# HOME RULE:

# FENIAN HOME RULE:

# HOME RULE ALL ROUND:

# DEVOLUTION:

## What do they mean?

BY

**ARTHUR WARREN SAMUELS, K.C.**

FOREWORD

BY

**EDWARD DOWDEN, LL.D., Litt.D.**

---

*A Constitution can be built—Constitutions enough à la Sieyes, but the frightful difficulty is that of getting men to come and live in them.*

— CARLYLE—"French Revolution."

---

**Price ONE PENNY.**

DUBLIN
HODGES, FIGGIS & CO., LTD.
LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO., LTD.

"In the lifetime of those who have attained middle age three great works have been accomplished in the world which far transcend all others in importance, and of which it is probably no exaggeration to say that the memory can never pass while the human race remains upon this planet. One of them, which is connected with the great name of Cavour, was the movement of unification by which the old and illustrious, but weak because divided, States of Italy were drawn together and fused into one great and prosperous kingdom. Another, which is chiefly connected with the name of Bismarck, was that movement of unification which has made Germany the most powerful nation upon the Continent. The third, which may, I believe, one day be thought the most important of the three, was due much less to the genius of any statesman than to the patriotism and courage of a great democracy. It was the contest of America with the spirit of secession which had arisen within its border; and although that spirit was spread over a far larger area than Ireland, although it existed over that area in a far larger proportion of the population than in Ireland, and was supported by an immeasurably greater amount of earnestness and self-sacrifice, it has now disappeared, and the present generation of Americans have in all human probability secured for centuries the unity of the great Republic of the West. These great works of consolidation have been the contributions of other nations to the history of the nineteenth century. Shall it be said of English statesmen that their most prolific and most characteristic work has been to introduce the principle of dissolution into the very heart of their Empire?"—W. E. H. Lecky.

# FOREWORD.

BEHIND the question of a Second Chamber lies what is called "The Irish Question." But what is called the Irish Question is, if understood aright, an English question, a question for Great Britain. Will the Irish trouble be got rid of, will the hostile part of Ireland—for it is only a part—be permanently conciliated by the grant of a subordinate Home Rule Parliament? Or will the trouble be intensified, and a new danger, which a foreign Government can in the hour of peril turn into the equivalent of many Dreadnoughts, be planted upon the flank of Great Britain? This pamphlet, written by a highly qualified authority and establishing its case by contemporary evidence and the evidence of history, gives what I believe to be the true answer. It is of the utmost importance, not only to the loyal Irish, but to the people of Great Britain that they should not take a leap in the dark. Here they will find truth and proofs of the truth. There is a hostile Ireland in the pay of Mr. Patrick Ford, who has recently declared himself at once the supporter of the policy of dynamite, and of the policy of the party led by Mr. Redmond. There is also a loyal Ireland passionately attached to the English connection, but which may be turned into a helpless and sullen herd. Will the electors of Great Britain cast off loyal friends for the sake of strengthening the forces financed by such an implacable foe as Mr. Patrick Ford? Because I desire that they should act at least with open eyes, I beg them to study this pamphlet.

EDWARD DOWDEN.

"*If this election is won, the battle for Home Rule is won; and a victory at this election is a decisive and final victory for Home Rule. The victory will be a victory for Home Rule, for, as Mr. Asquith said in his Albert Hall speech, the policy of the Liberal Party is full self-government for Ireland, and that position has been reaffirmed in the most emphatic terms. Said Mr. Lloyd George in his speech at Mile End—'We stand absolutely by the position we have taken up in the matter of self-government for Ireland always as a party—the position taken up by the Prime Minister in the Albert Hall; and the declaration of Mr. Asquith on April 14th on that point not only stands, but has been reaffirmed in the most emphatic language.'*

"*Mr. Asquith, in the House of Commons on November 18th, used these words—'That declaration, the language of which was carefully chosen, represents now, as it did then, the intention of His Majesty's Government.'*"—IRISH MANIFESTO TO BRITISH ELECTORS: HOME RULE AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

## Home Rule = Ireland a Nation.

To understand the Constitutional effect of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland and the meaning of the expression "Home Rule" as an Irish Nationalist aspiration, it is necessary to consider the position of the Irish Parliament before the Act of Union.

The Nationalist call is "Ireland a Nation." Parnell said, at Castlebar, on 3rd November, 1885:—

> "Speaking for myself, and I believe for the Irish people, and for all my colleagues, I have to declare that we will never accept, either expressly or implied, anything but the full and complete right to arrange our own affairs, and to make our land a nation; to secure for her, free from outside control, the right to direct her own cause among the peoples of the world."

Mr. John Redmond, on 14th November, 1910, on his recent return from America, said :—

> " I stand here to-day, as I have stood for the last twenty-five years, for the principles of Irish Nationality."
>
> " The democracy of Ireland will at long last gain their right of self-government. What do we care for material reforms in Ireland? They may fill the stomachs of the Irish people; that will not satisfy their spirits. I say that we have preferred in the past rags and the spirit of liberty rather than be the sleekest slave that ever was fed at the hand of the conqueror. No ; we in Ireland are out for the principle of Nationality. Nothing will bribe us from that. We are for ' Home Rule,' and nothing but ' Home Rule.' God save Ireland."—*Freeman's Journal*, 14th Nov., 1910.

On the pedestal of the statue now being erected to Parnell in Dublin is engraved this quotation from his words :—

> **" No man has a right to fix the boundary to the march of a nation. No man has a right to say to his country, ' Thus far shalt thou go and no farther.' We have never attempted to fix the ne plus ultra to the progress of Ireland's nationhood, and we never shall."**

This is the chiselled watchword of all the Nationalist sections. Thousands of quotations to the same effect can be cited from Nationalist speakers. The cry is iterated day by day. Not one of them would be listened to in Ireland if he spoke on a lower key. The ultimate aim of the Irish Nationalists is—Separation from England ; Independence from all control by the British Parliament or by a British Executive. " Home Rule," " Federation," " Devolution," whatever the concession if once granted, will be only used as a means to wring further concessions until ultimate independence is achieved. As one of their American emissaries said :—

> " The message we bear is from that illustrious leader of our Party, John Redmond. If there is a man who says to us as representing that Parliamentary movement, ' I don't believe in your Parliamentary ideas. I don't accept Home Rule, I go beyond it. I believe in an independent Irish nation.' If any man says this, I say

that we don't disbelieve in it. These are our tactics—if you are to take a fortress, first take the outer works." —Mr. T. M. Kettle, M.P., at New York, as reported in the *Irish World*, 24th Nov., 1906.

Remember that the Irish Nationalist movement centres in Ireland and is backed by Irish-American Fenianism. No soft words spoken on English or Canadian platforms echo the true ring of Irish Nationalism. They are spoken for a purpose. The driving power is found in the men whom Mr. John Redmond on the 23rd June, 1909, when unveiling the memorial to the insurgents in the Rebellion of 1798, addressed in these words:—

"We are not only honouring the memory of the men of '98, but publicly pleading our devotion to the same ideals for which they died, namely, the freedom of our country. We may differ from time to time as to our policy, but England should take note of the fact that so far as the object is concerned, that so far as the freedom of Ireland is concerned, we are all united, and we would sooner face one hundred years more persecution and of wrong than abandon or abate one single jot of the National demand. We to-day from this county of Wexford send therefore this message to England. We tell her that we Wexford men to-day hate her rule just as bitterly as our forefathers did when they shed their blood on the spot. We tell her we are as much rebels to her rule to-day as our fathers were in '98."—*Freeman's Journal*, 24th June, 1909.

Bearing, then, this truism of Nationalist politics in mind, "Ireland a Nation," let us consider what is the constitutional meaning of, and what would be the constitutional result of granting "Home Rule," "Devolution," or "Home Rule all Round," and what value there is in the expression, "A subordinate Irish Parliament," and what is meant by the demand for an "Irish Parliament and an Independent Irish Executive to deal with Irish affairs." Such words convey to Irish hearers a concrete historical meaning, but to persons not acquainted with Irish legislative systems and their history they are indeterminate and indefinite and give rise to many loose imaginings.

Subordinate legislative assemblies have an innate tendency

to achieve ultimately practical or actual independence. The history of the Irish Subordinate Parliament is an example of this rule. The position of almost complete independence gradually gained by our Colonial legislatures further illustrates it. It is demonstrable that if a subordinate Parliament is granted to Ireland it will repeat Irish history and rapidly achieve complete independence.

## An Irish Subordinated Parliament.

The Irish Parliament and Executive in the early part of the eighteenth century was completely subordinated to the British Parliament and Executive. The English House of Lords and Court of King's Bench claimed judicial jurisdiction over the Irish Courts. The British Parliament claimed absolute domination over the Irish Parliament, though the Irish Parliament never admitted the right of the English Parliament to make laws for Ireland. By the Declaratory Act of 6th George I. the English Parliament asserted the absolute right of legislating for Ireland. It was, as Lecky points out (*History of Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 155), "a case precisely parallel with the Declaratory Act relating to America which was passed by the British Parliament when the American Stamp Act was repealed. In both cases the right was denied, but in both cases the great majority of politicians were practically ready to acquiesce provided certain limitations and restrictions were secured to them. The Americans did not dispute the power of the English Legislature to bind their commerce and regulate their affairs as members of an extended Empire as long as they were untrammelled in their local concerns and were not taxed except by their own representatives. The position of most Irish politicians was very similar. The Irish Parliament legislated for the local concerns of Ireland, and it still retained with great jealousy a certain control over the purse which it justly looked upon as incomparably the most important of its prerogatives." The attitude of the Irish

politicians at that time is very like that assumed on English and Canadian platforms by Irish Nationalist politicians at the present time when they say they are quite willing to accept a subordinate, but independent Parliament to manage only Irish affairs. They can rely on the precedents of Irish, Scotch, and American history to get rid soon of any pretence of subordination once a vital issue is raised between the Suzerain and Subordinate Parliaments.

## The Subordinated Irish Parliament becomes Supreme.

Danger of invasion threatened the British Islands. The Irish Parliament enrolled volunteers in 1779. The Volunteers then were loyal to the British Crown, but determined to get rid of the domination of the British Parliament which asserted a right to legislate for Ireland and exercised the detested right of regulating Irish commerce. "In 1775 the Americans issued a special address to the Irish, urging the identity of their interests, and in the same year Chatham asserted that Ireland on the Colonial question was with America 'to a man.' The Presbyterians of the North were fiercely American, and few classes were so largely represented in the American Army as Irish emigrants" (Lecky, *History of Ireland*, ii., 160). In 1910 history repeats itself, and Mr. John Redmond informs his audience at Cork on the 13th November, 1910, that he attributes his collection of 150,000 dollars and the position the Irish cause holds in America

> "to the fact that in the United States they recognise that Home Rule never had as good a chance as now, and that we are extremely likely to win Home Rule out of the present political crisis. And of course it meant that American interest, apart from Irish-American interest, was roused in a way that it never was before. Everybody in America is talking of the great Constitutional issue in this country. They never could understand how the English people tolerated the House of Lords. They do not understand the Hereditary Chambers. It is foreign to their ideas of liberty in America . . . and the fact that we are helping the democracy in England to limit the power of the House of Lords

has brought all parties in America to our side in a way they never were before."—*Freeman's Journal*, 14th November, 1910.

The subordinate Irish Parliament of the eighteenth century caught the spirit of the American revolt, were in touch with it, raised the Volunteers, and in two years gained the complete independence of the Irish Parliament. Grant to-morrow a Parliament to Ireland as completely subordinate as the Irish Parliament before 1782; it will follow its example. The Fenians, Clan-na-Gaels, and American-Irish, whose dollars are to destroy the House of Lords and smash the British Constitution, will be ready with many more dollars to help on to Separation easy of achievement then. "Few classes are so largely represented" in American politics as the Irish-Germans and Irish emigrants, and with England's control weakened on her Atlantic outpost, there will be but little difficulty for the subordinate Parliament of Ireland to enrol not indeed loyal but disloyal volunteers under the guise of National Defence; to insist on Universal Service; to organise their Boy Scouts, and train every man to the use of the rifle against the day when the dominant Parliament is in the throes of some Titanic struggle against some gigantic power. The Radical Ministry that dare not to-day to extend the Territorial Army System to Ireland is made "toe the line" by its Commander-in-Chief, Mr. Redmond, and is prepared on the requisition of Patrick Ford—the Paymaster-General—to level the defences of the British Constitution, sweep away the House of Lords, and present to insurrectionary Ireland for her mercenary services Home Rule, "the plant of an armed revolution."

Listen to the words of Parnell:—

"They are a defenceless people in Ireland. The right to carry arms is denied, and that birthright of every freeman is punished in Ireland with imprisonment for two years.* A large body of Constabulary is

* The Peace Preservation Act has since been allowed to expire by the Radical Government, and revolvers are now sold wholesale all over the country.

employed, with 30,000 soldiers, but the time may come when Ireland will have a chance. When England is at war and beaten to her knees, the idea of the Irish Nationalists may be realised."—*Special Commission Report*, p. 21.

Listen to Patrick Ford, the dollar dealer :—

"I believe that England ought to be plagued with all the plagues of Egypt; that she ought to be scourged by day and terrorised by night. I believe this species of warfare ought to be kept up until England, hurt as well as scared, falls paralysed upon her knees and begs Ireland to depart from her. This is my idea of making war on England."

Read the Clan-na-Gael American-Irish circular of 18th December, 1885 :—

"While our objects lie far beyond what may be obtained by agitation, a National Parliament is an object which we are bound to attain by any means offered. The achievement of a National Parliament gives us a footing upon Irish soil; it gives us the agencies and instrumentalities of a Government *de facto* at the very commencement of the Irish struggle. It places the Government of the land in the hands of our friends and brothers. It removes the Castle rings and gives us what we may well express as the plant of an armed revolution."—*Special Commission Report*, p. 116.

In the *Irish World* of 8th June, 1907, an article appeared by Dr. Thomas Addis Emmett in defence of the use of dynamite in Ireland. To it Patrick Ford added this significant comment :—

"I am in entire agreement with the views expressed and the conclusions reached by Dr. Emmett himself. I am also in sympathy with the United Irish League and the Irish Parliamentary Party, so admirably led by Mr. John Redmond." (See *Spectator*, 22nd Oct., 1910.)

"What are our motives and objects?" said Mr. John Redmond in the United States, 14th November, 1901. "First of all our ultimate goal is the National independence of our country. I say in its essence the National movement is the same to-day as it was in the days of Hugh O'Neill, of Owen Roe, of Emmet, and of Wolfe Tone—to overturn the

foreign domination in our land and put Irishmen in charge of their own affairs. The object is always the same, and if we are working by methods, that seem slow and ineffective to a free and armed people, our critics should remember that people must labour with what they have at hand; whether the freedom of Ireland is attained by moral suasion or physical force, what difference so long as it is achieved."

Returning from America on 13th November, 1910, he said at Tipperary:—"A ridiculous rumour was spread that I had lowered the flag. Well, if I were inclined to lower the flag America is scarcely the place I would choose to do it. I would have endeavoured to get home by the other end of the world rather than touch at Tipperary."

Therefore all along down to the last utterance, a few days ago, of Nationalism the warning is clearly given to England that if a subordinate Parliament is given to Ireland it will be used to secure the absolute independence of Ireland.

Is England mad enough to return to power a set of demagogue ministers who are whooping on wild uninformed and ignorant voters to destroy the checking power of the House of Lords, so that they may pay their price to the salaried representatives of American Fenianism, and shatter her ancient Constitution, and plant a hostile power with a hostile Parliament within sixty miles of her shores?

It is not conceivable that any Parliament would be accepted in Ireland which would not control the external as well as the internal trade relations of the country, but the danger which may lurk in the grant of such powers can be judged from an incident which occurred while the Irish Parliament was absolutely subordinate to the English Parliament in 1782. The restriction which the British Parliament had placed upon the exportation of Irish wool had been abolished in 1779, and the Irish Parliament then claimed that Irish woollen goods should be admitted free of duty into Portugal, where British woollens entered free under the Methuen Treaty. The Portuguese denied the right, and refused to admit the Irish produce. The Irish Parliament then

addressed the Crown and called upon the Government of England to insist that Irish wool should be admitted by Portugal. The Crown remonstrated with Portugal, but achieved nothing; but if it had taken effective action to compel Portugal to yield then, in the words of Sir R. Peel, "One of two events might have occurred—either the foreign relations of Great Britain with a friendly power might have been disturbed, contrary to the wish of the British Parliament and British Ministers, or Ireland might have been involved in a war in which Great Britain refused to be a party." (See Ball, *Irish Legislative Systems*, p. 162; Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 267; *Peel's Speeches*, vol. ii., p. 425.)

## The Subordinate Parliament becomes Independent.

The subordinate Irish Parliament, whose fiscal policy, whose trade, whose legislation—was by British Acts of Parliament dominated by England,—whose executive was English, whose Courts of Law were according to English decisions subject to the control of the English Court of King's Bench and the British House of Lords, and in a country where the Mutiny Act was perpetual, and no necessity existed to summon the Legislature annually to vote an Army Bill, emancipated itself without striking a single blow in actual civil strife, by raising an armed force to protect its shores from invasion, and demanding from England independence from subjection to Britain or the British Parliament.

## Example of the Scotch Parliament.

In doing so it followed the example of the Parliament of Scotland, for the Union of Scotland was necessitated just as the Union of Ireland by the arming of the Scottish people by the Parliament of Scotland in the reign of Queen Anne. Scotland, like Ireland, was hampered in her trade by the English Parliament. The throne of Scotland was wholly separate and distinct from the throne of England, and a

different person might be entitled to each. The Scotch Convention Parliament had conferred the Crown on William and Mary, then on William, and then on Anne, but after Anne it was uncertain what would happen. It still remained for the Scotch Parliament to decide who, in the event of Anne dying without issue, should succeed to the Scottish Crown. The mode by which the Parliament of Scotland employed these circumstances was by making the descent of the Crown depend upon the concession of commercial freedom. In 1704 it passed an Act called the Act of Security, which provided that in the event of Queen Anne's death without issue the Parliament of Scotland should choose a successor of the Royal line and Protestant religion, but that the same person should be incapable of holding the Crowns of England and Scotland, unless the Scotch were admitted to the privileges of trade and navigation equally with the English people. *It also contained a clause that the men of Scotland capable of bearing arms should be trained to the use of them by monthly drills.* Anne was compelled to give the Royal Assent to this Bill by refusal of Supplies, the Scotch Parliament shouting, "*Liberty before subsidy*"; and on the advice of Godolphin Anne yielded and gave assent. Then it became evident that only one position was possible—one Kingdom, one Crown, and the Union of Scotland was effected.—Ball, *Legislative Systems*, p. 81; Swift, *Public Spirit of the Whigs*, etc., *The Story of the Injured Lady*.

## The Independent Irish Parliament.

The National demand of Ireland found expression in words, which are the constantly repeated watch-words of the Sinn Fein party in Ireland to-day. The resolutions of the Irish Volunteers at Dungannon, passed on the 15th February, 1782, asserted—"That the claim of any body of men other than the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland to make laws to bind the Kingdom is unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance." A week afterwards Grattan moved and

carried an address to the King in the Irish House of Commons founded on these resolutions—" That the people of Ireland were a free people. The Crown of Ireland, an Imperial Crown, and the Kingdom of Ireland, a distinct Kingdom with a Parliament of its own, the sole legislature thereof; that by these fundamental laws and franchises, the subjects of this separate Kingdom could not be bound, affected or obliged by any Legislature save only by the King, Lords and Commons of His Majesty's realm of Ireland, nor was there any other body of men who had power to make laws for them: that in this privilege was contained the very essence of their liberty."

The Irish Parliament left no doubt as to the precise conditions of the Irish demand for legislative independence. They were as follows, and were carried into effect by subsequent legislation in 1782:—

1. Repeal of the Irish Perpetual Mutiny Bill, and dependency of the Irish Army upon the Irish Parliament.

2. The abrogation of the claim of England to make laws for Ireland.

3. Exclusion of the English House of Peers and English Court of King's Bench from any judicial authority in Ireland.

4. The restoration of the Irish Peers to their final judicature.

5. The independency of the Irish Parliament in its sole and exclusive legislature.

The British Parliament, then involved in a tremendous armed struggle was, in Parnell's words, "beaten to its knees," and following the action and demands of the Irish Parliament the British Act of Parliament, known as the Renunciation Act (23 G. III., c. 28) declared that "the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom in all cases whatever was established and ascertained for ever."

> "The Irish Parliament was thus constituted absolutely independent of the British Parliament. The Crown was

> outside the struggle, for an Irish Act of Henry VIII. and the Act of Recognition of William and Mary had established that the Crowns of England and Ireland were inseparable, so that whoever was King of England was, *ipso facto*, King of Ireland, but the two legislatures were now regarded as independent co-ordinate, and in their respective spheres co-equal."—Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 335

Under whatever verbiage, by means of whatever subterfuge, using whatever rhetorical modulation may be necessary on British platforms, the aim of the Nationalist Irish is to regain this position. They only advocate "Home Rule," whatever these words may be tuned to convey, because they intend to secure by means of "Home Rule" as a starting point the restoration of such an independent Parliament.

> "Home Rule is not a finality. It is worth having partly for what it is worth, but even more as furnishing the means for an agitation which will end in repeal of the Union. . . . Ireland can recognise no finality short of absolute justice, which means the restoration of what British invasion and the bribed Union took from her."—Patrick Ford's paper, the *Irish World*, 11th April, 1908.

## Constitutional Position of the Irish Parliament before the Union.

The demand is at present framed by the official Nationalists under the formula, "Full executive and legislative control of Irish affairs." Let us consider (1) the Legislative, (2) the Executive demand. It should be remembered that in 1782 there was no Police Force; the Irish Army then performed the duties of keeping the King's peace now discharged by the Royal Irish Constabulary. "By the Constitution of 1782 the Irish Parliament was rendered free and independent; it could no longer be controlled or interfered with by the Parliament of Great Britain. There was no limit imposed upon the subject-matter of debate or legislation. Whatever was within the province of a National Parliament might come before it. Its relations to

Great Britain and the British Parliament were substantially the same as before 1707 the relations had been of the Parliament of Scotland to England" (Ball, *Irish Legislative Systems*, pp. 137, 138).

In the Irish Constitution of 1782 there was no provision for the case of a disagreement in policy between the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland. They were equal and co-ordinate without any paramount authority being provided to over-rule or reconcile them. No matter how injurious to British interests the intended legislation of the Irish Parliament might be, the only restraint upon it which the Constitution provided for the British Government was the power of refusing to return under the Great Seal of Great Britain the Bill sent over, and to refuse the Royal Assent in Ireland. But neither of these checks applied to resolutions or proceedings of Parliament not taking the form of Bills. The Irish Parliament could adopt and give expression to whatever views it chose upon questions of trade and commerce, foreign policy, treaties, and other relations with foreign Powers. And even in the case of Bills where these checks did apply little was to be expected from them, since statesmen would be reluctant to use a power which must place the Crown by itself in an attitude of hostility to one of the nations subject to its rule (see Ball, *ub. sup.*).

## Meaning of Independent Irish Parliament.

The expression so often used on Nationalist platforms when the demand is reiterated for an "Independent Irish Parliament," is therefore thoroughly well understood in Ireland. It is the demand for a Parliament supreme in Ireland as was the Parliament of 1782.

Any modified measure such as "Devolution," or "Home Rule" of the Gladstonian or any other type, if ever granted, will be only used, as has been over and over again proclaimed by all the leaders of the Nationalist Party, and as every one in Ireland knows, for the purpose of extorting further concessions until the absolute Independence of Ireland and the Irish

Parliament is secured. There is no halting place between the Union and the absolute Independence of the Irish Parliament. The British people will be only befooled if they are misled by utterances on English platforms into the belief that any half-measures will ever satisfy the Irish Nationalist demand. They must make up their minds either to retain the Union or repeal the Union.

## Meaning of Independent Irish Executive.

The demand for an "Independent Irish Executive" is a very important portion of the Nationalist claim. It is a demand for greater Executive powers than existed in Grattan's Parliament.

There was under the Ante-Union Constitution, properly speaking, no ministry in Ireland responsible to the Irish Parliament. The position of Irish Ministers was essentially different from the position of their colleagues in England. Ministerial power was vested chiefly in the Lord Lieutenant and his Chief Secretary who filled in Ireland a position at least as important as that of a Prime Minister in England; but the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary were appointed and instructed by English Ministers and changed with each succeeding English administration. The Irish Executive Government was thus completely subordinated to the play of party government in England. The Irish administration was, in fact, appointed and directed by the English Cabinet, and the English doctrine that a Parliamentary censure carried against a Ministry or the defeat of an important Ministerial measure must be followed by resignation was not recognised in Ireland (Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., ch. 5).

The Irish Parliament accordingly had full legislative independence, but it did not control the Executive, which was directed wholly from London by the English Government.

Therefore the demand for "an Irish Parliament with full executive control over Irish affairs" is a demand for a

Parliament possessing greater executive powers than Grattan's Parliament possessed.

## Composition of Grattan's Parliament.

It is altogether impossible now to restore such a Parliament as Grattan's Parliament to Ireland, and it is a complete misrepresentation or misconception to pretend that conditions such as then prevailed could again exist in Ireland. There never was a body more intensely loyal and Imperial than the gentry who sat in Grattan's Parliament. Their descendants are still intensely loyal and Imperial, and they are the Unionists of Ireland, but in the Provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught they have been under the modern franchise deprived almost totally of political representation.

> "The Irish Parliament of the eighteenth century was entirely a Protestant body. It was something like an enlarged Grand Jury, or like the present Synod of the Disestablished Church. It represented in the highest degree the property, and especially the landed property, as well as the intelligence of the country. It placed the management of Irish affairs in the hands of the Irish aristocracy and resident landlords with a large admixture of the leading Protestant lawyers, but their power was qualified by an inordinate number of nomination boroughs directly or indirectly under Government control.
>
> "There is no inconsistency in maintaining that in the peculiar condition of Ireland such a Parliament was, or might be, a very efficient instrument of Government, while a purely democratic Parliament in which the poorest and most ignorant Roman Catholics would have an overwhelming power would be ruinous to property, to Irish Protestantism, to the maintenance of order, to the connection with England."—Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 102.
>
> "A separate Irish Parliament consisting of men who were disloyal to the English Government could only lead others to complete separation or civil war. It would be the most powerful and most certain agent that the wit of man could devise for organising the resources of Ireland against England."—Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 327.

Owing to the ardent loyalty and Imperial spirit of the Irish gentry the Irish Parliament supported England with all its power during the great wars at the end of the eighteenth century. Their bearing contrasts splendidly with that of the party which then existed in the English Parliament, the base English minority of that date who were fiercely opposed to the war—that minority which has found its successors in the Pro-Boer party in recent years, and which did, as its successors did, everything in its power to embarrass the conduct of the war and to degrade their country.

> "If the majority in the Irish Parliament had shared during the great war the sentiments of the minority in England, we should probably have seen Ireland neutralising her ports, withdrawing her troops, forbidding recruiting, passing votes of censure on the war, and addressing the King in favour of peace. Could it be questioned that under such circumstances the very existence of the Empire might have been endangered?"—Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., p. 343.

Can it be questioned that if Home Rule is granted now the very existence of the Empire may be still endangered? The Nationalist members would be in a permanent majority in any Irish Parliament, and unquestionably they would use all their powers to thwart and embarrass England, and aid her enemies. The men that cheered in the House of Commons the defeat of British troops in South Africa are not the men to entrust with the custody of the many-harboured island lying on the flank of Britain, and at the heart of the British Empire. Nor can England expect that if she betrays the loyal minority any of them that remain in Ireland will feel any sympathy whatever with her in any conflict with her Nationalist enemies to whom she has abandoned those who were the main supporters of the Imperial connection.

## The Regency Conflict and French Invasion.

The danger of having an independent Parliament in Ireland is illustrated by the conflict which occurred in 1789

between the British and Irish Parliaments in reference to the Regency during the mental incapacity of George III. The controversy terminated on the recovery of the King, but the relations between the two countries were seriously strained, and it is a remarkable fact that

> "One of the consequences of the conflict between the two Parliaments on the Regency question, and the exaggerated language that was used about the danger to the connection was that Irish affairs began to attract the serious attention of the French Government."—Lecky, *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 486–488.

A secret agent was sent over to Ireland, and this was probably the first step of a series of French dealings with Ireland, which a few years later assumed a grave importance. If a Continental power during the control of a Loyalist Parliament in Ireland seized the opportunity of sending secret emissaries into the country, with results which subsequently led on to the actual invasion by that power of Ireland, is it improbable that if a disloyal Irish Parliament is now created foreign powers may again send in their welcomed emissaries and be ready for invasion when "England's difficulty means Ireland's opportunity"?

Ireland was twice invaded by the French during the period of the Irish Parliament. A storm indeed scattered their fleet, carrying Hoche's formidable army, in Bantry Bay at Christmas, 1796; but in 1798 they successfully landed a body of troops under Humbert at Killala, who, after defeating General Lake at Castlebar, and winning another engagement near Sligo, penetrated across the Shannon, and were only ultimately defeated by greatly superior numbers under Cornwallis.

> "Within the short period of six years from what is called the independence of the Irish Parliament, the foreign relations of the two countries, the commercial intercourse of the two countries, the Sovereign exercise of authority in the two countries, were the subject of litigation and dispute, and it was owing more to an accident than any other cause that they did not produce actual alienation and rupture." (Sir R. Peel, speaking in 1834.)

All this took place while the Irish Parliament was but the instrument of the Protestant gentry of Ireland. Is it to be supposed that an Independent Nationalist Parliament, representing the peasantry and tenement houses of Ireland, would be more submissive than Grattan's Parliament?

## No Third Course Proposed at the time of the Union.

The Constitutional dispute about the Regency, the great Irish Rebellion of 1798, the invasion by the French, and the divided strength of the British Isles grappling with the tremendous power of Napoleon forced upon the English people the conviction that safety was not possible for the British Empire save in a legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. The Union was carried, and from the 1st January, 1801, these two kingdoms were united into one kingdom under the title of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and for this United Kingdom a single Parliament was constituted. In this single Parliament the separate Parliaments were fused together. Each lost its individuality. They combined in and for Imperial strength.

At the time of the Union, no third course, no intermediate scheme between the existing independence of the two Parliaments and their incorporation into one Parliament was proposed; no scheme of "Federation," of "Home Rule," of "Devolution" was adventured. The Irish people had too recent an experience of the inconvenience, and the English people too recent an experience of the dangers of a "Subordinate Parliament." Sheridan speaking, in 1779, in the English House of Commons against the Union, under the apprehension that some "Home Rule" scheme might be suggested as an intermediate system, uttered the opinion of Ireland at the time:—

> "Are we to be told that Union will not wholly dissolve the Legislature of Ireland: that independence will survive Union though in a modified state: that Parliament will be left to judge of the local affairs of Ireland? Really this seems almost too much for men's feelings—

a Parliament; a sort of National Vestry for the Parish of Ireland sitting in a kind of mock legislative capacity after being ignobly degraded from the rank of representatives of an independent people and deprived of the functions of an inquisitorial power exercising and enjoying the greatest authority any Parliament can possess."

Canning said:—

"There can be no mode of arrangement devised for the several possible differences and disagreements between the two kingdoms short of Union which will not take away from the Parliament of Ireland even the shadow of independence and deprive it of all freedom and dignity in the points most essential to its very being as a Parliament" (see Ball, *Irish Legislative Systems*, p. 237).

The views then expressed and held then universally in Ireland are the views held to-day by nearly every Unionist in the country. There is no halting between the Union and Repeal of the Union. No more authoritative expression of the combined views of Irish Unionists from the North, South, East, and West of Ireland can be given than the resolution of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, an assembly closely resembling, as Lecky says, in its constituent elements Grattan's Parliament. In 1893 its members unanimously declared against Gladstone's Home Rule Bill; and as loyal subjects of the British Empire protesting against its threatened disintegration, the dismemberment of the Empire, and the consequent ruin of our position and influence among the nations, added:—

"We call on all true patriots who have the welfare of their native land at heart, to repudiate a measure which, under the semblance of Home Rule, imposes new political disabilities, injurious commercial restrictions, and many conditions at once vexatious and humiliating; and we believe that all parties in Ireland would even prefer a measure of total separation with all its risks and evils rather than consent to the ignominious terms of apparent independence and actual political vassalage offered under the Bill."

Bishop Alexander, then Bishop of Derry and now Primate

of the Church of Ireland—a man venerated by all men of all creeds in Ireland—said, amid ringing cheers :—

> "No rational man could possibly respect or honour the Empire under the baneful power of a constitution like this. There is no safe element in it—no element of finality. Finality, indeed, is a word unknown by the majority of the members of the party who force it on us. As far as we are concerned there will be no finality. You have only to read our resolutions to see that, and as far as our countrymen are concerned they have taken good care to tell those whom it concerns beforehand that there shall be no finality with them."

The English people may be well assured if they desert those in Ireland to whom they are in honour bound, then, undoubtedly, the bitterest opponents of England in the future, wherever their lot may be cast, will be those men and their descendants who shall have been so betrayed. If they remain in Ireland they will spare no effort to sweep away the cobwebs spun by fancy Constitution weavers to enmesh the follies of those that, wishing to deceive and be deceived, now fly around vote-catching, buzzing of "guarantees," "subordination," "unquestioned supremacy," and such like inarticulations. Those that love Ireland will not brook her degradation, and those that hate England will not suffer her domination. They again will feel that savage indignation which eat into the heart of Swift as he in his time protested against the wrongs Ireland suffered at the time of her "Subordinate" Parliament, and they will see that as far as in them lies England that deserted them shall not dominate wherever they may be.

## Repeal.

The struggle for Repeal under O'Connell failed; it was not linked with the struggle for "the land for the people" that has energised the movement of Parnell. The statesmen, too, of the time were too much alive to the dangers of the Divided Kingdoms to dally with the question, and there was no readiness then to sell the British Empire for the Irish vote.

Macaulay, on 6th February, 1853, dealing with the proposal, thus described it:—

"This dual business was like the twins of Siam in some remarkable points, each man was the constant plague of the other, each was always in the other's way. They were more helpless than most other people because they had twice the number of hands. They were slower than other people because they had twice the number of legs. Sympathising only in evil, not tasting each other's pleasures, not supported by each other's ailments, but tormented by each other's infirmities, and certain to perish by each other's dissolution."

The attitude of English statesmen towards the Repeal Movement of O'Connell's is thus summarised by Lecky:—

"Although the Repeal movement of O'Connell was much less dangerous than the present one, it is well known how it was regarded by the greatest English statesmen of every party. Few English public men have known Ireland better than the Duke of Wellington, and he wrote that Repeal must occasion the dissolution of the connection with Great Britain, and he predicted that its inevitable issue in Ireland would be a religious war. Sir R. Peel, who had served as Chief Secretary for Ireland, and was thoroughly acquainted with the conditions of Irish life, was even more emphatic. Repeal of the Union, he said, must lead to the dismemberment of this great empire, and must render Great Britain a fourth-rate power in Europe. Lord Althorp, who then led the Whigs in the House of Commons, echoed the argument of Peel, that in the existing state of Ireland a distinct Parliament must necessarily lead to separation; and Lord Grey, the leader of the party, who had in his youth been a strenuous opponent of the Union, declared that the effect of its repeal would be ruin to both countries. That Home Rule in any form in which it is now likely to be attained would be ruinous to Ireland is not difficult to prove. The policy of Mr. Gladstone and the agitation of Mr. Parnell have together so completely shattered the social type which had existed for generations; they have so effectually destroyed all the old relations of classes and all the more healthy forms of influence and reverence by which Irish society cohered; and they have diffused so widely through three provinces the belief that outrage and violence are the natural means of attaining political ends—that Ireland is at present probably less fitted for prosperous self-

government than at any period within the memory of man."

## The Genesis of Fenian Home Rule.

The Repeal Movement was followed by the absurd Young Ireland Rebellion of 1848. At this period a newspaper called the *Irish Felon*, published by James Fintan Lalor, one of the seditious writers of the time, appeared. Lalor's articles have had an immense influence on the Home Rule Movement. His teaching, adopted by the Fenians Devoy and Davitt, and at their instigation by Parnell, brought into alliance the Agrarian Movement and the Nationalist agitation. Lalor's teaching was this:—"The reconquest of Irish liberties depends on the reconquest of the land. The mode of reconquest is to refuse payment of rent and resist process of ejectment." "Moral agitation, military force, moral insurrection are impotent against the English Government, which is beyond their reach, but resistless against the English garrison, who stand here scattered and isolated, girdled round by a mighty people." "The land question contains, and the legislative question does not contain, the materials from which victory is manufactured." "You can never count again on the support of the country peasantry in any shape or degree, or on the question of Repeal, their interest in it was never ardent, nor was it native or spontaneous, but forced and factitious." "There is but one way only, link Repeal to some other question, like a railway carriage to an engine; some question possessing the intrinsic strength which Repeal wants, and strong enough to carry both itself and Repeal together; and such a question there is in the land." "Repeal had always to be dragged." "There is a wolf dog in every cabin in the land nearly fit to be untied, and he will be savage by and by, for Repeal he will never bite but only bay; but there is another matter to settle between us and England." "The absolute ownership of the lands of Ireland is vested of right in the people of Ireland." (See P. Bagenal, *American Irish*,

pp. 153–197; Brougham Leech, *The Continuity of the Irish Revolutionary Movement*; *Report of the Special Commission, passim*; Lecky, *Irish History*, vol. v., p. 484.) This has been the evangel of the "Home Rule" Movement. This its inspiration and power. How absolutely true the statement is that "the interest of the peasantry in Repeal was never ardent, native, or spontaneous, but forced and factitious," is proved by the well known fact that as soon as ever the peasant tenant becomes the peasant proprietor he ceases to subscribe to the National League, and is only anxious to have rest from political turmoil and agitation, and to settle down to till his fields and tend his herd. It is the consciousness of this fact that inspires the Dillonite section of the Nationalist members and agitators to do all in their power to slay Land Purchase, and that codified at their dictation their principles in the Birrell Land Bill of 1909—a Bill which has killed voluntary land purchase completely, and stopped the beneficent creation of a great peasant proprietary rapidly achieving full accomplishment under the Wyndham Act of 1903, following on the Ashbourne Acts.

Once the Irish farmer owns his farm in fee he is no longer a fund-feeder for Separation.

> "I tell you here—there is no reason why I should not be perfectly frank—the Irish National Party would have been Bankrupt in this election were it not for the success of Mr. O'Connor's mission to America, which yielded over 50,000 dollars."—Mr. J. Redmond, 10th February, 1910.

It is the knowledge and apprehension of this fact that inspired Mr. Redmond's utterance at Tipperary, returning flushed from America a week ago.

> "What do we care for material reforms in Ireland. They may fill the stomachs of the Irish people. That will not satisfy their spirits. I say we have preferred in the past rags and the spirit of liberty rather than be the sleekest slave that ever was fed at the hand of the conqueror. No; we in Ireland are out for the principle of Nationality. Nothing will bribe us from that, as

nothing has intimidated us from that. We are for 'Home Rule,' and nothing but 'Home Rule.'"

The separatists know that the Irish farmer, with his "stomach filled," well clad and comfortable, "tending fat cattle and himself quite fat," will send them to Chicago for the dollars, but he himself will not give a dime for "Home Rule." He may be a "sleek slave fed at the hand of the Conqueror," according to the rhetoric at Limerick Junction, but in himself he has settled down to be a hard-working, industrious citizen, not without enterprise, and with ample intelligence to make him bless the day that the "hand of the Conqueror," has advanced £105,000,000 of Imperial money to make a man of him and his fellows, and that he has been happy enough to be one of those who bought out his farm before the blast of the breath of the rag preferring politicians withered the too prosperous progress of the Unionist policy of Land Purchase.

## Danger: The "Irish Felon" and A General State Tax.

But the British people had better, before they hand over the executive and legislative power of Ireland to Separatism, take heed of other words of the *Irish Felon*. Lalor is the Bentham, the Philosopher, that inspires the doctrines and economy of the new Separatism. His principles can be applied against the payment of the State purchase annuities just as they have been applied against the payment of landlord's rents. The basis of his advice to attack the landlords is that the English Government, under former conditions, was invulnerable against a strike against rent, when he enunciated the axiom.

> "The land question contains, and the legislative question does not contain, the materials from which victory is manufactured."

He did so because—

> "In Ireland unluckily there is no direct and general State Tax, payment of which might be refused and resisted."

Archbishop Croke, of Cashel, who was stated in *United Ireland* of 27th November, 1886, to have first broached the

idea of the "Plan of Campaign" in 1848 with John Mitchell and James Fintan Lalor, wrote to the *Freeman* on 17th February, 1887, stating:—

> "I opposed the 'No Rent Manifesto' six years ago because, apart from other reasons, I thought it was inopportune and not likely to be generally acted on. Had a manifesto against paying taxes been issued at the time I should certainly have supported it on principle. I am precisely the same frame of mind just now."

The "No Rent Manifesto" started the Plan of Campaign in 1881, the whole design of which had been accurately plotted out by Fintan Lalor in 1848 in the *Irish Felon*. The Archbishop urged that a general strike against State taxes would be a better plan than a strike against rent.

The condition of a great State ownership of land did not exist then, but the warning has been given. Lalor's teaching has been adopted, has been worked successfully against rent, has received clerical sanction for its extension to taxation, is primarily applicable to a strike against the tenant purchaser's annuities payable to the Imperial Exchequer, is instinct with Irish American Fenianism and Nationalist Separatism, and could, the moment Executive power was given to an Irish Legislature, break the Imperial credit which now guarantees £105,000,000 of Irish Land Stock.

As long as the United Parliament and Imperial Executive govern Ireland, the tenants' annuities are perfectly safe, but if the British people hand over legislative and executive powers to direct Irish affairs to an Irish Parliament representing the Democracy of Ireland, then assuredly the £105,000,000, for which the Imperial credit already stands guaranteed, and the £90,000,000 more required to complete the transfer of the land will be an imperilled security, and the shock to the stability of the funds of the British Government will ruin the finances of the Empire. The only safety for the advanced millions lies in the maintenance of British law, British power, and British credit, under the United and Imperial Parliament.

In 1848 there was "no direct and General State Tax" in Ireland; there is to-day interest on £105,000,000 represent-

ing such a tax. The State annuities can be struck against as the landlords' rents were struck against. Is the Imperial credit, under cover of the abolition of the House of Lords, to be sent whirling down, tossed along by the electioneering froth poured forth by dollar-driven demagogues and the Cleons of a reckless Ministry?

## "Fenian Home Rule."

In 1870 Isaac Butt, with whom were associated some Protestants who bitterly resented the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, as a breach of a "fundamental" compact contained in the Act of Union, proposed a Federal arrangement under the title of "Home Rule," under which a Parliament should be set up in Dublin to legislate for and regulate all matters relating to the affairs of Ireland.

Their constitutional agitation for "Home Rule" made but little headway. Butt was thrust aside. The Fenians, Davitt and Devoy, seeing the possibilities latent in the name and the movement, threw themselves into it, and Devoy, writing from New York, expounded the new policy in the *Freeman's Journal* on 31st January, 1879. These two men founded the Land League, the progenitor of the National League. They adopted the principles of Fintan Lalor linking the Separatist Movement with the Land Question, urged the gradual appropriation of all municipal local and elective positions by the Nationalist Party, and Devoy declared in the letter to the *Freeman* that the object aimed at by the advanced Irish Party was the recovery of Ireland's National Independence and the severance of all political connection with England. In 1879 Parnell joined the new movement and adopted at Westport the programme of the Fenians Davitt and Devoy, urging the peasantry "to keep a firm grip on their homesteads." The new "Home Rule" Movement dates from this period. Parnell threw himself into it with all his energy, he went to America in 1880 to raise funds and further the cause, and at Cincinnati, on 23rd February, 1880, he said:—

"The feudal tenure and the rule of the minority have

been the corner-stone of English misrule. Pull out that corner-stone, break it up, destroy it, and you undermine English misgovernment. . . . And let us not forget that that is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us—whether we are in America or Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

Returning from America, where he had been in touch with the same Irish-American elements as are now financing the Redmondite attack on the House of Lords, he said, at Cork, 22nd March, 1880:—

"The time is not far distant when Ireland would gain the greater right—the right of self-government—the right of nationhood. If we succeed in emigrating the Irish landlords, the English Government will soon have to follow them."

On 26th September, 1871, Mr. Gladstone, speaking of Butt's proposals for "Home Rule," had said:—

"This United Kingdom, which we have endeavoured to make a United Kingdom in heart as in law, we trust will remain a United Kingdom . . . and we intend that it shall remain a United Kingdom. . . . If the doctrines of 'Home Rule' are to be established in Ireland I protest on your behalf you will be just as well entitled to it in Scotland . . . and I protest on behalf of Wales that they are entitled to 'Home Rule' there. Can any sensible man; can any rational man suppose at this time of day—in this condition of the world—we are going to disintegrate the great capital constitution of the country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind, and crippling any powers we possess for bestowing benefits, through legislation, on the country to which we belong?"

Yet it was the same Mr. Gladstone who, after the Home Rule Movement had been indoctrinated and driven by Fenianism, endeavoured to give expression to the Fenian aspirations by two legislative attempts to put "Home Rule" into an Act of Parliament in 1886 and 1893. The blood-stained Agrarian agitation of the men who were "marching through rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire," had been yoked to "Home Rule" under the tutelage of James Fintan Lalor's ideas by Devoy, Davitt, and Parnell, it had

dragged along the Separatist Policy, and an Irish Parliamentary Party, agrarian and revolutionary, held the balance in the United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. Let us recall the conditions under which the Bill of 1886 was introduced.

## 1886.

The terror of the times and the attitude of Unionist Ireland cannot be better described than they were on May 18th, 1886, at Grangemouth in Stirlingshire, by the Right Hon. T. W. Russell, now the Vice-President of the Agricultural Department in Ireland, a Scotchman long settled in Ireland. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1886 was before the country. Every word spoken by Mr. Russell could be repeated to-day without deviation in describing the events in Ireland and the attitude of Irishmen. Having referred to Gladstone's fierce denunciations of Parnell, and "the small body of men who with him preached the doctrine of public plunder," he said:—

> "It is not our usual practice to trust people described in such language, and having some faith in the old theological doctrine as to the tendency of character to become fixed, and not being aware that the National Party has ever honestly recanted a single doctrine under which the seven years war (from 1879 to 1886) was fought, I venture to say the Loyalists have good cause for their distrust. Who are these people we are called upon to trust; to whom are we to entrust our lives, liberty, property and conscience? I will not refer to what may be called ancient history. I simply ask you to think of the events that have occurred since 1879. Were I to unlock the secrets of the prison home—
>
> 'I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
> Would harrow up thy soul; freeze thy young blood,
> Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres.'
>
> It is not fortunately necessary that I should recall all the deplorable incidents of what was justly called a reign of terror, when murder walked red-handed through the land and treason was enthroned on every hill-top. . . . I have told you three cases; I could tell you scores. I could weary you with sketches of crime, outrage, and persecution—all going to show, not alone the prevalence of these things, but what to my mind is unfortunately

worse—the sympathy of the people with them. I feel that no one has a right to feel surprised at the reluctance of law-abiding, peaceable, God-fearing citizens to be governed by the Moon-lighters of Kerry and the Cattle Maimers of Galway and Limerick."

Then speaking of the Irish "sympathy which ran high" with France, even "to extravagant lengths," during the Franco-Prussian War, he said:—

"No one who lived in Ireland then can doubt that had Ireland been a nation free from outside control, she would have gone to the help of France. Well, supposing something of the kind to occur again, with an Irish Parliament supreme, what would happen? Ireland would probably set the Foreign Enlistment Act at defiance. Great Britain would be powerless to prevent her; but she would be responsible for her every act. Is there no danger here? Again, what would hinder Ireland building Alabamas in Queenstown and Galway? What would hinder her fitting out privateers in a time of national strain and difficulty? Nothing in the world; Great Britain being responsible for her every act to foreign nations, but unable save by force and reconquest, to prevent any one of these things being done. Before closing, may I make a final appeal to this audience on behalf of the Loyalist minority? What, I ask, have they done that they are to be deprived of their Imperial inheritance, that in the words of the Apostle they are to be made 'bastards and not sons'? Three hundred years ago Ulster was peopled by Scotch settlers for State reasons. You are bound to remember this. The men then are bone of your bone, flesh of your flesh. The blood of the covenanters courses through their veins; they read the same Bible, they sing the same Psalms, they have the same Church polity. Nor have they proved altogether unworthy of their ancestry. Two hundred years ago, when the Empire was in peril, the descendants of these Scottish settlers, hunted from post to pillar, remembering that they belonged to an Imperial race, 'turned desperately to bay' under the walls of Derry, and left a by no means dishonourable record of their prowess for the historian. The descendants of these men have made Ulster what it is. They have turned the most sterile province of Ireland into the most fertile; they have planted industries, and established commerce; the shipyards of Belfast and Derry vie with those of the Clyde and the Mersey; the linen trade of Ulster takes its place

among the great industries of the land. Wherever we find these Loyalists, as Mr. Chamberlain has said, 'there we find the nucleus of prosperity, order and industry.' It is the same in Dublin, in Cork, wherever you go—Scotchmen and Englishmen are to be found at the head of those great business affairs in which capital has been sunk. Their hands are unstained with crime or outrage; they are not the moon-lighters or cattle maimers; they neither make up the criminals or paupers of the country. And, taking a wider view, have these despised Loyalists not played their part in the affairs of the Empire? The Duke of Wellington was an Irish Protestant. These Loyalists have given the Empire such men as Lord Dufferin, Lord Wolseley, Sir Frederick Roberts, the two Lawrences, who saved India in her hour of deadly peril. It was an Ulster Loyalist who stood by Gordon in his lonely vigil at Khartoum. The blood of these Loyalists flowed in the vein of the soldier who led that 'thin red line' across the Bayuda Desert, and stood in the centre of that awful square at Abu Klea. It was round the dead body of an Irish Loyalist the colours of England were found wrapped, at the close of the disastrous day of Isandula. I maintain that not only have we done our duty in, and by Ireland itself, but we have done our duty by, and to, the Empire. Why, then, are we to be despoiled of our Imperial rights, and transformed into the inhabitants of a degraded and tributary province? We shall never willingly consent to be so despoiled. Not until our last shilling has been spent, not until our last resource has been exhausted, not until we have done everything that honest men dare do, shall we consent to be governed by men whose record in the past is so stained with crime, outrage, and plunder, as wholly to destroy all confidence in their future. . . . Not even at the bidding of Mr. Gladstone will this Empire, the envy of the world and pride of our own race, for centuries be broken up . . . men who have had a priceless inheritance bequeathed to them will never consent to do at the ballot box the thing they would scorn to do on the battle field. They will put patriotism before party. They will save the Empire from the greatest danger it has been called to face since the Spanish Armada hove in sight of the shores of England."

On 3rd November, 1885, Parnell, who voiced what Sir Wm. Harcourt termed "Fenian Home Rule," speaking at Castlebar, said:—

"For myself, and I believe for the Irish people and all my colleagues, I have to declare we will never accept, expressly or impliedly, anything but the full and complete right to arrange our own affairs, and **to make our land a nation; to secure for her, free from outside control, the right to direct her own course among the peoples of the world.**"

Six days after this date Gladstone, with these words of Parnell still resounding, spoke thus at Edinburgh on 9th November, 1885:—

"Suppose that owing to some cause the present Government has disappeared, and the Liberal Party were called to deal with this great constitutional question of the Government of Ireland, in a position where it was a minority dependent on the Irish vote for converting it into a majority. Now, gentlemen, I tell you seriously and solemnly, that though I believe the Liberal Party to be honest, patriotic, and trustworthy, in such a position as that, it would not be safe for it to enter on the particulars of a measure in respect to the consideration of which at the first step of its progress it would be in the power of a party coming from Ireland to say, unless you do this, or do that, we will turn you out to-morrow."

The election took place.

"All was at last over. The Liberals had now a majority in the new Parliament of 82 over the Tories . . . . but they had no majority over Tories and Irishmen combined. That hopeful dream had glided away through the ivory gate." (Morley, *Gladstone*, vol. ii., p. 368.)

Then came the "Great Surrender," and the Home Rule Bill of 1886.

## GLADSTONE'S FIRST HOME RULE BILL.

*(Rejected by House of Commons 8 June, 1886, by 343 to 313.)*

The following were the main provisions of the Bill when introduced and as modified:—

### LEGISLATURE.

1. To consist of a first and second order.
2. To deliberate together and vote together, with power to call for a vote by orders.

3. The first order to consist of 28 peers and 75 elective members, the latter to have an income of £200 per annum and upwards.

The second order to consist of 204 members chosen by the existing Irish constituencies.

EXCEPTIONS FROM POWERS.

Not to make laws relating to :—

1. The Crown or Regency.
2. Peace or War.
3. Army, Navy, Militia, or defence of Realm.
4. Treaties or Foreign Relations.
5. Dignities.
6. Prize or Booty of War.
7. Offences against the law of nations, or violation of treaty, or offences on the high seas.
8. Treason, Alienage, or Naturalisation.
9. Trade, Navigation, or Quarantine.
10. Postal or Telegraph Service, except as to transmission of letters and telegrams in Ireland.
11. Beacons or Lighthouses.
12. Carriage, Weights and Measures, Legal Tender, or Value of Foreign Money.
13. Copyright, Patents, or Inventions.

Any law made in contravention of these prohibitions was to be void.

RESTRICTIONS ON POWERS.

The Irish Legislature shall not make any law :—

1. Respecting the Establishment or Endowment of Religion, or prohibiting free exercise of it.
2. Enforcing any disability or religious belief.
3. Abrogating or derogating from the right to establish or maintain any place of denominational education or charity.
4. Prejudicing the right of any child to attend any school receiving public money without attending religious instruction.

5. Impairing without the leave of the Crown in Council or the consent of the Corporation interested, any rights, property, or privileges of any Corporation.
6. Relating to any Duties of Customs and Excise.
7. Affecting the Act itself.

The duration of the Irish Legislative Body was not to exceed four years.

The Land Question was not withdrawn from the powers of the Irish Parliament, the rights of landlords being supposed to be adequately safeguarded by the Accompanying Land Purchase Bill.

THE EXECUTIVE.

In the Lord Lieutenant and such Council as the Crown might appoint.

FINANCE.

The Legislature to have power to enforce taxes other than Customs and Excise. The produce to be paid into an Irish Consolidated Fund.

Customs and Excise duties were to be levied exclusively by the Imperial Parliament. The Irish Parliament was to have nothing to do with them.

Ireland, before she could apply anything for her own purposes, had to contribute—

| | |
|---|---|
| For the Irish share of management and interest of National Debt (one fifteenth of the whole) | £1,466,000 |
| On account of Imperial Expenditure on Army and Navy (one fifteenth of whole) ..... | 1,666,000 |
| Contribution to Imperial Civil Expenditure ..... | 110,000 |
| Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police ..... | 1,000,000 |
| National Debt Commissioners for reduction of debt in respect of Ireland's share, estimated at £48,000,000, an annual sum of ..... | 360,000 |
| | £4,600,000 |

It was provided that neither the Imperial taxes of Excise nor any local taxes which might be imposed

by the Irish Legislature should be paid into the Irish Exchequer. An Imperial Officer, called the Receiver-General, was appointed, into whose hands the produce of every tax, both Imperial and local, was required to be paid, and it was his duty to take care that all claims of the English Exchequer—including especially the contribution payable by Ireland for Imperial purposes—were satisfied before a farthing found its way into the Irish Exchequer for Irish purposes. The Receiver-General was provided with an Imperial Court of Exchequer to sit in Dublin and enforce the rights of Imperial taxation; the judges of which were to be appointed on the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant and the English Lord Chancellor. It appears from the Purchase Bill which accompanied the Home Rule Bill that both the instalments payable by the tenants and the Irish imposed taxes should be collected by collectors appointed by the Irish Government. There was a strange provision in the Act, that if the Sheriff omitted to enforce the decree of the Exchequer Court so manned under English patronage, the judges could appoint some other person to take steps to enforce such decree. No appeal was to lie to any Irish Court from this Court of Exchequer; appeals were to lie to the British House of Lords. Thus was reintroduced the very system of English judicial authority in an English Court and English House of Lords, which brought the "Subordinate" Irish Parliament, and the British House of Parliament, and English Courts of King's Bench, and the Irish Courts, and the English House of Lords, and the Irish House of Lords, into violent conflict before 1782, and which led to the Resolutions of the Volunteers, and the English Act of Renunciation, and the independence of Grattan's Parliament.

The existing judges of Courts other than the Exchequer were secured by reserving authority in relation to them to the Imperial Parliament. New judges were only to be removable on address by the two orders of the Irish Legislature voting separately.

The Dublin Metropolitan Police were for two years to

remain under control of the Lord Lieutenant, and the Constabulary, while that force subsisted, was to be under control of the Lord Lieutenant as representing the Queen. The Irish Legislature was to be at liberty to establish and maintain police in the counties and boroughs under local control.

The Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council in England was created into a Court for deciding Constitutional questions, and the Viceroy might, before assenting to any Bills passed in Ireland, refer them for decision as to their validity. He might also refer to them for decision as to the legality of any non-legislative matters, while when any law was challenged as unconstitutional an appeal lay to this Privy Council Committee, whose decision was to be final, and should exclude the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, which remained in other respects as the ultimate Court of Appeal from the Irish Courts.

Irish members were no longer to sit in the Imperial Parliament, nor were Irish Representative Peers to sit in the House of Peers.

The Bill provided that in case of war the Irish Legislative Body might appropriate a further sum than the fixed contribution for the Army and Navy for the prosecution of the war. This was an optional privilege.

No one was able to interpret the clause saving the rights of the Imperial Parliament. It ran thus :—

> " Save as herein expressly provided, all matters in relation to which it is not competent for the Irish Legislative Body to make or repeal laws shall remain, and be within the exclusive authority of the Imperial Parliament, save as aforesaid, whose power and authority in relation thereto shall in nowise be diminished or restrained by anything herein contained."

It is at once evident from the mere statement of the provisions of the Act that an Irish Subordinate Parliament under such conditions would set itself to work to get rid of all restrictions which were humiliating to Irish National Sentiment. No English executive representing a " foreign

dominion," and acting through an "alien Court," could hope to control the resistance, passive or active, of the Irish Legislature and Councils. The Bill would have placed the Irish Parliament in a position immeasurably inferior to that it ever occupied during all its history. As to the finance of the Bill, it is now universally admitted it would have left Ireland bankrupt. It contained every element for inducing either total separation as a relief from English domination, or civil war to compel obedience to its irritating provisions. Ireland was to be taxed without representation. The taxes so imposed were to be collected by decrees of a Court subject to an English Executive, and enforced by the armed forces of the Crown in the anticipated refusal of the Irish Sheriffs to obey them.

In case of war, if the Irish Legislature refused to contribute, not a penny extra contribution could be compelled, however urgent the strain on the Imperial resources. While buried in the clauses of this extraordinary measure lay the extraordinary provision that, though the Irish Parliament could not pass a law concerning certain subjects, it might, with the consent of the Queen in Council, appropriate Irish revenue and taxes for the purposes of such forbidden subjects. Thus, though a law made for the endowment of religion should not be made, an annual tax to be paid for the support of the Roman Catholic clergy or any other sectarian object would be possible. It is unnecessary to go into details of objection both from the British and Irish, as well as from the Imperial view of this measure framed in language studiously ambiguous and inconsistent. Almost in every clause it contravened the elementary principles of Constitutional Government as it had hitherto existed in England and Ireland. It was impracticable as a working measure, but it had a real value for Separatist Politicians. If ever it had passed into law the ruin to Ireland, financial, administrative and social, would have been so great that any Loyal man would have left the country if he possibly could get out of it, and the Nationalists

would have had the field clear to use the measure in accordance with their declaration as "the plant of an armed revolution." The financial clauses were denounced by Parnell as "unnecessary," "absurd," "most offensive," and a "source of irritation." He protested against the voting by orders. Mr. Gladstone yielded. The Purchase Bill was to protect the landlords by a grant of £120,000,000 to buy them out, it was to cut down to £50,000,000, and the Liberals were told that a vote in favour of the Home Rule Bill did not necessitate a vote in favour of the Land Bill. In the words of Lord Morley (*Nineteenth Century*, 1st Feb., 1887): "The Lord Lieutenant, the veto, the control of the military force, the resort on occasion to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, all involve relations between the Irish and English Executive, and therefore all imply the possibility of collision between the Irish and English Legislatures."

"Ireland was placed in a position altogether different from that of a self-governing Colony—the favourite parallel of the Gladstonians. While the dilemma whether the Irish representatives were to be excluded from Westminster; while Ireland was to be taxed, without her consent, or to be allowed to sit in Westminster, while taking either a full or partial share in the deliberations of the Imperial Parliament 'passed the wit of man,' and was admittedly insoluble." Dicey's *Case Against Home Rule*, and *The Times'* articles in December, 1885, *What Home Rule Means*, should be studied by those who wish to grasp the constitutional aspect of the Bill of 1886 and its bearing on Imperial British and Irish interests. The introduction of the Home Rule Bill of 1886 broke up the Historical Liberal Party, and led to the formation of the Unionist Party as distinct from the Conservative Party.

The Unionist Party were in office from 1886 to 1892. It restored order under Mr. Arthur Balfour. The Ashbourne Land Purchase Acts had granted £10,000,000, under which nearly 15,000 tenants had purchased out their holdings; about 12,000 of them being farmers of holdings under thirty

acres in extent. And the experiment had proved so satisfactory, and the instalments were paid with such regularity, that in 1891 a further Land Purchase Act was passed, under which the Imperial Taxpayers guaranteed £33,000,000 more for the purpose of creating a peasant proprietary.

In 1890–1891 there was severe distress, and the potato crop failed. Relief works of permanent value were started. New roads, piers, sea-walls, drainage. Fifteen light railways, covering 284 miles, opened up remote and isolated districts; gave immediate employment to 7,000 men, and have done incalculable good in opening up and developing Ireland. The English tourist, who penetrates into the wild and beautiful scenery of Donegal, Connemara, Kerry, and Clare, travels by these railways, and over them comes year by year an increasing volume of traffic—the produce of the congested districts relieved by the Unionist policy of productive Imperial expenditure. The Light Railway Bill was pushed through Parliament against the obstruction of the Nationalist members. If Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1886 had been passed, would Imperial free grants to carry out these splendid works have been forthcoming? Ireland herself would have been bankrupt; and the money relations between England and Ireland would have been the automatic grasping by the dead hand of the Receiver-General of her resources, mortgaged under the Bill to Great Britain the first incumbrancer. Would Ireland, under such Irish Government, have submitted to pay? Had she struck against the £4,800,000 tribute, how was it to be enforced? These problems must be answered under financial conditions infinitely more entangled than they were in 1886, before statesmen or demagogues undertake to frame a Home Rule constitution again.

## The Home Rule Bill of 1893.

In 1893 Mr. Gladstone again essayed the task of putting Home Rule on paper—a task which it is a remarkable fact the combined brains and drafting ability of all the Nationalist

Statesmen from 1870 down to the present date have neither attempted in outline or in detail. They annually introduce into the Imperial Parliament Bills on an infinite number of subjects. They formulate and carry, or don't carry, Home Rule general resolutions, such as that of 30th March, 1908 :—"That the solution of the problem can be obtained only by giving to the Irish people the legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament." But they never frame a Home Rule Bill.

Mr. Redmond, in his much debated article in *McClure's Magazine* for October, 1910—now published by the Irish Press Agency for distribution as a pamphlet—tells his readers that—"What 'Ireland wants' is really so reasonable, so moderate, so commonplace, in view of the experience of the nations, and especially of the British Empire, that once it is understood all the fears and arguments of honest opponents must vanish into thin air."

Why is this "commonplace, moderate, and reasonable demand" not put into the shape of a Bill by the Nationalist party draftsmen, so that it may once for all be "understood"?

It seems a strange thing for Ireland to have to ask English statesmen to draft her constitution, and not to be able, with all the great ability of her nationalist publicists to draft a Home Rule Bill of her own.

Mr. Gladstone made his second attempt in 1893; to a great extent it followed the lines of his former measure.

The chief difference between the Bills of 1886 and 1893 lay in the retention of the Irish members at Westminster. Eighty Irish members were to sit in the House of Commons. Neither they or any Irish representative Peer in the House of Lords could deliberate or vote on any Bill confined to Great Britain, on any motion or resolution relating to a tax not to be raised in Ireland; or on any vote for services other than "Imperial" liabilities or expenditure as defined in the schedule to the Act.

The Legislature was to consist of a Legislative Council of 48, and a Legislative Assembly of 103 members, to sit and deliberate separately, but provision was made in the event of the houses disagreeing, for the two houses sitting together and deciding on the question. Custom and Excise and postage duties were to be subject to the Imperial Parliament.

Again a Court of Exchequer was to control Revenue questions, and was to be appointed under the great seal of the United Kingdom. Provisions similar to those in the Act of 1886 existed for enforcing its decrees. The internal Postal Service was made over to the Irish Government.

Appeals to the House of Lords were to cease, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council became the Supreme Tribunal. It was to decide constitutional questions when the Lord Lieutenant referred the validity of any Bill for their consideration.

The nominal safeguards were :—

1. A veto to be exercised by the Lord Lieutenant at the instance of the Irish Ministry. (This would not be used when the Irish Ministry was in conflict with the Imperial Ministry.)
2. A veto to be exercised by the Lord Lieutenant on the advice of the Imperial Cabinet. (But if such a veto was used against an Irish Minisitry it would resign. No other Irish Ministry could expect to be formed. There would be a deadlock).
3. The power of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland. (If, however, the Imperial Parliament passed a law the Irish Parliament objected to, it could not be carried into effect, as the executive was to be in the control of the Irish Parliament.)

Mr. Redmond, writing in the *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1892, said :—"We would expect a clause in the Home Rule Bill to specifically provide an undertaking that while the Irish Parliament continued in existence the powers of the Imperial Parliament to legislate for Ireland would never be

used." This expectation was not fulfilled by any clause in the Bill, but as a practical matter it was clear the veto could not be effectively worked, and would only give rise to violent collision between the two countries. The safeguards were mere illusions, as the executive power was vested in the Irish Government, responsible to the Irish Legislature.

Again, if the Irish Legislature exceeded its powers, according to the decision of the Privy Council there was no power to enforce the judgment. In the words of Mr. Chamberlain—"The weapon of the veto breaks in your hands the very first time you attempt to use it." The safeguards for the minority were an absolute farce. In Ireland the farmers and farm labourers outnumber all other classes of society, and at least four-fifths of the Legislature would be representatives of a class, as recent history proves, more liable to be coerced and misled than any other class upon whom such powers were ever conferred. All interests would be at the mercy of this dominant interest. There would be a permanent majority representing them, and a permanent Ministry installed to administer the country under their direction. What chance was there for the Loyal minority? To attempt such a revolution, as Mr. Lecky said, "Made one disbelieve in the moral government of the world."

The Land Question was not to be dealt with by the Irish Legislature for three years. After that the Irish landowners were to be handed over to the mercy of the Land League chiefs. As during the three years the Irish Executive might decline to enforce any judgments for rent or other rights of property, it required no formal Act of Parliament to annihilate the value of Irish property.

Within a month after the introduction of the Bill Irish Banking and Railway shares fell over £5,000,000 in value, so great was the apprehension excited in commercial circles by the Bill.

As to the religious difficulty, it is useless to ignore the antagonism between Protestants and Roman Catholics. It exists, and unfortunately is very bitter. The Bill placed the

Protestants at the mercy of the permanent Roman Catholic majority which would control the Legislature and the Executive. The majority could deal with the Marriage Laws. Quite recently we have known in Ireland instances of startling results from the enforcement of the Papal Bull, *Ne Temere*, in relation to mixed marriages by the Roman Catholic Church. It is causing well grounded alarm and dissatisfaction through the Protestant community, and women lawfully married according to British law to their husbands are, because a marriage has not been celebrated according to the decrees of the Roman Church in presence of a priest, insulted as mere concubines ; their marriages are pronounced by the Roman Catholic Church to be utterly void. There would be nothing in the Home Rule Bill which would prevent the new Papal Bull from being transferred to the Irish Statute Book as part of the Marriage Law of Ireland.

The Permanent Civil Servants of the Crown were under the Bill liable to dismissal on six months' notice by the Irish Government.

That splendid body the Royal Irish Constabulary was to be broken up and disbanded within six years. They had done their duty too faithfully and nobly to hope for consideration from Mr. Gladstone or the National Leaguers to whom the government of Ireland was to be given. With their disbandment what English Executive was to enforce the decrees of the Imperial Parliament? It would be necessary to revert to a military garrison, and war to compel submission. Never was there a measure so calculated to ruin Ireland, dismember the Empire, and break the Imperial credit.

As for the Finance of the Measure, it was like that of the Bill of 1886, of such a character that the two countries would have been at once involved in a furious controversy. England believed she was being mulcted, while Ireland looked upon the financial provision as an insult, and there is no question that the burdens imposed on her would not have been discharged without national bankruptcy. The credit

of both countries would have been seriously shaken, and the long and intricate inquiry of the Financial Relations Commission shows how in every clause of the accounts between the two countries collision would have occurred between their legislatures.

If the Finance of 1893 was difficult, the Finance of 1910 is far more difficult. Imperial obligations to the amount of £200,000,000 have been or are engaged to be undertaken for Land Purchase. Old Age Pensions to an enormous amount are payable in Ireland, and it will pass the wit of all the financial geniuses in the House of Commons, of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of the Nationalists combined to satisfy Ireland with any new Financial clauses in a Home Rule Bill, or to cajole England into meeting Old Age Pensions and Land Purchase liabilities when administrative and Executive control is taken from the Imperial Parliament and entrusted to Mr. Redmond and his supporters.

The "In and Out" Clause by which the 80 Irish members were to deliberate and vote at Westminster on certain matters and not on others involved, as Professor Dicey says, "the ruin of Ireland and the weakness of England." The impossibility of defining what were British and what Imperial affairs was sufficient in itself to reduce Parliamentary procedure to chaos, and it was absurd that the Irish members could put out a Government on Imperial affairs which was in a majority on British affairs. The composition of the British Cabinet would be determined by the Irish vote. Which Cabinet would retain power? The answer is neither. There would be a deadlock. The proposed plan undermined the whole scheme of Government. Parliament again would be never free from Irish debates, while the Irish members would be looked upon as a mere delegation. The multiplex and manifold difficulties and dangers of the Home Rule scheme of 1893 are fully dealt with by Professor Dicey in *A Leap in the Dark*, and should be consulted. As he says, "The Bill involved a new Constitution framed by the Gladstonians for the United

Kingdom. The proposed change in our Government touches the very foundation of the State, and deeply though indirectly threatens the limits of the whole Empire."

The Bill was closured through the House of Commons and rejected by the House of Lords by 418 to 41. Their action was endorsed by the verdict of the country at the General Election when the Unionists were returned by an immense majority. The House of Lords in 1893 interpreted well the feelings of the British people, and were then their true representatives on the question of granting Home Rule. It is because they then saved Great Britain and Ireland and the Empire from disaster that they are now attacked by the Irish-American and Nationalist Party as the opponents of the policy of the Disunion.

## Devolution.

In September, 1907, Lord Dunraven, assisted by Lord McDonnell, then Sir Anthony McDonnell, formulated a scheme of "Devolution" for Ireland. Unlike the Nationalist party, they had the courage to put their ideas into a concrete form, and the public could understand their proposals. They afterwards inspired the Irish Councils' Bill, which was introduced by Mr. Birrell in 1907, in pursuance of the Campbell-Bannerman policy of granting Home Rule by Instalments.

In the original Devolution Scheme the main proposals were to create in Ireland (1) a Financial Council, and (2) a Statutory Legislative Body.

The Financial Council was to consist of the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, twelve nominated members, and twelve members elected by "the County Council and Borough Council constituencies and Parliamentary constituencies gathered into convenient groups."

"The votes of the majority were to decide;" "Decisions were to be final, unless reversed by the House of Commons on a motion adopted by not less than a one-fourth majority of votes."

This bureau was to "prepare and submit the Irish Estimates, and to examine, supervise, and control every item of expenditure" of the £6,000,000 voted for Irish services, and "to propose reductions and to apply the savings from such reductions to the improvement of the administration and development of the country's resources."

This would involve a recasting of the financial system of the Act of Union. It is also hopelessly incompatible with every constitutional usage.

As far as Ireland is concerned, Parliament would part with the power of the purse, and the Commons no longer control the appropriation of supply. A majority of that House would have to be no longer a majority, but a majority and a quarter, and the members would vote under three-quarters of the instalments of Home Rule.

Here are some of the "Irish services" which the conglomerate Council (sure to be dominated by the Nationalist elected members) would have to estimate for and control.

The Lord Lieutenant's establishment, the Chief Secretary's salary and those of the staff of his office, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Education, the Local Government Board, the Board of Works, Land Commission, Prisons, National Education, law charges and criminal prosecutions, Dublin Police, and the Royal Irish Constabulary.

The whole administration of Ireland could be tripped by this paramount Financial Council.

This irresponsible Council could cry halt to the strongest Government. It could, without regard to the Executive, decline to estimate for the Constabulary; could cut down their pay to a fraction; could stop the administration of civil and criminal justice; dictate terms on National Education. It could refuse the expenses of protection to the Sheriff to execute decrees, and thus, if a "no instalment campaign" were organised against the Treasury—now fast becoming the landlord of Ireland—to prevent payment of the land purchase advances, it could paralyse the State, imperil the Imperial credit of £105,000,000, and reduce the judgments of the

King's Courts to nullity by refusing to estimate for expenses for executions of decrees.

The Council was to be subordinate only to a three-quarter vote of the Commons, while the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary were to be subordinate to the Council and responsible to Parliament, but not responsible to the Council. A strange tangle of authorities. It inverts and perverts the deadlock of the Grattan Constitution. Then the Irish Executive was not responsible to the Irish Parliament. Under the Devolution Scheme we should have an Irish Financial Executive not responsible to the Imperial Parliament, and an Irish Government Executive helpless in the hands of a bureau.

As to the statutory Legislative Body proposed. It was to consist of the Irish representative peers and Irish Members of the House of Commons, plus the Members of the Financial Council. Parliament was to delegate to this body—which would, of course, be permanently Nationalist—"such matters as in its wisdom it may deem suitable." The result would be that Irish members at Westminster would sit in the Imperial Parliament and in Ireland sit in the Legislative Council, and they could obstruct until they got measures delegated, and then run every delegated measure on Nationalist lines, dictated by the priests and peasants who return the Irish members, while the Loyalists would be held under the heel of the majority. The Catholic Association propaganda and the Anti-enlistment crusade show what influences would predominate. Nor could any such subordinate legislative assembly be controlled in its discussions or its operations. It would, like all such bodies, tend to enlarge its jurisdiction, and, backed by popular power, get rid of all control and develop into a Parliament, after long and irritating conflicts and agitation.

There is no half-way house between separation and the Union, and to call on the electors to vote for Devolution is to humbug them into voting for "preposterous proposals" that have been repudiated alike by Nationalists and Loyalists. Mr. John Dillon said that "if set up they would not last

for six months, and if set up for criticism in the House of Commons they would not last a night's debate," and Lord Atkinson aptly termed them "a weak and silly attempt to grant Home Rule on the sly."

Mr. Birrell's Councils' Bill of 1907 proposed to set up an administrative Council of 82 elected and 24 nominated members in Dublin to control the chief departments of Irish Government. To establish an Irish Treasury, and to establish an Irish Fund of £4,164,000 per annum with certain supplemental grants to use for Irish administration.

The measure was utterly condemned by Unionists and Nationalists alike. It was denounced in unmeasured terms by a great "National Convention" in Dublin on 21st May, 1907, as "utterly inadequate in scope, and unsatisfactory in details." The Convention declaring that "the production of such a measure by a British Government pledged to Home Rule is confirmation of the position we have always taken up that any attempt to settle the Irish problem by half measures would be entirely unsuccessful, and we call upon the Irish Party to oppose the Bill in the House of Commons, and to press upon the Government with all their strength and power to introduce a measure for the establishment of a National Parliament with a responsible Executive, having power over all purely Irish affairs."

The Bill was withdrawn on 3rd June, 1907, and with it fell the "Home Rule by Instalment" policy.

Mr. Balfour, addressing a Unionist demonstration in London on 13th June, 1907, summarised the position in these terms:—

> **"Devolution is dead. Two Policies only remain alive, the policy of the Union and the policy of disintegration. No dexterity of statement, no obscurity of language, can disguise henceforth from any politician, from any member of the Cabinet, from any voter, however**

**ignorant he may be of public affairs, nothing can henceforth disguise the fact that two great forces, the force for Union and the force for Division, are now ranged opposite one another and that there is no room between them for those who hesitate as to which of those two forces shall henceforth get their allegiance."**

## Home Rule All Round.

Quite recently soft-toned speeches of the Irish delegates in the United States and Canada have brought into prominence the idea of Home Rule all round, or Federalism, in the United Kingdom. The proposal, so far as anything definite can be detected in the nebula of utterances, is that there should be Home Rule for England, Home Rule for Scotland, Home Rule for Wales, and Home Rule for Ireland. The method has, of course, never been thought out or attempted to be worked out. Consider what it involves. It implies five Cabinets. It implies that there must be five Parliaments—a supreme Parliament for the four kingdoms, or the three kingdoms and the Principality, and four local Parliaments. Is this supreme Parliament to be the ancient Parliament originated in England in ages past, with which was united the ancient Parliament of Scotland and the ancient Parliament of Ireland? Are the two Houses of Peers and Commons still to continue, or are they to disappear, and is some new Constitution to be created with an Assembly and a Senate, the functions of which are to be limited and defined? If the ancient Parliament is to continue, then, it must abnegate its sovereignty and resign its functions for legislation on all domestic matters—all questions of social reform, executive, administrative, and internal finance in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. This is a tremendous revolution in itself ; a complete shattering of the British

Constitution slowly evolved through centuries. The Parliament of England was never shorn of such powers, nor the Parliament of Scotland. The Parliament of Ireland struggled for centuries for them, and gained them to a great extent; but in all its history was never shorn of such powers as are now to be taken from the United Parliament. This one sovereign Parliament of the Empire will be left nothing but powers in relation to the succession to the Crown, peace and war, the Army and Navy, coinage, and foreign affairs. It may be protested that it will retain supremacy over the four local Parliaments, and powers to raise Imperial revenue. Such supremacy and powers, even if retained in a paper Constitution, would be futile in working. The Imperial Executive would have to act either through, or in spite of, the local executive in each division of the three kingdoms. Let us assume that in the Irish or Scotch Parliament a law is passed for the compulsory buying out at ten years' purchase of all land-owners. How is such a law to be overridden by the supreme Parliament? It may meet together, and by English votes negative the enactment of the Scotch or Irish Houses; but would Scotland or Ireland stand it? And if Scotland or Ireland resisted, how is the will of the supreme Parliament to be enforced? Are the armed forces of the Crown to be employed to compel obedience? Suppose, again, that a war breaks out, and Ireland or Wales objects, through her legislature, to the war, and refuses to contribute. How is she to be compelled to contribute unless there is an Imperial Executive with its tax gatherers backed by Imperial forces, overriding the Irish or Welsh Executive? The possibility is not far from being a probability. If there was a Welsh Parliament led by Mr. Lloyd George at the time of the Boer war, it would, just as an Irish Parliament led by Mr. Dillon, have refused to contribute a penny to the war, and taxation would have to be enforced by an invading executive against the legislative will of Wales or Ireland. If there was war with America, would Ireland, after having bought Home Rule with American dollars, vote contribu-

tions to fight America? What could be reserved to the supreme Parliament and what could be delegated to the local Parliaments defies definition. There is an immense amount of non-legislative functions discharged by Parliament. The question of supreme or local jurisdiction not merely in legislation, but in administration also, could only be decided by a lawsuit before a Supreme Court. The British people are not prepared, nor are the Irish people prepared, to submit the prerogatives of Parliament to the arbitrament of lawyers; nor can the affairs of nations be allowed to dally during the inevitable delays of legal debate and decision.

How, again, is the supreme Parliament to be selected? Are all the peers of the United Kingdom, with the Scotch and Irish representative peers, to sit, or are only selected members of the peerage to be summoned, and, if so, how are they to be selected? You must solve the great constitutional question of the House of Lords before you create your new Parliament. Then, how is the new House of Commons to be selected? Are the same men to sit in it and in the local legislatures? If so, Parliament will have to be in four places at once. Or are different representatives to sit at Westminster? If so, they must be fewer in number than the representatives in the local legislatures, and these selected few, along with representatives from the other divisions, are to be given power to override the decisions of the local legislatures upon local questions, if the Central Parliament is to be supreme. Imagine an English Parliament submitting in such domestic matters to be overridden by Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, or Scotland to be overridden by England, Wales, and Ireland, or Ireland to be overridden by England, Scotland, and Wales, or Wales to be overridden by England, Scotland, and Ireland—or Ulster, if we are to have an Ulster legislature, too—submitting to be overruled by the whole lot of them combined. And yet this is the theory of Home Rule-All-Round, and this theory would, if ever the British and Irish people were mad enough to carry it into concrete existence, inevitably result in conflict upon

conflict. The fact is that the supreme Parliament would be in practice the subordinate Parliament to every one of the other assemblies, and could only enforce its will in their dominions with their assent and active co-operation. Against this resistance, active or passive, it would be powerless. As Lord Derby said in 1888:—

> "If anybody believes that in these two little islands there is room for four separate National Governments, with one Imperial Government over them all—five Cabinets and five Parliaments—and that all these Cabinets and Parliaments can continue to work together, he must be of an exceptionally sanguine disposition, or must possess the happy faculty which some politicians have of being able to shut their eyes very hard."

Any person who has studied the constitutional, financial, and executive difficulties of the Home Rule Bills of 1886 and 1893 is aware of the impossibility of working out any practical scheme of Federalism in the United Kingdom. Since 1893 those difficulties have been enormously increased. The financial tangle between Great Britain and Ireland alone was such in 1886 and 1893 that it is absolutely certain that Ireland must have been immediately bankrupt under either of these schemes. Her Customs and Excise were handed over to the control of the English Parliament as a tribute. Apparently the idea is that the trade of Ireland is still to be controlled by some legislature other than that of Ireland. Whether the trade of England and Scotland is also to be dissevered from local control, and to be decided on not by local but a combined assembly, has not been stated. How the liability for National Debt and Sinking Fund is to be carved up between the four divisions, how the four contributions for Army and Navy, the Civil List, home and foreign establishments, are to be ascertainable—all this would give subject for debate and inquiry for many a year. You can hardly closure through a Constitution which involves the destruction of a Parliament now 600 years rooted deep in the history and development of the English people, and create five new assemblies in a couple of months' debate, as the result of the

furies of a reckless election and wild addresses to an uninformed electorate. And yet Mr. T. P. O'Connor in Canada has been glibly adumbrating this Federalism as if it was even remotely practicable. Federalism in the United Kingdom disintegrates the Three Kingdoms, and dissolves their ancient Parliamentary systems blended into one at the seat of an Empire, directing the destinies of 400 million subjects. To disintegrate a Parliament which controls an executive which is face to face with the tremendous armed nationalities of Europe, and is matched against the Chancelleries of the world, is a vastly different problem, works on vastly different materials, and pregnant with vastly different possibilities of catastrophe to that which prevailed in combining in federation Canada, South Africa, and Australia. These federations were, and are, Unions of formerly existing provincial legislatures, situate in wide, extended, and thinly populated regions newly endowed with legislative assemblies. Federation there combines them under certain reservations into more powerful States. The process is the reverse of what is pretended here. Their Federation is Union—Federation here is disintegration. In the Colonies Federation begets strength—in the United Kingdom it would debilitate and destroy.

## The Constitution of South Africa.

Consider, for instance, the recent confederation of South Africa. It is said, Why not do for Ireland what you did last year for the Boers in South Africa? The Boers were in arms against you, and yet you give them a Parliament; why not do the same for Ireland? The answer is that more than a hundred years ago the same thing was done for Ireland that was done last year for the Boers. The Irish had rebelled: they had to be held down by military power if they were to continue in the enjoyment, as subjects of the British Empire, of representative rights. Imperial safety demanded a legislative Union with Great Britain under an Imperial Executive. Take up the South Africa Act of 1909 and read it. The preamble states

its object:—"It is desirable for the welfare and future progress of South Africa that the several British Colonies therein should be *united under one Government in a legislative union* under the Crown"; and this was done by the Act. The only way to relieve the Boers from military domination was not to restore to independence the pre-existing Transvaal and Orange Free State representative assemblies, the Boer independent Sovereign Parliaments—the parallels, *mutatis mutandis*, of Grattan's Parliament in Ireland—but to give to the inhabitants of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State the full rights of British citizenship by creating a Union between the four provinces of South Africa; and thus 51 members representing the 167,000 European inhabitants of Cape Colony, 17 members representing the 35,000 European inhabitants of Natal, 36 members representing the 106,000 European inhabitants of the Transvaal, and 17 members representing the 41,000 European inhabitants of the Orange Free State, were to be elected members of the House of Assembly for the United State of South Africa. The Executive Government over all the Union is vested in the King, who acts through the Governor-General, on the advice of the Executive Council representing the Ministry of the United Parliament of the Union. This United Parliament is in the South African Union a Sovereign Parliament. It dominates all the four Provinces absolutely. Nothing in the South Africa Act reserves expressly any power whatever to the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland. It is subordinate to the Parliament of the United Kingdom in this sense only—like Canada and Australia—that the Parliament of the United Kingdom can, under the latent doctrine of the Constitution of the British Empire, revoke the South Africa Act, and could in theory override by legislation the legislation of the Parliament of South Africa; but if South Africa declined to submit, there would be no Imperial Executive in South Africa that could act under the direction of the British Parliament. The United Kingdom, if it sought to enforce its legislation in South Africa could,

unless South Africa chose to submit, enforce its will only by war. The South Africa United Parliament can create its own Army, its own Navy, control its own Customs and Trade, and enter into commercial treaties with foreign Powers. When men talk of giving to Ireland the rights given to the Boers as an argument for Home Rule they are either ignorant utterers or deliberate impostors. If they mean that Ireland is to be disunited from England and Scotland, and given an Independent Parliament and Executive, it is exactly reversing the Constitutional Settlement of South Africa. England, Scotland, and Ireland were, as were the four South African provinces, governed by separate Parliaments, and they were linked together in Union just as in 1909 Cape Colony, Natal, Orange Free State, and Transvaal have been. If the English people are asked, under guise of unacquaintance with the Constitution of South Africa, to grant Home Rule to Ireland, it will be a shocking example of deliberate misleading on the part of demagogues, and inexcusable ignorance on the part of the democracy.

But it may be said that the four South African Provinces have their own Assemblies and their own Executive. So they have; they are called "Provincial Councils." But what are they? Their powers are defined in the Act. They amount to merely County Council and Municipal Government in the separate Provinces. It is simply nonsense to talk of these powers as amounting to the powers claimed by Home Rulers or Separatists, or even Devolutionists, in Ireland. The only matters the Transvaal and Orange Free State Provincial Councils have power in their Provincial Assemblies to make ordinances in relation to are:—

1. To raise a revenue for Provincial purposes (just as our County Councils can).
2. To borrow on the credit of the Province with the consent of the Governor-General and in accordance with regulations made by the Parliament of South Africa (just as our local bodies can do

under the Local Loans Acts with sanction of the Board of Works and Local Government Board).

3. Education (other than University) (just the same control as local bodies have in Great Britain).
4. Agriculture (just as in Ireland is done through the popular and representative Agricultural Department).
5. Management of hospitals and charities.
6. Municipal Councils and local institutions of similar character.
7. Local works, other than railways and harbours, and such other works as the South Africa Parliament declares to be national works.
8. Roads and bridges other than bridges connecting two Provinces.
9. Markets and pounds.
10. Fish and Game preservation.
11. Fines and penalties for breaking Provincial ordinances relating to these matters (just like our local bodies' powers to make bye-laws).
12. Such things as the Governor-General considers merely local or private in their nature in the Province.
13. All other such powers as the South Africa Parliament may delegate to a Provincial Council.

Therefore the powers given to the Boers are nothing more than the powers which the County Councils of Ireland have long years enjoyed by virtue of the Municipal Reform Acts, Poor Law, Grand Jury, and other Acts extended by Unionist Legislation under the Local Government Act of 1898. The Provincial Councils are in every relation absolutely controlled by the Parliament and Executive of South Africa ; and it is talking nonsense to say why don't you give Ireland what you gave the Boers in 1909. The answer is, it was done more than a century ago, by the Union between Great Britain and Ireland, and by the Acts for Local Government passed by the United Parliament. As a matter of fact, if you were

now to give Ireland a Provincial Council framed on the model of the Boer Provincial Councils, you would have to deprive our Corporations, Municipalities, County Councils, Boards of Guardians, and all local bodies of these rights, privileges and powers, and transfer them to a General Assembly sitting in Dublin. Imagine the row in Ireland when they get Boer Home Rule!

## The Commonwealth of Australia.

Take again the Constitution of Australia, to which the British people are asked to refer as a model for a new Irish Constitution. It is a Union, not a Dis-union. New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, were all independent States in relation to one another, subordinate merely under the British Constitution to the never exercised and never exerciseable theory of subjection to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. These independent States, determined to constitute one Commonwealth, and as the preamble of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act of 1900, states, "They, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the Constitution thereby established."

"The laws of the Parliament of the Commonwealth" were to become "binding on the courts, judges, and people of every State, notwithstanding anything in the laws of the State," wherever there was a conflict between a State Law and a Commonwealth Law, the Commonwealth Law is to prevail. The powers of the Commonwealth Parliament extend to Trade and Commerce with foreign States, as well as the States of the Federation, Taxation in all the States, Naval and Military defence of the Commonwealth and of the several States, and direction of the force to execute and maintain the laws of the Commonwealth. It makes the laws as to Fisheries, Banking, Insurance, Bankruptcy, Copyright, Patents, Corporation, Marriage,

Divorce, Old Age Pensions. The control of the service and execution throughout the Commonwealth of civil and criminal process, and the judgments of the Courts of the several States of Immigration and Emigration; Foreign Affairs; the relations of the Commonwealth with the islands of the Pacific; control of railways, and numerous other powers and authorities detailed in the Constitution, were vested in the Commonwealth by surrender on the part of the several States of their previous independent powers. It was a surrender of individual authority by each State to the United Central Authority, and not a delegation by a Sovereign Parliament of its rights and powers to a Subordinate Assembly. The whole executive authority was put under the control of the Commonwealth Parliament, and the fact is patent to anyone who reads the Commonwealth Act of 1900, that under it the Australian States entered into a union as Scotland did with England, and as Ireland did with Great Britain; and that what Home Rule is intended to do is to reverse that great process of unification and consolidation that has grouped the independent Provinces of Canada and States of Australia and South Africa into powerful and splendid nations, in which the constituent elements preserve, as they do, under the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland certain individual rights and characteristics, but in which the confederated and combined communities have grown into Majestic States worthy in the evolution of the time to come to form with the United Kingdom a still more Majestic Empire, bound in Imperial Federation by the links of a common tariff and fortified for common defence. The unity of the Empire is the aspiration of the people's allegiance to the Commonwealth and loyal devotion to the Throne. This, too, is the aspiration of all who think and work for progress, prosperity and peace in Ireland. Ireland has helped to build the Great Britannic Empire. Her share has been at the very least a noble one in the creating and the keeping of this Imperial Heritage of the British peoples. The Loyalists of Ireland are no insignificant portion of her

population; they are the leaders of her commerce, her industries, of her achievements in arms and literature. They passionately resent the parochialising of their Empire-sharing island home, and never will tamely submit to her degradation and destruction.

## "What Ireland Wants."

Mr. Redmond's recent attitude in America is unfolded in the article in *McClure's Magazine* for October, 1910, and now circulated on behalf of the National League through the Irish Press Agency in Great Britain. He says on the first page: "What Ireland wants is something so reasonable, so moderate, so commonplace, that once it is understood all fears and arguments of honest opponents must vanish into thin air." "We do not seek any alteration of the Constitution, or supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. We ask merely to be permitted to take our place in the ranks of those other portions of the British Empire—some twenty-eight in number—which in their own purely local affairs are governed by free representative institutions."

This statement cannot apply to a "want" to be put in the position of any of the four great Dependencies—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa. They are but four in number. What does the number twenty-eight imply? Evidently that his readers are to suppose Ireland only wants to be put into the position of a "Province" in the Dominion of Canada, a "State" under the Commonwealth of Australia, or a "Province under the Union of South Africa." But it is clear from even the slightest acquaintance with these Constitutions—the outline of two of which has been stated above—that Ireland is in a far higher position than any such subordinate divisions of these great Unions. It would be absolutely absurd to be agitating for such a diminution of Irish rights. The Irish Devolution Scheme and Mr. Birrell's Councils Bill sought even higher re-delegation than this, and yet it was ignominiously flung back by the Nationalists in Convention. It is clear from Mr. Redmond's subsequent repudiation of such an interpretation and his energetic Home

Rule declarations on his return to Ireland which have been quoted already that it is nothing so "commonplace" as this. Mr. Dillon would not allow that. What, then, is it that "Ireland wants"? The gentle opening of the article is followed at the end by a very different statement of "something so commonplace, especially in the experience of the British Empire," "that all fears and arguments must vanish when it is understood."

"Here, then," he says, "is what Ireland wants." "Legislative and Executive control of all purely Irish affairs subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament. In other words, we want an Irish Parliament with an Executive responsible to it, created by an Act of the Imperial Parliament and charged with the management of purely Irish affairs (land, education, local government, transit, labour, industries, taxation for local purposes, law and justice, police, etc.), leaving to the Imperial Parliament in which Ireland would be represented, but in smaller numbers, the management, just as at present, of all Imperial affairs—Army, Navy, foreign relations, Customs, Imperial taxation, matters pertaining to the Crown, the Colonies, and all other questions which are Imperial and local in their nature. The Imperial Parliament also retaining an overriding supreme authority such as it possesses to-day over the various legislatures in Canada, Australia, South Africa, and other portions of the Empire. This it what Ireland wants." That is to say, Ireland wants (according to Mr. Redmond) the Gladstone Home Rule Bill of 1893 passed into an Act of Parliament. "In 1893 Gladstone," he says, "introduced his second Home Rule Bill; the chief difference between it and the first one being that he proposed to retain the Irish members at Westminster. On this point Ireland is willing to accept whatever alternative England prefers." "The position of Ireland has not changed since then."

It is not quite easy to understand Mr. Redmond's attitude in this article. The note in the preclude is quite different to that in the finale. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1893

was neither "reasonable nor moderate nor commonplace" in the view of statesmen of any party, or of the electorate of the United Kingdom, or "in the view of the experience of the nations, and especially of the British Empire." It was a monstrosity and a danger to the Empire. The House of Lords then saved the Empire, interpreting aright the judgment of the electorate. An attack almost identical with that made on them to-day was then made. History repeats itself in every detail. Lecky, in *Democracy and Liberty*, thus passes the period in review:—

> "The elections of 1886 and 1895 have shown beyond all possibility of doubt that, on the Home Rule question, the House of Lords represented the true sentiments of the democracy of the country. The members of the Gladstone Government clearly saw that it was impossible to carry Home Rule by a direct appeal to the nation. When the Home Rule Bill, which was a capital portion of their policy, was rejected by an overwhelming majority in the Lords, they did not venture to dissolve upon the question, and submit it to the adjudication of the constituencies. They hoped to secure a Home Rule majority on other grounds, by creating and stimulating an agitation against the House of Lords.
>
> "Radical organisations and Radical speakers and writers vied with one another in the violence of their denunciations, in their contemptuous or arrogant predictions that the hereditary principle had had its day. Catalogues of the pretended misdeeds of the House of Lords during the last fifty years were drawn up, without the slightest intimation that it had ever fulfilled any one useful purpose. One of the most malevolent and grossly partial of these works was widely circulated with the warm recommendation of Mr. Gladstone. Another popular Radical writer observed in a highly jubilant strain, that at the election of 1892 the country had given a clear mandate to the House of Commons to enact a Home Rule measure; that this was pre-eminently 'one of the acts upon which a great and serious people never go back'; and that the House of Lords was nothing more than a farce and a nuisance, which must be speedily crushed. He graciously added that its opposition might be overcome by raising 500 sweeps to the peerage. No circumstance of humiliation was wanting. The lesson was a salutary

one, and it was not likely to be forgotten. It proved beyond dispute what many had begun to doubt—the profound Conservatism of the great masses of the English people, and their genuine attachment to the constitution of their country. It showed clearly which section of the Liberal Party in the great Home Rule schism most truly reflected the sentiments and conviction of the nation. It showed how enormously men had over-rated the importance of the noisy groups of Socialists, Faddists, and Revolutionists that float upon the surface of English political thought like froth flakes on a deep and silent sea. It showed also not less clearly how entirely alien to English feeling was the log-rolling strategy which had of late been growing so rapidly in English politics."

What Ireland really wants is not rejection from her high estate of an equal share in all the rights which England and Scotland enjoy in the Sovereign Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas. She wants to keep her high place among the foremost of the nations of the world, under the equal laws, equal privileges and equal honour of sharing as co-partner in the government of herself, themselves, and the Empire.

The Redmondites depict Ireland as clothed in rags and shivering in misery, a mendicant among the peoples. The Unionists of Ireland and the multitudinous quiet and industrious men and women in Ireland, that trouble not at all about party cries and politics, but pursue their callings, making the real strength of the Irish nation—these true "Nationalists" of Ireland resent this shameless and shameful travesty of facts. The economic ills of Ireland have been many. She, like the other agricultural portions of the United Kingdom, has suffered severely. By the rigorous application to her of the Ricardian doctrines of political economy which forbade, when they dominated policy, any assistance from the State for industry or agriculture, she peculiarly suffered: but in recent years, through the constructive Unionist policy, inaugurated by Mr, Balfour, and through the patriotic efforts of those that have worked with

Sir Horace Plunkett for her agricultural development, adopted as these principles have been far and wide, her advance has been rapid; and her progress is assured as long as she can rely on the splendid and generous assistance of the Imperial credit extended to her for Land Purchase and in many other practical directions. The enormous importance to England of the Irish food supply, not merely day by day in times of peace, but in the event of war, cannot be measured in mere words. What wild folly it would be to entrust to enemies of England—the men who are looking on Home Rule as the "plant of an armed revolution"—the chief source of food supply for the British Islands in the event of European War. The statistics of the trade of Ireland are now annually published by the skilled statisticians of the Agricultural Department. In 1906 the trade of Ireland with Great Britain equalled the trade of the whole United Kingdom with the vast dominion of the Indian Empire. It exceeded by £9,000,000 our trade with France; by £11,000,000 our trade with our Colonies in the Australian seas; by £13,000,000 our trade with Germany; by £35,000,000 our trade with Holland; by £43,000,000 our trade with Belgium; by £40,000,000 our trade with British North America, and it exceeded by over £60,000,000 our trade with the Cape of Good Hope and Natal (*Journal of the Statistical Society of Ireland*, 1909, p. 204).

Since 1906 the value of Irish trade has increased by millions.

The following extract from the last report of the Department of Agriculture and Industries shows how this country, humiliated by being represented by separatist politicians as a mendicant grovelling in rags and misery, is in reality urging onward in prosperity.

## Irish Imports and Exports in 1909.

"The total import and export trade at Irish ports in 1909 is estimated at £125,675,847 as compared with £117,017,768 in 1908, an increase of £8,658,079. The imports amounted to a total of £63,947,155, and the exports to a total of

£61,728,692. The increase in the estimated value of the trade in 1909 as compared with 1908 has taken place both in imports and exports, the increase in imports amounting to £4,940,278, and in exports to £3,717,801. The following statement shows the total estimated values of imports and exports in the six years, 1904–1909, during which a record of Irish external trade has been kept :—

| | *Imports.* | *Exports.* | *Total.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1904 ... ... ... | 54,209,477 | 50,244,958 | 104,454,435 |
| 1905 ... ... ... | 55,759,452 | 51,972,708 | 107,732,160 |
| 1906 ... ... . | 57,441,152 | 56,616,749 | 114,057,901 |
| 1907 ... ... ... | 61,579,426 | 59,815,188 | 121,394,614 |
| 1908 ... ... ... | 59.006,877 | 58,010,891 | 117,017,768 |
| 1909 ... ... ... | 63,947,155 | 61,728,692 | 125,675,847 |
| 1909 over 1904 ... | 9,737,678 | 11,483,734 | 21,221,412 |
| ,, ,, 1905 ... | 8,187,703 | 9,755,984 | 17,943,687 |
| ,, ,, 1906 ... | 6,506,003 | 5,111,943 | 11,617,946 |
| ,, ,, 1907 ... | 2,367,729 | 1,913,504 | 4,281,233 |
| ,, ,, 1908 ... | 4,940,278 | 3,717,801 | 8,658,079 |

" From these figures it will be seen that the trade of 1909, while showing a very marked improvement on 1908—which was generally an unfavourable year in the annals of trade—also exceeds the records of any of the preceding years."

This prosperity is largely the result of the Irish policy of the Unionist Party, which is not a *non possumus* policy, but in the highest sense constructive and progressive.

From the initiation of Mr. Balfour's policy of material development the following Imperial Grants and Advances have been made to develop Ireland's prosperity up to 1909 :—

| | |
|---|---|
| Fishery Piers ..... | £40,000 |
| Congested Districts Board ..... | 425,000 |
| Light Railways ..... | 2,106,000 |
| Advances for Land Purchase for Estates already sold or agreed to be sold ..... | 105,000,000 |
| Agricultural Grant (per annum) ..... | 727,650 |
| Department of Agriculture and Industries (per annum) ..... | 166,000 |

The Fissiparous sections and contending factions that arrogate to themselves the title of "Nationalists" are not also entitled to arrogate to themselves the title to speak for Ireland. A million and a quarter of Protestants utterly repudiate them and all their ways, and thousands and thousands of quiet members of the Roman Catholic faith wish a plague on all their houses. Among themselves and by themselves they are torn into shreds and fragments, and they bludgeon one another at meetings to the cries of "Unity" or "Traitors to the cause." Nothing in nature do they so much recall as Goldsmith's description of the Polypus:—

> "When several polypi happen to fall upon the same worm they dispute their common prey with each other. Two of them are often seen seizing the same worm at different ends and dragging it at opposite directions with great force. It often happens that while one is swallowing its respective end, the other is also employed in the same manner, and thus they continue swallowing each his part until their mouths meet together: they then rest each for some time in this situation, till the worm breaks between them and each goes off with his share: but it often happens that a seemingly more dangerous combat ensues, when the mouths of both are thus joined upon one common prey together: the largest polypus then gapes and swallows his antagonist: but what is very wonderful the animal thus swallowed seems to be rather a-gainer by the misfortune. After it has lain in the conqueror's body for about an hour it issues unhurt, and often in possession of the prey which had been the original cause of the contention."

The Separatist politicians are not the true representatives of Ireland. It is the fact that owing to the character of the Franchise and the distribution of the population, they can outside Ulster carry the vast majority of seats at an election. It is true that in all Leinster, Munster, and Connaught only 15 Unionists sit in the County Councils to balance 705 Nationalists, but still all through the South of Ireland the direction of affairs in commerce and industry is vested in the hands of Unionists who, as loyal subjects of the

Crown, protest as strongly as Ulster protests against the threatened disintegration of the great British Empire. They know intimately how any measure of Home Rule is charged with dangerous elements of revolutionary disturbance destructive of the most sacred bonds by which Society is held together. They have lived and moved and had their being among the disloyal men who leagued with American Fenians and Anarchists have dealt red ruin in their midst. They know that no change of method represents change of ultimate design. No toning of the voice conceals from them the treachery. They know as men knowing the history of their native land and proud of their country and jealous for its honour and prosperity, how any such measure would produce grave and disastrous difficulties in questions of international treaties, war, and commerce; and that the creation of a Legislature under conditions such as exist in Ireland would be the creation of a body alien in sympathy and adverse in action to the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial Crown, and that from the day it came into being complications far more serious, wide, and vital than can be calculated or imagined by those who are blindly hustling on the British people to immeasurable dangers, will inevitably ensue. They know how fraught with peril to their civil and religious liberties, to their fortunes and their families would be the day in which Great Britain could forget her own honour and betray and desert, not only them, but her own inheritance of Imperial greatness, but they do not stoop to cry as mendicants for mercy. The Loyalists of the South of Ireland know that the men of the North will stand beside them as they have ever stood together. With the voice of Ulster so also arises the voice of the true men of Ireland in Leinster, and in Connaught, and in Munster, and they too with the men of the North speak to the people of England and of Scotland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, and "in all solemnity now declare that Home Rule will bring to Ireland not peace but the sword," and that if an Irish Parliament is set up, "the Unionists of the South, allied with the men of Ulster,

will not acknowledge its authority, and they will neither obey its decrees nor pay its taxes." If this means civil war, they too, with the Loyalists of Ulster, say, "The responsibility will not be theirs, but will be at the door of the craven Government, which, at the dictation of a party which has never withdrawn its declaration of hate towards England, now proposes legislation which involves the breaking up of the ancient British Constitution. But they cannot conceive that the British race will do otherwise than arise, as it has done before, worthily to the crisis, and reject this veiled and treacherous policy, and save the people of Ireland from unspeakable calamity, and the United Kingdom from irreparable disaster."*

---

* See the *Declaration of the Ulster Unionist Council* published 23rd November, 1910.

# INDEX.

PRINTED BY THE RAPID PRINTING CO., LTD.,
60 MIDDLE ABBEY STREET, DUBLIN.