

A
0
0
1
2
3
8
5
6
3
9



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

ABOUT ULSTER



Ireland
Ulster
→

ABOUT ULSTER

BY

E. LYNN LINTON

AUTHOR OF "ABOUT IRELAND"

THE HISTORY OF IRELAND
FROM THE EARLIEST PERIODS
TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY
MRS. J. G. W. W. W. W. W.
LONDON: METHUEN & CO.
1892

Methuen & Co.

18, BURY STREET, LONDON, W.C.

1892



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

DA
959
L65a

ABOUT ULSTER

LIBRARY SETS

LELAND, speaking of the introduction of "civility" into Ireland by the Plantation of Ulster, says, these six northern counties comprised "a tract of country covered with woods, where robbers and rebels found a secure shelter, desolated by war and famine, and destined to be waste without the deliberate and vigorous interposition of the English Government."

DEC 16 1940

HARDING

What was true in the seventeenth century would be true in the nineteenth and twentieth, were those "traitors to the Queen and rebels to the Crown," the Home Rulers, to gain the upper hand and carry out their theories into practice. All the way that Ulster has made by the industry, enterprise, self-control, and common-sense of her inhabitants would be lost were her hereditary foes to have the government of her affairs—were leave given to the thriftless and impetuous South to tax at will the prosperous and hard-working North—were the historic tables to be turned and, instead of the past persecution of Catholics by Protestants, the future power of oppressing, and, so if possible, rooting out Protestantism be vested in the

390709

Catholic priests. The situation is one of the gravest peril to the North; and Ulster does well to place herself in an attitude of defence, and show that she is alive to the danger by which she is threatened, and that come what may her spoliation and oppression will not be an easy walk-over.

The Irish question is in no sense a new one. For over fifty years it has stopped the way; and things said and written by competent men in the forties, and before, are as applicable to the present moment as they were to their own time. In 1847 Nassau Senior summed up the moral evils existing in Ireland as "insecurity, ignorance, and indolence." Go down to the South and you will find exactly the same state of things now in 1892. Of the insecurity of life and property we need hardly speak. It is not necessary to prove the existence of storms, of venomous beasts, of foul vapours, and as little that of moonlighters, assassins, cattle-maimers, and the rest of the methods by which Home Rule is advocated in Kerry and elsewhere. Of ignorance there remains still the full tale of illiterate voters who scarce know their right hand from their left, and who make their mark at the polling-booths according to the bidding of the priest, without the slightest knowledge of what they mean or what this candidate or that other means. Of indolence—the masterless men lounging and loafing about the lanes, leaning over fences, half sleeping away their time throughout the livelong day, leaving the land to take care of itself, and thinking that they have done all that they ought to do when

they have scratched the surface of the soil and lazily dropped in the seed—of this indolence two or three days alone in some wilderness of beauty, neglect, squalor, and unused capacities will convince the most sceptical. Nassau Senior wrote fifty odd years ago, and his words live as if uttered yesterday. A generation has come and gone since then, but the facts remain unaltered, and the same ethnic qualities produce the same economical results.

What can be truer, too, than this utterance? Any Unionist of the present day might repeat and adopt it as exactly expressing the present situation.

“Among the parties which distract Ireland, the most active, and (in proportion to its numbers) the most powerful, is the revolutionary party—a party to which we know no counterpart in the history of these islands. All other parties (we are speaking now not of mere demagogues, or agitators for individual and personal purposes, but of parties) seek as their ultimate object the public good, however they may mistake the means of promoting it. The Chartists and the Ultra-Tories, the Anti-Corn Law League and the Farmers’ Friends, all really believe that their success would be a public blessing. But the object of the Irish revolutionary party is not the general welfare of the United Empire; it is not even the general welfare of Ireland, either as part of the United Empire or as a separate Republic; their real objects are to overthrow the Protestant Church, to confiscate the Protestant estates, and to retaliate on the Protestant party the injuries and insults of cen-

turies. As they know that this cannot be effected under a British Sovereign, they strive to separate themselves from Britain; as a means of effecting that separation they strive to repeal the legislative union; and as a means to that repeal they strive to make the United Government work ill.'

Another extract is as pertinent. In a certain sense it is a repetition of the foregoing; but things sometimes gain force by repetition, and this sentiment or prophecy of Nassau Senior's is one of them:—

“The most numerous of the Irish parties desires that the existing institutions of the empire may work ill. It is delighted by the prospect of war, and glories over the probabilities of defeat.” (Some of us may remember the savage gloating of certain Irish newspapers over the difficulties of the Crimean War and the horrors of the Indian Mutiny. “England's extremity, Ireland's opportunity,” is a well-known phrase.) “It opposes whatever is likely to be useful, because it is likely to be useful, and rejects with loathing whatever is tendered to it as a favour or a grace.” (*Vide* the abuse heaped on Mr. Balfour by the Home Rulers for all that he has planned or done for the relief of distress or the settlement of disquiet.) “Colleges for secular instruction it denounces as godless, and schools in which Protestants and Catholics may meet are seminaries of infidelity;”¹

¹ “Bigots will be surprised to learn that O'Connell was in favour of united secular and of separate religious teaching for the Irish. It is singular that the two most powerful Churches, the Roman Catholic, and *longo intervallo* the English, are scared from their propriety by

and a provision for its clergy is a bribe. It agitates for the sake of agitation, and selects for its avowed object an unattainable end, because it is unattainable—because its mischief cannot be tested by experience or its stimulus deadened by possession.”

All this is as true as the sun of to-day ; but when Nassau Senior said of O’Connell that he was not to be reckoned among the sincere Repealers, being a man of too much political sagacity not to be aware that Repeal, even if obtained, must produce separation—that separation would be followed by war between the North and South and between the South and England—he had not foreseen the day of traitors in our own camp, of responsible statesmen basely trafficking with treason-felons, murderers, and rebels, while as basely deserting their Protestant and loyal fellow subjects of the North—responsible statesmen who for the sake of place and party would fling these Protestants under the iron heel of Rome and subject these loyalists to the dominion of the Nationalists. Nor, when Macaulay ridiculed the idea of a separate legislature for Wales as the analogue which disposed of that for Ireland, did he foresee the time when the silliest fad that was ever hatched in the mare’s nest among the reeds would boast of a certain number of followers when “Federation” had its accredited society, and Home

even the ghost of dissent. But the melancholy fact remains that the Irish, through want of education, are in the best condition to receive the lies sown broadcast by her agitators.”—*England’s Duty to Ireland as Plain to a Loyal Irish Roman Catholic*; by Thomas Maguire, LL.D., D.Lit.

Rule for Wales was gravely held as part of a quite possible programme not drawn up in Hanwell and not treated as treasonable.

All the objections formulated by Macaulay in 1833 hold good to this hour. Save for one or two topical allusions, the speech he made on the address in answer to the King's speech in that year might stand as a well-reasoned and statesmanlike argument against the Nationalists and their English allies of to-day; and when Earl Russell, twenty years later, said, "I own I can see no hope that Ireland would be well and quietly governed under the dispensation of Home Rule," he carried on the traditions of this wise statesmanship which judges by facts and looks ahead on the ground of that which has been proven, and does not let itself be guided by sentimental theories and seduced by fine phrases.

Those fine phrases, what have they done? Where is the difference between the iridescent bubble labelled "Union of Hearts" if but Home Rule is granted, and O'Connell's brilliant prophecy of universal peace and goodwill to follow on the "amalgamation of the people of Ireland with the people of England"? "I beg to state," he said, "that I am thoroughly convinced that the object of the Catholic clergy and laity in Ireland is sincerely and honestly to concur with the Government in every measure that shall increase the strength of the Government in Ireland, so as to consolidate Ireland with England completely." Catholic emancipation was a righteous necessity. No one would wish to go back on this act—no one refuses

to acknowledge the absolute equality of Catholics with Protestants, and the right they have to all the privileges of perfect citizenship. Yet those brilliant prophecies of peace and goodwill have resulted in evermore embittered strife, in evermore angry discord, in ever wider and more unreasonable demands, and in the gradual growth of the Catholic section, beginning with prayers for release from its own bonds and going on to the evident desire—and design—to impose bonds on the opposite party. The promises of contentment made by O'Connell, and probably believed in by him, have fulfilled themselves in Parliamentary obstruction and agrarian outrage, in the Plan of Campaign and the Land League, in New Tipperary and cruel boycotting, in cattle-maiming, midnight murder, and the assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Bourke. Of all the outrages perpetrated by the miscreants who were hounded on to crime by their more guilty leaders, how many were perpetrated by Protestants? True, Parnell was a Protestant, and Parnell had his hand on the piston here and the brake there. But the Nationalist movement is essentially a Romanist movement; and those who uphold the law and vote for order and peaceable government are mainly Protestants.

The truth is, the Roman Catholic Church is ever a standing menace to civil liberty both in countries where Catholicism is the national religion, as in France and Italy, and in those where she is struggling for pre-eminence, as now in Ireland. She is like that

weak and insignificant little fish of the *Arabian Nights' Tales*. Dying by reason of its narrow prison, the little fish asks for only a modest basin where it may swim more freely. Its prayer granted, it grows and grows, ever seeking for wider space, till at last it fills the whole sea and devours the weak and credulous sympathiser who set it free. So with the Catholic Church, specially in Ireland. From the "amalgamation" to follow on emancipation she has passed into the demand for virtual supremacy—into the rejection of all claims to even equality by those who so lately were her superiors—into the assumption of political command and the absolute control of the ballot-box and the voting-paper.

Save perhaps under the theocratic rule of ancient Egypt, the world has never seen such a close organisation as that of the Roman Catholic Church. When predominant, surely has the world never seen a rule so inimical to intellectual enlightenment or civic freedom. Every new fact in science, from Galileo's time onwards, has been established only after a hand-to-hand struggle with the Church. Some she has not acknowledged even yet; and at no time and in no country has she recognised the rights or duties of a citizen as in any way equal in importance or righteousness with the duties and obligations of a churchman. The Church comes first, a man's country next; but the Pope heads the lawful sovereign, and the tiara is greater than the crown. And it is to this Church, insatiable in her lust for power, unresting in her efforts for supremacy, contemptuous of civil liberties when

opposed to her demands, blind and deaf to scientific truth when she fears the results of knowledge—to this Church the sworn foe of Protestantism, and, in Ireland, the unrelenting foe of England—to this forger of chains to which we ourselves will not submit, we propose to hand over the free and prosperous North—to deliver up our natural brethren to their enemies and our own.

If it could be shown that the Roman Catholics and Nationalists were more industrious and enlightened than the Protestant and loyal men of Ulster, the Home Rule sympathisers in England might have something to say for themselves. They might argue on the ground of “the best to lead.” But when the contrary is the fact—when Ulster is prosperous and the South is impoverished; when the fertile fields of Armagh and Fermanagh are well farmed and those of Kerry and her neighbours are simply brutalised by bad management; when the Protestant workmen of the North are well educated, and the Catholics of the South are illiterate, how can we say that the one is even equal to the other? Still less can we say that, on the principle of the best to lead, the South should overpower the North.

There have ever been two Irelands—the North and South; and though the South has the numerical majority, the North has the brains, the industry, and the wealth thereby created, which give the rightful preponderance. “One man one vote” may be all very well as an ideal proposition based on abstract justice. And if all things were equal it would work well enough. But to say that the ignorant bog-

trotter, who knows nothing by himself, who votes as he is told by the priest, and who sometimes does not know even the name of the candidate for whom he votes—to say that such a one counts for as much in civic value as the intelligent workman who thinks for himself, or as the responsible and far-seeing employer of labour, some hundreds strong, is to talk rubbish that is not contemptible simply because it is mischievous. The Home Rulers bring forward their numerical majority as their mainstay, their unconquerable reason why. But they know, and we all know, how purely fallacious the argument is, and how, though an arithmetical truth, it is made to subserve the purpose of a political lie. A hundred of these illiterate voters led to the poll by the parish priest have not the moral nor the civic value of one independent and understanding man in Ulster. Politically they count, because we go by numbers, not individual worth. But when we are considering the claims to consideration of this cry for Home Rule, to give attention to the mere fact of numerical superiority is to falsify the true issue and to darken counsel by the admission of fraud and word-juggling as solid argument.

Reduced to its elements, the National Aspiration, of which we hear so much, comes to a very mean and meagre thing. Take away the endeavour of the Roman Catholic Church for supremacy and absolute political power, the personal ambition of a crowd of needy adventurers who want to find in the excitement of politics and the emoluments of place the

fortune they will not set themselves to win by hard and monotonous work ;—take away hereditary hatred of England and local jealousy of Ulster, and we come down to a residuum not worth much as a cause why an empire should be disintegrated and society convulsed. The Irish cry for Home Rule has been made more formidable than itself warrants by the English sympathisers who, for generous sentiment on the one hand and party purposes on the other, have enlarged a scannel pipe into a far-sounding bugle, and added factitious strength to a tottering cause.

What is it that the Irish need ? That is not saying What is it that a certain portion of them desire ? The whole question lies in the difference between these two words. Wherein are they worse off than we, their English fellow subjects ? A man with the pretensions to leadership of Mr. John Morley is not ashamed to speak of the “inequality” between the English and the Irish, and the disgrace to us that in spite of promises and enactments it should be so. Where does this inequality lie ? So far as one can see, the great inequality between the two countries lies in the facts that the Irish pay fewer taxes and lighter than we do—that the Irish landlord has been made a political cock-shy, practically persecuted by successive reductions, and in many cases wholly ruined for the satisfaction of the tenant—and that the Irish tenant is favoured more than any other tenant in any other country of the civilised world.

If “coercion” is still necessary, what makes it so ? Are crimes to go unpunished that English sentiment-

ality may not be affrighted by an ugly word? If Irish land leaguers would wholly leave off moonlighting, cattle-maiming, boycotting, assassination, and the whole roll-call of agrarian and political crimes which have made certain parts of the country a very hell upon earth, "coercion" would wholly cease to exist. At this present time, when, thanks to Mr. Balfour, the land is so much more tranquil than it has been, coercion is almost a dead letter. The Home Rulers, both here and in England, revive the word for the sake of inflaming party passion; but the thing is almost dead because crime has almost ceased. When Irishmen regard life as something to be respected, no matter what the political opinions held by this or that may be, and law as something to be obeyed, *bon gré mal gré*, coercion will have no *locus standi* and will fall to pieces of itself. But while landlords are shot or boycotted for evicting non-paying tenants, and men are shot or boycotted for taking an evicted farm, there must needs be special enactments to meet these special conditions. And the sympathy which Mr. Morley and his kind feel for the poor dear murderers cooling their hot blood in a prison-cell might better be transferred to the murdered lying cold in their graves so long before their time.

The real crux in this question of Home Rule is in the Protestant population generally and the condition of Ulster specifically. Were Ireland universally Roman Catholic the question would lie in a nutshell, and all that England would have then to do would

be to keep a few sharp cruisers, with a torpedo boat or two, as safeguards against surprises. If Parnellites and Nationalists liked to break one another's heads and call one another bad names, that would be their affair, not ours; and the fun of the fair would be free to them for as long as they liked. But when we come to Ulster and the Protestants scattered throughout the country, we have our duty as the mother country—as the Imperial Centre, from which not all the arguments of Mr. Tim Healy nor Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sexton nor Mr. Morley, can free us. We have no right to leave these our co-religionists and loyal brethren to be persecuted and destroyed by their enemies, as without the shadow of doubt they would be. The boast of the Church is “*semper eadem*”—that Church so useful to the individual needing moral guidance and spiritual help, so harmful to the community whose life should be one of civic freedom and manly independence! And where the Roman Catholic Church is predominant and above the laws, as she would be in Home-Ruled Ireland, she has ever been and ever will be a cruel and a persecuting Church. “*Semper eadem*”! The burnings and massacres which received her sanction in the days gone by would receive her sanction still, had she the force to ordain or condone without subjecting herself to a superior legal power. Here, in Ireland, where she would be supreme under Home Rule, no Protestant's life would be safe, and that tragedy in Phoenix Park would not want for repetitions.

This is no wild assertion made in the air. Turn

back to any of the accounts given by Irish sympathisers of things which the local priests have said and done during election times and the like, and then see what a total absence of fairness, moderation, or morality these leaders of the people show. It is not too much to say that when, or if, England abandons her own people in Ireland not one of the scattered handfuls of Protestants to be found in Catholic districts would escape with their lives. "Root out the accursed thing," has ever been the law that Rome has promulgated and her children have obeyed; and what has been would be again. In Ulster, where they are a compact body, the Protestants would be simply taxed to spoliation and ruin. The temptation would be too great to forego and the loot too rich to leave untouched. If Ulster did not know how to defend herself by her own strong arm she would be made the mere prey of the spoiler. This she knows, and for this she assembled that memorable Convention on the 17th of June.

Nothing in history surpasses the solemn significance of this Convention. In it was no boyish or unstable enthusiasm, no bluster, no rant, no fustian. Largely composed of elderly men who understood the full value of the responsibilities they assumed, the pervading sentiment was one of deep resolve, of unalterable determination. They knew they were in face of a great and real danger—a danger by which their homes, their civic liberties, their wealth, their very lives were and are menaced. In the prayer by which

the meeting opened, and in the hymn which was as a solemn oath binding them in one accord, one sacred vow of brotherhood and mutual fidelity—in the self-control which some of their opponents have sneered at as “want of enthusiasm”—in the strong avowal which others have called “bluster” and tried to reduce to the level of their own washy hysterics—in all the gravity of their cause and the grandeur of their protest, we turn as it were a page of old-time history when men had to fight for their liberties more strenuously than they do now, and when God stood nearer man’s life than now. The profound order of that large assembly of some fourteen thousand persons was as the sign of the law-abiding temper of the Ulster men at large. The self-controlled silence in which speaker after speaker was listened to, testified to their capacity for rule because of their capacity for self-government. The burst of pent-up enthusiasm with which the more telling points and the peroration of each speech were received proved how near to the heart of every man here lay the cause he had come to defend. From first to last the whole thing was instinct with sincerity, and as different from the frothy politics of party as a living tragedy is different from a stage play.

It was a protest no Government can afford to neglect. Those fourteen thousand earnest men had needed no wire-puller to bring them into line. The grand burst of “Ayes” when asked if they still wished to remain English citizens and did not wish to be cut off from the imperial mother and made a

province apart, rose up in one full volume of assent which should have convinced the most contemptuous sceptic and stirred the coldest heart. Perhaps even those one or two inimical press-men, who came as spies and reported as traitors, were more moved than they cared to own. Whether so or not, they fulfilled their mission by belittling the grandest political movement of our days, and the Able Editors in London and that smug young shopman translated from the counter to the world of letters, wrote their smart little sarcasms and polished up their neat little epigrams all to prove the Ulster men no better than blustering schoolboys, and worthy of the Grand Old Leader's memorable epithets. The low-class press in London is at the best a contemptible affair, but surely never was it more contemptible than when dealing with this Ulster Convention in an inimical sense. Those smart young Able Editors—the very spawn of journalism—sitting in jaunty judgment on these grave and stalwart men face to face with danger and resolute to resist oppression—these restricted Cockneys who measure all life and all thought by the utterances of certain hysterical High Priests heralding a brand-new morality and a quite spick and span regenerated humanity—they to pretend to fathom the depths to which the men of Ulster are stirred and carelessly to pronounce it “shallow”! If certain ape-like and fantastic tricks played by man make the very angels weep, there must have been a copious flood of heavenly tears when the papers, conducted by these Able Editors, were

launched the next day, and the measuring-tapes of some of the flimsiest intellects that ever floated on the top of absolutely bottomless vanity fluttered in broad sheets about the Strand.

The main desire of the wiser men of all parties, and of the Ulster men perhaps more than the rest, is to be let alone. Ireland has been the *corpus vile* whereon all manner of political experiments have been tried. Suffering as she does from want of capital and want of remunerative employment other than the land, we have done our best, we in England, by our successive and unsettling enactments, to prevent the influx of capital and the establishment of industries, by creating the sense of governmental insecurity. Fifty years' rest from interference and unnecessary legislation would do far more to create a prosperous Ireland than all the Home Rule panaceas that could be invented.

The mischief of mischiefs has been in this incessant tinkering. In 1870, 1881, and 1885, Parliament passed Land act after Land act, all in favour of the tenant and to the prejudice of the landlord, by which a feeling of insecurity has been created in the latter, that has stopped enterprise and improvements. That feeling of insecurity has extended to others than these landowners, and even Belfast herself has suffered from it. Instead of establishing manufactories by which the "congested districts" might be drained, Parliament has done its best to crystallise the evil of small holdings—holdings, say, at thirteen shillings a year, which give no man an adequate living. In Scotland or

England men do not buy land beyond its market value, but in Ireland fancy prices are given for poor little bits of bog or stone which do no more to make a man's real living than the villa and suburban garden. Here again Nassau Senior speaks fifty years ago with the voice and in the words of to-day.

“In a country, in which every one who can find a landlord to accept him can be a farmer, and scarcely any one can be a labourer; where the three only alternatives are—the occupation of land, beggary, or famine; where there is nothing to repress competition and everything to inflame it, the treaty between landlord and tenant is not a calm bargain, in which the tenant, having offered what he thinks the land worth to him, cares little whether his offer be accepted; it is a struggle like the struggle to buy bread in a besieged town, or to buy water in an African caravan, it is a struggle in which the landlord is tempted by an extravagant rent; the agent by fees or bribes; the person in possession by a premium to take him to another country; and rivals are scared away by threats and punished by torture, mutilation, and murder.”

How strangely the Irish question continues in the old groove may be seen also by these extracts from a letter of Burke to Dr. Hussey, written from Beaconsfield so long ago as May 18th, 1795. “The language of the day,” he says, “went plainly to a separation of the two kingdoms. God forbid that anything like it should ever happen! They would both be ruined by it, but Ireland would suffer most

and first. The thing, however, is impossible. It is a foolish language, adopted from the United Irishmen, that their grievances originate from England. . . . In the name of God ! what grievances has Ireland, as Ireland, to complain of with regard to Great Britain ?—unless the protection of the most powerful country upon earth, giving all her privileges, without exception, in common to Ireland, and reserving to herself only the painful pre-eminence of tenfold burdens, be a matter of complaint ! The subject, as a subject, is as free in Ireland as he is in England ; as a member of the empire, an Irishman has every privilege of a natural-born Englishman, in every part of it, in every occupation, and in every branch of commerce. No monopoly is established against him anywhere ; and the great staple manufacture of Ireland is not only not prohibited, not only not discouraged, but it is privileged in a manner that has no example.” (Substitute for “manufacture” “tenant,” and we have the same thing now as then) “That Ireland would in that case [the dissolution of the Union] come to make a figure amongst the nations, is an idea which has more of the ambition of individuals in it than of a sober regard to the happiness of a whole people. . . . Ireland constitutionally is independent ; politically she can never be so. It is a struggle against nature. She must be protected, and there is no protection to be found for her but either from France or England. . . . Should the Catholics alienate from them—the Protestants—they would have to choose men of desperate property and of no

property, and men of no religion and no moral principles.”

All this might have been said yesterday.

Well ! this being so, what do we find in Belfast, the commercial capital of the North? Here this tremendous evil of the land and land only as a man's portion has been done away with by the establishment of trades and manufactories. In Belfast is ample employment for every one. The men can go to the shipbuilding yard in Queen's Island, the women and children to the linen manufactories. Clean, quiet industrious, prosperous, Belfast has worked hard, minded her own business, and thriven in proportion to her industry and abstention from political excitement. The following table shows a little of the advance that has been made in the last forty years, an advance wrought for and gained by herself alone without help, subvention, or any kind of aid from England.

COMPARATIVE PARTICULARS—BELFAST 1850 or 1851
WITH BELFAST 1890 OR 1891.

Number of Vessels entered and left	1851	1890
Belfast Harbour	5,016	8,005
Tonnage	650,138	1,840,666
Customs Revenue.....	1851	1891
	£369,416	£2,247,528
Number of Houses in Borough	1850	1892
	15,000	56,000
Valuation of Borough	1851	1892
	£181,073	£737,816
Population	1851	1891
	100,301	273,055
Number of Spindles.....	1850	1891
	326,008	834,907

	1851	1891
Number of Power Looms	138	26,790
	1851	1891
Number of Shipbuilding Yards	3 small yards	3 extensive
	for building wooden vessels	yards
Acreege " "	About two acres	102 acres
Number of Hands employed	About 150	9,800
Annual Tonnage launched	100 to 200 tons	91,877
	1851	1891
Number of Banks..... .. .	3 Local and 3 Dublin	3 Local with 5 Branches and 3 Dublin
Volume of Business in Banks	3 Local £14,293,397

The "Volume of Business in Banks" for 1891 is the total of the three local banks only, viz., Belfast Bank, Ulster Bank, and Northern Bank.

It is a good account of themselves which these "undegenerate Englishmen" can give—these stalwart sons of Ulster sprung from Scotch and English ancestors—God-fearing, law-abiding, industrious, well-famed, whom their Nonconformist brethren in England have deserted—joining with the most unscrupulous of the Radical and Home Rule party in their plot to deliver up these Irish Protestants into the hands of Rome—to make this intelligent race¹ subservient to the priest-

¹ In the last General Election, 1885, the proportion of illiterates to the population were in Belfast 6 per cent. ; in Cork City 14 per cent. ; in County Antrim 8 per cent. ; in County Cork 40 per cent. In 1891 the percentage of illiterate persons five years of age and upwards was as follows :—

"CO. ANTRIM.—17,524 persons, or 9·5 per cent. Of these 7,381 were Roman Catholics, 4,253 Protestant Episcopalians, 5,349 Presbyterians, and the remainder other denominations.

"BELFAST CITY.—19,598 persons, or 8·7 per cent. Of these

directed will of men who cannot write their own names—to submit this prosperous city of Belfast to

8,666 were Roman Catholics, 6,134 Protestants, 3,765 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. DOWN.—26,375 persons, or 11 per cent. Of these 14,081 were Roman Catholics, 6,039 Protestants, and 5,262 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. DERRY.—19,503 persons, or 14 per cent. 13,391 Roman Catholics, 3,206 Protestants, 2,726 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. ARMAGH.—23,984 persons, or 18 per cent. 16,008 Roman Catholics, 6,252 Protestants, 1,262 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. CAVAN.—16,283 persons, or 16 per cent. 14,864 Roman Catholics, 1,208 Protestants, 165 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. FERMANAGH.—10,378 persons, or 15 per cent. 7,658 Roman Catholics, 2,503 Protestants, 61 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. MONAGHAN.—21,280 persons, or 23 per cent. 19,112 Roman Catholics, 1,401 Protestants, 712 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. TYRONE.—27,166 persons, or 17 per cent. 20,072 Roman Catholics, 4,748 Protestants, 2,138 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“CO. DONEGAL.—52,013 persons, or 34 per cent. 47,921 Roman Catholics, 2,700 Protestants, 1,253 Presbyterians; the remainder as above.

“Galway	had in 1881	45	per cent.	of illiterates.
Mayo	„	44	„	„
Roscommon	„	27	„	„
Leitrim	„	22	„	„
Kerry	„	24	„	„
Clare	„	21	„	„

And in all the figures I have given it will be seen that the dead weight of this illiteracy belongs to the Roman Catholic population.”—T. W. RUSSELL, the *Daily Graphic* of June 14, 1892.

In 1799 Mr. Luke Fox wrote these memorable words: “Laws may

the taxing powers of Moonlighters and Land Leaguers who think to raise themselves from poverty, not by hard work, but by spoliation and getting for nothing the land they would brutalise when they had it. In all the history of politics, full of treacheries, of mean alliances and base surrenders as it is, nothing comes near the shame of this desertion by English Nonconformists of their Protestant brethren in Ireland—for the sake of such paltry party gains as their alliance with Mr. Gladstone may give them.

The growth of Belfast in importance, commercial enterprise, and wealth has been more like the growth of an American city than anything we have in Great Britain. Without aid from without it has risen, as we have seen, from a place of no value at all, to one of the greatest in Ireland. No town in Ireland comes near it for wealth or industrial enterprise, and even a hostile critic who came to curse both the place and the people was obliged to allow that the city had “advanced by leaps and bounds”; and that it was more peaceable and cleanly, more orderly and more industrious, than the happy-go-lucky South. “*Italia farà da se,*” they say when excited at Monte Citorio. “Belfast *ha fatto da se,*” they may well say of the city

be enacted, establishments may be framed, stipends may be dispensed; but unless the people are educated the cause of religion and government will remain desperate. It is this which makes the only difference between man and man, nation and nation. To the philosophic eye there is no difference between a Protestant and Popish infant. But the same individuals arrived at manhood appear to be scarcely of the same species.”

which was once a mere hamlet on the banks of the Lagan, and now owns "miles of quays," 46,376 inhabited houses, and a population of 255,896.

As nothing tells so much as facts and figures, Mr. T. W. Russell's papers in the *Daily Graphic* will be largely drawn on for statistics. Law-abiding Ulster in 1891 required for the preservation of public peace the following proportion of policemen:—

Antrim	had 12 policemen for every 10,000 of population.
Down	„ 12 „ „ „ „
Londonderry	„ 12 „ „ „ „
Armagh	„ 14 „ „ „ „
Tyrone	„ 14 „ „ „ „

These five counties return the sixteen Ulster Unionist members to the Imperial Parliament. When we get out of this region the figures change.

Cavan	had 20 policemen for every 10,000 of population.
Donegal	„ 28 „ „ „ „
Fermanagh	„ 23 „ „ „ „
Monaghan	„ 20 „ „ „ „

But things get even worse in other parts of Ireland.

Tipperary	had 49 policemen for every 10,000 of population.
Limerick	„ 45 „ „ „ „
Westmeath	„ 44 „ „ „ „
Clare	„ 40 „ „ „ „

At the same time every " 'Coercion' Act—save the Westmeath Act has applied to Ulster as well as to Leinster, Munster, and Connaught. There has been absolutely nothing in the law to differentiate the one province from the other. The real difference lies in the fact that Ulster has had one law-abiding spirit

which has been absent from much of the rest of Ireland. Capital has not been disturbed; hence the difference.”—(T. W. Russell, *Daily Graphic*, June 16th, 1892.) And by the way if you want a genuine grievance it is that the orderly and peaceable Ulstermen should be taxed as much as County Clare or Limerick for the maintenance of a police of whom they have not one-third the need.

Another significant fact is the proportion of public-houses to the population.

“ PROPORTION OF PUBLIC-HOUSES TO POPULATION.

ANTRIM.	
Belfast I to	311 Ballymoney I to 428
Antrim Petty Sessions	Larne I to 474
Division I to	166 Whiteabbey I to 445
Ballymena I to	374
ARMAGH.	
Armagh I to	304 Keady I to 463
Ballybott I to	360 Portadown I to 575
Lurgan I to	773
CLARE.	
Ennis I to	137 M. Malbay I to 268
Ennistimon I to	155 Tulla I to 223
Kilrush I to	133
CORK.	
Cork City I to	150 Kinsale I to 224
Buttevant I to	146 Mallow I to 129
Bandon I to	136 Middleton... .. I to 147
Clonakilty I to	184 Mitchelstown I to 146
Fermoy I to	146 Youghal I to 155
DOWN.	
Banbridge I to	426 Hollywood I to 512
Castlewellan I to	295 Kirkeel I to 530
Hillsborough I to	1035 Rathfriland I to 426
DUBLIN.	
Dublin City I to	345 Balbriggan I to 293

GALWAY.

Galway City 1 to	142		Gort 1 to	236
Ballinasloe 1 to	208		Loughrea 1 to	235

KERRY.

Castleisland 1 to	230		Listowel 1 to	199
Dingle 1 to	259		Tralee 1 to	160

DERRY.

Derry City... .. 1 to	135		Limavady 1 to	286
Coleraine 1 to	335		Moneymore 1 to	1307
Garvagh 1 to	657			

MAYO.

Ballaghaderin 1 to	234		Ballyhaunus 1 to	428
Ballina 1 to	193		Belmullet 1 to	497
Ballinrohe 1 to	258		Swinford 1 to	243

In this special industry it must be frankly admitted Ulster is literally nowhere. Belfast does with one public-house for every 311 of its people. Cork requires one for every 150. The prosperous division of Ballymena has one for every 374 people. The poverty-stricken divisions of Swinford and Ballaghaderin, in Mayo, require one in 243 and one in 234 respectively."

I will now make a very long extract from Mr. Russell's concluding letter on the 17th of June—an extract which I hope will not subject me to the penalties of literary mis-appropriation. But what this earnest and vigorous Unionist has said is so much better said than I could put it, it seems foolish to make a perhaps weak argument when something so strong, so concise, so explanatory and comprehensive lies to one's hand. Here, then, is the situation summed up in Mr. Russell's own words:—

“They [the Ulster men] have given to the statesmanship of the empire men like Lord Dufferin, who once described himself ‘as a Scot greatly improved by 300 years’ residence in Ireland ;’ to its arms men such as the Lawrences, the Neills, and Montgomeries, who have played a great part in Indian affairs. They have been quick to rebel against injustice, and when Catholics were unable to fight for their own rights, they fought for them. They have formed the great Scoto-Irish race in America, of which the late John Francis Maguire had so much to say. This is their record, and I hold it is not one of which any people need be ashamed. How do they stand to-day? These despised Ulster Protestants are, as I have said, an actual and a large majority of the Ulster people. They are in the front as regards wealth. Their educational status is higher than that of their neighbours, and incomparably higher than that of many other districts in Ireland. They have been the founders of the industrial activity of the province ; they direct that activity now, and even the great mass of the skilled artisans are everywhere Protestants. They live in better houses ; they do not vote illiterate ; their districts are unstained by crime ; they are loyal and law-abiding citizens.

“ *A Machine Controlled by the Roman Catholic Church.*

“What is proposed to be done in regard to these people? Why the alarm everywhere felt throughout Ulster in view of the General Election? The alarm is not without a cause. It has been proposed to

establish and set up a Statutory Parliament in Dublin, to which Ulster would, of course, be subject. Outside of this Imperial province there are not half a million of Protestants in the rest of Ireland, and these are so scattered that they could not possibly secure representation in this proposed assembly. The great mass of the people in the other three provinces are Celtic, Catholic, and in the main backward, as compared with the Ulster I have described. Even in recent times they have shown what they are made of, and have conceded the claim of the Catholic Church to dominate in temporal as in spiritual things, almost without a struggle—a claim put forward unhesitatingly by Archbishop Walsh and Archbishop Logue. Constituency after constituency in the South and West has bent before the clerical rod. They have proved conclusively that an Irish Parliament would be a machine controlled by the Roman Catholic Church. Before Mr. Parnell's fall this might have been questioned; since that event the priests have been at the pains to demonstrate the fact before the eyes of the whole world. Under any conceivable system of separation, then, Ulster would be in a hopeless minority in such an assembly. What under these circumstances we should see would be this—the very men who have made Ulster what it is, rich, prosperous, loyal, and contented, would be placed under the control of those who had failed to do in the other provinces that which had been achieved in the North. We should see this proud, educated, industrious, law-abiding majority in Ulster placed

under the peasants of Galway, Mayo, Kerry, Leitrim and Clare, where, whatever be the test applied, whether it be education, wealth, industry, the law-abiding spirit, or capacity for business, the map must be shaded in the deepest black.

“Plundered of their Inheritance.”

“The question is—ought this to be done? Nobody thought of it in 1885. The idea was born in 1886, when Mr. Gladstone in the stress of political weather gave birth to a new development of doing justice to Ireland by doing injustice to the only prosperous part of that country. By virtue of the great principle which Carlyle once called ‘bellwetherism,’ the idea prevailed with a great section of the Liberal party. And it will be, or ought to be, the supreme issue at the next general election. Ulster is certainly entitled to her protest against this new doctrine. What she in effect says is that her people, born under, and possessing rights in, the Imperial Parliament, ought not to be plundered of their inheritance; that having invested their capital in the soil and commerce of the province on the security of the laws of this Parliament, the security ought not to be changed, and they peremptorily decline to accept in exchange for the security of English citizenship the security of the authors of the Plan of Campaign. They object to take their place in what would be a priest-ridden and a priest-governed Parliament. They refuse to have anything to say to it, and will neither elect members to nor take part in

its proceedings. This is the situation. Of course even with those who believe that force is no remedy, force is always an easy resort. And that this yoke can be fastened on the neck of Ulster by force goes without saying. But for those who have objected to the coercion of the moonlighter, the cattle-maimer, and the intimidator, this prospect of having to coerce Ulster cannot be a very pleasant reflection. To all those who consider that government is only just and possible when it is founded upon the consent of the governed, the outlook in Ulster cannot be very cheery.

“ A Feeling of Moral Loathing.

“ And why, if majorities are to decree everything, ought not the Ulster majority to prevail? Cut Ulster adrift, if you will, from the Imperial Parliament. Why decree who her future masters shall be? Why attempt the questionable procedure of transferring the allegiance of that province to another Parliament? Why not allow this people to remain, as now, an integral portion of the United Kingdom? Why force her into a partnership with men whose proceedings for the last thirteen years have left a deep impression on the minds of the people, and whose action during this period has caused a feeling of moral loathing to arise all through the northern province? Ulster does not want this constitutional change. Why should it be forced upon her people at the bayonet’s point? What about that sacred principle of Local Option, so dear to the heart of the modern Radical? Is the direct

veto only applicable to the liquor evil? And is it incapable of being applied in other directions?

“Not Peace but a Sword.”

“I cannot undertake to say what Ulster may resolve upon doing should Mr. Gladstone get his majority and proceed with the only work he cares about. But this I can say with perfect confidence—no Home Rule Bill can be a message of peace to Ireland. Such a measure will not bring peace, but a sword. Nor will it bring that relief which is so fondly expected to the Imperial Parliament. Launched in a raging storm as any such measure must needs be, the Irish question, at Westminster, will be real as ever—much more real than it now is. It will then, indeed, block the way in earnest.”

Such being the state of things, both material and moral, the great Convention of the 17th of June came as the natural expression of a people objecting to be made the sop flung to a party Cerberus. Mr. Gladstone’s sneer at “those who have not conquered the A B C of the subject” presuming to raise a voice on the Irish question would not apply to this meeting any more than his crude classification of “fools or rogues.” These Ulster men, headed by the Duke of Abercorn and marshalled by the foremost citizens of Belfast and the leading men of the province generally, knew clearly enough what they meant to say and what they mean to hold. The people of Ulster—“or rather a corner of the north-east of Ulster,” according to Sir

William Harcourt, taking it in hand to decry the whole thing as “disappointing”—had to have a definite line of policy and a clear idea of their own situation. The Duke of Abercorn struck the keynote of the situation when he first of all described the meeting as “a grand demonstration, vast in its extent and solemn in its nature,” and ended by saying, “Once more I say, we will not have Home Rule.” There was nothing “disappointing” in the enthusiasm with which this pledge of resistance was received—nothing meagre in the resolute cheers which responded to the Duke’s assertion that they, the men of Ulster, intended to show to their English and Scotch friends “that the name of Ulster is not a sham but a reality—that the people who have inhabited it for centuries are determined to live under the same laws, to enjoy the same liberties and privileges as the rest of the inhabitants of the British Isles, and not to be subject to a different treatment at the hands of a hostile majority.” “Is the intelligence, the skill, the hard-wrought labour of Ulster to be utterly ignored for the purpose of furthering a wild and impossible theory?” was a question answered with a burst of Nos and cheers; so too the assertion that “the common danger had brought together men forgetful of their former differences, united for one common object, and resolved to fight shoulder to shoulder under the banner of the Union.” No one who was at that magnificent meeting, not blind, deaf, or drunk with party prepossessions, could fail to understand the deep and earnest spirit which animated the whole assembly.

Speakers and audience were at one in their determination, as the Duke of Argyll said, to resist the "ascendency of the village ruffian and the parish pope." When it was said: "Mr. Gladstone calmly contemplates the possibility of using the forces of the Crown to subjugate the people of the North of Ireland under the foot of an overbearing and exultant majority," the indignant protests burst forth as from one man; and again when the Duke went on to say: "It is clear that no people would submit under the circumstances I have mentioned, unless compelled by force. Nothing but force and systematic coercion would hold down the people of Ulster, and this coercion would be applied by Englishmen to Irishmen of their own flesh and blood—men who in days gone by fought for the protection of England and England's rights." It may be that cheers and cries are but as the very froth of excitement, born of hysteria, dying with reflection; but no one could say this of those Ulster men in the pavilion which was as a temple that day. Far deeper than the surface, far more solid than froth, and far more lasting than the moment, that meeting pledged itself to a resistance with a solemnity that recalled the old times when religious liberty was a man's dearest possession, and his civic rights the honour for which he would go to his death as gladly as we of to-day would go to a wedding.

To Mr. Morley's mocking and sarcastic query: "What are these men of Ulster afraid of?" Sir William Ewart gave for answer the heart of the

position. Afraid, no ; but the reason of this resistance—"the demands that are made by that [Roman Catholic] clerical power. It places no limits on its right to direct and control all matters, secular and religious alike, of the members of the Church. It concedes no right of private judgment, for the hierarchy alone can decide what is for the interest of the Church. 'To secure rights has been and is the aim of the Christian civilisation, to destroy them and to establish the resistless domineering action of a purely central power is the aim of the Roman policy. Too much and too long in other times was this its tendency ; but what was its besetting sin has now become, so far as man can make it, its undisguised, unchecked rule of action and law of life.' These words are Mr. Gladstone's words," said Sir William Ewart, "and on this point should be a sufficient answer to Mr. Morley."

The Earl of Erne backed up this, and quoted from the *United Irishman* of November 25th, 1891, these words of the Rev. Mr. O'Reilly, spoken at a meeting of the National Federation :—

"Clerical dictation must and will exist so long as there is a priest in the country. The people must submit to clerical dictation, which is the law of God."

Now any one who happens to know a man who is a Liberal in politics and a Nonconformist in religion, knows with what holy terror the influence of the squire and the parson in England is descanted on. That influence, even where it exists at its worst, is not coercion. There are no pains and penalties

attached to free thought or free action in England. There are no cursings from the altar, no denial of sacred rites held as absolutely necessary for the soul's salvation, no boycotting and authoritative recommendations to a docile congregation to let the recalcitrant severely alone, as in Ireland. But this clerical domination, so cynically avowed and so openly practised, is passed over by the Nonconformist Home Ruler as a mere nothing in the political life of Protestants of Ireland, as less than nothing in the future condition of Ulster.

“We have no quarrel with the Roman Catholic Church as a Church,” said another speaker, Mr. Andrews, the president of the Ulster Reform Club. “It numbers some of my best friends, I have been a subscriber to its churches and a collector in the Roman Catholic chapel of my native village. We object to clerical government of either priest or parson. No country has ever prospered under either. The Roman Catholic bishops and priests now select the candidates, act as canvassers and personation agents in the polling booths, and see the ballot papers marked in many cases for one fourth of the electors as illiterates. . . . Mr. Gladstone, watching the Nonconformist conscience of Great Britain, finally shook off Parnell. The priests and the majority of the Irish leaders came round like a weathercock. They compelled the people to vote against Parnell, to whom they were devoted, and forced them to support those whom they believed to be his murderers. Is it to men such as these and with such power that the Noncon-

formists of Great Britain would be willing to entrust the government of England and Scotland? The answer must be No ; and, therefore, with no shadow of justice can they attempt to make them our rulers." "We don't ask to govern the South," he went on to say ; "they and we have lived under exactly the same laws for generations. They have been indolent, thriftless, and complaining ; we have been industrious, self-reliant, and prosperous. We refuse under any pretext of Home Rule to have our country degraded into the position of a tribute-paying province to Great Britain."

But there was no religious animosity in the meeting, when all shades of religious faith were represented. The *Daily Telegraph* of June 23rd has admirably expressed this, when it says, in speaking of Mr. Gladstone's *pronunciamiento* at Clapham :—

"Addressing a gathering of English Nonconformists, many of them ministers, it would have been natural for him, perhaps, to dwell somewhat strongly on the religious aspect of the question before him. Nevertheless in Mr. Gladstone's speech from first to last there was literally nothing else. One might have supposed that the Convention at Belfast had contented themselves with passing a body of resolutions setting forth their abhorrence of the errors of the Church of Rome, and their conviction that if the Home Rule Bill were passed their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen would endeavour, by methods of temporal and spiritual molestation, to interfere with their freedom of religious worship, and, by degrees,

to stamp out Protestantism in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone must know full well, not only that the Convention gave no expression to any extravagant apprehensions of this kind, but that the whole proceedings showed scarcely a trace of that jealous sectarian temper in which alone such apprehensions are ever likely to originate. The universal report of all competent observers attests the entire absence of this spirit from their deliberations. English visitors to Belfast, who went over for the purpose of witnessing what many of them expected to be an Orange demonstration, were astonished at finding in its place an assemblage of quietly determined, sternly self-controlled, and resolutely orderly citizens, who displayed no party banners, uttered no party cries, delivered no inflammatory party speeches, but addressed themselves in sober business-like fashion to the work before them—that of recording their solemn protest against the threatened attack on their liberties. There was not a word about religious differences in the resolutions voted by the Convention, and even in the speeches—wherein excited orators are so often in the habit of going much beyond the limit of the propositions they have been deputed to support—there is scarcely a word of such import to be found. A few stray phrases may be picked out here and there to show that the faith and worship of Protestantism were subjects on which the speaker felt deeply ; but the main and most striking characteristic of the whole body of these addresses was the almost total absence from them of any sentiment

hostile to the Roman Catholic community, or bordering on religious intolerance.

“ To approach such a body of men with a superfluous exhortation to lay aside animosities which do not inflame them, and fears by which they are not agitated, is the merest trifling. Mr. Gladstone must get nearer to his subject than this. He must face the fact that it is not her apprehension of religious trouble which has made Ulster ‘set her face like a flint’ against the Home Rule scheme, but the certain prospect of intolerable civil injustice and of the gravest material injury. The people of the Northern Province are determined to resist at all costs and hazards the attempt to place them under the domination of the majority of the three other provinces ; and that not because they themselves are Protestants, while this majority is mainly Catholic, but because they represent the wealth, the sobriety, the industry of the country, while the majority has placed itself in the hands of a party of professional politicians who represent nothing but those restless and mischievous elements in the Irish character which have for generations obstructed the political progress of the Irish race. Ulster, that is to say, repudiates the idea of subjection to the Nationalists, because she is loyal and they are disloyal ; because she is attached to public order and they live upon popular turbulence ; because all her fortunes are embarked in her commerce, and all theirs in their trade of agitation ; because her one object is to maintain and develop her prosperity, and their chief aim is to

exploit her resources for the purposes of their game of politics ; because, in a word, she wishes to enjoy the fruits of her industry under the protection of an Imperial Parliament, and they wish to seize upon and employ those possessions in the prosecution of their avowed aims of Separation.”

Much has been said of the “ advantages ” of Ulster, and many who know nothing but what they are told, believe that the North of Ireland is infinitely superior to the South in fertility of soil and the like. What did another speaker, Mr. Johnston, find to say to this hazy kind of belief which the English Home Rulers repeat as glibly as any other political falsehood set afloat for electioneering purposes ?

“ The land that was the poorest and most sterile in Ireland has become the most highly-cultivated and productive soil to be found throughout the length and breadth of our county. Originally the bleakest and most barren of the four provinces, she is now the most fertile and prosperous ; her farmers are honest and pay their rent, and the Plan of Campaign is unknown amongst us.”

But these men who have reclaimed and brought into high cultivation a barren and inhospitable soil are those of whom Mr. Michael Davitt said : “ The Unionist Protestants are not Irish. They are only English and Scotch. Leave them alone to us and we will make short work of these gentlemen.”

It is instructive to turn to these frank expressions of hatred and assured revenge from all the gushing promises of brotherly feeling and fair dealing

if only England will but consummate the treachery of certain of her politicians and endorse the spoliation they desire to accomplish.

Together with these hypothetical "advantages" much too has been said about the "ascendency" of Ulster, and the desire of Ulstermen to maintain this "ascendency"—their fear of losing which is indeed the meaning of the whole movement. Wherein does it lie? What tyrannous rule of exclusion or oppression has Ulster laid on her Roman Catholic fellow-subjects? That the great bulk of the wealth belongs to the Protestants means simply that the Protestants are the most industrious and the most thrifty. That the civic offices in Belfast are mainly filled by Protestants means also simply that these are the most intelligent and the best business men. Roman Catholics are in no sense whatever boycotted in Belfast, and with a franchise so low as £4 almost the whole population has the power of voting. Ulster had the Ulster custom¹ of which the most important feature was

¹ "In Mr. Richey's well-known work on the Irish Land Laws, the Ulster custom is thus defined from a judgment given in one of the county courts. 'Common,' he says, 'to all the usages of tenant-right customs, there are five leading features, which may be termed its essential attributes, namely:—

" '1. The right or custom in general of yearly tenants, or those deriving through them, to continue in undisturbed possession so long as they act properly and pay their rents.

" '2. The correlative right of the landlord perpetually to raise the rent, so as to give him a just, fair, and full participation in the increased value of the land, but not so as to extinguish the tenant's interest by imposing a rack-rent.

" '3. The usage or custom of the yearly tenants to sell their interest,

“fixity of tenure,” before that custom was applied to the rest of Ireland. It was a voluntary arrangement among themselves. No parliament enacted it; and if these “only English and Scotch men” saw that it was on the whole an advantageous arrangement this was due to their own perspicacity, and was not an unfair “advantage” superimposed on them from

if they do not wish to continue in possession, or if they become unable to pay their rent.

“4. The correlative right of the landlord to be consulted, and to exercise a potential voice in the approval or disapproval of the proposed assignee.

“5. The liability of the landlord, if taking land for his own purpose from a tenant, to pay the tenant the fair value of his tenant right.’

“The Land Act of 1870 legalised the Ulster custom in Ulster, and the Act of 1881 practically conferred the boon on the rest of Ireland. But it is impossible to deny that Ulster, in this respect, had a long start. And although it would not be difficult to argue that the custom weighted the incoming tenant, still it prevented, and where it did not prevent, it certainly mitigated and lessened the hardship of evictions. The position of Ulster to-day I believe to be due mainly to two things, namely, the introduction of the Protestant element in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the existence of the Ulster custom. Mr. Lecky is not a bigot. Neither can he be said to be unduly biassed in favour of Protestantism. But even he declares of Roman Catholicism that ‘it produces habits of thought and life not favourable to industrial activity, and extremely opposed to political freedom.’ One thing certain is that throughout Ulster the great Captains of Industry—the millowners, the shipbuilders, the bankers, the great merchants—are Protestants almost to a man. It is in the Protestant counties industrial and commercial activity alone prevail. And the workers, as in Belfast, are as essentially Protestant as are the employers. These facts speak for themselves. In my next article I propose to take stock of the agricultural and educational position and progress of the province.”—Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, *Daily Graphic*, June 11.

without. The "ascendency of Ulster" is simply and solely that which industry gains over idleness, thrift over extravagance, self-control over unrestraint, and the steady prosecution of definite aims over wild, vague, and distracting political theories. Were the Moonlighters and the Land Leaguers to take a leaf out of Ulster's book of wise living they would come to exactly the same place in national history. "Ascendency" of this kind must needs follow those who are worthy to obtain it ; and we might as well gird at the natural law which makes bees store honey and ants grain because other creatures die of hunger for lack of the instinct which unites industry with self-preservation.

One of the best bits of reasoning on this Ulster question is to be found in the famous letter by Mr. Lecky to Mr. Gladstone, when a true quotation was untruly applied. The letter came out originally in the *Times* of January 21st.

SIR,—I observe that Mr. Gladstone, in order to prove that there is no danger of sectarian or sacerdotal ascendency in Ireland, has quoted some remarks of mine to the effect that a healthy national feeling is the best corrective of the sectarian spirit. The statement in itself I believe to be perfectly true, but as the reader is evidently intended to infer that it was written with some application to the present condition of Ireland, I may be permitted to state that the passage Mr. Gladstone quotes is extracted from a chapter (suppressed in the subsequent edition) in a

little book published anonymously not less than thirty-one years ago. I need scarcely say that at that date clerical influence had not acquired anything even distantly approaching its present enormous power in Irish politics, and that the whole system of boycotting and intimidation which has been so conspicuous in the last years was still unborn.

I have myself never looked upon the Home Rule question as a question between Protestant and Catholic. It is a question between honesty and dishonesty, between loyalty and treason, between individual freedom and organised outrage and tyranny. I believe there are multitudes of Catholics in Ireland who accept *bonâ fide* the condemnation pronounced by the Head of their Church on boycotting and the Plan of Campaign, and who are as sensible as I am of the unspeakable infamy of attempting to place the government of Ireland in the hands of men who have been found guilty by a law court on overwhelming evidence of aiming at the dismemberment of the Empire, and of practising persistent and systematic intimidation, leading to crime and outrage, and "with knowledge of its effect." No one who will be at the pains to read the report of the Parnell Commissioners and the evidence they have collected can have the smallest doubt about the character of the men who would preside over an Irish Parliament, or about the methods on which they have based their power. To talk of a healthy national feeling guided by such men seems to me an impious mockery. To suppose that

any permanently beneficent Government could be established by such means is almost equivalent to a denial of the moral government of the world. But it is quite certain that a great portion of the Irish priests, including some of those most highly placed, have been the close allies of these men, and have persistently countenanced these means. Is it likely that men who have so systematically employed the weapons of oppression will cast them aside when they have obtained supreme power? Is it impossible that those who, in the words of the Commissioners, have pursued "a system of coercion and intimidation" "for the purpose of impoverishing and expelling from the country the Irish landlords who were styled the English garrison," may find the same description applicable to other classes? Is it probable that a party who have made the violation of contracts and the defiance of law their chief instruments of political action will be much restrained by paper ties if the command of the police gives them in great districts of Ireland an almost absolute power over the freedom, industry, and property of their fellow-citizens?

These are the questions that have been asked in Ulster, and which Ulster has answered in a demonstration that seems likely to form one of the great landmarks in Irish history. Nothing approaching it has been seen there since the Volunteer Convention of 1782. I do not envy the sagacity of the statesman who cannot see the significance of the complete union between Presbyterian Liberalism and Orange Toryism, and who fails to detect the accent of genuine

conviction and of indomitable resolution in the speeches at Belfast. Compare the proceedings in the Ulster Convention with the proceedings in the committee room No. 15, and the difference between the two parties becomes very clear. ‘The North of Ireland,’ Grattan once wrote, ‘contains the active citizens of Ireland, its principal wealth, industry, and spirit.’ I do not believe that it has ever rendered a better service either to Ireland or the Empire than by the firm, moderate, and unsectarian attitude which it has assumed.—Your obedient servant,

“W. E. H. LECKY.

“Athenæum Club, June 20.”

Nothing could be calmer or more explicit than this letter. It disposes of more than one fallacy, puts a misinterpreted fact on a proper basis of truth, and cuts the ground from under the feet of those who would claim one of our soundest thinkers and most philosophic historians as the advocate for Romish supremacy and Home Rule tyranny. For indeed what do the Home Rulers want but the very “ascendancy” with which they taunt Ulster—but ascendancy of a vastly different kind? What does Ireland lack that the English Parliament can give her? She lacks money and commercial enterprise and political stability—for which last we in our desire to pacify her have been somewhat to blame. We have so continually enacted and altered and re-arranged that we have created a profound feeling of insecurity among the landlords, who, after all, have to be taken

into consideration as the richest and most important, the "head men" of their districts. We have given the tenants privileges no other tenants possess. Fair Rent, Free Sale, Fixity of Tenure—they have them all; and the only men who suffer now from legislative injustice are the landlords.

What, then, do they lack so desperately that the Empire is to become practically and for so much dismembered, and the chances of civil war are to be braved? Religion is free and no man suffers socially or officially for his faith—at least no Roman Catholic suffers at the hands of the Protestants. Education is provided for the children all the same as in England. When not utilised, as in England, it is because of the bigotry of the priests, who refuse all enlightenment unless stamped with their official seal, and who, when they get the mastership in schools, teach things which are more pleasing to themselves than exact as matters of fact; as that map in a certain Roman Catholic school near Cork of which I have heard, where England is figured as a black spot, and Ireland as a large and, where Roman Catholics prevail, brilliantly coloured country. No, Ireland lacks no redress of injustice for which she has the right to demand Home Rule.

If, indeed, the priests could find some useful, remunerative, and peaceful work for her people, and would leave politics alone, and if all those pestilent agitators who now disturb the country, create misery, and cause crime wherever they go were sternly muzzled as the traitors and incendiaries they are, there is not a

happier country nor a more prosperous than Ireland would be. With political security capital would flow in, and resident landlordism would make those now deserted properties in the South "bloom like a rose." Manufactures would be established ; and what Belfast has done for herself would be done for all other available towns and seaports. With manufactories established in adequate numbers the congested districts would be drained of their surplus population, and the land, relieved of its burden, would support in decency and sufficiency those who were left.

Home Rule would give none of these things. Rather would it accentuate all present evils and add to all present causes of misery. A settled condition of society—law and not outrage, peace and not war, industry and not politics—would be more to the purpose than the tyranny of the South over the North and the practical spoliation of Belfast. But the cry has "caught on" with the sentimental among our own countrymen, the romantic, and those who believe in theory rather than practice, as well as with the declared enemies of England and the unrelenting foes of Protestantism—as well as with the unscrupulous followers of a party who would give up their country to destruction if only they could bring Mr. Gladstone back to power and taste the sweets of office for themselves.

I have written this pamphlet for the English, not the Irish—for those who know even less of the subject than I do myself. I have written it hoping that it may do some good to those who are either waver-

ing or misinformed, ignorant or misled. What Mr. Lecky says is true:—This question of Unionism and Home Rule is one “between honesty and dishonesty, between loyalty and treason, between individual freedom and organised tyranny and outrage.” The cry that has been got up is factitious or it is criminal. The leaders of the movement know that they and the priests together inflame the ignorant peasantry with fine words and futile promises—“the boys get drunk on rhetoric and madden at a word”—and that they lead them as a flock of sheep are led by the bell wether—as a magnet draws after it a mass of steel filings. They rouse the passions of these poor fellows, who shout for what they do not know and desire that which no man can have; but they do not give them means by which to make their daily bread.

If all the money collected for these criminal political movements had been applied to the creation of industries, the Home Rulers would have a very different account to give of themselves. As things are, let any candid person ask himself: What have they done besides causing discontent, strife, murder, and outrage? Nothing. Neither the fishing industry nor the railway works, neither lace-making nor embroidery owes a hundredth part to the Roman Catholic Home Rulers where it owes ninety-nine to Protestant Unionist men and women. It has not been their *rôle* to create content. Quite the reverse, and some have had the cynical honesty to avow this.

The greater the misery of the people the greater

the power they had, and the more cruelly they used it for the purpose of political warfare and destructive partisanship. These men want Ireland for themselves—the “gutter sparrows” and their kind for personal aggrandisement; the priests for the supremacy which would come with the withdrawal of English law and justice. Between them the good of the nation falls to the ground like unconsidered fruit. And blind, good-hearted, and good-natured sympathisers, credulous as only Englishmen can be, believe in the “national aspiration” so glibly talked about and so absolutely non-existing. For this fine phrase they would dismember, despoil, and dishonour their own country and ruin thousands of their fellow-subjects and co-religionists. For the sake of enabling a few needy political adventurers to flourish as the leaders of a nation, they would destroy the prosperity of Ulster; to aid in the supremacy of the Roman Catholics they would oppress the Protestants. *Absit omen!* By the determined attitude of Ulster and the manly utterances of Lord Fingall—the premier Catholic of Ireland, but a patriot, not a placeman, an imperialist, not a petty partisan—by such men as he, larger than faction and wiser than sectarianism, may the dangers that threaten our beautiful sister isle be averted, and the “knavish tricks” of her real enemies, as of our own avowed foes, be confounded.

E. LYNN LINTON.

APPENDIX.

I GIVE these papers as a reminder—1st, Of what Ulster means; 2nd, Of the privileges which the Irish tenant possesses; 3rd, Of the methods by which the New Tipperary farce was carried out; 4th, Of the comparisons to be made between Mr. Gladstone's administration and Mr. Balfour's.

ULSTER UNIONIST CONVENTION.

At a numerously attended Conference of Ulster Unionists held in Belfast on Friday, the 8th April, 1892, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

FIRST—That this Conference, representing the loyal men of every creed, class, and party throughout Ulster, having heard the report of the Provisional Committee, and recognising to the fullest extent the gravity of the occasion, resolves to summon a Great Convention of Ulstermen, in June next, to declare their position in view of the near approach of a General Election involving the most momentous issues to Ireland and to the Empire.

SECOND—That, in summoning this Convention, we declare its objects to be—

(a) To express the devoted loyalty of Ulster Unionists to the Crown and Constitution of the United Kingdom.

(b) To avow our first resolve to retain unchanged our present position as an integral portion of the United Kingdom, and to protest in the most unequivocal manner against the passage of any measure that would rob us of our inheritance in the Imperial Parliament, under the protection of which our capital has been invested and our homes and rights safeguarded.

(c) To record our determination to have nothing to do with a Parliament certain to be controlled by men responsible for the crime and outrage of the Land League, the dishonesty of the Plan of Campaign, and the cruelties of boycotting, many of whom have shown themselves the ready instruments of clerical domination.

(*d*) To declare to the people of Great Britain our conviction that the attempt to set up such a Parliament in Ireland will inevitably result in disorder, violence, and bloodshed such as have not been experienced in this century; and to announce our resolve to take no part in the election or the proceedings of such a Parliament, the authority of which, should it ever be constituted, we shall be forced to repudiate.

(*e*) To protest against this great question, which involves our lives, property, and civil rights, being treated as a mere side issue in the impending electoral struggle.

(*f*) To appeal to those of our fellow-countrymen who have hitherto been in favour of a separate Parliament to abandon a demand which hopelessly divides Irishmen, and to unite with us under the Imperial Legislature in developing the resources and furthering the best interests of our common country.

DANIEL DIXON, MAYOR OF BELFAST,
Chairman.

M. WYLIE, LL.D., }
R. I. CALWELL, C.E., } *Hon. Secs.*

AN IRISH TENANT'S PRIVILEGES.

THE privileges of Irish Tenant Farmers have been largely extended by three measures : (I.) the Land Act of 1870 ; (II.) the Land Law Act, 1881 ; and (III.) the Land Purchase Act, 1885. It will be convenient to consider these in chronological order :—

I.

PRIVILEGES UNDER THE LAND ACT OF 1870.

1. A tenant who voluntarily gives up his farm must be paid by his landlord full compensation for all improvements made by himself or his predecessors.
2. A tenant who is disturbed in his holding by his landlord for any other cause than non-payment of rent must not only be paid full compensation for all improvements, but also compensation for disturbance, in the form of a sum of money which may equal seven years' rent. [*This privilege has been further extended by the Land Law Act of 1881. See Privilege 10.*]
3. A tenant when evicted for non-payment of rent must be paid :—
 - (a) full compensation for all improvements : and (b) in case his rent does not exceed £15, a sum of money which may equal seven years' rent, should the court think the rent excessive.
4. A tenant cannot be evicted even for non-payment of rent till one year's rent is in arrear. [*This privilege existed long before the Land Act of 1870, by which it was confirmed.*]
5. A tenant when evicted can get back into possession within six months on payment of the amount due, less by any profit the landlord may have made out of the holding while the tenant was out of possession.

6. A tenant immediately after notice to quit can bring his claim for compensation, and he cannot be ejected until the landlord has paid the amount awarded. [*It must be noted, however, that the Act of 1881 has practically abolished notice to quit. See Privilege 10.*]
7. In the absence of proof to the contrary, improvements are presumed to have been made by the tenant.
8. If a tenant's holding is valued at or over £4, the landlord must pay half the poor rate. If the holding is valued under £4, the landlord must pay the entire poor rate.

II.

PRIVILEGES UNDER THE LAND LAW ACT OF 1881.

9. If a tenant thinks his rent too high, he may go before the Land Commission Court and get a rent fixed. This rent cannot be raised for 15 years. This privilege is called "FAIR RENT."
10. When a tenant has a fair rent fixed, what is called a Statutory Tenancy is created. When this is done a tenant cannot be evicted by his landlord except for non-payment of rent, for dilapidation, persistent waste, or the breach of some other statutory condition. This privilege is called "FIXITY OF TENURE."
11. Every yearly tenant has now an interest in his holding which he can sell. Thus a tenant wishing to give up his farm can sell the right of succession for a sum equal to several years' purchase of the rent. Many instances have occurred in each of the four provinces of Ireland during the present year (1886) where upwards of 20 years' purchase has been obtained. This privilege is called "FREE SALE."
12. If a tenant has not had a fair rent fixed, and his landlord proceeds to evict him, he [the tenant] can apply to the Court to fix the rent, and while his application is pending the landlord's proceedings are restrained.

13. If a tenant is evicted he has the right either to redeem at any time within six months (*see Privilege 5*), or to sell his tenancy within the same period to a purchaser, who can likewise redeem, and thus acquire all the privileges of the tenant.

III.

PRIVILEGE UNDER THE LAND PURCHASE ACT OF 1885.

14. If a tenant wishes to buy his holding, and arranges with his landlord as to terms, he can change his position from that of a perpetual rent payer into that of the payer of an annuity terminable at the end of 49 years, the Government supplying him with the entire purchase money, to be repaid during those 49 years at 4 per cent. This annual payment of £4 for every £100 borrowed covers both principal and interest. Thus, if a tenant already paying a statutory rent of £50 agrees to buy from his landlord at 20 years' purchase, or £1,000, the Government will lend him the money, his rent will at once cease, and he will pay, not £50, but £40 yearly, for 49 years, and then become the owner of his holding free of all charge. It is hardly necessary to point out that as these 49 years of payment roll by the interest of the holding increases rapidly in value.

In considering these privileges it must be borne in mind that those conferred by the Act of 1881 [which broke down old contracts of tenancy, and even prohibited tenants of holdings valued at £150 yearly from contracting themselves out of the Act] COULD NOT HAVE BEEN GIVEN UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.¹

It must also be remembered that the privileges cited in this summary, though the most important, are by no means the entire of the legal privileges of the Irish tenant.

¹ See Federal Constitution, Article I, sec. x. i.—“NO STATE SHALL PASS ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS.”

TIPPERARY UNDER NATIONAL LEAGUE COERCION.

LIST OF OUTRAGES COMMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH THE SMITH-BARRY ESTATE IN TIPPERARY.

THE METHODS BY WHICH THE AGITATION IS MAINTAINED.

This list does not include the many Outrages committed on the Police.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of Outrage.</i>	<i>Brief Particulars.</i>
1 ...	4th Sept., 1889 ...	The houses of J. Dogherty, James O'Neill, Edmond Fitzgerald, who bought in their interest at Sheriff's Sale, were wrecked by a mob of 3,000, followed by a band.
2 ...	5th Sept., 1889 ...	Joseph Woods, caretaker, had his donkey-cart, with load of straw and some oats, set on fire and totally consumed.
3 ...	7th Sept., 1889 ..	A metal box of a cart wheel, charged with powder, was exploded in the Estate Office window of Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P.
4 ...	13th Sept., 1889 ...	A metal box, charged with gunpowder, was thrown into Edmond Fitzgerald's yard, and an explosion occurred. Fitzgerald had purchased his interest at Sheriff's Sale.
5 ...	16th Sept., 1889 ...	A leaden pipe, charged with gunpowder, was thrown against the back bedroom of H. Heffernan's house. Explosion occurred without injury, except breaking a pane of glass. Heffernan dealt with E. Fitzgerald. (<i>See above.</i>)
6 ...	26th Sept., 1889 ...	Patrick Barlow's cart stopped in the street, and a parcel of calico which had been purchased from James O'Neill (a boycotted shopkeeper) was taken out and burned, after first being saturated with oil.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of Outrage.</i>	<i>Brief Particulars.</i>
7 ...	27th Sept., 1889	... Some powder, rolled in brown paper, placed in J. Ryan's window, with fuse attached. Explosion occurred, breaking the glass.
8 ...	29th Nov., 1889	... A leaden pipe, full of gunpowder, thrown through Mr. Nolan's plate glass window into his office.
9 ...	2nd Dec., 1889	... A shell, filled with powder, placed near a police patrol, and exploded, breaking the eave-shoot of a house and a gas-lamp adjacent.
10 ...	5th Dec., 1889	... Printed Boycotting Notices posted in Tipperary.
11 ...	6th Dec., 1889	... Two windows smashed at the house of Patrick Hanrahan, Clerk of the Works on Mr. Smith-Barry's estate. A bottle full of blasting powder, with fuse attached, left outside.
12 ...	20th Dec., 1889	... Five shots fired into the house of John Quinlan. He had paid his rent.
13 ...	Between 16th and 30th Dec., 1889	... A number of sub-tenants, who were evicted in Tipperary Town, on 31st December, burned the doors, window sashes, &c., before leaving, in order to injure the property.
14 ...	1st Jan., 1890	... Three panes of glass and a shutter broken by stones in Dr. Nadin's window, and three panes of glass broken in John Maloney's window.
15 ...	18th Feb., 1890	... Six shots fired at Pegsboro', two of which went through the window of Mr. Bell's house. Mr. Bell was believed to sympathise with Mr. Smith-Barry.
16 ...	27th April, 1890	.. Boycotting Notices found posted in town and neighbourhood, calling on the people to boycott eleven shopkeepers and farmers believed to have paid their rents.
17 ...	14th June, 1890	... A bag of flour, the property of Mrs. Fahey, of Drumwood, Dundrum, cut open. She had purchased the flour from Rutherford, a boycotted shopkeeper.

No.	Date of Outrage.	Brief Particulars.
18	... 24th June, 1890	... When passing down Meeting Street, James English, servant to Mr. Rutherford, mentioned above, was struck on the head by a heavy weapon.
19	... 19th June, 1890	... The children of the Convent and other schools out on strike because children of unpopular persons attended it. A man named Quinlan, when passing into the town, was stoned and hooted by those children, because he had paid his rent. A little girl was stoned because she attended the school.
20	... 20th June, 1890	... Wm. Sadlier (son of Mrs. Sadlier, of Carroclough, boycotted because she paid her rent), met on his way home from Tipperary, and attacked with stones from behind a wall.
21	... 24th June, 1890	... A number of Boycotting Notices found posted through the town and neighbourhood to boycott certain persons who had paid their rent.
22	... 24th June, 1890	... The house of P. Clifford wrecked and his wife assaulted. He had supplied unpopular persons with newspapers, and his name appeared in a Boycotting Notice, June 24th, 1890.
23	... 25th June, 1890	... A brass tube, filled with gunpowder, thrown by Thos. Kirwan at the house of J. F. Duggan, a shopkeeper, boycotted because he paid his rent. (<i>Kirwan was convicted and sentenced at the Nenagh Assizes to 18 months' imprisonment with hard labour.</i>)
24	... 28th June, 1890	... Two female servants of Mrs. Whites, Greenrath (boycotted because she paid her rent), attacked on the road home from Tipperary by two men, who were immediately arrested.
25	... 10th Aug., 1890	... Twenty-three printed Boycotting Notices found posted in and around Tipperary.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of Outrage.</i>	<i>Brief Particulars.</i>
26 ...	20th Aug., 1890	... An earthenware jar, filled with gunpowder, and fuse attached, exploded on the fanlight over the shop door of Jas. Godfrey (boycotted shopkeeper), ding-ing the side posts of doors and break-ing the glass.
27 ...	30th Aug., 1890	... Boycotting Notices found posted, calling on the people to boycott a man named Barrett.
28 ...	5th Sept., 1890	... Three iron spikes driven in the ground in corner of meadow of Mrs. White, in-jured her mowing machine. (Mrs. White boycotted because she paid her rent.)
29 ...	7th Sept., 1890	... Boycotting Notices posted, naming several persons to be boycotted for having paid their rent.
30 ...	9th Sept., 1890	... Similar Boycotting Notices to the ones above.
31 ...	9th Sept., 1890	... Similar Boycotting Notices (but in manu-script).
32 ...	11th Sept., 1890	... Glass in the window of Jockeys' room, racecourse, and four panes in another were broken, and a window and some fixtures taken away, the property of Jas. Sadlier, who was boycotted for paying his rent.
33 ...	20th Sept., 1890	... Two windows and fanlight in Michael Gillane's house broken with stones.
34 ...	25th Sept., 1890	... A jar, filled with powder, with fuse attached, placed on window sill of Dr. O'Ryan's house, which exploded, breaking several panes of glass.
35 ...	12th Oct., 1890	... Notices of a scurrilous nature posted around the town, calling on the tax-payers not to elect Messrs. Breen & Co. to some vacant places in the Town Council, because they protested against the system of intimidation reigning in Tipperary.

No.	Date of Outrage.	Brief Particulars.
36 ...	13th Oct., 1890 ...	Rev. D. Humphries, C.C., meeting Sergt. Jas. Mullin, R.I.C., and his wife, accused the latter of being a prostitute, and assaulted her by seizing her by the shoulder and attempting to drag her away. He was fined £20 or 3 months' imprisonment at Petty Sessions, on 23/10/90.
37 ...	2nd Nov., 1890 ...	Mrs. Mullin, the injured woman in above case, lodged with Mrs. Linney, also a policeman's wife, and on that account Mrs. Linney was assaulted by a man named Fleming on the street, who struck her with his fist in the stomach. This brought on miscarriage, which endangered her life. She had been previously threatened. (<i>Fleming was convicted and sentenced at the Nenagh Assizes to 18 months' imprisonment with hard labour.</i>)
38 ...	10th Nov., 1890 ...	A man unknown threw stones at Mrs. Mahoney, and afterwards broke into the evicted house of Jno. Lowrey, into which the Mahoneys were about to move as caretakers. One pane of glass was broken, and tops of chimney pulled down.
39 ...	14th Nov., 1890 ...	House from which Patrick Halloran was evicted on 5/5/90 found on fire by police patrol so as to deter Halloran from re-taking possession.
40 ...	15th Nov., 1890 ...	A house from which Patrick Lysaght was evicted on 6/6/90 was discovered on fire. Four men with white cloths on their faces were seen going to the house and afterwards running away. House burned.
41 ...	19th Nov., 1890 ...	Boycotting Notice found on wall of Churchyard, signed "A Tipperary Girl."
42 ...	19th Nov., 1890 ...	House formerly occupied by Mrs. Eliza O'Connor (evicted), known as Railway Hotel, redeemed by Bank of Ireland, set fire to in the rear to prevent any one taking it.

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of Outrage.</i>	<i>Brief Particulars.</i>
43 ..	22nd Nov., 1890 ...	House from which John Lowrey was evicted on 22/10/90 burned down, to prevent former tenant re-taking it.
44 ...	29th Nov., 1890 ...	Notice posted in and about Tipperary to boycott various shopkeepers, &c., tenants of Mr. S.-Barry, and persons who had given evidence in recent case against Wm. O'Brien, M.P., and others.
45 ...	7th Dec., 1890 ...	A notice posted in Lisvernane similar to above.
46 ...	21st Dec., 1890 ...	A notice posted in and around Tipperary calling on the people to treat traitors as traitors ever were treated.
47 ...	6th Jan., 1891 ...	Printed Boycotting Notices posted in and around Tipperary to boycott certain shopkeepers and farmers who had paid their rent.
48 ...	8th or 9th Jan., 1891 ...	A barn, the property of Mr. Smith-Barry, was maliciously torn down at Carronreddy, formerly belonged to Mr. Dawson, Town Clerk. A cabin roof pulled down and timber taken away.
49 ...	27th Jan., 1891 ...	Michael Landers was arrested posting a Boycotting Notice in Tipperary, calling on all Nationalists to boycott, crush, and banish various shopkeepers and tenants on the Smith-Barry estate. (<i>Convicted and sentenced at the Cork Assizes to 12 months' imprisonment with hard labour.</i>)
50 ...	28th Jan., 1891 ...	Michael Hanley caught posting one of the above Boycotting Notices, and four more were found in his possession. (<i>Pleaded guilty, and sentenced at the Cork Assizes to 18 months' imprisonment with hard labour.</i>)
51 ...	28th Jan., 1891 ...	John Foley, a well-known vigilance man, arrested on suspicion of having fire-arms. An explosive substance was found in his possession, with a fuse attached. (<i>Convicted and sentenced at the Cork Assizes to 7 years' penal servitude.</i>)

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of Outrage.</i>	<i>Brief Particulars.</i>
52 ...	6th Feb., 1891 ...	Col. Caddell, R.M., was returning to Tipperary by car, and when at Bohercrow, beside the house of an evicted tenant, a wire was tightly stretched across the road in order to throw the horse.
53 ...	15th Feb., 1891 ...	Mr. Wm. Baker found a wire stretched breast-high across the public road between Bansha and Ballydavid. Mr. Bates, Stock Manager, and Mr. Bowles, Dairy Manager, to Mr. Smith-Barry, were fishing at the time, and were expected to return that way.
54 ...	2nd April, 1891 ...	A caretaker employed by Mr. Smith-Barry attacked by seven men. His revolver missed fire, and he had to fly for his life. One of the men was arrested, and sentenced to a month's imprisonment with hard labour.

Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., who is largely responsible for the state of things set out above, and who was prosecuted and convicted for taking part in the Tipperary conspiracy, addressed a Meeting of the Smith-Barry tenants at Cashel, on 27th May, 1890, as follows:—

“Your cause has not been sullied by a single stain of crime that could call a blush to the cheek of our English friends.”

ENGLISHMEN, JUDGE FOR YOURSELVES THE VALUE
OF MR. O'BRIEN'S UTTERANCE.

PRINTED FOR AND PUBLISHED BY THE IRISH UNIONIST
ALLIANCE.

DUBLIN: 109 GRAFTON STREET. LONDON: 26 PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE
STREET, WESTMINSTER.

IRISH POVERTY AND CRIME.

A COMPARISON.

The increase since 1886 in the deposits in Irish savings banks and joint stock banks, as well as the growth of the railway receipts, bear testimony to the greater prosperity which Ireland now enjoys as compared with the period when Mr. Gladstone was in power.

Equally remarkable is the reduction which has taken place in the volume of emigration, poverty, and crime, in the same period, as the following statistics show:—

PAUPERISM.

Average number of paupers in Irish workhouses, 1881-5	51,558
The same on January 1st, 1891	46,110
11 per cent. decrease under Unionist Government	<u>5,448</u>

EMIGRATION.

Number of Irish emigrants in five years, 1881-5	... 398,658
The same in five years, 1886-90 335,817
16 per cent. less emigration under Unionist Government	<u>62,841</u>

INDICTABLE OFFENCES.

Number of indictable offences in 1886 7,315
The same in 1890 5,289
28 per cent. reduction in serious crimes	<u>2,026</u>

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES.

Number of agrarian offences in 1886 1,056
The same in 1890 502
53 per cent. decrease in agrarian crime	<u>554</u>

BOYCOTTING.

Persons under police protection against intimidation in 1886 4,901
The same in December, 1889 152
Number of persons relieved in three years <u>4,749</u>

R.

PRINTED FOR AND PUBLISHED BY THE IRISH UNIONIST ALLIANCE.

DUBLIN: 109 GRAFTON STREET. LONDON: 26 PALACE CHAMBERS, BRIDGE STREET, WESTMINSTER.

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BUNGAY.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

JUN 22 1950

OCT 22 1952:

Form L9—15m—10,'48(B1039)444

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY
LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

DA Linton -
959 About Ulster.
L65a

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 238 563 9

111N 22 1950
- 2 1952

DA
959
L65a

