

Dublin Notes.

(From the National papers.)

LIGHT is thrown on the manner in which this landlord ideal is realised by the history of a Mitchell who evicted which took place on Saturday, November 2. The evicted tenant was Mr. James J. Greene. He was evicted for considerable arrears of rent. Previous to his eviction negotiations for a settlement had taken place. The demand of the landlord was that the tenant should purchase at an exorbitant price, which should recoup the landlord for the arrears at the expense of the taxpayer. The tenant offered to buy at a fair price irrespective of the question of arrears. The answer to his offer was eviction. The case shows how the Ashbourne Act which is panegyrised by the landlords works. The attention of Great Britain should be directed towards it, as it shows the little plot that Mr. Goschen's Irish friends are executing.

The Liberal party in England have won almost all along the line in the English municipal elections. The total party gains are reported to be as follows:—122 for the Liberals, 62 for the Conservatives, and 3 for the Liberal Unionists, thus giving a tolerable fair indication of how the current of British public opinion is flowing just now. The Gladstonian successes in Birmingham prove beyond all doubt that Chamberlainism is getting played out in its citadel. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain up to last Saturday looked on that city as a lord of the soil looked on his close borough in "the good old times" when few had votes, and those who had the votes were never loth to sell them. Birmingham was, in fact, the happy hunting ground of the Chamberlain family, including its enterprising valet, Jesse Collings. Now, however, it appears that the great manufacturing centre has grown weary of Mr. Joseph and all his works and pumps. His son, the Marcellus of the Liberal Unionism of the future—bless the mark!—has been defeated in his candidature for a seat in the Corporation. This is all the more surprising as Mr. Austen Chamberlain is, according to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, an image in miniature of his notorious sire, having the family eye-glass, the family orchid, the family wave of the hair, the family assurance, and a first-class set of the family opinions. The Birmingham *Times* adds that the son and heir has also got the family nose. Yet, although he was a true chip of the old block, he has been flung pitilessly into nether darkness by a humble follower of Mr. Gladstone's. This is assuredly an instructive sign of the times. The Liberal Unionist Party never caught a serious hold of the English people. The only constituency where it could be said to possess any power and influence worth speaking of was Birmingham. Birmingham itself now seems to have turned its back on the renegades who abandoned Mr. Gladstone. A local Tory organ, blurring out the truth, says that the heart has gone out of the party, and that for all practical purposes it is in a demoralised and deplorable condition, like a house divided against itself.

On Tuesday, Earl Spencer and John Morley were present at the annual dinner of the Newcastle-on-Tyne Liberal Club. Lord Spencer speaking on the occasion, drew Mr. Goschen very effectively over the coals for some loose statements he recently made bearing on the statistics of the bye-elections. Mr. Goschen, said his lordship, had been going into the statistics of the bye-elections, and had proved that the Conservatives had polled more votes than the Gladstonians. He would not go into Mr. Goschen's figures. What the Liberal party had to consider were the practical results of the bye-elections, and those bye-elections meant in a division that Mr. Gladstone's followers would have far more votes. Referring to the confusion prevailing at Birmingham, Earl Spencer thought that the Liberal Unionists and Conservatives of that city were not a happy family. In conclusion, his lordship observed that the Liberal party had many reforms before them, but the question of Ireland must be settled first, and he felt confident that when a general election came the voice of the people would ring loud and clear in favour of Home Rule.

Mr. Molloy, M.P., speaking at a meeting in Sheffield on Wednesday night, made an announcement which will not be found very palatable either by Mr. Houston or his employer. The Irish party, said the hon. gentleman, now hold in their possession documentary evidence which will prove the complicity of the Government officials in its conspiracy against Mr. Parnell and his colleagues. "We have," he continued, "in our possession the private diary of Pigott, and have gathered evidence which, when it is made public, will create a sensation throughout the country—a sensation that will put that of the Commission far out of sight." Mr. Molloy concluded by declaring that the Government would be unable to pass any legislation next session till the Irish party had made this exposure.

Mr. John Morley is an indefatigable champion of Irish autonomy. Twice this week he raised his voice in vindication of Home Rule. Speaking at a Liberal demonstration at Middlesboro' on Wednesday, November 6, he said that he and his friends were told that they did not answer the arguments of their opponents, but he did not see any arguments to answer. One of the "arguments," for instance, is that the Imperial Parliament is able to carry out all the improvements that were required in Ireland. What consolation, he asked, would it be to those whom he was addressing if all the material improvements that were required in the great county of York were to be carried out with an absolute indifference to the wishes of every Yorkshire man? Another line of argument was that if the Imperial Parliament were given up, and a National Parliament was given to Ireland, it would be absolutely necessary to go on and give her all the rights of a separate nationality. That argument was, said Mr. Morley, partly a misrepresentation, and partly a prophecy. It was a misrepresentation, because neither in the Home Rule Bill of 1886, nor in any exposition of the policy on which it was founded, was it proposed to give up the Imperial Parliament. In regard to the other portion of the argument, he would point out that a policy could not be refuted. All this argumentation, he continued, turned, firstly, upon pride—bad, false, inhuman pride; and, secondly, upon a most unworthy fear. He, for one, did not desire to see a subject Ireland. He wanted

to see Ireland in equal friendship with England as Scotland was. Furthermore, he confessed he did not understand those alarms at the pride of nationality. Why was it, he very justly asked, that an Irishman alone was not to be allowed to love his native land?

£7,915,678 has been applied for under the Ashbourne Act. Proposals of purchase amounting to £5,281,383 have already been sanctioned. Purchases involving loans to the amount of £4,629,654 have been completed. The original five millions have, therefore, been absorbed, and an additional million practically expended out of the new five. There, therefore, remains £4,000,000 for the working of the Act, and applications for half that amount are being entertained. By the end of the year there will remain only about £2,000,000 at the disposal of the Commissioners. Something will have to be done, therefore, if the operations under the Act are to be continued. Anticipating Lord Salisbury's speech at the Guildhall on Saturday, the *Times* of that day said:—"A Land Purchase Bill for Ireland and a Tithe Bill for England are two measures of the first magnitude which may be confidently expected to occupy a prominent position in the Government programme. To construct a scheme of land purchase which should entirely satisfy Irish landlords without involving considerable risks to the British taxpayers is a task which would baffle Mr. Balfour's ingenuity. Happily, the task actually before him is somewhat less formidable, since the people of this country will expect Irish landlords to be content with guarantees of the reasonable but far from absolute kind upon which the vast majority of mankind have to rely for the security of their interests. The responsibility of the British taxpayer may not wholly disappear, but we may confidently expect that it will be made remote. We may also assume that the scope of the measure will be limited by discarding the idea of universal and compulsory expropriation. There is no necessity whatever to contemplate anything so sweeping, nor could any such operation be carried out without a social dislocation of a perilous kind." The condemnation of the principle of the Ashbourne Act is there complete. Is the passage inspired? or is it merely a guess? Lord Salisbury made no sign.

Mr. Balfour, has, however, in a letter to Mr. Macartney, M.P., rather discountenanced the suggestion that the Government is meditating any large Land Purchase scheme. He says, referring to the deductions drawn by the London Press from Mr. George Wyndham's Dover speech:—"I believe Mr. George Wyndham stated nothing in his speech at Dover which could at all justify the fanciful conclusions built on it by certain portions of the London Press, nor am I aware that anything has ever been said by my colleagues or by myself which gives the slightest justification for the extravagant anticipations which have been so confidently made with regard to the character of any further proposals for facilitating land purchase which it may be our duty to produce, and those who build on the accuracy of those unauthorised forecasts are, I fear, doomed to disappointment." In fact the gigantic scheme that was supposed to be in the air will prove to be a very pretty affair. This looks, the declaration of the *Times* notwithstanding, as if we were to have another peddling extension of the Ashbourne Act. The problem of the Irish Land Question is growing too big after all for the Cromwell-Parnell combination of a Chief Secretary. The question is not ripe. So we are neither to have a settlement of the Land Question nor a settlement of the University Question. What then is the Government going to do? The constructive policy is to be a tame affair, and Mr. Chamberlain's twopenny-halfpenny manual is not the political handbook of the Unionist Cabinet.

Kilkenny gave in its adhesion to the Tenants' Defence Association on last Tuesday, when a convention of the county delegates met in the Town Hall of the City of the Confederation. The members of the Irish party present on the occasion were Messrs. J. J. Clancy, P. A. Clancy, P. J. Power, Mulholland, Marum, and Dr. Tanner. Mr. Clancy, M.P., who was voted to the chair, in the course of an able speech observed that the tenants of Ireland should join the new movement on the grounds of gratitude and self-interest—gratitude to their colleagues on the Posenby and other estates for the action they had taken, and self-interest inasmuch as the landlord conspiracy has not been formed for wreaking vengeance on the Posenby tenants alone, and if it succeeds in ruining them the rest of the tenants of Ireland had better clearly understand that its operations may at any moment be extended elsewhere. For these reasons Mr. Clancy appealed to the people of Kilkenny to come valiantly to the front and take up the gauntlet flung down by Smith-Barry and his syndicate. Letters of apology were received from Dr. Brownrigg, Bishop of Ossory; Mr. Quinn, M.P.; and Mr. Daniel Brophy, an Irish Australian, at present on a visit in this country. Rev. Father Halloran, Administrator, moved a resolution pledging Kilkenny to support the objects and aims of the Tenants' Defence Association—a motion which was seconded by Alderman Coyle the Mayor, and spoken to by Dr. Tanner, M.P., who warned the people to be careful how they availed of the Ashbourne Act, and to remember that good prices would never come again. Mr. Marum instanced the fact that while in 1841, the inhabitants of Kilkenny numbered 202,000, the number at the last census was only 91,287.

The Roscommon Convention, which took place last Wednesday, was the first as yet held in the province of Connaught. The Irish party was represented by Messrs. J. E. Redmond, James O'Kelly, Daniel Crilly, Luke Hayden, and Dr. Commins. Mr. J. E. Redmond who was voted to the chair, delivered a powerful address, in which he dwelt particularly on the fact that landlordism has for many years swept like a plague the province of Connaught. It was, therefore, on that account all the more incumbent on Connaught to gird up its loins and take its stand against a system which has almost been its ruin. The movement of the Tenants' Defence Association, said Mr. Redmond, has already brought consternation and dismay into the ranks of Ireland's enemies. The landlords of Ireland thought, in their folly and in their cowardice of heart, that because the combination of tenants under the plan of Campaign had been declared to be illegal by certain legal tribunals, that the tenants on these estates would be left to be evicted by the landlords. This movement, however, meaning, as it does, the rallying of the entire