

loyalty of an entire nation, obstinately perseveres in evil-doing, these Leagues pointed out to an almost hopeless, and consequently desperate, people the road of legal redress, and inspired them with the hope of obtaining justice in a peaceable and constitutional way. For this they deserve the thanks of all law-abiding, peace-loving, and just men. It is not to the purpose to point to an interview between Mr. PARNELL and French republicans. We fail to see in this a crime. We freely admit, indeed, that there was, under the circumstances, an error of judgment, but where is the evidence that Mr. PARNELL advocated any wrong principle, or compromised any right one. Surely he was at liberty to hold an interview with a foreign politician, and even discuss political situations so long as he kept his honour untarnished and his principles intact. And it has yet to be proved that Mr. PARNELL compromised the one or abandoned the other. Besides, it is not for the admirers and patrons of GARIBALDI and MAZZINI, their helpers and friends, to endeavour to draw political capital from the comparatively innocuous action of an Irish politician.

Dr. BAKWELL seems to be indignant with us for publishing a report of his speech, and broadly asserts that he did not say the Land League and National League were condemned by the Pope. The speech referred to is now before our readers, and it will be for them to judge whether his assertion is borne out by the speech. For ourselves we must say that we find ourselves unable to perceive how the Doctor can say that his speech affords proof of the misrepresentation to which he says he has been subjected. On the contrary, it appears to us that he has in his speech laboured hard to prove that the Pope has condemned these organisations, and we think that the report of which he complains, and for the publishing of which he charges us with anti-English prejudices, is fully justified by the text of the speech itself. And now we may ask what good object could the Doctor have had in view in bringing his motion before the Literary Society. Did he expect he should succeed in carrying it? Hardly, we fancy. The affair was over; the hall had been lent; the meeting had been held. The speech of Mr. REDMOND had been such that no dispassionate man could find fault with it, and peace was reigning. Under these circumstances Dr. BAKWELL brings forward his motion, and delivers his most injudicious speech: Could he have been ignorant that such a motion and such a speech must necessarily arouse strong, even passionate, and certainly successful opposition? Had the Doctor intended to injure the Society, to rouse the feelings he would have us believe he deprecates, he could not have adopted a course better calculated to attain this end. He it is that is entirely responsible for the state of feeling that now exists, he it is that has roused national feelings and antagonism: and we have not the least idea of permitting him to ride off from the unhappy situation he has created, on the groundless contention that Irishmen are to blame for it.

A Branch of the Irish National League was formed at Notown Grey Valley, on the 5th of November, which to all appearance bids fair to be a grand success. The meeting was adjourned to the 25th, at which the following gentlemen were unanimously elected for the ensuing six months:—Mr. J. Flynn, President; Mr. J. O'Reilly, Vice-President; Mr. M. Molone, Treasurer; and Mr. J. Kerrigan, secretary. After revising rules, and transacting other business of a routine nature, the meeting was adjourned to February 1.

We are glad to learn that the method of paying off the debt on the Dominican Convent at Invercargill by means of weekly subscriptions has been originated and taken up by the people with so much enthusiasm that the debt is likely to be wiped out by it, together with such accidental contributions as may come in, in about twelve months. This system of paying church debts, which has worked such wonders elsewhere, with so much ease to the people, cannot but be successful, and aided by the donations of country friends, the fulfilment of promises made, and the holding of a concert, and, perhaps, in about a year, a bazaar, cannot fail to remove the weight that at present oppresses the little community.

THE Melbourne *Advocate* very pertinently remarks that the *Argus* has published four or five prominent articles, all to prove that the Irish-Australian Convention was a dead failure and quite unworthy of notice. The *Australasian* also, which is an enlarged edition of the *Argus*, has published several articles on the same subject.

We gather from a couple of correspondents who write to our contemporary the *Graaf Reinet Advertiser* that they take things pretty easy in the South African colonies. These gentlemen have evidently returned there recently from Australia, and give their fellow-colonists the benefits of their experience. The first—Mr. W. C. Parkes—explains that Australia is no better than their own Colony, because people there work harder to earn higher wages. He

says no one who has been in South Africa for ten years should go to Australia. "Farmers had better not go, for it seemed to me the Australian farmers are the hardest worked and worst paid class. Labourers had better not go, because they can never stand the work. Mechanics are the best off, they can generally get into something, if not good then reasonable." And as to clerks, he describes their condition as one of starvation pure and simple. Of New Zealand this gentleman gives a still poorer opinion. "Though I did not go there myself," he says, "I spoke to many people who had been there, and from them I gathered that things there are dearer and finer-out in every way. In fact the country is getting over-crowded, and many people have already come over from there to Australia to better themselves." The other correspondent also refers to the hard work done in the colonies. "You wonder how it is that farmers," he says, "can pay such wages and still sell produce so cheap. The fact is that when the farmer's wife wants a drink she does not call: 'Kaatie bring me a cup of coffee, or a glass of water.' Neither does the farmer when he wants to light his pipe call: 'Klaas, bring me a stick of fire.' They fetch it themselves. They all work, sir, work; and that is how they manage it."

"THE killing of the nun in Belfast," says the *Nation* of October 20, "is evidently not to be the only deed of its kind to which Sir Stafford Northcote can point as the result of his recent campaign amongst the Orange fanatics of the North. On Saturday night an attempt was made to burn down a Land League hut at Gortayoy, Bridge, county Tyrone, with his occupants—an old evicted tenant and his wife; and in all probability the crime of murder as well as arson would have been consummated but for the vigilance of the old couple, who detected the fire before it had time to burst into flame. In the case of the nun, Sir Stafford Northcote allowed three days to elapse before he uttered even a halting deprecation of the outrage; in the case of this second characteristic manifestation of Orange fanaticism, he bids fair not to speak at all. We hope, however, that when Parliament re-assembles he will be catechised on the subject. He and the other firebrands who have lately been striving to fan the flame of Sectarian strife in Belfast and Derry are morally responsible for both crimes, and they should be shown to be so in the face of the world.

MR J. E. REDMOND took the occasion the other day of a lecture given by him at Adelaide to contradict Mr Archibald Forbes's statements concerning him made in the *Nineteenth Century*. "He has said," remarked Mr. Redmond, "that when I first came to Australia I spoke with my usual excitable manner, but that my first lectures were attended by riots, caused by the indignant loyalty of the people of Australia; that in consequence of that indignant loyalty culminating in riots, I saw fit to alter my tone, and that I therefore actually caused the National Anthem to be sung at every future meeting. These statements may seem to be small matters, but they are deliberate falsehoods. They cannot, by any possibility, be mistakes, because Forbes and I went through the colonies together. He knew what occurred at my meetings as well as I knew what occurred at his, and these statements are deliberate falsehoods." Mr Redmond then gave a categorical denial to each statement of Forbes reflecting on him.

THE *Nation* says:—The speech of the Marquis of Waterford at the Orange banquet to Sir Stafford Northcote in Belfast must have been something like a bombshell thrown into the midst of the revelers. It contained, of course, the usual Tory denunciations of the National party, but it also contained an emphatic condemnation of the English policy which destroyed the manufactures of Ireland and now banishes the Irish across the ocean instead of finding them employment at home; and, besides, it was a direct appeal to England to help in re-establishing the manufactures of Ireland and trying the experiment of a peasant proprietary. That is to say, it was a speech of the sort the English Tory leader, who would announce no policy for Ireland, least liked to hear. We would not give much for the marquis's chance of a post in the next Tory administration. A Tory with ideas harmonising to any extent with Irish popular opinion is "a marked man" amongst the members of the controlling ring.

MR. JOHN MURDOCH is bringing the "unaided Word," in Gaelic and English, to bear on the land question in Scotland with good effect. He has compiled a leaflet for circulation containing several texts supporting the doctrine of the land for the people,—and which it is calculated will prove a two-edged sword in the hands of the Highlanders. "The minister and people of a district visited in advance of the Royal Commission by Mr. Murdoch," says the *Nation's* correspondent, "were assembled together in the church to receive instruction and assistance in preparing a statement of their case in English. As a preparatory exercise the minister read an extract from the first chapter of Nebemiah, after which Mr. Murdoch turned to the fifth chapter of the same book and read from the first to the thirteenth verses, evidently to the discomfort of the parson and the consolation of the people, the peremptory orders given to the Jews to restore to the people 'their lands, their vineyards, their olive-yards, and their houses'—an order which the Jews instantly obeyed." But, as is usual otherwise, it appears that in this matter also