

MR. REDMOND'S VISIT.

THE following letter has been refused insertion by the *West Coast Times* :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WEST COAST TIMES.

Sir,—Since the arrival of Mr. Redmond in Australia the columns of the *West Coast Times* are almost daily filled with one-sided extracts from the landlord Castle Press of Ireland, and their faithful henchmen among the colonial Press, obviously in order to defame his character and those of the other Irish leaders, and to prevent his mission from being successful. In this conduct there is neither justice nor honesty, much less courtesy or hospitality to a respected member of the Imperial Legislature visiting this distant Colony, and affords another proof, if proof were wanting, of "British fair play," which we hear and read so much about. It may be considered some to be courage and magnanimity of the highest kind to assassinate the characters of such noble-minded men as Parnell, Davitt, Egan and Healy, at a distance of sixteen thousand miles, on the assertion of the foulest murderer and the most repulsive informer that ever did the dirty work of the British Government in Ireland. Irishmen do not expect truth or justice from your luminous evening contemporary of Auckland, to which you have looked up with so much admiration lately, as it is the organ of a sect which were always the tools of the dominant oligarchy of Ireland. But something more in consonance with liberal principles should be expected from a paper posing as the cream of liberalism on the West Coast, and the opponent of all squatteristic abominations in the Colony. There is liberalism and liberalism, but the liberalism which is confined by geographical boundaries is not worthy of the name, for true liberalism, like charity, is universal. Now, I do not set out to lecture you on your right to do those things, as I believe you are as unfitted to receive any advice from me or any other Irishman, as Irishmen are to take yours as to the mode and manner of receiving Mr. Redmond, if that gentleman do us the honour of paying us a visit. But I do claim the right that, in common justice and honesty, you should state both sides of the question, and let your readers judge between the landlords, bailiffs, and emergency men, on the one side, and the whole Irish people on the other.

One of the most outspoken declarations made by an Englishman on the Irish question was made at Leeds in February last, by Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P. He asked his constituents always to remember that wise legislation for Ireland re-acted in every way beneficially upon England. He then proceeded to tell the English people what no Irishman dare tell in Ireland, "that the Government of Ireland was one of the most disgraceful despotisms on the face of the earth." After paying an eloquent tribute to the high degree of civilisation which the Irish people had reached in the early ages of Christianity and up to the time of the Norman invasion, he characterised the English Government as "a complete catalogue of political blunders." "The repulsive selfishness of English merchants and traders had crushed Irish manufactures for their own benefit." He denounced the traditions of the Castle, and declared that the confidence of Irishmen could never be given to an Executive Government which at times came in contact with the people through the medium of an "official magistracy and an Imperial police force." He dealt quite as plainly with the subject of Home Rule. As England had given a Parliament to her great colonies, with the most beneficial results, and as she had lost America through withholding political freedom, he thought there were strong reasons for granting Home Rule." Such are the statements of the son of the great statesman who presides over the destinies of England. Then again Mr. Duiquan, an English gentleman speaking at Walsall in the same month after hearing Sir Charles Forster address his constituents, said: "Again we are told that the Irish are a most discontented and turbulent race, and that it is impossible to govern them. Nothing is further from the truth, and if you ask any person who has dealt amongst them they will tell you that if you treat them kindly they are tranquil and easily led. There are some classes of people who will stand oppression. You may oppress the Hindoos, and they will not rebel, but the Irish belong to a race which it is impossible to oppress; they have Celtic blood in their veins—the best blood in the world—and when you oppress Irishmen you are sure to make them rebellious. Let me point out to you what is the state of affairs in Ireland at the present moment. You find freedom of the Press absolutely gone, you find freedom of speech gone, and you find the right of public meeting gone. In England the Englishman's house is his castle, but that does not prevail in Ireland; the Government have the absolute power to suppress any newspaper, and fine and imprison any editor who writes anything of them, consequently they are exasperated." I also send you an article which appeared in the London *St. James's Gazette* of February 7, written by an English officer totally unconnected with any Irish whatever, which I think would be read with astonishment by some of your readers. With your permission I will make one or two extracts from it. "Of all the blunders committed by the Castle Government there has been none so certain to produce disastrous results as the latest device, borrowed apparently from the Franco-German war, of fining whole districts for alleged 'hostile attitude,' robbing struggling and starving peasants of their scanty earnings under pretext of defraying the cost of (in most cases wholly unnecessary) additional constabulary. There is no better contrivance than the wanton and reckless imposition of an undeserved fine for converting into dangerously active, though for a time impossibly covert antagonism, the passively 'hostile attitude' which, until his country regains the self-government that is her right, must, and will be the attitude of every honest Irishman towards the 'Castle' machinery of oppression and repression. . . . And the inventors of this precious trick are the new-fangled officials, whose enormous salaries would be in jeopardy if they could not point at least 'hostile attitude' to justify their retention and authority." . . . "Forgetting for the time the cynical protection accorded to the uniformed murderers of the poor little boys with their toy drums and whistles at Ballina, and to the bayoneters of prostrate women at Belmullet,

the most advanced of the popular journals, led by *United Ireland*, vied with one another in clamouring with one accord for the sweeping of the strange assassins from the face of the earth." I shall leave to your own discretion to quote any more from this manly Englishman's outspoken truthful article.

The *West Coast Times* prides itself on its opposition to the land sharks of New Zealand. But let us suppose that the squatters of Australia had appropriated New Zealand and governed it by a majority of their own ilk from Melbourne or Sydney, that the Judges, police and army were depending on them for their pay, that the same squatting government passed a Curfew Act to prevent honest people in New Zealand to leave their homes after sunset, that the police and soldiery could enter and violate the sacredness of the virginal or maternal bed-chamber, that the same squatting police suppressed meetings held to protest against such diabolical conduct, that the reporters of the Press, whose duty compelled them to be arrested and imprisoned, and that the leaders of the people were also obliged to don the prison garb and go into solitary confinement, that some men, maddened at such tyranny, murdered two officials, and that the same squatting government wishes to destroy the popular leaders by getting hiring scribes to defame their character, by attempting to trace in some manner their connection with the murderers. How would the people of New Zealand act under such circumstances? They would, unless they were deprived of arms as Irishmen are, rise as one man and banish the squatting government once and for ever. As for the lip loyalty of the *Auckland Star* and its ravings about sedition, I think I may venture to say for my countrymen that if ever this their adopted country was attacked, by any foe whatever, they would rush to its defence, while some of the lip loyalists would run to hide their precious carcasses until the danger was over, and then commence afresh to calumniate its Irish defenders.—I am, etc.,
J. J. CROFTS.

Ross, April 22, 1883.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

AFTER Mr. Parnell had spoken on Mr. Gorst's amendment to the address, Mr. Chamberlain, President of the Board of Trade, and other gentlemen addressed the House. From Mr. Chamberlain's speech we take the following passages :—

It has been asserted again and again that I have been a party to intrigues within the Cabinet having for their object the expulsion of my right hon. friend the member for Bradford. I must say that a charge of that kind pays a very poor compliment indeed to my colleagues in the Cabinet, and to my right hon. friend the member for Bradford, who is not a man to be expelled by unworthy intrigues. I am content to refer to the statement of my right hon. friend himself, that while he was in the Government he was loyally supported by all his colleagues. For my own part I have to say that any communications received by me with reference to the Kilmainham transactions were communicated to me instantly by my right hon. friend. He was as much a party to all that took place when he was a member of the Government as I was myself. If I have ever differed from him I have frankly told him so, and I should be ashamed to be a party to anything like backstairs intrigue or unworthy motive (cheers). In this case twelve men thought the prisoners ought to be released, and one man thought not. That is the sole difference of opinion. My right hon. friend says he knew Ireland and that we did not. But my right hon. friend was not the only man in the Cabinet who knew Ireland. The release of the prisoners was supported by Lord Spencer, whose administration satisfies you now (hear, hear). It was supported by Lord Kimberley, who has also been the authority of the English Government in Ireland. It was supported by my noble friend the Secretary for War, who formerly conducted the administration as Chief Secretary; and it was supported by Lord Carlingford, who has also been Chief Secretary. My right hon. friend set his experience against those four members of the Cabinet who knew Ireland. Well, sir, there is one other object which has been perfectly evident throughout the whole course of this debate, and that is the desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to discredit what they call the policy of conciliation. They take advantage of the excitement of the natural indignation which is caused by the disclosures in Dublin of an assassination conspiracy in Ireland, and they try to divert that indignation, and to cause the whole people of Ireland to suffer for it. There can be nothing more unstatesmanlike than to refuse justice to Ireland (Opposition cries of "justice"). Yes, justice to Ireland (Ministerial cheers). Because a horde of assassins have been unmasked in Dublin we are told by the ex-Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) that we are to rely entirely on the Crimes Act.

Mr. Gibson—I did not make that statement.

Mr. Chamberlain—The only effect of the speech of the right hon. gentleman was that at this time it was only by a firm administration of the Crimes Act and not by remedial measures, that the difficulty in Ireland could be properly dealt with. The Crimes Act is for assassins; it is not for the people of Ireland (loud Ministerial cheers). What message are you going to send to the Irish people when the assassins, when the conspirators have been crushed? How are we to meet the discontent which it is admitted still prevails in that country? Will it be possible that we can go on governing Ireland permanently by a system of absolute repression and nothing else? How long will that policy bear the test of experience? How long is "England's danger" to be "Ireland's opportunity"? (Ministerial cheers.) How long will the people of this country tolerate such a policy as that—involving, as I said on another occasion, the existence of a Poland within four hours of our shores? (Opposition cries of "Oh!" and Ministerial cheers.) That policy will break down in practice, as it deserves to break down (cheers), and then we shall be face to face once more with what has been called "The greatest problem of our time." If your only remedy is repression,