

He adds, in another place, that the rates of transportation of these emigrants would amount to a sum less than it would cost to support them in the workhouse for a single year. That is one point of view of the question. I do not doubt that this was a scheme approved of by the then Lord Lansdowne from humane motives; its execution was grossly faulty. Its history is still told, and the hill sides of Kerry, and the traditions of the place kept alive the story of the Lansdowne ward in New York Hospital, where many of these ill-starred emigrants fell victims to disease and death.

It is curious that the present agent seems to have denied strenuously the existence of distress on the Lansdowne estate in 1879-80, and to have refused to act upon any of the relief committees established in the neighbourhood. To Dr. Fox, the Government Inspector; to Mr. Fletcher, a member of the Duchess of Marlborough's Relief Committee; and to the Rev. Canon Bagot, representing the Mansion House Committee, he is reported to have given emphatic denials of the existence of any distress in the district; indeed, so far as has been ascertained, the first occasion on which he admitted its existence was in April, 1880, when he applied to the Mansion House Committee for funds to promote a new emigration scheme. I mention with pain one fact. The Nun of Kenmare, to whom I have already alluded, one of the Sisters in the convent of Poor Clares, in Kenmare, a lady not less known for her active benevolence than for her literary work, in her printed expression of thanks to America for the funds entrusted to her for relieving the distressed tenantry, says, under the date of Easter week, 1879:—

One land agent said to me that when he saw the distress coming he told his noble master that it would be the best thing that had ever happened for the landlord; they would have their tenants at their mercy.

He adds:—

These same land agents were the principal cause of the distress being denied, for clearly if the distress were admitted to demand rents and rack rents from the starving people would have been too gross an act of inhumanity.

It can hardly be doubted to whom this language refers. I hope it may be shown to be the result of some grave misapprehension. The lady by her public appeals collected a sum of about £15,000, which was in great part expended in South Kerry. She assured me that many tenants of Lord Lansdowne had been recipients of blankets, of meal, of seed potatoes, and that as to three national schools, attended principally by the children on Lord Lansdowne's estate—namely those of Laragh, Lehud, and Copperas, one of them being placed outside the entrance gate of Derreen House, she had to supply clothes to cover the children. She had done so in consequence of the statements made to her by the schoolmistress that, for the sake of decency, they could not otherwise allow the children to attend the schools, even if their parents were willing to permit them to do so. One gentleman also, conversant with the action of the relief committees in the town, informed us that fully half of the relief which passed through his hands had been given to Lord Lansdowne's tenants. He said—

The people came crying to me for it; in fact, on his estate there were tenants who called on me personally between the dates of the meetings of the committee asking me for God's sake, to give them supplemental orders for meal.

He added that of these tenants many were living upon the produce of the seed potatoes supplied by charity. He added further that Lord Lansdowne had brought some forty tons of potatoes to Kenmare, which had been sold for cash at something below the market price; that these were wholly insufficient to sow the land; and he finally added—

My belief is that were it not for the relief given by our committees a great number of the Lansdowne tenants would have died.

This emphatic testimony certainly received corroboration in several other quarters. Compared with other estates which I visited, the rents, tested by Griffiths' valuation, are not the highest. Indeed, taking some dozen cases or more, I found that the rent did not exceed the valuation by more than about 35 to 40 per cent., and yet I believe the cases to be exceedingly few in which the tenants could out of the land pay the existing rent if they reserved to themselves a sufficiency of food and of clothing for decent maintenance. The normal food of the tenants is as I have described it to be elsewhere. It is a noticeable fact that in one house, and in one house only, and on this estate, did I see a piece of bacon hanging up in the kitchen. I was struck with this, and with the otherwise greater comfort of the dwelling. I complimented the tenant upon what I presumed was his greater industry or his better management. His answer was pithy and to the point. He said, "I never could afford that, or to live anyway decent out of the land." "How then do you afford it?" I asked. His answer was satisfactory. He was an ex-policeman, with a pension of £44 a year. In one case, and that of a tenant, who seemed much better off than the rest, we took the trouble of ascertaining as accurately as we could a profit and loss account. This was the case of a widow whose story illustrated another subject much complained of by the tenants—namely, rent raisings on the occasion of the tenants marrying. Her son wanted to get married, and thereupon, with her consent, to get the land transferred into his own name, he went to the office for permission, which was promised conditionally upon the rent being raised. This he declined, and married without permission, his mother's name remaining on the books as tenant. The rent was about £23, the valuation about £17; the holding contained grass for ten cows. He estimated his profits thus—12 firkins of butter, which would fetch about £40. Owing, he said, to the bareness of the land he would not get the highest price. His profits from rearing and selling young stock cattle, would be about £6, and from the keeping of a few sheep about £5. He grew only enough potatoes and oats for home consumption—none for sale. In addition to the potatoes raised he reckoned that he expended on Indian meal close on £17; on flour, groceries, clothes, and like luxuries, about £25; and in wages of servants, indoor and out, about £18; showing, after the support of his family, a loss of some £30 a year. Pressed to explain this, and how, notwithstanding, he managed to live, he said he married a fortune of £100, all of which was gone, and he

owed in the town nearly £100 more. He said that he had been getting out of debt in the good years, but was now sunk again, and another bad year would ruin him altogether. His family consisted of eight persons in all, including servants.

I reserve the further consideration of Lord Lansdowne's Kenmare estate for another letter.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
CHARLES RUSSELL.

### A STIRRING SPEECH.

At the land meeting at Killoock, on December 5, the Rev. Hugh Behan, P.P., who said he had nominated Mr. Parnell when he first stood for the county Meath is reported by the *Leinster Leader* also to have spoken as follows:—

Charles Stewart Parnell is accused of a great many crimes, and so is T. D. Sullivan, and all their followers. They are about being arraigned as you know at present, and will in a few days be involved in a State prosecution. I don't know how many counts there are against them, but I will tell you one or two. They have, so the Government says, upset the contracts that have existed between landlords and tenants. Now what are these contracts? What is a contract? A contract means a bargain between man and man on fair grounds. If you go into my friend, Mr. Kelly, (laughter) for a 4lb loaf, and that he wants to pawn a twopenny on you, would you give him the fourpence? If you go into any merchant or trader, and that they want to pawn bad goods upon you for your good money, you will enter into no contract with these people, and why? because you can go elsewhere and get the value of your money. But it is different with the poor tenant farmer; he cannot go elsewhere. What sort of a contract would it be between a cat and a mouse (laughter). The landlords, most of them, were the cats, and we the poor mice; we had to take his terms or go to America, if we were able, or rot in the workhouse. (Hear, hear.) These were not fair contracts, because the tenant was not a free agent, and I say that to upset unfair and unjust contracts is an act for which Mr. Parnell and his associates, though they may be arraigned here below, will never be arraigned above. (Loud cheers.) What sort of a contract was it there beyond between the priests of Maynooth College and the bishops of Ireland and his Grace the Duke? (Groans.) The case was very well brought before the public a few days ago by the respected and venerated president of the college, the Very Rev. Canon Walsh. You all remember his letter. What did the Duke object to on the part of those who were his tenants so long? Was it that they would not pay him the rent? (No, no.) Was it that they were not solvent tenants? (No, and laughter.) Was it that they were not peaceable people? (Renewed laughter and cries of "no") You are right, my friends; it was because they would not sanction by their high authority and approval and by their signature this infamous Leinster Lease. (Groans.) If the bishops signed this lease, and I ask you now to give three cheers for the bishops of Ireland.— (Great cheering.)

A Voice.—Another for the Archbishop of Cashel. (Renewed cheers.)

Father Behan—If the bishops signed the lease, oh then the Duke could go about to his tenants and he could say, "Well now my good fellows, sure you have no sense; look at their lordships, look at the great bishops! Are you not Catholic people; don't you take the word from the lips of your priests; were you not always led by them and wont you be led now by the great heads of them all." They would not sign this lease. If they signed it the lands of Laraghbryan, as they belonged to the college, so the college could have kept them on. (A Voice—And they will, too. Cheers.) This land question, I say, is the great question of Ireland. What else have we, as I said a moment ago, but the land? What have our masters done for us for centuries gone by in developing the resources of this very fertile country? Where are our manufactures?

A Voice.—Gone.

Father Behan—They are not gone, because we never had them. (A laugh.) Where are our minerals and mines—how are they developed? Look at the great rivers that flow through the country idly into the sea. If these rivers were in England there would be mills and factories on every half mile of them if possible, or less; but we have a paternal Government, to be sure. We have fathers over us; how are they minding their children? (Badly.) They leave us unprovided for, they leave the industries and resources that would be in the country undeveloped; they leave us, then, with but the land, and now, forsooth, when we have been ground down for centuries by these bad landlords, and when we rise in our strength at long last, and God knows it was time, and when we have recourse to the only weapon at our hand, that is, rational, legitimate, agitation, Mr. Parnell and his associates are branded as Communists, firebrands, disturbers of the public peace, and so forth. What did we ever get from England in Ireland except by agitation. (Nothing.) There are some of you who well remember the superhuman efforts of that greatest of Ireland's sons, the venerated and ever to be lamented J. K. L., bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the great Dr. Doyle (cheers). By letters and by speeches he advocated the cause of the people, and was the means, to a great extent, of getting up wholesome agitation to put down that accursed tithes system. These things he preached. He told the people not to violate the law, but to evade the law, the very thing the people are doing now by Boycotting. And his words were taken up, and when the parson wanted an auction of a few little ranthans of calves (laughter) here and there, or a few little stackeens of oats, he would have no one to bid when he would go to the place; or where he thought there were a few beeves and fatlings they were sure to be gone. (Cries of "bravo.") "Peelers," he said, at that time,

—March on with the musket and sword,

And fight for my tithes in the name of the Lord.

(Great laughter.) The agitation that time did good, and has not the agitation this year done good? (cheers and cries of "yes"), and it will do greater good still, for from the moment that the Government made up their mind to prosecute Charles Stewart Parnell (cheers)