

ord Bros.

Ireland

SHALL THE LOYAL BE DESERTED

AND THE

DISLOYAL SET OVER THEM?

AN APPEAL TO LIBERALS AND NONCONFORMISTS.

BY

WILLIAM ARTHUR.

London
1880

BEMROSE & SONS, 23, OLD BAILEY;

AND DERBY.

Price Sixpence.

PREFATORY NOTE.

IRISHMEN AND IRISHMEN.

I SHALL preface what I have to say by a few extracts from the utterances of loyal Irishmen and of disloyal ones, respectively. To these I entreat the attention of any one who really desires to form his own opinion of what is impending.

The opinions of Professor Maguire, an Irish Roman Catholic, merit particular attention.

SAYINGS OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

Dr. T. Maguire, Professor of Moral Philosophy of T. C. D., an Irish Roman Catholic: "The specific that has been prepared by Mr. Parnell, and vouched for by the Catholic Bishops and Moon-lighters, is Home Rule. Home Rule, we are told *ad nauseam*, does not mean separation from the Empire. . . . And such atrocities would not be tolerated if Ireland was materially joined to England; why should they be tolerated because Ireland is separated from England by less than three hours' strip of water?"

"Home Rule means the boycotting and massacre of the loyalists. Boycotting and mas-

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN.

"England's mode of warfare—what is it? . . . Ask every unfortunate people on whom England has ever breathed her unwholesome breath, and in whose midst her ruffian soldiery has planted her robber flag."—*Irish World*.

"Parnell is a good fellow. I believe in him. He has his mission; and, if I am not mistaken, has the courage to bear him through it."—*Rossa in Irish World*.

Rossa suggests a resolution.—*"Resolved.* We authorize Mr. C. S. Parnell to demand it (the land of Ireland), on terms, which, in no event, must exceed the probable cost of making its

SAYINGS OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

sacre. This cannot be too often dinned into the ears of thirty odd millions of all shades of race, religion, and politics. . . . and while H.B.M. ship *Belleisle* would be riding in Kingstown harbour there would be nothing in the world, except the cowardice of the Parnellites, to prevent the loyalists of a secluded spot, like Delgany, from being massacred on any Sunday afternoon, any more than there was anything to prevent the democrats of Corcyrá from massacring the aristocrats and piling their corpses up 'like soap,' while the ships of the imperial democracy, the most intellectual ever on earth, cruised about the bay. I defy any man who knows Ireland honestly to question the probability of my supposed case. Let any one ask any Irish Law Officer. The Imperial Government can deal with Ireland in two consistent ways: it can enforce Law and Order. I repeat the hated words, or it can give up Ireland. . . . Again the Archbishop tells us he must have Trinity College—the only thing in Ireland which an Irishman need not be ashamed of.

"Mr. Parnell in his recent sucking-dove speech on the Address, tells the Irish Protestants that he will protect them; but if the Irish Protestants prefer Mr. Parnell's promises to Magna Charta, backed by bayonets that will not do for corkscrews, they are greater fools than they look. Does history record a single case where the agitator could lay the storm he raised? . . . Englishmen must not forget that Mr. Parnell called a dynamite explosion a practical

4

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN.

occupation unprofitable to the present trespassing occupants. . . . No bluster, no bravado, no humbug, but the cool, dark, deep, desperate resolve, and behind that resolve the positive understanding that refusal of the demand means war—honourable or dishonourable—as it suits us Fire and Sword, but chiefly Fire. Every man, alone or in "groups, to commence it on every spot of earth where English power and English property confronts an Irishman."—*Rossa in Irish World.*

Mr. Parnell at Cincinnati.—"When we have undermined English Government, we have paved the way for Ireland to take her place among the nations of the earth (applause), and let us not forget that that is the goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us, whether we in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England (applause)."

At Liverpool, November 30, 1879: "Let us see, as in 1782, one hundred thousand swords, both Catholic and Protestant, leaping from their scabbards, and, believe me, fellow-countrymen, it will not be a question of chicanery or of Acts of Parliament, or of anything that can possibly interfere between the rights of our people to make their own laws on the soil of Ireland."

At Cork, March 22, 1880: "If we succeed in emigrating

5

SAYINGS OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

joke. The *Freeman* called the murders in the Park an altercation; and Michael Davitt called the dastardly attack on the Curtins devil-may-careishness. The Parnellites have one great virtue. Fifty to one they run away, and their raids on Canada never came off, and never will. . . . Ireland, under Parnellite Home Rule, would become the sanctuary of all the scoundrel-dom of Great Britain and America."

From Statement, submitted to the Prime Minister by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union. Part III:—

"Let us now ask the question if, with commerce more than doubled, with a revenue raised almost entirely by indirect taxation, which is one and three-quarter times its former amount, and with an available capital in banks alone, which is three times as great as it was thirty-three years ago, any candid and impartial man can doubt that the state of Ireland, since 1852, has been one of prosperity and progress. . . . The truth is that which Ireland wants is not legislation, but government; not new laws, but the steady enforcement of existing laws. The curse of the 'Irish People'—we use the word in its Parnellite sense—is that they look to Parliament for help in every difficulty; and Parliament—or rather the rival parties in Parliament—have much to answer for, for encouraging this helpless spirit, by special legislation on every conceivable detail."

"Legislation in any of these directions would, in our judgment, tend to ascendancy of

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN.

the Irish Landlords the English Government will soon have to follow them."

At Dublin on April 29, 1880, on his return from America: "A gentleman came to the platform and handed me twenty-five dollars, saying, 'Here are five dollars for bread and twenty for lead.'"

At Cork, October 3, 1880:— "Determined as we are to achieve these ends, we believe we can only achieve them by making the land of Ireland as free as it was when the waters of the flood left it."

At Waterford, December 6, 1880:— "If it could be shown to him that there was a fair prospect of success from the sacrifice, I may ask my reverend and lay friends whether they would not consider it their highest duty to give their lives for the country that gave them birth."

At Dublin, September 26, 1881:— "That spirit, fellow-countrymen, will never die until it destroys the alien rule which has kept our country impoverished and in chains, and sweeps that detestable rule with its buckshot and its bayonets far away over the Channel, whence it can never return."

At Wexford, October 10, 1881:— "He said he was going to put them down, and as soon as he discovered that they were able to shoot straighter than his own soldiers, he allowed those few men to put him and his Government down; and although he has attempted to regain some of his lost position in the Transvaal by subsequent

SAYINGS OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

one class and creed in matters pertaining to religion, education, and civil administration. We do not believe that any guarantees, moral or material, could be devised which would safeguard the rights and privileges of minorities, scattered throughout Ireland, against the encroachments of a majority vested with legislative or executive functions."—*General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church.*

"We believe that the cry for legislative independence covers a desire for separation, and that any measure tending to weaken the existing tie of the Union would be but a prelude to results utterly disastrous to the economic and general interests of the country, as well as to the public peace."—*Association of Non-subscribing Presbyterians.*

Merchants of Belfast:

"This meeting is deeply sensible that the commercial prosperity which has blessed the peaceable parts of this country will receive a sudden shock and lasting injury from legislation which would have any tendency to imperil the connection between this country and Great Britain, whether by the creation of a separate Parliament or National Council, or otherwise."

The Ulster Liberals:

"That this meeting of Ulster Liberals hereby expresses its confidence in the patriotism and

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN.

chicanery and diplomatic negotiations, yet that sturdy and small people in the Transvaal have seen through William Ewart Gladstone, and they have told him again for the second time that they will not have their liberties filched from them; and I believe that as a result we shall see that William Ewart Gladstone will again yield to the people of the Transvaal, and I trust that as the result of this great movement we shall see that, just as Gladstone, by the Act of 1881, has eaten all his own words, and has departed from all his formerly declared principles, now we shall see that these brave words of this English Prime Minister will be scattered as chaff before the united and advancing determination of the Irish people to regain for themselves their lost land and their lost legislative independence."

At Rotundo, Dublin, upon receiving Testimonial, £40,000, December 13th, 1883:—"This force has already gained for Ireland inclusion in the coming Franchise Bill, and we have reason to be proud, hopeful, and energetic, determined that this generation shall not pass away until it has bequeathed to those who come after us the great birthright of national independence and prosperity."

At London, March 17, 1885:

"But we ought, at the same time, to recollect that we should not hamper or impede the march of our nation; that though our

To these specimens of the spirit of the two nations which dwell together under the Union flag, I may add some words of a well-known Continental FREETHINKER, a friend of Garibaldi and Mazzini, and, like Mr. Gladstone, a labourer for Italian unity. He is at a long remove from what are called the Irish Protestants, but, like most men who have stood face to face in Italy with what they have to meet in Ireland, he speaks much as they do, though from his own point of view.

Mr. Karl Blind says: "That exclusion" [of Austria from Germany] "has brought, more especially upon the German population of Bohemia, an amount of persecution on the part of the Czechs which may serve as a fair warning to those who would fain hand over the Anglo-Scotch population of Ireland to the tender mercies of a separate parliament . . . I imagine Englishmen will remember their brethren and nearest kinsmen living within it, and not throw them into the fangs of the Ultramontane party . . . Raise up an independent, or semi-independent Ireland, and you organise as a political power a Clericalist Party, which is not only an enemy of Protestant or Freethinking England, but also an enemy of Italian Union, freedom, and independence . . . If freethinkers or Protestants, or men professing to work for democratic progress, will now go down on their knees before the new Baal which is raised up on the pedestal of the repeal of the Union, I will not. If that measure were adopted, I hold that misery would follow for Ireland as well as for England; and not least of all for the working classes of this country, upon whom the duty would soon fall of meeting in arms a great national danger, unless they were ready to see their own land subjected to the deepest degradation. Having lived so long in England, I feel a more poignant pain than I can express. Already intriguers of all kinds are pricking up their ears at this first reading of the Bill. Let the second reading pass, and schemes that must still shun the light for the nonce will be matured in many a Cabinet and conclave." See *Echo*, April 19, 1886.

The following quotation was given by Mr. Goschen in his speech. The proprietor of the paper, Mr. E. D. Gray, was seated as a member of the House of Commons. Of course the paper denied it all. It never meant any attack on the linen trade; it was "an honest plea in favour of the linen trade."

The part quoted was only a quotation from an Englishman, Mr. Redfern. But people in Ireland well know such denials, and are not caught like gentlemen in the House of Commons. The quotation was exact; Redfern's words were given after and before those of the writer who thus smoothly denied. Mr. J. S. Brown, who has more than once contested seats for the Liberal party, proved that few of the linen manufacturers were Orangemen, and many Liberals. But, of course, on this side of the water it will be said that Mr. Goschen totally misrepresented; it was "an honest plea in favour," not a cry for boycotting against the linen trade. This will be repeated by innocent people as what was said by an "Irish gentleman," and they will be content. Now for the quotation. The date of the paper is the *Belfast Morning News*, Dec. 19th, 1884; see also Jan. 5th, 1885:

"In the *Belfast Morning News*, the paper of an honourable member opposite, it was recently suggested that the linen trade had been a scourge and not a blessing to Ulster: 'But for the linen trade, Ulster could never have been rack-rented as it was and as it continues to be. But for the stone of flax, the hank of yarn, the web of linen, the grinding landlord exactions which kept Ulster poor could not have been put in force. . . . That is the reward Ulster gained by her unswerving, blind devotion to linen, loyalty, and landlordism. The two are identical—for the linen trade of Ulster is solidly Orange. As an interest, and a powerful interest, it is the worst and most formidable enemy of the Irish people. To Northern public opinion these 'linenites' are case-hardened. . . . To Southern and Western public opinion they may be more amenable, more especially if South and West resolve to do for linen what they did for land; if South and West rise up and establish a Flax and Linen League. But, above and beyond all, American public opinion may be relied on as most effective with the unteachable 'linenites.' . . . A casual visitor said that Ulster linen was not Irish but Orange linen, and that when he went back to America he would preach a crusade over the length and breadth of the States against the use of an article, the sustenance of which and whose widespread vogue were equivalent to the perpetuation of Ulster's slavery and stability.'"—Mr. Goschen's speech, *Times*, Wednesday, April 14, 1886.

The following are further portions of the "honest plea in favour" of the linen trade:—

"This province is by far the poorest of the four, except Connaught, and even it tops Ulster in many respects . . . But he does not mention what intensified the sterility of the province; what added to the ruggedness of hill and mountain; what accentuated the inhospitality of bog and morass—the existence of the

linen trade . . . 'Up the heathery mountain, down the rustling glen,' the fair linen has laid its foul mark in impossible rents; for lint and loom and linen, not the land, paid the rent . . . The trio are identical, for 'the linen trade of Ulster is solidly Orange,' and 'as an interest, and a powerful interest, is the worst, most vicious, and most formidable enemy of the Irish people.'

Of course when the estimable commissioner who makes this honest plea in favour of the linen trade says that Ulster is "by far the poorest of the four" Provinces, he means in soil and climate, not in goods. In spite of its inferior soil and climate, its people have made it prosperous, and by their own industry given a more peaceable and comfortable home to an equal number of Roman Catholics than they could find elsewhere in Ireland.

SAYINGS ON LOYAL IRISHMEN.

statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone, and its gratitude to him for his magnificent and untiring services to Ireland; and that it respectfully urges him not to risk the fate of his remedial legislation on land by entangling it with the vexed question of Home Rule."

Statement submitted to the Prime Minister:—"If we add together the families living in first and second class houses, and also those living in houses of the third and fourth class, we find that while in 1851 there were in round numbers 873,000 families living in the poorer classes of houses, or 72·3 per cent. of the whole, and only 27·7 per cent. occupying the two better classes of houses; there were in 1881 only 43·3 per cent. living in the poorer classes of houses, and 56·7 per cent. living in the better class; only 4·1 per cent. of the whole being housed in mud cabins. . . . In 1740-1 there was a famine in Ireland, owing to the destruction of the potato crop by severe frosts in the preceding year. This famine was followed by a period of prosperity which lasted through the middle of the last century. Then came agitation and disturbance, and in 1782 the sovereign remedy for which the people applied—Home Rule—was granted. We all know what followed. Within ten years the country was the scene of lawlessness and outrage, not only in the provinces, but in the metropolis, under the very shadow of the Houses of Parliament; and within sixteen years the people were in open rebel-

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN.

programme may be limited and small, it should be such a one as shall not prevent hereafter the fullest realization of the hopes of Ireland."

At Wicklow Oct. 5, 1885:

"I have claimed for Ireland a Parliament that shall have power to protect Irish manufactures if it be the will of the Parliament and of the Irish people that they should be protected. . . . A peril that sooner or later, it may be sooner than later, will certainly find an opportunity of revenging itself by the destruction of the British Empire for the misfortunes, the oppressions, and the misgovernment of our country."

Quoted by Karl Blind. At a banquet given at Cork to Mr. Parnell, who personally presented that worthy to the meeting, Father Greene said:—"I here declare openly that, as the Pope at Rome denied the right of Victor Emmanuel to rob him of his dominions, and was ready to throw him out by armed force—(great cheering)—so we Irishmen have the same right to kick out John Bull from Ireland even as the Pope at Rome had the right to kick out Victor Emmanuel. (Cheers.) And if the successor of St. Peter made a declaration in that sense, I say that the Irish people have the right to do here the same."

An Irish paper The Catholic Progress (!):—"The woes of Ireland are all due to one single cause—the existence of Protestantism in Ireland. The remedy can only be found in the re-

SHALL THE LOYAL BE DESERTED AND THE DISLOYAL SET OVER THEM?

A PRIME MINISTER venerable in years, and one who through his virtues, gifts, and triumphs holds a place of unexampled power, has made to the nation a proposal which bears upon loyal Irishmen in a manner in which no proposal on record has ever borne upon innocent citizens of this Empire. That proposal is, in effect, to take them down from the rank in which they were born—that, namely, of citizens on a par with men living in Yorkshire or the Lothians—and to reduce them to the grade of *citizens-on-condition*. The condition would be that henceforth, before they could enjoy the immunities of the Empire, they should first of all become practically the subjects of the Irish National League, should take laws at the hand of a parliament constituted of men selected by its authorities, should submit to the taxes it would levy, should be judged by its judges, and tried by juries sitting under terror. That League has seventeen hundred branches, and in almost every case the branch is headed by a Roman Catholic priest, either as president or secretary. The Bill embodying this portentous proposition has been read a first time without a division by the House of Commons, after a debate of power unsurpassed, if not unequalled—one that must put to silence those who hold that our parliament is degenerating in point of ability. It did,

SAYINGS OF LOYAL IRISHMEN.

lion. . . So sure as the Parliament is led to sanction the revival of an Irish Parliament in any shape or form, so sure will the scenes of the closing years of the last century be re-enacted. Ireland will again become the theatre of outrage and crime, before which the worst days of the Land League will sink into insignificance. The 'Right Boys,' the 'Assassins,' the 'Tarring and Feathering Committees,' the 'Houghers,' the 'Defenders,' the 'Revolutionists,' will again appear on the stage; they are only waiting till the strong hand of England is withdrawn to issue from their hiding places. And then will come rebellion and civil war; and when thousands of lives and millions' worth of property have been destroyed, England will be compelled to conquer the country once more."

SAYINGS OF DISLOYAL IRISHMEN

moval (!) of that which caused the evil, which still continues. . . . Would that every Protestant meeting-house were swept from the land! Then would Ireland recover herself, and outrages would be unknown; for there would be no admixture of misbelievers with her champions."

Mr. Biggar at Cork, Mar. 21st, 1880:—"They had seen what Hartmann had done in Russia, and if the constitutional course they were pursuing in parliament at present failed of its object, he thought Ireland might be able to produce another Hartmann, and probably with better results."

The President of the Land League Mr. Parnell, in the House of Commons, speaking on an explosion of dynamite in Salford, which had killed a child:—"The circumstances pointed to its being a practical joke."

The Secretary of the League, Mr. Brennan, writing at about the same date to the Irish World:—"All sorts of theories are afloat concerning this explosion, but the truly loyal one is that Fenianism did it. Accidents can never occur in times like these. It is asserted that the regiment now quartered in Salford Barracks contains many Irish, and that Fenianism had been previously suspected among them."

The Freeman's Journal omitted the above from its report of Mr. Parnell's speech.

during the last few years, degenerate in point of order, under the joint obstructiveness of Parnellites and Tory Democrats, the representatives of two forms of arbitrary principles, not of popular government.

In this state of things the country is placed in a peril wherein only the power of a gracious Providence, in whose guiding and guard of this realm I have profound faith, can save us from civil war;—if the Bill is rejected, a war to make the discontented submit to the lot of full citizens of the British Empire on equal terms; or, if the Bill is accepted, a war to force those who vehemently prize that lot as their pride and best estate to submit to the loss of full citizenship and to go down to the condition of subjects of a local majority, having the prospect before them of never-ceasing broil, with an Irish Republic in the offing. In a moment so grave, brought upon us by a minister so mighty, it is the duty of the humblest citizen to speak, if he only do so in truthfulness and charity. If I speak plainly, it is by reason of a perfect consciousness that I have no title to speak to any one but those who please to listen, or to speak for any human being but myself. If I speak especially to Liberals and Nonconformists, it is because in their principles I find the grounds on which I stand, and because on them, at this juncture, depends the future of Ireland and of the Empire.

Now it is for Liberals calmly to consider the proposal made, and to ask themselves, Is this Liberal policy—a policy that brings to all good citizens equal rights and secure liberties? and it is for Nonconformists to ask themselves, Is this a policy in the direction of religious equality?

In raising these questions, I feel that I have to meet a state of mind that is all but impossible to account for, and very difficult to reason with. The moment one

begins to speak of any title on the part of loyal Irishmen to equal rights, men, and men who are Liberals, fly off and declaim against their narrowness, their unreasonableness, and so forth. Then again, if one points to danger in setting over them men avowedly disloyal, and often men whose sacred principles bind them to narrowness, Members of the House of Commons will tell you of how affectionately Mr. Healy speaks of Mr. Gladstone, and will assure you on the word of an M.P. that all will be perfectly secure. Moreover, if I may judge by a London morning and evening journal which I daily see, the Press that used to be Liberal has for the last few months been one-sided in its information, to a degree that would lead me to say. If they remain Liberal in any sense, their Liberalism has become so Parnellized that no man who takes his information from their columns, and thinks he has got a view of the case all round, is in any state of mind to weigh the facts as they stand. On the contrary, he is predisposed to fling facts to the winds, and to say we *must* follow Mr. Gladstone and must content Mr. Parnell. But Liberal principles cannot be pressed into a formula which assumes that a great man cannot err, and that a dangerous one must not be resisted.

Under real discouragement as to getting a hearing, after so much evidence of a disposition to escape facts and arguments unless they are on the right side, I do, however, appeal first to the love of fairness, and next to the love of facts, which two attributes have been the strength of Englishmen. I beg any one who may honour me with a reading not to decide beforehand that an Irishman, if he be loyal, even though since his teens he has lived among Englishmen or foreigners, must by reason of "a double dose of original sin" be

a person not to be reasoned with, but one to be silenced by sounding a great name, and by a declaration of perfect faith in a halcyon future, if men only do as they are bid.

I am one of those who, ever since I formed my own opinions, have held that inequalities inflicted by law on any class of our fellow subjects should be by law removed.

As in the past, so to-day, I should claim for the peasant in Mayo or Clare precisely the same rights as for the peasant in Antrim, Kent, or Perthshire; should claim for the Roman Catholic priest the same freedom, the same protection of the law, as for every other minister of religion, neither more nor less; and should claim for Ireland and its provinces precisely the same measure of local self-government as for any portions of England, Scotland, or Wales. Exceptional legislation, as for any class, or as against any class, I hold to be first wrong and then mischievous. I think—even after the late change—enough of the liberal mind must surely be left in professed Liberals to lead men to say: Those used to be our principles, if they are not so still. The question then is, whether those principles acquit or condemn what is now claimed on behalf of the Roman Catholic majority in Ireland.

Again, so long as Mr. Gladstone was either removing inequalities or redressing injustice, I always supported him. When it was said, on the one side, This measure will heal, will reconcile, will settle, will satisfy, I could only sigh at the simplicity which imagined any such thing. On the other hand, when it was said: It will not satisfy; it will only whet the appetite for a new ascendancy to replace the old, I was forced to say, whether it will do so or not, it will weaken the justification of any demand in that direction. Such demand

is sure to come; but up to the line of equal rights—equal rights, both civil and religious—for all, it is a duty to follow Mr. Gladstone as any other leader; though his preferences will certainly never permit him to come up to that line as respects English Nonconformists, scarcely as respects Scotch and Welsh ones, so long as he can drive back the grant of religious equality to the dim and distant future. His disestablishment of the Irish Church was to be judged on principles of justice. The assertion of his enemies that he meant it as the precursor of the disestablishment of the English Church, I always disbelieved, saying that he more probably meant it to stave off that measure. Accusations of double purpose seemed misplaced. Strong predilections, with overriding tastes and sympathies, were obvious. He would readily think of grants to Churchmen and Roman Catholics as natural, while corresponding ones to Nonconformists would have to wrench his æsthetics round to bring him into line with his intellect. But, whatever might be one's conviction that it was not he that would ever lead England up to the line of equal rights for Nonconformists, that was no reason for either refusing to follow up to that line where he did lead, or for charges of double purpose where all that appeared was a case of complex sympathies.

The limit of equal rights is the line on which it is the part of observant men to fix their eyes, saying, on the one hand, No fear of consequences shall prevent us from following up to it; saying, on the other hand, No one shall beguile us when once any attempt is made to pass beyond that line. Any one who knew the principles at work in Ireland, absolutely knew that such an attempt would be made, whether to-day or to-morrow. The call of the Liberal mind is to discern when that point has come, and the part of

the Liberal citizen is there to take his stand like a man, and refuse to flinch a hairbreadth, no matter what blinded Samson may sway with his full weight against the pillars.

In Mr. Gladstone's legislation the coming of that moment was clearly adumbrated in 1870 in the Education Bill for England; it was signalled in advance with a startling ring in his Irish University Bill of 1873—a Bill I say, without fear of contradiction, which would not have been proposed by a Liberal statesman, even in a purely Roman Catholic country on the Continent, say in Belgium or Italy. I do not mean that I shall not be contradicted by political partisans: I do mean that I shall not be contradicted by any serious student of modern history, who, being familiar with the languages and people of the Continent, has spent half the time and toil I have spent in mastering the principles and the policy of the Vatican and also those by which statesmen who understand the Vatican are wont to confront it, or by any one whose writing on that point ever received from Continental critics as much testimony to care and accuracy as did my history of the Vatican Council. In 1870 the statesmen of most countries, of all Roman Catholic ones—notably of France and Austria—showed that for a time, at least, they had gone down to the principles and taken knowledge of what they had to deal with. But the Nonconformist members of Parliament were not carried away with that Bill of 1873, and it was lost. Now, however, we are not in presence of any doubtful shadow, or any signal in advance. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. John Morley now seem to pass clean beyond the line of equal rights, and to be striving to set up an isolated Ireland on the ground of exceptional privilege and virtual ecclesiastical dominion. When I wrote the last

sentence, before I had read the Bill, I should have said they are doing this unconsciously;—in fact, did say it to many. Now I have seen the Bill.

Long beforehand I had in mind applied the principles above stated to what is now demanded—demanded not on behalf of the Irish nation, as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. John Morley say, for the Irish nation is divided; but on behalf of the Roman Catholic majority, and not of all Roman Catholics; for not all of them are disloyal, any more than all Protestants are loyal. The disloyal Protestants are a very feeble few; and what is their type of liberalism may be judged from the case of John Mitchel, who, when once safe in America, turned out to be in doctrine and practice an upholder of slavery. The loyal Catholics are not so few or feeble; they are in great numbers and many of them educated; but it is only those of them who are in a position to defy terrorism who dare declare themselves. Persons like Mr. John Morley, or journalists like the latest *Daily News* scribes, or politicians of equally monocular type in Parliament, may indeed speak as if this was dividing the population of Ireland on theological, and not on political lines; and they may train their minds to move on a transcendental plane where this division falls completely out of view, as Mr. Morley, in a published collection of his articles, clearly shows that he has done. That is just as if a man judged of India, nobly bent on ignoring the divisions of caste—divisions to notice which no high politician could stoop; or as if one trained his mind to judge of Thessaly without admitting as fundamental the division of Turk and Christian. Even Mr. Morley himself, if planning for the future government of France, might possibly admit that, instead of some figment classes of the brain, it would be as well

to reckon, like a man of every day work, with Freethinkers and Clericals. High politics or low, the division of Ireland into Roman Catholic and Protestant are the divisions which centuries have made, and which Mr. Morley may superbly ignore; but which men with even one eye, if that is open, will see to be the practical divisions which have to be faced. This premised, we have to ask, What then is demanded on behalf of the Roman Catholic majority?

What is demanded is not the removal of any inequality, or the abolition of any exceptional privileges. If it were so, every Liberal and Nonconformist would, by instinct, say them yea. What they demand is, on their part, free from any taint of inconsistency with their principles. It is the founding in their own favour, by an exceptional Act of Parliament, of new privileges in both legislative and executive power. They demand what no other three millions out of thirty-six millions possess, or would dream of claiming. They demand that they shall themselves be exempted from the balancing control of the thirty millions of the United Kingdom; and, in the second place, that the loyal Irish shall be deprived of the balancing safeguard of thirty millions of fellow subjects, and shall be put into their power.

No one can say that in this I exaggerate the scope of the demand made by them, and now, alas! not by them only, but made by Mr. Gladstone, backed by a residuary Cabinet; and by him put forward, above all things, in the name of the Liberal party of England and Scotland. No one can say that, such being the scope of the demand, it does not involve exceptional legislation and real privilege; the exceptional character of the proposed Act being not only conspicuous but staring; the privilege created by it amounting not only to

preference in law but to practical domination. The loyal Irishman, whether Catholic or Protestant, was born to the heritage of equal laws, adopted for the common good by thirty millions of free people.

A heritage, it seems to me,
A King might wish to hold in fee.

But England has seen the day when her Prime Minister comes before her and proposes that a million at least, perhaps two millions, of citizens who love the flag shall have their birthright sold over their heads, because out of thirty-six millions some three or three and a-half will not be content with an equal lot as British citizens; will not be content unless they are exempted from the common law, and unless their reluctant fellow-countrymen are pushed away from under its shield to be legislated for by them.

Considering the tone in which supporters of the Bill speak, as if they were only going to gratify good boys and curb saucy ones, I must say to such gentlemen that I do not believe that any one of them who sat in the last Parliament or two with the Parnellites, before they saw the Liberal party tied to their chariot wheels, could help contemplating, for himself, his children, and his country the prospect of exchanging the rule of the British Parliament for their rule as less than a calamity and a degradation to be resisted in every way that loyal men can employ. Have I not seen them full of disgust and weariness, ready to give all up in order to escape the "Irish" turmoil and tease? And little wonder. But if it was not an easy matter to sit with those gentlemen, what will it be to sit under them?

How exceptional are the powers to be created for the three or three and a-half millions of discontented Irish is obvious. They can repeal all laws, make

new ones, and levy taxes; and the bayonets of the British Empire are to be put at the command of those three millions to force loyal fellow countrymen into subjection, their law being adopted as British law. Considering that it is the loyal minority from whom comes the greater proportion of the income tax and other taxes, which minority costs, in proportion, far less for governing, this is simply setting your friends to pay for their own oppression by your defiant enemies. Men do not now use that word; but, say what they will, they cannot quite expunge from their minds all the sayings and doings of past years. No section of the people in England, Scotland, or Wales can lay on taxes upon the rest; for all, that right rests under the ægis of the Imperial law. It is for the Roman Catholic majority in Ireland only that this tremendous power is snatched away from national, and passed over into sectional guard.

Yes, it is replied, but not to establish their religion! Pause, and pause again. It is said in the fourth clause of the Bill that the Irish Legislature shall not establish any religion. But, with profound pain, and with other feelings which I will not put any name upon, I say that clause is a deception. Warned by my experience in the Irish University Bill, I begged some members of Parliament to search in the supplemental clauses, lest they should nullify seeming safeguards in the body of the Bill. When it came into my hand, the first thing I did was to turn to the supplemental clauses. They seemed not to cover any guile. But behold, in searching the Bill itself, when arrived at clause *nineteen*, I find a few stealthy lines of a short sub-section which turn the prohibition respecting religion in clause *four* into waste words. The effect of clause *four* is that the Roman Catholic majority cannot

establish any religion; the effect of clause *nineteen* is that "notwithstanding" such prohibition, with the assent of Her Majesty in Council, they can spend money out of the taxes on their church.

Section IV. (1).

"The Irish Legislature shall not make any law—

Respecting the establishment or endowment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

[Mark, this prohibits not only establishing but also endowing a religion.]

That is the manner of legislation which Englishmen are to register as English, which Liberals are to be communicated if they do not register as Liberal, and to which Nonconformists are expected to say Amen. It is as like the old supplemental clauses of 1873 "as my fingers is to my fingers." So the separated Irish are not to establish a religion, but may subsidize one in the first year; and that done, the next step will need nothing but threats in Ireland, and tremblers in office here. An English Catholic journal says that if they are not to be free to establish "the Church" in Ireland, they will no longer have any reason for helping to keep up the Establishment in England. Precisely so: and after the scene of 1869 in the House of Lords, when the English Lords spiritual showed themselves so ready to go share-and-share alike, the complaint seems natural. That does not prevent it from indicating what is in view. And those who said from the first, Mr. Gladstone means to set up Roman ascendancy in place of Protestant ascendancy, will say to the rest of us, Did we not tell you!

Section XIX. (2).

"Notwithstanding that the Irish Legislature is prohibited by this Act from making laws relating to certain subjects, that Legislature may, with the assent of Her Majesty in Council first obtained, appropriate any part of the Irish public revenue, or any tax, duty, or impost imposed by such Legislature, for the purpose of, or in connection with, such subjects."

The stress of argument in support of claims so enormous, to be ratified by legislation so exceptional, lies in the fact that they who ask constitute a local majority. How great would be the majority in favour of separation from England is hard to say. The votes recorded for the Nationalists in the last elections did not largely differ from the half of those on the register.¹ Had no terrorism existed the vote for the Nationalists would have been less. Still, that they have a great majority is no more to be denied than that the Nonconformists of Scotland and Wales have in each of those countries a majority.

What has this Roman Catholic Irish majority done to merit, above all other local majorities, the homage of England's chosen minister, and to justify the grant by this great Empire of powers, such as no other local majority are deemed worthy of—such as, happily, any other local majority would repudiate? Have they made their own own section of Ireland the most prosperous? or, when they go to America, do they show themselves persons fitted to bear rule with wisdom and equity above and beyond the men they are to rule over—that is, above the Protestant Irish? Even Mr. Giffen confesses that the "disaffected" districts and the impoverished ones go together. It is quite true that poverty tends to disaffection; it is equally true that disaffection, as it is cherished and played upon in Ireland, tends to poverty, just as loyalty tends to industry and wellbeing. And in America no distinction is more sharply drawn in the minds of Americans than that between "Irish," and what they loosely call "Scotch Irish"; for in that category they include all Irish who are

¹ The half of those on the register would have been 297,857. The total who voted for Nationalists was 295,269.

like other citizens, who do not hate England, do not club to carry elections, do not make local politics too odious for men to take part in, except such as are not delicate about associations, or about everlasting jars and jobs. This class includes not only "English-Irish," but a considerable number who either went to America to become Protestants, which they durst not for dear life do at home, or else became Protestants after going there. Of these I have in America met with not a few. Whether of Celtic blood or not made no difference, this class would never feed the furnaces of Ford and Rossa. At the same time it is to be said that, as to the ordinary "Irish," I always found the Americans speaking much more favourably of those who are free to show their proper character, by being away from the organized forces of great cities, than they spoke of those who in them are under the hands of the priests and anti-British agitators. In families the Irish servant maids stand high.

I am not aware that even in the totally untrue assertions often of late made as to the relative proportions of Irish crime, it has been claimed that in that respect the Irish majority has a superiority so meritorious as to warrant the grant of highly exceptional legislative and administrative powers. How untrue are such statements as have been made, any one may see in Mr. Arnold Forster's *Truth about the Land League*, a short book, and very lively reading. If the total of home crime were added to the export of Irish crime into England and America, instead of any one on the side of exceptional power venturing to touch that question, it would be thought of only by advocates of exceptional restraints; and therefore, but for the audacity of some, and the simple credulity of our neo-Liberals, I should not even allude to it.

But, if need be, the facts are to be had. The ground of exceptional merit, may then be taken as hardly tenable. It is not my object to prove anything more; seeing that I resist only exceptional privilege.

This, then, being the case, is not their demand of the same nature as if the Nonconformists of Scotland and Wales, instead of asking that they should be relieved of exceptional legislation in favour of a minority, that they should be permitted to stand in things civil and religious on an equal footing with their fellow citizens, less in number than themselves, should come forward to ask that the National Legislature should cease to make laws for the two parties in common, and should hand over the power of making them to the local majority. If I am told that the cases are not the same, I admit that the demands made are not the same; but, suppose they were the same: What would Mr. Gladstone, what would every man with an English soul in him say? Not to be listened to. The demands are not the same, because the principles of the local majority in Scotland and Wales are of one kind, and those of the local majority in Ireland are of another. The demands are not the same on another score: the Scotch and Welsh ask peacefully, and without menace. The Irish majority demands, under pain of all manner of occult crime and overt annoyance; of attempts to exasperate against us foreign nations; of resolves to weaken our power in every available way. Any statesman, and any ordinary Englishman, would say that a peaceful demand may be listened to, but that threats are not to be reasoned with; just as Mr. John Morley has shown that fears do not reason. Had he not been so affected with the idea of having to face fighting priests and bishops, his reason would have told him

that Englishmen of Liberal creed and moderate nerve are not to be convulsed with terrors at the thought of ecclesiastical rebellion. If the Archbishop of Canterbury and all the parsons of the kingdom threatened to blow up Queen, Lords and Commons, Hawarden Castle, the Irish Office, and so forth, unless they were empowered in Convocation to put down Dissent, I do not believe that the bulk of Englishmen would think that the threat either added to the merits of the clergy or to the reasons for giving in. I beg a thousand pardons for using the names of the Archbishop and clergy in such a figure of speech.

We are told of Home Rule in the Colonies; and here Mr. Gladstone actually seems to think that the case is analogous to that of the "British Party" in some of our small Colonies, and even seems under a kind of impression that what colonists might occasionally have called disloyalty in one another, is much the same as that old and staid disloyalty from the yoke of which the loyal Irish shrink. More than that, he has brought himself to think of what was done for the Colonies and what he desires to do to Ireland, as being in substance identical. It is one thing when legislative acts, diverse by vast distinctions, are confounded by men of dull intellect; and it is quite another thing when they are confounded by one whose intellect is not more remarkable for pliability and breadth than for subtlety. But never was contrast clearer than between the case of the Colonies and that of the proposed legislation for Ireland. What Colony had for eighty-six years possessed a place in the Imperial legislature on equal footing with England and Scotland, and after that was put away from its place? Colonies had been in

the pupilage of the Colonial Office; and out of this pupilage they were lifted to possess representative institutions. It is true that the majority of Irishmen do not value representation in the Imperial Parliament, but prefer power to tax and spend over all Ireland at their will. It is true that Mr. Parnell and his men naturally desire the place, the power, the pay, and the patronage which being "the Government of Ireland" would imply. It is equally true that a minority of certainly one, perhaps of two millions out of five, do not wish to be in their power; and would flee from Ireland, if they could, the day when the strong free millions, an equal part in whose lot they consider the highest citizenship on earth, shall prefer rather to desert them than to face the terrors brandished from the Treasury Bench in the eyes of Britons. But those strong millions know that never did fathers of theirs desert a loyal minority in any Colony to a disloyal majority, three to one in number, organized into local juntas, well trained in terrorizing wherever they dare. They never in such a case said: You and we together are only twelve to one; we cannot face it; you must run your chance alone.

Did Mr. Gladstone when setting forth the analogy between the case of the Colonies and this case also set before the nation the all-dominating fact, of which no man is better aware than he, that the majority demanding exemption from Imperial legislation, willing, desirous to forego representation in the Imperial Parliament, is organized into seventeen hundred juntas, each giving local law with frightful penalties, each showing that cool crime and cool persistence are equally at command, in most cases the chief officers of the junta being priests representing the policy of a foreign Court, and the ordnance

and commissariat departments of the whole force being fed from foreign funds? No; he set this "behind the curtain." Law made in common by all the three kingdoms is held up to odium as foreign; but the case in which a Colony was handed over to real foreign rule of this palpable sort is not cited, for it is not yet in the annals of men born of free fathers.

Now, I put it to all Liberals of whatever shade, if there ever was a Colony handed over to such a *régime*? I put it to them, if it is practical or just to compare a case dominated by this element, to cases in which no such element exists? To any of them who have resided in Roman Catholic countries, say France or Italy, I put it, whether any one in those countries, calling himself a Liberal, could dream of such a proceeding? Do not flinch; if the facts are for you, you can face them.

Let any such gentleman imagine himself in Brussels, Paris, Munich, or Rome with a few enlightened Liberal politicians, and saying to them, I shall put a case and on it ask a question. Given a United Kingdom of thirty-five millions, which includes one section of five millions, three-fourths Roman Catholics, one-fourth Protestants, the Catholics being what you call fanatically clerical, the Protestants being what in England is called intensely bigoted; and the Catholics, moreover, being organized in seventeen hundred committees presided over in almost every case by a priest. They demand that the National Legislature shall cease to make laws for the two parties in common, and shall leave to the local majority all legislation for both parties. That is the case. The question is this: Would it be the policy of a Liberal statesman, because he could not otherwise content the Catholics, and was threatened with the terrors

of the priests and their flocks, to withdraw from the five millions the moderating balance of the thirty? A Liberal statesman! they would cry, Impossible, the very idea is wild. Well, then, would it be the policy of a Conservative statesman? At this question a doctor would say, *distinguo*:—If he were a moderate Conservative, no; if he were a clerical and a reactionary, he might. Liberals in those countries know more than Englishmen can know what is meant by being ruled by a thin agricultural population, itself ruled by priests.

Now, I say, as a mere matter of fact, that the only man fully capable of judging what are the true bearings of the proposed changes is one who has resided, not visited, in Munster or Connaught; or else one who has resided in the Neapolitan or Roman States when they were under the rule of the priests; in the one case ostensibly, in the other mediately through the King and Court. Men who have resided in Ulster or Leinster know pretty well.

We are told of Home Rule in the United States: Was there ever a State *put away* from the control of the National Legislature, to give entire practical control over it to a majority composed of men disloyal to the Union, and that against the protest of a powerful minority? Virginia was divided because the minority in Western Virginia, loyal to the Union, claimed to be exempted from the *régime* of the disaffected majority in the bulk of the State; just as, if the worst came to the worst, Ulster should have to be freed from the yoke she dreads. The two processes are the reverse of one another. In America, the States being in existence, made the Union. We, having the Union in existence about as long as that in America had existed before the Civil War, are invited to break

it up for fear of another insurrection. The Americans declined to break up their Union when threatened with insurrection, and declined so to do when defeated in battle again and again, and when Mr. Gladstone was eloquently proving that it was hopelessly gone, they were hopefully holding it together. The National Legislature has never loosened the ties of the Union over any State, much less in a case having features such as this one has. Was there ever a State exempted from the control of the National Supreme Court, capable of declaring its laws unconstitutional, ever a State set outside of the national tariff? Was there ever a State under an organized system of juntas headed by priests? Yet, with all the effective ties existing in the American system, already Home Rule or States' Rights have cost the United States a civil war of four years' duration, and may give more trouble yet; although, happily, in America the tendency is to consolidate the nation, and no Prime Minister has proposed to loosen its joints.

As to the parallels on the Continent, that of Austria-Hungary has been well disposed of by the ridicule and indignant comments of both the Austrian and Hungarian Press. As to Sweden and Norway, if local juntas were as numerous in Norway as they are in Ireland, and were headed just as those are; and if the King was of a religion not acceptable to the Court represented by the presidents and secretaries of those juntas, an element of disturbance would exist, which politicians and journalists might be unreal enough to try to ignore, but which would make itself felt in every step that had to be taken. Again: had Sweden and Norway been a United Kingdom, with a common legislature for eighty years, *the only eighty years ever known in the history of one of the two without a civil war*; the

eighty years wherein beyond all parallel the United Kingdom grew and flourished? and did a Prime Minister at the end propose to put them under two separate legislatures, because a proportion of one to twelve of the whole population threatened dagger and dynamite if that were not done? To find an analogy in a case wherein not one of these elements exists, fancy shoots above all solid footing, and rests on nothing but its strength of wing. Had Sweden and Norway been under a common legislature, their mutual assimilation would have proceeded more rapidly and fears now felt of a future rupture would have been less well grounded.

The case of America gives not any example of what is about to be done, but is a warning against the dangers of attempting to force a separation *after a union*. What a mercy to mankind that the attempt to do so failed! I once heard the late Canon Bardsley, of Manchester, say that, "though Gladstone could make speeches, he could not, like Disraeli, make phrases. He has, however," added the Canon, "just made one that will live, in this speech of his at Newcastle, when he said that Jeff Davis has 'made a nation.'" I chuckled and said nothing, seeing I took Disraeli to be vastly inferior. The phrase involved an act of foresight, founded on an estimate of things as they stood. I had heard Mr. Gladstone, with Mr. Cyrus W. Field, discuss the case for a whole dinner hour, and longer; and had seen that his discernment of the bearings of facts fell far short of his powers of pleasantly putting his views, so as to be embarrassing even for one who knew all about it. Had his wishes for that disruption been fulfilled, the continent of North America to-day would have been groaning under a two-fold incubus—the military system of the Old World

added on to the slave system of the New. A slave Empire or Republic all around the Gulf of Mexico, and up to the Potomac at least, with its huge standing army. North of this, a great free Republic with a larger standing army; further north, Canada with another standing army, by necessity disproportioned to its power. A disruption which must have led to such a state of things would never have been in prospect hailed by a statesman of real foresight. The fate of the one phrase with which my excellent friend consented to credit the rival of his favourite has often occurred to me since it was signalled from Hawarden that the country wherein I was born, and that wherein my children were born, are to be made, if he succeeds, foreign countries to one another. When I said to myself, so long ago, The nation will not be made; foresight is not Mr. Gladstone's forte; the phrase will never be heard of again, little did I think that it would come up once more like a stormy petrel, when the winds should be threatening to wreck the union, not of America, but of Great Britain and Ireland. Canon Bardsley was right, and I was wrong. The phrase will live; but will it not live as a monitor to Ministers of State who have succeeded to the inheritance of a united country, not to be beguiled into attempting to leave behind them a disunited one? The sense in which Jefferson Davis made a nation was this: by seeking to destroy a union that was not close enough, he awoke a national sentiment that made it vastly closer; made what politicians inclined to division had rendered a group of ill-knit communities into a solid whole. May a merciful Providence grant a like issue to the sad attempt of Mr. Gladstone!

Mr. Morley was right in setting over against the mistake as to America Mr. Gladstone's deeds else-

where. With what warmth of respect—I might say of love—have I heard his name mentioned by Italians, Greeks, and others on the Mediterranean, mentioned for substantial services nobly performed, worthily remembered. But he did not in a united Italy help the clericals to detach Sardinia or Sicily from the nation. He helped oppressed fragments of a common country—continent, peninsula, islands,—to gather themselves together, and be at one, even though the clericals did greatly wail. He did not in Greece help the Ionian Isles to separate themselves and start without a “last link” of union with the great bulk of territory; but the reverse. He did not help Roumania, Servia, or Bulgaria to depart from a free and equal citizenship, in the freest of all States, in order to set forth on the perilous passage from that Fair Haven to an Irish Republic.

But, I shall be asked, Do you mean to say that the Union has been a good to Ireland? On the contrary, was not the country flourishing and happy before, whereas ever since it has been going down and distracted?

Alas, alas! for the systematic *suppressio veri*, with the systematic free course to the bounces of disloyal men which has of late been to the taste of many who mean to be Liberals, and who are led away only by the very sympathies they cherish for equal rights; at least they are led away by this, together with that which is one of the greatest weaknesses in the political character of men whose life experience is *purely* English, namely, their proneness to take statements for facts, and not for what they are worth, if only the statements are made by decent people and in a pleasant way. For instance, take Mr. Healy's apostrophe to Mr. Gladstone's beauti-

ful feet: Very fine; says the man of purely English experience, accustomed all his life to Englishmen. That man would think an Irish Protestant narrow, intolerant, bitter, five hundred ugly things, if he should say, Let Mr. Gladstone refuse to follow his leaders, and next week this same gentleman would "throttle" him. Yet, among men whose experience teaches them the value of words, he would be held for a simpleton if he did not say so; and for the purposes of a nation a mischievous sort of simpleton too, albeit well meaning. The masters of the Ministry are too shrewd not to see when Mr. Gladstone fails to give them more only because he is not able, and offers them to-day less because he cannot give them more, they being free to make up lost ground. But let him turn of his own motion a few points from the proper course, and then!

To return to the question if I mean to say that the Union has been a good to Ireland; of course I do mean to say it, for the tame but not bad reason that I wish to tell the truth. Have you in these fourscore and six years had another great Irish rebellion or massacre? No. Were there ever fourscore and six years without a civil war or massacre either before the Normans (not the Saxons, as people always say) were sent by the Pope to fasten upon Ireland St. Peter's pence, or since that event? Never.

Well, but was not the country rapidly rising under Grattan's Parliament, and has it not been as rapidly sinking ever since? The Statement laid before Mr. Gladstone in answer to his invitation to Lord de Vesci by the Loyal Irish Patriotic Union gives returns and figures in reply to this question.¹ In the ten years

¹ Statement submitted to the Prime Minister. Especially Part III.

preceding the rebellion of '98 Irish shipping had gone down from sixty thousand tons to fifty-three. I speak in round numbers. In the last two years before the Union it was only thirty-five thousand tons a year, if equally divided between the two. The number of new ships built in the ten years preceding the Union went down from fifty to eighteen. Taking the exports of "the growth, produce, and manufactures of Ireland" for the fourteen years previous to the Union, the falling off was 30 per cent. or more on every article except five, in a table, including fifteen, while in wheat, barley, wool, &c., the falling off was 50 per cent. In the nine years preceding the Union the Irish Debt had increased TEN TIMES; from two millions and less than a-half to twenty-five and more than a-half.

Just as in the East all old buildings are ascribed by the Arabs to King Solomon, so in Dublin all public buildings are ascribed to the eighteen years of Grattan's Parliament. Trinity College, the Royal Exchange, the central portion of the Bank were there before those years. The Custom House had been begun ere those years set in, but took ten years in building, and was described in Grattan's Parliament as "A monument of Irish folly and corruption." The Post Office and King's Inns were built after the Union. The Four Courts and the Eastern and Western Fronts of the Bank were built during the eighteen years.

These facts have some bearing upon the assertion that England robbed Ireland of her legislature out of jealousy of her growing commerce, and in order to put it down; they are strongly corroborated by public incidents of the years in which the jealousy is alleged to have been excited. If all branches of trade were

steadily and yet rapidly declining, it was in the face of a system of bounties—bounties on flax, on ships, on silk, on coarse linen, on refined sugar, on fish; and even bounties on the carriage to Dublin of corn and coals. The committee blessed with the patronage of these bounties bore the name of the Scrambling Committee.

In the first year of the independent Parliament it was petitioned to restore the "almost ruined manufactures," by imposing import duties. The makers of broadcloth proclaim "unparalleled distress"; hatters and weavers of worsted speak in like manner; and petitions from Cork, Roscrea, Carrick-on-Suir, describe Ireland as "pregnant with most alarming circumstances of distress." Four years later the woollen manufacturers of Cork and Dublin pray for aid to avert the necessity of discharging their workmen. Similar petitions mark the next year or two. Eleven years after the Parliament was in existence a general petition from woollen manufacturers states that nearly fifteen thousand workers "would perish unless relieved," while at the same time the silk manufacturers cried that their industry was "nearly annihilated"; the hosiers, that their trade was "rapidly declining"; the cotton manufacturers, that they could "no longer give employment." Later, printers declare that the publishing trade has been "nearly extinguished." Later still, carpenters and bricklayers petition because they are "reduced to the utmost distress by want of employment"; and tanners cry that they are "not able to purchase within ten thousand hides of the number purchased by them in the preceding year." This brings us to the eve of the Rebellion of 1798; and in the last year of Grattan's Parliament was presented a report that the woollen trade had decayed

throughout Ireland, and that the manufacture of coarse woollens and sateens had "rapidly declined and was nearly destroyed." Perhaps nothing better illustrates the fact of how far this rapid decline applied to commerce generally, than the index to the spending power of the people yielded by the production of whisky. In the three years before the Union that production fell off twenty-four per cent.

Now, this period of eighteen years was the sole one during which an independent parliament ever existed in Ireland. Of the many bewitchments produced by the last elections on Mr. Gladstone's imagination, scarcely one is more interesting than his idea that parliaments had existed for several centuries. The earlier "conventions of the English settlers, . . . without any attributes of either legislative or deliberative assemblies," to use the language of Isaac Butt, the father of Home Rule, were no more "parliaments," in the sense of the word as understood by those who read Mr. Gladstone's great speech on introducing his Bill, than were the Bishops of the flock at Ephesus, who knelt with St. Paul on the shore, barons and "lords spiritual." At a later date the things called "parliaments," which sat from Henry VII. down for nearly three hundred years, could not initiate any measure. They had to receive such Bills as they were permitted to pass from the English Privy Council, licensed under the great seal of England.

Grattan's parliament itself could not pass an Act without the great seal of England, not of Ireland. *There was no Irish Ministry or Irish Cabinet.* The English Privy Council was above the Irish Parliament, and the *executive was entirely in the* Lord-Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary.

The acts and deeds of this "independent" legisla-

ture proceeded amid that steady decay of the national interests which I have stated; proceeded amid agitations and broils and collisions of men under arms; proceeded amid increasing disturbances, not excluding irruptions of armed mobs into the Parliament house, and even the burning of it, until all this naturally and surely led up to the woeful civil war of 1798.

Of course, if I were in Parliament, an Irish member with the disadvantage of being loyal, Mr. Gladstone would interrupt at the above utterance to say: "It was Mr. Pitt led up to it." In such a case few men would have the courage to reply as Major Sanderson did: "I expected that; it is always something done by those who support law and order." Was ever such reply delivered to an English Minister; delivered to one who had turned into the exponent and instrument of men, whose steps "dogged by crime," whose aims at "dismemberment of the Empire," pursued through "rapine," had been branded by his own eloquent lips with notes of guilt only too judicial; whose persons he had cast into prison: in my own hearing in Guildhall, justifying the deed by sheer necessity of preserving the first elements of society? True, Major Sanderson's reply was greatly exaggerated: it is not "always" something done by the friends of law and order. That is true as to the Nationalists. But when the Prime Minister of England is spoken of, it is little to say that such a charge is greatly exaggerated. It is not on any man, however great, that the blow falls, but upon the vitals of the State, upon the heartstrings of Society.

After the course of decay at which I have glanced, came the rebellion of 1798; and who was in fault in all that led up to it, I shall not say. The whole blame lies neither on Grattan's Parliament nor on England; neither on the landlords nor the priests; and, *pace* the

Prime Minister, not even on Mr. Pitt. Faults here, faults there, faults everywhere, were not diminished, but increased, by the "independent" parliament; and the conflict brought on was not lessened but increased by it. With what ears, when a small boy, did I hear the officer who had commanded the artillery at Vinegar Hill¹—then an old man—talk over the events of that year. None of his words left upon my mind such an impression as these: "We may say what we please now, but at the time when the battle of Ballinahinch was fought, we had little prospect of being able to hold the country. After all, the massacre of the Protestants in Wexford saved us. Had not that opened the eyes of the Presbyterians of the North to the value of the promises by which they had been deceived, it would have gone hard with us." Yea, verily; but there are some men to-day in the House of Commons whose eyes you will in vain try to open to the value of promises, till one of two things happens: either massacres in Ireland, or a hint from their constituents, beyond the reach either of tearoom blarney or of party intimidation, to the effect: "If you have forgotten all words but words said to your face, we have not. Moreover, we have not forgotten what was said before and during the elections about alliance with the Parnellites."

This leads me to note one simple method of estimating fair words. Divide the sayings of the Nationalists into four circles: first, those uttered in Parliament; next, those uttered in Ireland in a public place, where mayhap a Government reporter is present; at all events, one of some loyal newspaper

¹ Major General Robert Crawford. Later he was in charge of the defences of Antwerp, for Wellington, when Waterloo was fought, preparing in case the army should have to fall back.

that would not eliminate actionable things; after that those uttered in a banquet or private place, still in Ireland, where the absence of a Government reporter could be reckoned upon, but not that of the law; and finally, those uttered in America, out of reach of British law. Now, I could lay my hand on men in Parliament who, if they knew that I held four styles of language, nicely graduated to suit four such circles, and knew that the modifications between my utterances made within the narrowest circle of the four and those made in the widest amounted to the difference between law-respecting sentiment and treason; they would never take my promises for more than pie-crust. They would be right. Yet those men will look one in the face, and tell how fairly they are spoken by men whose utterances are no secret—men who are members of Parliament in reward of their treason; men who have no other blazon; men whose pocket-money comes from the wretches who write, and the people who subscribe to, the *Irish World* in America; men whose constituents are the persons for whom that paper is coveted reading.

To turn from the class of Nationalists just spoken of to Mr. Parnell, who has his own distinct position and character, he was once reminded by Lord Hartington of an awkward fact, not awkward for him—it is the very thing to commend him to his followers—but awkward for excellent Englishmen who are supposed to know the world, and yet judge only by what is said to their faces. Lord Hartington expressed a wish that the hon. gentleman would make the speeches in Ireland which he made in the House, and make the speeches in the House which he made in Ireland.

In 1880, when Mr. Parnell visited America, his course was thus spoken of by the *New York Herald*, no

apologist of England, in its issue of February 20, of that year: "His mission in America has sunk from what we call a 'boom' into a 'fizzle.' . . . He ought to have returned to Ireland 'for sweet charity's sake,' and have endeavoured to re-establish himself in the good opinion of the world, instead of stalking round this country preaching treason against the government of his native country." Mr. Parnell did not admire American criticism any more than English justice. At Rochester, in the State of New York, he is reported as having said: "The very best punishment for the *New York Herald*, when it goes to the lower regions, would be to send the Irish land system and the British Government with it." Three days after the article from which I have quoted appeared in the *Herald*, at Cincinnati, he used words which are often cited as if used at Chicago. For aught I know, they may have been uttered there also; for I spent five months in America a little later in the same year, and heard over and over again the same reports, in substance, of the tenor of his utterances, reports from both Americans and American Irish—by which I mean such Irish as become assimilated to the American people; and I do not mean those who never assimilate themselves to the Americans, but remain only Irish in America, clubbed together under agitators, plotting against England to the disgust of all Americans, *except such politicians as want their votes*. It would do a great many "Liberal" M.P.s and editors some service to hear all I heard, as well then as on a former visit, from real Americans; for whom it would make them feel more respect, making them, at the same time, less easy to be hoodwinked; helping them to take blarney for blarney, and to fear threats in proportion to the power behind them, which is always in an inverse ratio to the fortitude that faces them.

The words in the Cincinnati speech are as follows:—"When we have undermined English misgovernment, we have paved the way for Ireland to take her place among the nations of the earth—(applause). And let us not forget that that is the goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us—whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which binds Ireland to England"—(applause).

We now pass to the view of Ireland in a new era.

After the Rebellion of 1798 came the Union, inflicted by England in order to destroy flourishing Irish commerce, and to trouble the sweet vale in whose bosom met and slept the two limpid streams of Irish party. Has not the country gone down ever since, and that more and more rapidly as time wore on? In 1799 the tonnage of Irish ships was one hundred and twelve thousand tons; by the year 1845, before the famine, this had increased 462 per cent. I do not see a return in this form for the subsequent years; but in 1884 the tonnage inwards was six millions and nearly three-quarters of tons, and that outwards a little less. The value of Irish exports in the mid period of the Grattan Parliament was four millions and less than a-quarter; thirty-six years after the Union it was seventeen millions and more than a-quarter. The year after the Union England took of Irish exports to the value of three millions and a-half, and twenty-five years later to that of eight and a-half. From the Union to the year 1845, the consumption in Ireland of tea increased 288 per cent.; of coffee, 566; of sugar, 107; of spirits, 153.

The returns given divide the period down to 1845 from that subsequent to the famine. The few specimens I have presented do not show that England,

bent on ruining Irish commerce by the Union, knew how to make head in her "nefarious" scheme, at least during the first forty-five years. The famine came. Americans are coolly told, not by American Irish, but by Roman Irish, or Infidel Irish in America, that England murdered the Irish in the years of famine by hundreds of thousands at least. England saved by hard cash tens of thousands from death; cash from the treasury, cash from private hands. It was a true American Irishman, A. T. Stewart, who sent a whole shipload of food on his own account; but never, never could any mention of that act be coupled with the fact that he was a County Antrim Protestant. Others such, the Browns, the Henrys, and multitudes beyond what any one could believe, sent bountifully from America, whose gifts are never thought of as anything but American, no credit being given to the Irish birth and sympathies of the men to whose powers America had opened grand opportunities. Not because the Celtic Irish are an ungrateful race; never was a charge more unfounded; indeed, in my course through life I have proved such a charge to be false of Hindu, of Arab, of Berber, of Kabyle, of all sorts and shades of European races. But of grateful races the Irish individually, when taken away from agitators and certain authorities, are among the most grateful; even though when under word of command, and dealing with points where the animosity constantly played upon for ages is called out, they are, like all people in animosity, unjust.

In 1740, before the Union, neither legislature nor executive did anything when the churchyards could not contain "those who died by the wayside or were taken from the deserted cabins." I do not know that in India the people in years of famine have told

foreigners that the English had murdered them. I do know I often heard them tell of former times when there was no one to help, either for prevention or relief. Had it not been for the closer ties between the two countries, created by the Union, the woe of the famine in Ireland would have been much sorer even than it was. The distinguished father of Mr. Trevelyan and the noble Quaker father of Mr. Forster did not wage their good warfare against death on the pale horse from any impulse of Irish blood, or under any commission from the Pope, but from purely English and Christian sympathies.

Taking the years since the famine, say from 1851 onwards, the *Statement* submitted to Mr. Gladstone shows that between 1852 and 1884 the tonnage outwards increased 193 per cent., and in the same period of time the revenue rose 76 per cent. What is very odd is that examination brings out the result that the revenue of Ireland has in that time increased more even than that of Great Britain. Had the revenue of Great Britain, says the *Statement*, increased in the same ratio as that of Ireland, it would have been in 1885 two per cent. greater than it was. The *Statement* recognises the fact that since 1852 the prosperity of England and Scotland has been "without parallel in the history of either country." Yet the revenue of Ireland, a good test, has risen even more than theirs.

This does not merely prove that agitators who accuse England and the Union of having ruined Ireland are mistaken. It further proves that those who imagine they are Conservatives, because they decry everything that Liberals do, could hardly have been infallible in all the cases when they proclaimed to the listening world that Mr. Gladstone had ruined Ireland, and ruined it a second time, and ruined it over again, by his fiscal

and agrarian measures. If with one set of voices crying ruin against the Union, and another set crying ruin against Mr. Gladstone, the outside world has believed in ruin, and become impatient, ready to let any remedies, however wild, be tried, the Conservatives in Ireland have some share of the blame. Mr. Gladstone's remedial measures have proved themselves truly conservative by the good they have done, and if he confined himself to fiscal questions, and to such domestic legislation as ample discussion has prepared, up to the stage at which the chief requisite is genius to conceive and shape, not judgment to choose, he, his party, and the nation would not have been, every now and then, shaken out of gear by jerks of a giant giving a start all alone.

It is one thing to succeed by reforms in doing people real good; it is another thing to content those who will not be contented; and still another thing to attempt contenting them by depriving yourself of power to do them good.

Between '52 and '85 the deposits in joint-stock banks in Ireland increased 172 per cent., and those in savings banks 245 per cent.; cattle in number increased 36 per cent. and in value 105 per cent.; sheep in number 33, and in value 72; pigs in number 18, in value 151 per cent. These gleanings from the ample figures of the *Statement* show that, when Mr. Gladstone asserted that improvement was taking place, he was founding himself on facts; whereas in proposing to cast the hopes of Ireland into the hands of the enemies of England, he can found himself only on imagination; and what if his imaginations are vain?

The Union has permitted the Empire to grow with rapidity unprecedented; and Ireland, the weaker partner, has been the greater gainer. Under it, her

improvement would steadily proceed. Break it up, and wars and distresses, weeping and wailing, will be her lot. Technically, Mr. Gladstone's Bill is not a repeal of the Union, but it is far more. The simple repeal of that Act would leave a very different state of things from the one now imagined and provided for in his Bill; would leave much greater power of conserving the Empire, and, if need be, of retracing a false step. He tears up the principles of English polity, and the embodiments of them tested by the strain of time, with equal disregard of experience and of consequences. I do not examine the details of his Bill; they have been criticised with consummate mastery by more than one, and day by day fresh objections will appear.

As to what he considers guarantees of the integrity of the Empire and the supremacy of Parliament, every one of them is in the nature of a restriction on the power created by his Bill and called "the Government of Ireland." Prodigious grants alternate with preposterous reserves; spurs to goad on to a rush for a "place among the nations," and curbs, first to check and next to enrage that rush, are his expedients. Some have seen in Rome, in time of Carnival, the show called "races," when horses without riders are let loose with metal balls slung dangling at their sides, which balls set with spikes keep slashing the creatures into fury as they rush down the main street. That is the only picture which presents to me the case of the team which the new Bill will let loose upon poor Ireland, only an old gentleman called John Bull must be persuaded to think that he can hold a rein all the time, sitting in his parlour, and curb the racers if they should dash against anything precious. Putting out of sight politicians yoked to what the Ameri-

cans call "the machine," and editors equally yoked, can anyone say that he has asked a sensible man, "Have you faith in the guarantees?" and heard him reply, "I have," looking one in the face. I have personally met with but one who said it, and when he professed his faith, somehow, his face was not turned towards mine.

Every reserve upon the fatal grants given is simply in the nature of a bone of contention; every contention will be raised by the men of "war honourable and dishonourable as it suits us, fire and sword, but chiefly fire"; and just as often as you can set upon the Treasury bench persons holding office, and capable of taking up these threats and "terrorizing" England, one reserve after another will go; till the nation becomes as impatient of them as she did of the obstructives, and is rendered mad enough for any plunge.

Guarantees! One guarantee would be asked for as soon as the "last link" should be severed, and as an authoritative interpretation should be given to Mr. Gladstone's dream that "nationality" in the Roman-Irish sense is something of the same sort as it is in the Scotch and Welsh. Seeing that Ireland would be weaker than Belgium, England would be politely requested to guarantee her independence as she does that of Belgium. Indeed, Belgium was the model cited by Mr. Meagher of the sword. He never thought, however, of saying whose sword it was that guaranteed her. In 1870, when Germany on this side and France on that were nearing her frontiers, when the journals in Paris spoke coolly of "sending a regiment to occupy Belgium," it was the sword of horrid, hateful, tyrannic "foreign" England that turned into her shield, by a quiet act, seldom heard of—an act of strong and righteous statesmanship, that

stands amongst Mr. Gladstone's many imperishable honours. If England declined to guarantee, Europe and America would be asked to do so; then the ghost of some former Irish secretary might have something with which to frighten us more considerable than a war with priests and bishops.

Of all the dreams impossible to broad day, I should have thought that the guaranteeing of English money by Imperial taxes and Imperial rents to be collected by Nationalist officials for a Receiver "behind a curtain" would have been the last to flit across any human brain. It would be something worth while to hear some genial Parnellite members tell a simple English one how perfect were Mr. Gladstone's guarantees, how absolutely sound the security; and then to see how they would look at one another when by themselves. Whether was Bunker's Hill fought about local rates or Imperial taxes? Were Receivers "absolute security" in those parts? I have heard some who have worked close by Mr. Gladstone say—whatever they may say in Parliament—that he has no judgment in men. Almost every word in those passages of his speeches on the two Bills which involve a judgment of the men with whom he is dealing recalls that opinion, which probably would have made no impression on me had it not partially reflected my own. From the first time I heard him argue a case—that of the admission of the Jews to Parliament—I felt that to me his intellect was an enigma: breadth and elevation of view, depth of feeling, justice of intention, consummate subtlety of analysis, and flexibility of expression; but—but a mode of judging, now direct, now oblique, essentially fitful, not to say wayward.

Those whose new type of Liberalism is so like the tenet of implicit obedience, so severe against any

exercise of private judgment, must face this proposed arrangement, and ask themselves if they can help exercising their private judgment; or, at least, if they will not admit that one may do so and be a creature of God after all. Did not even Mr. Gladstone's rhetoric for once fly like a bird badly winged? His Receiver is the "neck" between head and body. Yes, indeed; "Just the right thing, boys; mighty convenient to throttle and be done with." Did not some one wish that all his enemies had only one neck, that he might easily dispose of them; and would not one neck for a Government be as economical an arrangement?

At the close of the last elections, after it had become plain that only Mr. Parnell could give to the Liberals a working majority, Mr. Gladstone told the people of Flintshire that the Irish were a Liberal nation. So saying, he settled nothing about the nation, but he did settle something about himself. The Irish nation is a nation of two extremes, neither of which is a model of Liberal sentiment. The effect of Mr. Gladstone's patting of Home Rule on the back, and inviting it to come forward and put its demands into form, was at the last election to blot out of the returns the very name of Liberal. No man, except adherents through thick and thin, such as ruin statesmen, could trust his judgment, and the two classes of his enemies cried, "We hold the field." But in the utterance quoted, Mr. Gladstone did not mean the Irish nation; he meant either the Roman Catholic majority or else Mr. Parnell's adherents; and for him these are Liberals. Mr. Gladstone's knowledge of their Parliamentary proceedings, of their course in Ireland and in America, and of the principles which underlie their movements—in all of which points his

knowledge vastly surpasses that of ordinary members of Parliament—leads him to say these men are Liberals:—the men of altar denunciations, of no-rent manifestoes, of obstruction in Parliament, of exclusive dealing, of boycotting, of midnight house-breaking and hedgerow murder, of fierce hatred to England; the men who had all through Great Britain fiercely fought the Liberal party, and whose leader boasted that they had throttled it, are, in Mr. Gladstone's judgment, Liberals.

They are certainly liberal enough to avail themselves of any man's illusions, and to accept advantages even from Liberal hands; but that is one thing, and what they are in Mr. Gladstone's judgment is another; they are, he thinks, Liberals. My poor saying was, repeating what I had said in print earlier: They are the most illiberal of any party within these islands. Take their words, take their deeds, and the only proof of Liberalism lies in their voting with the Liberal party when it is from that party they can get most—not a day longer. Mark, I did not say that they are Conservative. Anything but that; they combine extremes of perfect absolutism, of arbitrary rule, with insubordination and anarchy of a very serious type. If the term had a meaning, Tory-Democrats would come nearer than most others to a description of them, viewed in a merely political aspect, which is an unpractical and totally incomplete one.

I should not venture to describe the Protestant section of the Irish nation as Liberal; though it contains a large Liberal element which was rapidly growing. But, ever since the Disestablishment of the Church, I have told all Irish Protestants that their future place was, where their principles and not the traditions of past conflict point to, with the Liberals;

while the natural place of their opponents was anywhere but there. But any one who wants to know what are Liberal sayings and doings, according to the judgment of Mr. Gladstone, publicly expressed, at a moment when every eye was upon him, has only to read the journals published in Ireland and America while he was in office by the section of Irishmen who are to him the Irish nation; has only to note the speeches they made, the purposes for which they gave money, the modes in which they wished it to be spent in advancing such purposes; the counsel leaders gave to followers, the spirit in which followers interpreted leaders; their attitude towards occult crime on the one hand, and towards public justice on the other, with their treatment of any party or any measure by which they could not further their own ends. Having weighed all this, he will be able to see, either that Liberalism is not what the world takes it for, or else that Mr. Gladstone's inerrancy is not absolute. If the men guilty of such words and deeds are Liberals, all the Liberals I have known in England and other countries are happily of a different caste; yet, of course, true Liberals are as ready to help them in obtaining a redress of wrongs and an equality of rights, as if they believed them to be incapable of desiring anything more. What they are capable of aiming at, no one knows who has always lived in England, America, or even in countries as free as France and Belgium.

The *Daily News* cries out that people who speak of the part taken in Ireland by "the Church" are raising the old No Popery cry. That is a specimen of the way in which it is attempted to set the hounds at the heels of those who do not follow Mr. Gladstone in his following of Mr. Parnell. If anyone raises any old persecuting cry, it is not such Liberals as stand to

their principles; not Nonconformists who for themselves never asked of Cæsar "from a thread to a shoe latchet," saving only that protection which is for all. When the *Daily News* noted the part played at the last General Election by the clergy of the English Established Church, would not its editor have thought a gentleman singularly intelligent who should have said that the paper was raising the cry for a Five Mile Act against the parsons?

When Lord Randolph Churchill raised the war-whoop in Belfast, the *Daily News* said that the Orangemen were fonder of fighting their fellow countrymen than of having any other kind of intercourse with them. If they wanted opportunities of fighting, instead of opportunities of following their business, and meeting all classes of their fellow countrymen in every lawful way, most certainly they would welcome the repeal of the Union, especially in Mr. Gladstone's form of it. Old days would then come back; and the fighting men—for there are such—would find their time come; while to nine out of ten, the necessity for fighting would be a woe. Those who have all their lives discouraged every bellicose word and deed, look forward with deep sorrow. The lovers of fighting are few; the believers in the need of a constant watch are many; and those who feel certain that if the Bill become an Act it will ride in on the Red horse are of the loyal well nigh all. It is one thing to point out how mad resistance would be, and how foolish are threats of war; but it is another thing to tame the stormy spirits.

In one passage of the book made up of his papers and speeches, Mr. John Morley actually does show that he is not wholly unconscious of the fact that there is a minority in Ireland. He recognises it, as if

for a moment his second eye had opened. Then he dismisses it:—it is strong enough to take care of itself. Does he mean to let it take care of itself? That is what fighting men would want; what sane men do not want; what Mr. Morley does not intend. Major Waring in the House and Mr. Johnston in an "interview," both spoke as if they expected to be able to "take care of themselves." But there is a lion in the way.

When Lord Randolph's brag was reported, the *Pall Mall Gazette* said that the men of Ulster were only eight hundred thousand, and the people of England and Scotland being thirty millions would soon put them down. That is how they are to be allowed to take care of themselves. Those who scream out against coercion when it strikes underground crime, at once scream out for it when open rebellion is pointed at by those who have always been loyal. Just so, exceptional legislation is inveighed against, if it is directed against murderers, maimers, and so forth; but exceptional legislation of terrible proportions is hailed as some angel, when it is only directed against a million or two of good citizens, when all it will do is to sink them down from their secure place in a stable commonwealth, to take their chance in a bog with the feet of new masters over them. The editor who hails this exceptional legislation against such naughty people, tells them with great valour that thirty millions can put down one; and that is just the way to turn wild thoughts into acts, by driving brave men to despair.

Yes; thirty millions of Englishmen and Scotchmen can put down one of loyal Irishmen; and those who are in such haste to foretell it may, perhaps, have the reward of seeing men, when they find such odds against them, prefer to surrender, each with thirty

bayonets pointed at his breast, rather than wait to let them go through. But when you shut them up to a choice between the bayonets and the bottomless bog, men may go mad—then?

Yet how are our Parnellite-Liberals so sure that the thirty Englishmen and Scotchmen are made of the right stuff? Will they contentedly be marched, thirty to one, against men who have committed no crimes, who have never insulted the nation, and who, bad as men make them out to be since others became all at once so good, somehow always enabled Englishmen and Scotchmen to say: After all, wherever Irishmen are loyal, they are neither discreditable to us nor ill-doing for themselves? Are they perfectly sure that Englishmen and Scotchmen will say, We must side with the three against the one, with the strong against the weak, with the disorderly against the lawful; with the masters and men of foul plots and outrages against the masters and men of industry and trade; with those who have tried to blacken England before all nations, against those who ask nothing but to remain free citizens on equal terms. The Parnellites shall execute those laws and levy the taxes, and our arms three to one though they be, they might not like to fight for. That we shall do for them. Such a course would be justice to Ireland—a Christian policy for Ireland. Any one who demurs to that is an enemy to the Irish race; is a bigot raising the persecuting Popery cry. Is it not just possible that Englishmen and Scotchmen may say: On both sides talk of fighting must be put down. We can fight for laws made by the Imperial Parliament; we are not sure that with a good conscience we could fight for laws made by one in Dublin. It will never do to leave them to fight

it out among themselves; and there is nothing else for it but either to do that, or else to be compelled to fight for the laws made by a narrow party. The plain path, therefore, is to leave "parochial" matters to local self-government, but to keep all national legislation safe and sure, where it is most likely to be equal to all parties alike? If Englishmen and Scotchmen should say so, Ireland will be delivered, and England may look for peace with honour.

Think not that it is a question of social class. The agricultural labourer, who would bless Mr. Arch for all he has done for his class, would dread, as men in happy England know not what to dread is, the advent to power, in the form proposed, of the men whose methods he knows from of old. Justice to Ireland:—put its lives, liberties, and goods; its cottages and its workshops in the power of the tyrants of the field, the preachers of the "Anti-Linenite" crusade, with the strong, calm guard of the Empire withdrawn, and every Protestant labourer who could would seek another home. No man dares to carry his labour to those whom the Parnellites proscribe, or to earn his bread except under their thumb. If he does not obey, blood is the brief argument.

To one like me, seven days of whose life were passed within sound of battle, and months in a city under a state of siege, it is no literary play to picture Ulsterman, Scotchman and Englishman taking aim at one another on fields I know. But to that it may come. That day will be a sad one for the very large numbers of Protestant Irish soldiers who are in the army. Will not some of them pray that they may rather be shot than shoot anyone? As to the officers they can, of course, escape by throwing up their commissions. By Lord Wolseley's words some token

is given of the deep questions which this terrible slip in judgment has raised in the heart of loyal soldiers:—

"Hitherto it had been the lot of our soldiers and sailors to face the foreign enemies of this country with arms in their hands; hitherto they had succeeded in keeping at a distance from our shores all foreign foes; but now they called upon the people of England in their turn to do their duty, and trample under foot those enemies who were more serious than any foreigners could be, because they were enemies living in our very midst. (Deafening cheers.) He called upon them to a man, he called upon the English nation with one voice to say 'Hands off!' to that man, whoever he might be, who would dare to break and dismember this Empire, and who in so doing would ruthlessly destroy it. (Enthusiastic cheers, which lasted for some minutes.)"—
Lord Wolesley, speech reported in "Daily Telegraph," April 12, 1886.

Let the nation so speak, and the talk of fighting will die away. Let both parties in Ireland hear both parties in England saying in earnest; Order first: and order will come.

A Yorkshire member, Mr. Shirley, spoke in the House, as if he thought any idea of resistance by the loyalists was only Irish vapour. Does he think that the Conservatives of Yorkshire would submit to be turned out of their birthright, to be obliged to take laws, and taxes, and administration from the local Liberal majority, instead of from the British legislature? Does he think Ulstermen are totally unlike Yorkshiremen? It is to be said that the antecedents of the Yorkshire Liberals would not be as disheartening for a man whose property or person were to be at their disposal, as are the antecedents of those whom the Ulstermen are called upon to trust as masters. Notwithstanding the different record made in the past by their neighbours; the response of all freeborn men would be No, no; and their hearts will answer to the heart of the few who are content, and

who seek not one hair-breadth of legal privilege above other Irishmen, rather than to the heart of those who will not be content till Great Britain stands aside, and their fellow-countrymen are put in their power.

Now, I ask both English and Scotch Liberals what the loyal Irish have done? Why should they either be deserted to fight for themselves, or be shot down by Englishmen and Scotchmen till those who survive submit to be ruled by Parnellites? Why should a load so exceptional be laid upon them? Further, what have the discontented Irish done that such exceptional powers and privileges should be put into their hands, that you should endow them with the revenues of Ireland, and the armed forces of thirty millions of English and Scotch Protestants to enforce the decrees of three millions of Roman Catholics? Did ever civilised State hear of such a proposed endowment? You yourselves have not and seek not any such exceptional powers, yet you are to give them to the discontented Irish, and to pay for doing it in huge heaps of gold, besides paying with loss of name for good sense and judgment in governing. God forbid that against the discontented I should invoke any exceptional disabilities, unless, indeed, as the penalty of exceptional disorder. Against exceptional disorder, however, whether in Surrey, where I live, or in any county, north or south, English, Irish, Scotch, I should certainly invoke exceptional measures. If Ulstermen openly rebel they must take the consequence. If Munstermen secretly rebel, they must do so too. Force means force; and the nation whose statesmen on both sides palter with armed force, secret or open, must come to the pass to which England is now brought. The leaders of both parties, what-

ever their merits on other questions, have in this matter deserved ill of the country. Lord Salisbury, after beguiling the priests at the General Election, has proved himself the more crafty of the two. His rival rushed on to the "slippery footing," and he took the chance to wriggle off it; he at once began to go up hill, his rival began to go down, till a vote against Mr. Howard Vincent's proposal for encouraging the national defence was carried by Mr. Gladstone only with the patronage of Mr. Parnell. When England may be at war, it will be the word of some future Mr. Parnell which shall decide whether the enemy's ships are or are not to be free of all the bays and rivers of Ireland, free, openly, or secretly "as it suits us." For aught I know, the Minister was right in resisting the motion; but when on such a matter his majority depends on men to whom, when out in the open, the flag of England is an object of hatred, surely sober men will ask themselves whether either honour or strength is consulted.

The two pleas on which Members of Parliament dwell is, that they must not forsake Mr. Gladstone, and that they must finally settle the Irish question, which only he can do. Let them never forsake Mr. Gladstone when he promotes equal rights, or the redress of any legal wrong; or proposes remedial measures, the operation of which is beforehand ascertained or rendered probable by experience. But let the constituencies forsake any man who dares to follow, no matter what giant, on to the ground of special privileges, omnipotence of a local party, and virtual ecclesiastical domination. Let it be no palliation of such reactionary legislation that the ecclesiastics are not Anglican but Papal ones; for these answer to the description given by a French prelate in the

Chamber: "My clergy are a regiment; they have to march, and they do march." Turn back again to the words of Professor Maguire, the Roman Catholic, and of Karl Blind, the Freethinker, as quoted in the Prefatory Note, and say is it men with the faith of British Liberals in them, men with some bone of John Knox in them, men with the sympathies of the Puritans in them; is it the Presbyterians of Scotland, the Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists of England, who are to hand over the Presbyterians, Irish Churchmen, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers of Ireland to the care of Archbishop Walsh? It is at his word that the regiment must march, just as he must march at the word of his Sovereign, "the King of kings," over yonder "behind the curtain." Mr. Gladstone could have no power at all but for Nonconformists. For themselves they want no special privileges, any more than the Irish Protestants—not a shred of the purple, or fine linen, of the gold, or lands, or revenues, which Cæsar can bestow. They submitted in 1870 to be taxed, in his Education Bill, for the benefit of the Anglican and Romish Communion, and that in a form which turned both the aristocracy and pauperism of those two communities into means of increasing their power to draw from the purses of Nonconformists who had neither.¹ They not only patiently but loyally submitted to stern, hard dealing at the last election—dealing which illustrated Mr. Gladstone's weakness at home, abroad, and in the Colonies; his habit of giving in before his enemies, as if in fear of them, and of making immense demands on his friends because he does not fear them.

¹ When I once put this to Mr. Forster, in a company of friends, he had no reply. All he said was that he did think it best, on the whole, to put the education of the country, as far as possible, into the hands of the clergy of the Established Church.

This last blunder, however, was little to think about, and for me nothing to speak about. But when he comes forward to use the power given to him by free men to set up in Ireland, instead of the old Protestant Ascendency, a political ascendancy virtually of Romanism; when to do this he disunites the kingdom; when he reverses the progressive policy of Cavour, of Bismarck, of Abraham Lincoln, of the noble Swiss General Dufour, of all great men who have made a mark by opposing small contentious States to weld great and magnanimous ones; when he does this because it is well pleasing to Cardinal Manning, and because Mr. Parnell graciously accepting it, in part, for the day, gives him votes; and when he manipulates Nonconformist members till their talk with the shibboleths of Liberalism has acquired the substance of the Romanists' and rebels' talk, it is time for those who follow the old flag to say: The hour of parting has come. Thou wilt go the way thy inclinations lead thee; as for the sons of the men whose fathers were the pioneers and watchmen of civil and religious freedom all over the world, they will follow in the steps of their fathers. We shall gratefully remember all the good thou hast done. May it be remembered after thee, and may the evil be interred before thy bones! We cannot, however, be partners in degrading from full and equal citizenship our fellow Protestants, in order to elevate others to more than full and equal citizenship, by making them masters of as good men as they are, to say the least.

So far as to the forsaking of Mr. Gladstone. Now as to finally settling the Irish question. What he proposes to do will unsettle the foundations which for fourscore years have held us together without a civil war. We know that it has done so—that it has given.

to Ireland and Irishmen a place and heritage they never could have won had they stood alone. We know, therefore, what he will unsettle. We do not know what questions this measure will raise. But it will raise ten Irish questions for one it settles. It will raise them with an exasperation and vehemence hitherto unknown ever since the Union. It will raise them between nation and nation, in the harbours, in the custom houses, the excise offices, the rent offices, where England will appear as bondholder, and be vituperated as usurer. It will raise them amid yells of scorn and a boundless sense of power. You did it; will be dimmed in your timorous ears; You did it, because you were afraid of us and of our clergy; you said so, because you were afraid of the boys and girls in America; and you want us, indeed, to be gentle, and not draw the rope tight about the "neck." We told you, Mr. Gladstone, when you ran away from the Boers, that you would live to run another day; and you'll see. No one who knows Ireland will say that this caricatures the men or their mood. With men in such a mood, the change will raise old questions in new and more irritating forms, without the lubricating influence which time brings to working gear. Ay, it will raise them, too, with friends and strong-hearted freemen betrayed, scorned, cast off, thrust down by British bayonets under oppression.

When I read the words of any intelligent man who can say that Mr. Gladstone's measure will settle Ireland and bring content, I feel more than amazement. I shall not say what besides I feel. But this I will say, if such a gentleman can after that retain his own self-respect, he is constructed on principles I do not understand.

The storm birds are on the wing, and so are the

birds that scent blood. An evil counsel has troubled the realm, and the days of strife are nigh. Surrender to violence, surrender to plots, surrender to men who behind your back excite to all manner of crimes, and to your face speak fair; surrender to a court of ecclesiastics, whose lower officers in Ireland keep in touch with the agitators, whose officers in lawn sleeves or red stockings keep in touch with ministers, and gently offer their good offices with those "unreasonable people"; and for the Church want nothing, only—only this and that. Surrender with loud declarations of what and whom you are afraid of. Surrender of principles, of promises, of professions, flinging to the ground as if lumber a million or two of harmless citizens; and after surrender captivity. They to whom you lay down both sceptre and sword will know how to make your chains rattle. That John Bull will not stand; worse days for your captors will come; John will make his will prevail, though most of your friends will then be in Irish graves or on foreign fields; and the evil counsel that brought back the evil days as before the Union will be ever marked in the memory of England as one of the most sombre passages in the annals of unwisdom.

Finally, as to the point that only Mr. Gladstone can settle the question, all that can mean after the position into which he has swung himself and his party is this: that only he will make terms with Mr. Parnell, such as that dictator will provisionally accept. But dragging the Liberal party down to the level of Mr. Parnell's following is not the way either to settle the Irish question or to settle the composition of the Liberal party. Already it has broken it; and if this goes on it will be brayed as in a mortar. I am no pessimist. as all who know me know. My faith in the mission c

the British Empire was strong in youth, when I first troubled the world with print. My faith was still stronger when, in 1853, writing in the *London Quarterly*, I proposed its federation. Now, after comparison of many lands and many systems, it is stronger than ever. That Empire is not going to be wrecked. There is a blessing in it; and many of those who were ready to perish call it blessed in the name of the Lord. I have heard the slave ransomed and the slave in bonds bless it. I have heard the ryot tell of how in his boyhood when you brought in the cows at night you knew not where they would be in the morning, and when you sowed the rice you knew not who would reap it; heard him tell this, adding: But now we bring in the cows at night, and there they are in the morning; and when we sow the rice we know who will reap it. Ah, the British have done a great thing. I have heard colonists of other nations say over and over again that if England had their country it would advance far faster. And no men I ever knew have spoken more intelligently of its value to mankind and of its beneficent influence than Americans who have long resided in India, Turkey, or Africa.

It is not going to be destroyed. There is, I repeat, a blessing in it; but a blow has been delivered upon its vitals more dangerous than any foe could deal. It will take time to heal the effects of that blow, delivered by a single hand, unbidden but unrestrained.

But, as surely as, in 1870, without meaning to wound his party, he did grievously wound it, and without meaning to endow and reinforce a foreign educating power which would fight that party in every English borough whenever the party would not serve its foreign ends, he did endow and reinforce such a combative power, to feel its fist both in the election

next succeeding and lately in 1885; as surely as in 1874, without meaning to throw his party into confusion, and the nation into the hands of his rival, he, by one of his jerks, did so; as surely as without meaning to raise up at home and abroad enemies to him and to us by the very impression that he only needed to be beaten and he would run, he did make that impression, and brought his party under the shadow of it; as surely as without meaning that Gordon should perish, he took the way to let him perish, and entailed on his party all the woe of deep odium and even contempt—so surely has he now impaled the party and the nation on the horns of one of those dilemmas which in his marvellous career have been created whenever his herculean services have alternated with the jerks of a giant in wrong directions.

At the close of the elections so false, so hollow was the position in which his rivals had placed themselves, and so fair seemed his own, that had he abode his time, and let the men of the monstrous Maamtrasna scene try to do better than Lord Spencer and Mr. Trevelyan, whose services they had recompensed with official repudiation in order to gain the Parnellites, he and his party would have seen openings for vast usefulness, probably for power. His personal character and position perhaps never rose so fast as from the day he left office till the day he began his last ill-managed Midlothian campaign. In Opposition he had acted the Englishman, the gentleman, the statesman; his course in each one of these respects contrasting with and condemning the one that had been held towards him by the men he had to oppose. That was a great service to our institutions, as well as a wholesome example for all men. And in his words and appeals to high principles, when other politicians would appeal to low

ones, full oft have I felt as if he made me his personal debtor, instead of lowering my tone.

But, suddenly, "behind a curtain," he commits his party and the country to the plans of the National Irish League, and meets the nation as a candidate for office by favour of Mr. Parnell. Then opens a new career. It was his finger that pointed to those men as men marching through "rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire." It was his finger that had pointed to the traces which proved that "crime dogged the footsteps of the League"; and behold, while the eyes of all men are gazing where he has pointed, smitten by some mysterious charm, he sinks down, and the honoured head is pillowed on the lap so stained, with the glory of its white hairs covering from the common gaze the soil of the rapine and the dye of the blood.

Amid the general misgivings as to mistakes and vacillations in the Colonies and abroad, that which warmed the heart of the people towards Mr. Gladstone was a belief that in intent he worked for peace and righteousness, and in the main advanced them. Now, however, when we see him taking away equal power from the many, to confer exceptional powers on a few, and in order to do so robbing a loyal fraction practically of all power, whether imperial or in Ireland, surely something has overbalanced his sense of equity. Considering, also, the antecedents in action of those to be now set over others, with their two-fold foreign dependence, on the one hand for religious direction, on the other for money and agents of violence; considering, also, the intense British and Protestant sympathies of those who are to be put down, surely the state of mind whereby he conceives of the arrangement as one to give tranquillity is one

upon which experience makes no impressions and to which knowledge yields no light.

So crime is to be a terror to statesmen, and they who do well are to be terrorized. So my native country is to be pushed off from the elder sister, under whose wing the Creator has placed her, to whose keeping the ocean shuts her in. So the men whose words when free and among their own breathe threatening and slaughter, are to be the lords and lawgivers of the poor people of Ireland in general, who hail them to-day and will greatly wail because of them hereafter; lords and lawgivers of the Protestants in particular, who know what to expect; seeing they judge both by words and deeds, by principles expressed clearly and acted out whenever opportunity has permitted. So the Queen is to be the second, third, or fourth person in what used to be part of the United Kingdom, till the time comes when it must be reconquered, for given up it cannot be; England will learn that.

Ay, the old flag, is no more to mean Union to me. I dwell in the midst of a people, who when I came among them, in my teens, made no foreigner of me; who, if the fact that I was Irish influenced them at all, rather turned to a reason for greater kindness; but their Prime Minister calls me a foreigner, for he has gone over to the other side, and taken up their dialect.

Before the governor's palace in Malta, Dr. Lyman Coleman, of Philadelphia, said as we met: "I have just landed; and I can tell you, Sir, that this morning I have had a feeling I never expected to have. After spending months over yonder in Italy, in those places where you and I met several times, under the things they call governments over there [it was in the days of Pio Nono and King Bomba], when I set foot ashore, and looked up and saw that old flag over me,

I felt—well, I felt as I never expected to feel under any flag but my own."

To me that flag has meant at home, meant law, a glorious citizenship, a sure protection in many lands, among civilized and uncivilized. Never was my feeling foreign to it, or its shadow cold to me. But the Prime Minister of England has tried to tear out of it the Union, and all of us who both love it and were born in Ireland will have to say: When I look up at that old flag, I feel as I never expected to feel under my own flag. It protects me here, but not my kith and kin over the Channel; between it and them the English people has hoisted the banner of Mr. Parnell. Ay, and even me it protects askance, as a foreigner; for Queen, Lords, and Commons have turned the Prime Minister's words into deeds. My friend, Mr. Subramanyam, the Brahman barrister, from Madras, told me that when he landed at Marseilles foreigners were compelled to shew their passports. He said: "I am English," and that word passed him at once. Statesmen who can make a Hindu gentleman say, I am English, are made to build up Empires; statesmen who can make a man with English, Irish and Scotch blood in him say, I am a foreigner, are made to break Empires down. But, will the nation brand us as foreigners, and force us into subjugation to men whose real king is a foreign priest, and whose funds are, for the moment, drawn from a foreign country? No, no; surely the nation will say to Parliament, Spare that flag; let us not untie a Union under which both parties have thriven, even if one has been discontent. Repair breaches, redress grievances, extend absolutely equal local immunities, do justly, love mercy; but walk together, and never part.

WILLIAM ARTHUR'S WORKS.

AUTHOR'S NEW UNIFORM EDITION.

8vo., price 3s.

ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PHYSICAL & MORAL LAW.

Two Vols., 8vo., price 24s.

THE POPE, THE KINGS, AND THE PEOPLE :

A History of the Vatican Council.

Crown 8vo, Sewed, 2s.

POSITIVISM AND MR. FREDERIC HARRISON.

BEING THE FIRST PART OF

Religion without God and God without Religion.

Crown 8vo, Sewed, Price 4s. 6d.

AGNOSTICISM AND MR. HERBERT SPENCER.

BEING THE SECOND PART OF

Religion without God and God without Religion.

DEISM AND SIR FITZJAMES STEPHEN.

BEING THE THIRD AND CONCLUDING PART OF

Religion without God and God without Religion.

[IN THE PRESS.]

Crown 8vo, Cloth Gilt, price 4s. 6d. ; Half-calf, Gilt, 6s. 6d. ; Calf extra, 9s. 6d.

THE TONGUE OF FIRE ; or, The True Power of Christianity.

Crown 8vo, Sewed, 1s.

THE PEOPLE'S DAY ; An Appeal against a French Sunday.

London : BEMROSE & SONS, 23, Old Bailey ; and Derby.

aylord Bros.
Makers

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. MAR. 21, 1908

