicker, 3/6 and 4/6. Inflators, 3/6. Camara, 4/6, 5/6, and 6/6. Camote, 2/6 and 3/6. Hurley Balls (match) 5/6.

CLINCH & GLEESON NAVAN

Razors.

BEST STOCK IN IRELAND. PRICES TO SUIT ALL.

Three Special Lines:—

The Shandon Ring	McQuillan's Special	Extra Hollow
7/6	10/6	12/6

Every one guaranteed.

Your Old Razor and Set, 2/6, post free.

McQuillan,

35-38 CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN.

Patrick Mahon

National Printer

DUBLIN

Phone 603.

McGann & McGann

Can give you the benefit of a Lifetime's Experience as AUCTIONEERS, VALUERS, HOUSE AND ESTATE AGENTS. CATTLE, SHEEP, PIG, & WOOL SALESMEN. MEADOW LETTINGS. LIVE STOCK SALES, ETC., conducted in any part of the country.

Note Only Address:—

77 QUEEN STREET, DUBLIN.

All Classes of Work Made to Order.

WILLIAM O'DEA

Wicker Furniture and Basket Manufacturer

34 Parnell Street, Dublin.

Repairs neatly executed. Estimates free.

Electrical Engineer and Contractor.

JOHN P. ATKINS

For Electric Motors, Lighting, Heating, Bells and Telephones.

Phone 2570.

70 South Circular Road and Spencer Street, Dublin.

McKEOWN, MacKEOGH & Co.

4 HAYMARKET, DUBLIN.

Auctioneers, Cattle, Sheep and Pig Salesmen, Farm Produce Factors, etc.

Phones: Office, No. 3, Laiba, 3020. Stand Corn Exchange, 106, Laiba, 38 Manor Street.

Νορ Ουρ ποσλ μαλ πιαλ Ρακ

p. ua muipeazam,

Dental Surgery, 67 SOUTH RICHMOND ST., Dublin.

PREPAID ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements under this head are charged for at the rate of 1d. per word; minimum, 3/6.

SITUATIONS VACANT.

AGENTS WANTED: To sell Irish-made products—a few good lines—to hardware and general merchants, drapers, etc., throughout Munster, west commission paid. Previous experience not necessary but honesty, energy and ability to open up a trade vital; a good opening for men of whom there are few in Irish development. Apply to "Development," this Office.

BE INDEPENDENT FOR LIFE—A progressive Irish company offers splendid opportunities to pushing, capable men and women to build up remunerative business connections for themselves, and to secure their future careers. We can send you signed statements from some of our agents, who earn from £25 to £200 per week. Good commissions are paid. Write at once for agency literature and terms, and secure your territory. Only live, energetic Irish-Irelanders prepared to hustle for business are required. State present conditions and capabilities when writing. Apply to "Fourth & Sixth," 4th & 6th Og's Office.

MISCELLANEOUS

COATINGS EMBROIDERY (Irish-made). Before any brand can be sent by Post. Trade Mark.

IRISH LACE—direct from First Prize Workers—Genuine—Foster Lane Depot, 44 Mary St., Dublin. Delivery at ready for foreign postage from 2/6 each.

ELECTION BADGES—Sun & Fein and Labour, with colours, 1000 in ribbon and paper, 1d. and 2d. each. Trade supplied. Large Art Calendar for 1920; The Irish Volunteer in College Green, 1916, price 1/6. Republican Badges, Tricolour Flags, etc. Best wholesale terms for cash—The Irish Supply Dept., 20 Richmond, Dublin.

NOTICES

PRISONERS' DEVIATIONS: Full—Result of Draw will appear in next week's issue.

P. Conway & Co.

Tobacconists

31 Exchange St., Dublin.

ESTABLISHED 1854.

W. MCGABE,

Church and House Decorator,

9 LARISSA VILLAS, KIMMAGE RD., DUBLIN.

First Class Work. Estimates Free.

YOU CANNOT SUPPRESS

The feeling of satisfaction which Leander Margarine gives you is a daily well. In favour it is delicious, and its nutriment is equal to the choicest butter. . . .

LEANDER MARGARINE

Has built up its unrivalled reputation in excellence of quality. Irish-made Leander is the best. "Leander" surpasses all other brands. Don't wait until to-morrow. Give your Grocer a Sample Order to-day. . . .

MADE IN GORK.

DOWDALL O'MAHONEY, LTD.

HOME HAPPINESS GOES



MAGEE'S

Provisions & Groceries

WM. MAGEE & CO., Rathmines, TERNUR & BLACROCK, CO. DUBLIN.

WHOLESALE AGENTS: Dublin—Messrs. Dawson and Son, Gt. Brunswick St., and Belfast. Messrs. Dawson and Son, 5 & 6 Molesworth Place, Molesworth Street. Belfast—Messrs. C. Porter and Co., 123 and 125 Old Lodge Road. Cork—Messrs. Sean O'Callaghan & Co., 95 Patrick St. Messrs. News Bros., 20 Bowling Green Street. Tralee—E. O'Connor, 42 Nelson St. Liverpool—Peter Murphy, 13 Scotland Place.

Printed by Patrick Mahon, 3 Yarnall St., Dublin, and published by the Proprietors, at their Office, 204 St. Brunsrick Street, Dublin.