

lessen their loyalty to the country in which they have made themselves so prominent and successful a part. Loving personal and religious liberty, insisting upon broad tolerance and equality before the law, they are a most valuable element in our body politic. Relieved from the sadness of the surroundings in their island home, they do not, like some of the rest of us, take their pleasures sadly. Broad, open-hearted, full of that spirit of good fellowship and love of human kind, they create an atmosphere by their presence in the community that it is healthful and delightful to breathe.

The Beauty and Fascinating Wit

of the daughters of Ireland have ever been wreathed in story and poem. No greater proof of the irresistible glances of the Irish lassies can be found than the bloody Statute which an English king felt it necessary to pass, providing that English settlers in Ireland marrying Irish women should be condemned to death and hanged after having been previously disembowelled. It would seem as if the death penalty might have been enough, but it was necessary to add horrors to the preliminaries of death to overcome the temptations of Irish beauty.

I well remember visiting the Emerald Isle now a quarter of a century ago. We landed on her shores early in the morning of a July day, and it seemed to me that nothing was ever greener, nothing was ever sweeter, nothing was ever more attractive than Queenstown Harbor at that hour. What struck me most in our progress through Ireland was the lightning flash of repartee from every son and daughter of the soil whom we addressed. Whether it was the waiter or maid at the hotel, the news-boy upon the street, the driver of the jaunting car, the old woman at the door of her cabin, the farmer boy trudging on the road, or the boatman on the Lakes of Killarney, one never engaged him or her in a conversation that it did not end with a flash of friendly wit at the expense of the interrogator. There is something about the landscape of the island that reminds one of

Irish Character and History;

it is soft and sad with the overhanging clouds, and then dark with the sudden storm, and then bright again with the brilliant flashes of the sun. As we toiled through the Gap of Dunlow and met those pretty barefooted Irish lasses that tempted us with milk, it seemed a fair land and one that should have prospered. It was a land full of suggestions of poetry and song, and giving out on every side the reason for the sweet but sad attachment that the sons of Erin bear to the old sod.

As I have said, the history of Ireland is such that until recent years her great sons were cut off either as the martyrs of a rebellion, like Robert Emmet or Wolfe Tone, or were driven to manifest their brilliant intellectual powers and great traits of character in other lands than that of their birth.

English history and English literature are full of the achievements of native sons of Ireland. The greatest of English political philosophers, statesmen, and orators, Edmund Burke, was born in Dublin of parents who came from Cork, and a family long settled in the South of Ireland. So, too, an earlier, and only less noted political writer and literary genius, Dean Swift, was born in Dublin. The literary men of England—Sheridan, Goldsmith, and Sterne—were Irishmen. Of British military geniuses many were Irishmen. So, too, at the bar. The greatest equity lawyer that England has ever known, Hugh Cairns, made Lord Chancellor and Earl of the English peerage, was born in County Down, Ireland, and the same county produced the first Catholic Chief Justice of England, Lord Russell Killowen. Nor should we omit mention of the Parliamentary orators, Flood and Grattan, and the greatest of all, O'Connell.

In other countries, in France, in Spain, in Austria, are many Irishmen and families of prominence and position won by able, loyal, and courageous service under a foreign flag. The MacMahons of France, the O'Donnells of Spain, the Taaffes of Austria, are but a few of the illustrious names. In this country it is worthy of note that Andrew Jackson and his great political opponent, John C. Calhoun, both boasted of their Irish stock. Richard Montgomery, who fell at Quebec, the Sullivans of New Hampshire, and Knox, Washington's devoted assistant during the Revolutionary War and the first Secretary of War, were Irishmen. And then as we come to the Civil War, in all the long list of Irish stock we find the greatest purely military genius of the war—Philip H. Sheridan.

Never in the history of the world has there been for the making of a new citizenship such a commingling and mixture of races as we have had in this country to make a typical American.

But in all this commingling of the races, in all this babel of tongues that are gradually changing into English, in all the different ways of looking at life that such a variety in races must present, it would be a distinct loss if we were to lose in any degree whatever the fine social quality of the Irishman, his wit and humor, and his love of his human kind. For this club you could have no more suitable name than the Irish Fellowship Club, for if you called it the Irish Club it would be necessarily a Fellowship club. If you called it a Fellowship club it would be a reasonable presumption that it must be an Irish club. I am glad to be here. I am glad to feel the inspiration of

the love of one's kind that permeates this entire company, and I shall long carry in grateful remembrance your cordial greeting.

PARNELLISM AND CRIME

THE ANDERSON EPISODE

As we learned by cable at the time, the admissions made by Sir Robert Anderson in *Blackwood's Magazine* that he was the author of some of the articles on 'Parnellism and Crime' which appeared in the *Times* whilst he held an official position under the Government, created no small sensation in the United Kingdom at the time.

In the House of Commons on April 11, Mr. MacVeagh asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention had been called to the statement of Sir Robert Anderson that he was the author of the *Times* newspaper articles under the title 'Parnellism and Crime'; what official position he occupied at the time; whether he subsequently was promoted to the post of political adviser to the Home Office, and Chief of the Criminal Investigation Department at Scotland Yard; whether he was aware that there was not any precedent for such conduct on the part of an official of a Government Department, and whether, under the circumstances, he would consent to lay upon the table of the House all Home Office documents bearing on the Parnell Commission or the *Times* articles.

Mr. John Redmond had a similar question on the paper, but addressed to the Prime Minister, namely—whether his attention had been called to the statement made by Sir Robert Anderson that while he was a servant of the Government, as adviser to the Home Office in 1887, he wrote the articles entitled 'Parnellism and Crime,' which appeared in the *Times* newspaper; whether shortly after the articles appeared Sir Robert Anderson was promoted to be head of the Criminal Investigation Department of Scotland Yard, and during the years 1888 and 1889 placed the resources of the Department at the disposal of the *Times* to support the articles he had himself written; was there any record to show whether the Government of the day were a party to this action; whether such conduct had any precedent; whether it was possible under existing conditions to-day, and whether he would cause inquiry to be made into the matter.

Mr. Asquith—I will answer this question, and at the same time the question of the hon. and learned member for Waterford. In 1887, when the articles on 'Parnellism and Crime' appeared in the *Times*, Sir Robert Anderson was Secretary to the Prison Commissioners and was also employed by Mr. Monro on secret service work. He was promoted to be head of the Criminal Investigation Department in August, 1888, but he never held that which could be described as political adviser to the Home Office in 1889. During the sitting of the Commission he placed certain documents which he had obtained when employed in the secret service at the disposal of the witness Le Caron for use in the evidence which he gave before the Statutory Commission, but in doing so he acted without the previous consent or knowledge of the then Home Secretary, and I can say with some confidence that the Home Secretary had no knowledge of his being or claiming to be author or part author of the *Times* articles. If Sir Robert Anderson wrote the *Times* articles—if he did—or any part of them—his action was contrary to the rules and traditions of the Civil Service, and so far as I know entirely without precedent. I cannot conceive that such a thing could happen under existing conditions. After a lapse of more than twenty years I do not think the suggested inquiry would serve any useful purpose, and I am informed that the papers in the Home Office bearing upon the Parnell Commission are few and unimportant, and that there are none which could properly be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. Redmond—May I ask the right hon. gentleman, in view of the extreme gravity of the question, whether he really thinks that the lapse of time is a sufficient reason for refusing an inquiry? It is impossible for me to enlarge upon it now, but the gravity of the question must be apparent to the House. I submit to the right hon. gentleman, is it not apparent, on his own statement, that an officer of the Government in the employment of the Home Office was secretly engaged in supplying confidential documents belonging to the Government to the *Times* in a private prosecution against Mr. Parnell and his colleagues, and I would ask him, in view of the natural suspicions which must arise as to the way in which these attacks on Ireland are made, whether he does not think it would be wise to institute an inquiry into the whole circumstances?

Mr. Asquith—I am sure I shall not be suspected of any desire to shield Sir Robert Anderson or any of the parties in this matter. The lot which fell to me in connection with that case is sufficiently well known, and I cannot use language sufficiently strong to express my condemnation of the admitted breach of official duty of which Sir Robert Anderson was guilty. The only question the hon. gentleman puts to me is whether now at this distance of time any useful purpose will be served by an inquiry. I confess at the moment I do not see how it could. We must prevent—I do not see that it is necessary to do so, but every step