



Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

1954

01858214



THE LIBRARY,
TRINITY COLLEGE,
COLLEGE STREET,
DUBLIN 2,
IRELAND



THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY
IN THE LIBRARY

27. bb. 7



THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF Ph.D.

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

"IRISH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION"

(1891 - 1910)

by

F. S. L. Lyons.

Copy of entry for the Blake National History Scholarship

THESES

130

1898
for the Blake Plateau History School

PREFACE

History has dealt unkindly with the Parliamentary movement in Ireland in the years between the death of Parnell and the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill, and the events which loomed so large in the records of the time have been compressed within a few pages, or at most a few chapters, of those books - and they are not many - which deal with the period 1891 - 1910. The reasons for this are obvious. In the first place, the internal quarrels which divided Irish parties during most of that period have contributed to give the impression that those were years of futility and frustration and little else besides. Moreover, the ultimate failure of constitutionalism to secure the full realisation of all the aims which it had so long set in the forefront of its programme, and the apparently greater success of more direct methods of action, have alike cast a shadow over Irish Parliamentary Representation from which it has not yet emerged. Furthermore, the events between 1885 and 1890 and from 1911 onwards were so dramatic and so pregnant with important consequences that the intervening years cannot but appear by contrast dull and uninspiring. Typical of the attitude towards this period is the remark with which one historian prefaces his account of the years after 1892: "We are now in the doldrums of Irish political affairs."¹

Yet, to take as an example the largest single group in Ireland, the fact that the Irish Parliamentary Party, apparently broken in 1890 beyond hope of recovery, should within 20 years have regained a position of power and influence is in

1. Sir J. O'Connor, History of Ireland, 1798 - 1924, ii, p. 149.

itself a fact which indicates that this period of quiescence was also one of recuperation, and that it has an importance which cannot be ignored. It is the primary purpose of this thesis to follow the fortunes of the Parliamentary machine, which Parnell had virtually created, after his dominating personality had been withdrawn from the scene. It is our intention to indicate the stresses to which that machine was subjected in the decade after Parnell's death and also to show the manner in which it was restored to efficiency in and out of Parliament in the ten years following the reunion of the Party in 1900.

But, as the debates on the Third Home Rule Bill were to show, the Irish Nationalists had no monopoly of party organisation and parliamentary ability. The Irish Unionists also showed themselves capable of utilising all the resources of the party system. While, therefore, the greater part of our space is devoted to an examination of the Nationalist representation, a second and scarcely less important object of our attention is the political organisation of Irish Unionism.

In order to achieve these aims a straightforward narrative of the political history of Ireland is insufficient, and a more specialised approach becomes necessary. The parliamentary representatives of a people may be viewed in three main aspects. They may be studied in relation to the constituencies which elect them, they may be studied as members of a party, and they may be studied at work in the legislature to which they have been elected. This triple division corresponds closely to the objectives which we have outlined above. We wish to trace the organisation of Irish parties and to estimate their Parliamentary activity during a period commonly regarded as unimportant, but which we believe to have been one of vital significance, witnessing, as it did, the mustering of Parliamentary forces in Ireland for the battle which began with the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill. We have,

therefore, divided this study into three main Parts, devoted to the examination respectively of the relations of Irish parties with their constituencies, of their personnel, and of their activities in Parliament. It may be desirable to add a few words further on the scope and method of these divisions.

Part I opens with a section containing ^eanalyses of the six General Elections during the period, thus showing the relative strengths of the different parties and the areas from which they drew their principal support. The second section examines the methods by which the parties selected their candidates for the General Elections. This obviously provides the most important test for determining the relations of the constituencies with the party leaders, and particular attention is paid to the question of how far the constituencies were free to choose their own candidates. Part I concludes with a survey of the electoral programmes of the parties during the period indicating the issues on which they based their appeals to public opinion.

Part II is concerned with the personnel of the parties and is an attempt to reconstruct the social and economic background of Irish Parliamentary Representation. A series of sections analyses the age and experience of members, their education, their occupations, and their individual knowledge of their constituencies. The two concluding sections deal respectively with the salaries paid to Nationalist members and the financial resources of the Irish Parliamentary Party, and with the contrasts between Nationalist and Unionist representatives as revealed in the fore-going analyses.

The third and final Part deals with the Parliamentary record of the different parties. It would be tedious, and indeed impossible within a short space, to give a detailed account of the activity of each individual member. It would be equally unsatisfactory to describe the work of the Irish parties in terms of the important speeches of their leaders.

Instead, we have sought to find a mean between these two extremes and to attempt an answer to such general questions as the attitude of the Irish members towards English and Irish affairs, the subjects discussed, the standard and method of debate, the legislation achieved, and the average attendance of members. Since these debates were very numerous and extended over a period of almost twenty years, it was inevitable that much would have to be compressed into a small space.

Thus, although the importance of individual contributions to the debates has been recognised in this thesis, the amount of direct quotation from Hansard has been reduced to a minimum. We have preferred to study the activities of the Irish parties en bloc and have been more concerned to trace the evolution of party tactics over a long period, than to dwell upon the isolated speeches of individuals, however brilliant and important they may have been.

In conclusion, it must be emphasised that no attempt has been made in the following pages to provide a detailed survey of the general political history of the period. Where the various quarrels and schisms within the different parties have had a direct bearing upon our subject, then they have received attention; they have not, however, been studied as ends in themselves.

Such, then, is the framework of this thesis. The constitutional movement in Ireland has, as we have said, fallen into some disrepute in recent years. If the present study can serve to place it once more in a truer perspective, its purpose will have been achieved.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Pages.</u>
Preface.	ii - v
Introduction.	1 - 15
<u>Part I The Irish Members and their Constituencies</u>	
1. Analysis of the General Elections.	16 - 40
2. The Selection of Candidates.	41 - 72
3. The Issues at the General Elections.	73 - 99
<u>Part II. The Personnel of the Irish Parties.</u>	
1. Age and Experience of Members.	100 - 158
2. Education of Members.	102 - 109
3. Occupations of Members.	109 - 118
4. Members and their Constituencies.	118 - 130
5. Members and their Constituencies.	131 - 137
6. Payment of Nationalist Members.	138 - 155
7. Two Contrasting Types of Representation.	155 - 158
<u>Part III. The Irish Members in Parliament.</u>	
1. The Parliament of 1892 - 1895.	159b- 174
2. The Parliament of 1895 - 1900.	175 - 192
3. The Parliament of 1900 - 1906.	193 - 227
4. The Parliaments of 1906 - 1910.	228 - 278
Conclusion.	279 - 292

APPENDIXES

1. Biographical List of Members.	293 - 327
II. List of Constituencies.	328 - 339
III. Comparative Table of General Election Results.	340 -
IV. The Attendance of Members.	341 - 346
V. Note on the discipline of the Irish Parliamentary Party.	347 - 352

Pages

List of Sources. 353 - 359

Critical Note on Sources. 360 - 363

TABLES IN PART II

I. Average Age of Members. 102

II A and II B. Parliamentary Experience of Members. 104 & 108

III A and III B. Education of Members. 111 & 116

IV A and IV B. Occupations of Nationalist Members. 119 & 123

V. Occupations of Unionist Members. 127

VI A and VI B. Nationalist Members and their Constituencies. 131 & 133

VII A and VII B. Unionist Members and their Constituencies 135 & 136

VIII Nationalist Party Receipts and Expenditure Dec. 1890 - Apr. 1896. 148

IX. Nationalist Party Receipts 1901 - 1910. 152

any suggestion of a struggle. Of the three contested elections, one, in North Belfast, took place between the Conservatives in 1890 and thus had no influence upon the relative strength of parties. "As both were professedly supporters of the Nationalist cause, the contest was only a personal preference to be determined," and as J. W. Wolff, being the larger employer of labour in Belfast, gained the greater body of votes and was returned.

These results in the contested July 1890 by-elections were very close and included the attention of the whole of Ireland during the three months succeeding the death of Parrell. The first of these was the direct result of the death of Parrell, for John Nelson, determined to succeed Parrell in the City of Belfast formerly occupied by his father, as we shall see, failed of its object. The Parrellite number for 1890 was

INTRODUCTION

Between the death of Parnell on 6 October 1891 and the General Election of July 1892, six by-elections took place in Ireland. Of these, three were uncontested. Upon the death of Sir John Pope Hennessy, North Kilkenny, which had been the scene of the first electoral conflict between Parnell and his former supporters, fell without opposition to the Anti-Parnellite candidate, P. McDermott. When John Redmond retired from North Wexford to contest Parnell's late seat in Cork his place was taken by another Anti-Parnellite, T.J.Healy, who also was returned without opposition and with the minimum of disturbance. The third uncontested election took place in Mid Armagh where D.P.Barton succeeded to the seat left vacant by the death of Sir James Porter Corry; in this area, Conservative strength was sufficient to preclude any suggestion of a struggle. Of the three contested elections, one, in East Belfast, took place between two Conservatives in March 1892 and thus had no influence upon the relative strength of parties. "As both were professedly supporters of the government, there was only a personal preference to be determined,"¹ and so G.W.Wolff, being the larger employer of labour in Belfast, gained the greater body of votes and was returned.

There remain to be considered only two by-elections and upon these was fastened the attention of the whole of Ireland during the three months succeeding the death of Parnell. The first of these was the direct outcome of that event, for John Redmond determined to contest the seat (Cork City) formerly occupied by his leader. This manoeuvre, as we shall see, failed of its intent, and when Richard Power, the Parnellite member for Waterford City died on 30 November,

1. Irish Times, 10 March, 1892.

1891, Redmond decided to contest that seat also. Since these two campaigns occupied so completely the thoughts and passions of contemporaries, and since they provide so clear a picture of the progress of party strife from the point at which reconciliation between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites seemed for a moment to be possible to the point where the gulf was seen to be wider than ever, they deserve to be studied in some detail.

That further disunion would be the unhappy issue of events was hidden from most men in October 1891. The news of Parnell's death came as a stupefying surprise to Ireland and, in the momentary hush which fell upon controversy, almost all the newspapers of Dublin and of the provinces assumed that the period of strife was over. The organ of the majority, the National Press, declared "With the death of Mr. Parnell the last pretext for faction has died." And again: "No Parnellite, however honestly mistaken in the past, can now honestly persevere in his delusion."¹ The Freeman's Journal, recently converted from Parnellism and anxious to demonstrate its convictions wrote: - "The controversy is closed and the struggle absolutely at an end. It only remains to consolidate our national unity."² In Cork also, the Examiner spoke for the body of Nationalist opinion when it said:- "With the disappearance of Mr. Parnell from the scene, Parnellism as a Political force in the country becomes absurd and impossible."³

These opinions were fully shared by responsible leaders, as is shown by statements made by Joseph Chamberlain and Justin McCarthy in interviews which they gave to the press. the former considered that - - - "the Parnellite party is dead; it died as the Boulanger faction died in France, in its leader."⁴

-
1. National Press, 8 Oct. 1891
 2. Freeman's Journal, 8 Oct. 1891.
 3. Cork Examiner, 8 Oct. 1891.
 4. Irish Times, 8 Oct. 1891.

Justin M'Carthy, the official leader of the Anti-Parnellites was optimistic: "I hope the effect will be that we shall now drop all controversy and become a united party, and work together for the common cause.¹ Amid such cheerful forecasts of the future the cool and reasoned articles of such newspapers as the Irish Times and the Cork Constitution were dismissed as the cynical utterances of Unionist organs anxious to prolong the disunity of the Irish Parliamentary Party. The comment of the Cork Constitution is a striking example of political prescience:- "We do not consider it at all probable that Mr. M'Carthy's expectation of an immediate abandonment of the strife will be realised." It went on to argue that the Parnellites had now become organised as a party and - - - "cannot, without stultifying themselves, join hands with those they have for months been accusing of yielding to English dictation."²

It was not long before these forebodings were fully realised. Parnell was not yet buried before the rival wings of his erstwhile united party were launched upon a campaign of recrimination. United Ireland, the leading Parnellite newspaper, published an article, which, while it may be explained as an ebullition of hysterical grief, contributed much towards the widening of the breach between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites. The article contained these words:-

"Slain, sacrificed by Irishmen on the altar of English Liberalism, he, the greatest chief that this land has known in the struggle of centuries against English domination, has been murdered by the men whom he had dragged from obscurity and who hated him, even whilst they fawned upon him, because they could never repay all that he had done for them personally. Murdered he has been as certainly as if the gang of

1. Irish Times, 8 Oct. 1891
 2. Cork Constitution, 8 Oct. 1891.

conspirators had surrounded him and hacked him to pieces."¹

The provocation, however, was not all upon one side. Among Anti-Parnellite newspapers, two, the Irish Catholic and the Evening Press, distinguished themselves by the virulence of their attacks upon Parnell, and an article published by the former immediately after Parnell's death was described in Dublin by John Dillon as "un-Catholic, un-Christian and a disgrace to Irish journalism."

Until the funeral of Parnell had taken place (Sunday, 11 October), his followers had given no sign of their future intentions. The following day, however, they met in Dublin and drew up a Manifesto which was signed by the twenty-eight members there present,² and which was issued to the press the next day. The Parnellites repudiated the policy of alliance with the Liberal Party and took their stand upon that principle of "Independent Opposition" with which the name of Parnell was inextricably linked. Their appeal to the country was couched in these terms:- "The great leader is dead, but the cause lives on, and, relying upon your devotion to Irish Nationality, we propose to carry on the struggle until the principles for which he lived and died have triumphed."³ The issue was now joined as the Irish Catholic recognised with gusto - - -

"We, at any rate, never placed faith in the boasted patriotism of Mr. Parnell's followers, and consequently we have no feeling of disappointment to confess to now that at length they have revealed themselves in their true colours, and have taken their places beneath the black flag of the worst and most wicked of the enemies of Ireland."⁴

Events now moved forward rapidly and by 20 October it had become general knowledge that John Redmond had decided to

1. United Ireland, 10 Oct. 1891. The article specially singled out T.M.Healy, William O'Brien and John Dillon as targets for abuse.
2. Three were absent but signified their assent later.
3. Irish Times, 13 Oct., 1891.
4. Irish Catholic, 17 Oct. 1891.

contest the Cork City constituency. It was everywhere realised that this would be an election of crucial importance and one whose result would go far towards determining the future of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Redmond himself showed that he understood the importance of the occasion when he arrived in Cork on October 21st anxious to begin an early and thorough canvass of the city in order to counteract the lack of newspaper support from which he suffered throughout the election campaign. In a press interview he stated his view of the situation with the utmost frankness:-

"The plain issue before the electors of Cork is - Are they prepared to put the destinies of Ireland into the hands of a party whose independence was sold to an English statesman for the price of his continued countenance and support, or are they prepared to vindicate Parnell's memory and rescue Ireland from the shame that is sought to be cast upon her by those whose action undoubtedly had the effect of sending him to an early grave?"¹

This passage is exceedingly illuminating, linking together, as it does, the two planks which were to form the Parnellite platform not merely at this election, but for the next ten years. On the one hand there is the emotional appeal to the memory of the dead leader with its implication that he was basely betrayed; on the other hand there is the suggestion that the majority party has already bartered its independence to Gladstone and has therefore ceased to merit the confidence of the nation. So long as Gladstone remained silent concerning the nature of his projected Home Rule Bill this charge was particularly difficult for the Anti-Parnellites to refute.

By Friday, October 23rd, it was known that there would be two other candidates. One was Captain Peter Sarsfield

1. Irish Times, 21 Oct. 1891

representing the Unionists, and the other was Martin Flavin nominated by a convention of the National Federation held in Cork. The nomination of Flavin was a stroke of tactical excellence; he was a prosperous butter merchant of Cork, closely associated with its affairs, and had in the past been much concerned in the activities of the National League. His candidature was well calculated to win the approval of the citizens of Cork,¹ while, even if he were defeated, he was not sufficiently eminent to involve the fortunes of the party in his fall.

The line to be taken by the Anti-Parnellites was soon indicated by Justin M'Carthy in an interview given to the *Freeman's Journal* - - "What has divided the Irish Party is not a question of principle but a question of personality."² This attempt to narrow the issue was pursued by the Anti-Parnellites' press and by Anti-Parnellite politicians before, during, and after the election. But, so far from narrowing the issue, they served to inflame it still further. At frequent intervals County Conventions were held all over the country and at these Conventions Anti-Parnellite M.Ps reiterated again and again the view of the majorities that the Parnellites had no principle of action but were persisting in their career of opposition out of a blind devotion to their dead leader; sometimes this devotion was characterised as an honest but misguided attachment, sometimes it was castigated as wilful perverseness, but in either event the result was the same. The gulf was widened and the area of conflict extended over the country at large. The electoral struggle at Cork took on a nation-wide significance and in the pitiless light directed upon that struggle many incidents, which might have passed unheeded upon a lesser occasion, were magnified out of all proportion, and continued to

1. *Cork Examiner*, 24 Oct. 1891, comments enthusiastically on the choice of a local man.

2. *Freeman's Journal*, 19 Oct. 1891.

poison the relations of the opposing parties long after the immediate conflict had ended

As the electoral campaign progressed such incidents grew in numbers and the press was filled with accounts of rioting, stone-throwing and personal violence. Accusations and counter-accusations were bandied to and fro, the Anti-Parnellites accusing the Parnellites of terrorist methods while the Parnellites in their turn raised the cry of clerical intimidation. This latter complaint deserves some notice because it was to be bitterly debated at many future elections. The Roman Catholic Church had thrown all its vast influence into the scale against Parnell; it now seemed probable that this hostility would be extended to his followers also. It would be difficult to determine with precision the extent of clerical influence in this election; the Irish Times observer, after the election was over, thought the Parnellite accusations exaggerated. On the other hand, that some such influence was exerted, the following incident may serve to prove. John O'Connor, one of the most energetic of Redmond's supporters, was conducting a house-to-house canvass in one of the districts of Cork city. He was followed by a Roman Catholic priest, Canon O'Mahony by name, who incited the people against O'Connor in these terms:- "These are Kitty O'Shea's men; hunt them out of this."¹ O'Connor's canvass was thus rendered, not merely difficult, but positively dangerous to himself. The arrival in the city on October 27th of William O'Brien and John Dillon in support of Flavin's candidature raised the temper of the constituency to a still higher pitch. Scenes of violence became of ever increasing frequency and, according to one observer, the Blackpool district appeared "to be given up to a state of primitive savagery."²

1. This incident was widely reported; this account is taken from the Irish Times, 26 Oct. 1891.

2. Irish Times, 2 Nov. 1891.

While their humble supporters were belabouring each other in the streets of Cork, the principal figures of each party had embarked upon a prolonged controversy in the press and upon the platform. The origin of the dispute was an attempt made by John Redmond in an electioneering speech to develop his theme of Parnell's betrayal by a reference to the abortive Boulogne negotiations. In January and February of that year (1891) a series of meetings had taken place at Boulogne between Parnell and the leaders of the seceding members of the Party; reconciliation had at one time seemed within reach and Redmond now tried to fasten the odium for the failure of the negotiations upon the shoulders of his opponents. One of the conditions of agreement at Boulogne - indeed the essential condition - had been that Parnell should retire from the chairmanship of the Party provided that an assurance was received from Gladstone that, if returned to power at the next election, he would produce a Home Rule Bill which Parnell would consider adequate. Redmond now maintained that this retirement was to have been only temporary whereas William O'Brien held that it was to have been permanent and that, on M'Carthy's resigning the leadership of the Anti-Parnellites, John Dillon would succeed to the permanent chairmanship of the re-united party.¹ Neither side was able to convince the other of the truth of its case, but the controversy finds its place in the records of the campaign because it was one of those incidents which revealed so clearly the width of the gulf between the two parties.

As the polling-day approached the excitement became intense. It was realised that the contest lay virtually between Redmond and Flavin but none could say with certainty

1. O'Brien gives a fully documented account of the negotiations in chaps. 2 & 3 of his "Olive Branch in Ireland." Ostensibly Parnell broke off the negotiations because he was dissatisfied with Gladstone's proposals for Home Rule, but primarily, in O'Brien's opinion, because Dillon offended him on a point of personal honour.

how the result would go. Cork was an unusual urban constituency in that it possessed many outlying country districts as in other parts of Ireland the rural vote was particularly amenable to clerical dictation and there seems little reason to doubt that this factor was an important contribution towards the Anti-Parnellite victory. Within the city there was strong support for Redmond, but both he and his opponent showed by their frequent visits to the poorer districts that they regarded the working-class vote as the key of the situation. When the result was declared on November 7 it was found that the North-West Ward (which was predominantly a working-class area) had achieved the highest poll of all districts with 2,157 votes out of a possible 2,987; moreover, this vote went heavily in favour of the Anti-Parnellite candidate. The North-East Ward, on the other hand, which was a Conservative district, polled only $61\frac{1}{2}\%$ of its votes whereas the average in the city as a whole was 70% .¹ The final figures were :-

M. Flavin (A.P.) . . .	3,669
J.E. Redmond (P.) . . .	2,157
P. Sarsfield (C) . . .	1,161
<hr/>	<hr/>
Majority for Flavin	1,512

An examination of the figures reveals an interesting discrepancy in the Conservative vote. It was estimated that some 1,470 Conservative votes were cast, yet Capt. Sarsfield received only 1,161 of those votes. The inference was unmistakable 309 Conservative votes had been cast for Redmond. The number was too small to affect the issue for, as we have seen, Flavin's total outnumbered those of his two opponents taken together; none the less, the incident was a further warning to

1. These figures are based upon an analysis in the Cork Examiner, 9 Nov., 1891.

the hostile sections of the Irish Party of the perils of disunion,

Just as after Parnell's death, so now after Redmond's defeat, the Anti-Parnellite press expressed its confidence in the speedy re-union of the party. The tone of this comment was, however, more peremptory than on the previous occasion; it was impossible to ignore the bitter strife which had filled the intervening month. The Freeman's Journal declared abruptly that - - - "Mr. Redmond's cause is dead. Cork has given it the coup de grace."¹ Already, before the result had been declared, the National Press had anticipated the trend of events with equal confidence.

- "A victory in Cork concludes the work that Kilkenny so bravely began and that Sligo and Carlow carried so far. Cork closes the struggle. In the return of a Nationalist for Cork faction dies and peace and unity revive."²

"Faction" however did not die so easily. Although shaken by their defeat the Parnellites consoled themselves that they had been defeated by clerical influence, and with dogged determination regrouped their forces in readiness to take the field again if necessity should arise.

The opportunity came more quickly than either party expected. Scarcely had the passions aroused by the Cork election subsided when, on November 29, Richard Power, the Parnellite member for Waterford City, died in London. Within little more than a week Redmond had announced his intention of standing for the vacant seat.³ On the same day Michael Davitt published a letter in the press in which he pleaded for a truce between the rival parties in the hope that the violence and bitterness which had characterised the Cork election would

1. Freeman's Journal, 9 Nov. 1891

2. National Press, 3 Nov. 1891

3. The announcement appeared in the Irish Times, 7 Dec. 1891

not be repeated at the Waterford. The reception accorded to this well-intentioned letter reveals clearly how far from reconciliation both parties now were. Even the Freeman's Journal, which had perhaps the greatest sympathy for such a policy, could only adopt a negative attitude - - - "we fear Mr. Davitt's proposal, although in many ways an admirable and patriotic one, will fall upon deaf ears."¹ The National Press, which may be regarded as the organ of the Healyite section of the party, was equally cool, complaining that Davitt's proposals "lacked definiteness" and pointing out that they would in any event be rejected by the "Factionists" who looked upon the majority party as the murderers of Parnell.²

In this last assumption they were perfectly correct. The Parnellites made no effort to conceal their contempt for the pacific proposal. T.J. Corbet described the suggestion as "simply preposterous"³, while two other Parnellites, Leamy and Dalton, interpreted Davitt as "suing for peace in Waterford where defeat stares them [i.e. the Anti-Parnellites] in the face."⁴ This was a challenge which the Anti-Parnellites could not afford to ignore and, on Sunday, 13th December, Michael Davitt himself arrived in Waterford, in order to support, it was believed, the candidature of J. Keane, the Anti-Parnellite nominee. Sunday, however, in the words of the Irish Times observer - - - "was a wild day in Waterford"⁵ and there was considerable uproar in the streets. The exuberance of Redmond's supporters became uncontrollable and several people were injured; among them was Davitt himself who received a severe blow on the temple. The attack upon his person seems to have led Davitt to change his tactics overnight, for he immediately

-
1. Freeman's Journal, 7 Dec. 1891.
 2. National Press, 7 Dec. 1891.
 3. Freeman's Journal, 8 Dec. 1891.
 4. Ibid. 9 Dec. 1891.
 5. Irish Times, 14 Dec. 1891.

announced that he himself would contest the seat. It was the opinion of observers on the spot that the decision was the direct outcome of his having received the injury; the theory is advanced in these words: "Amongst the injured is Mr. Davitt who, in consequence of a blow that he received, has at once proclaimed his intention of fighting the constituency with Mr. Redmond."¹

Two other pieces of evidence suggest that Davitt's candidature was unpremeditated. One was his letter of December 7th to which we have already referred and in which there was no hint of his contesting the seat. The other is the fact that when he returned from America, shortly after the death of Sir John Pope Hennessy (in October 1891) he was offered the vacant constituency of North Kilkenny: this he refused, to the regret of the party, on the grounds that he believed his best work could still be done outside Parliament. On the other hand it is difficult to believe that a man so experienced as Davitt in all the perils of Irish electioneering would allow himself to be rushed into a far-reaching decision merely by being made the victim of a savage and unprovoked attack. A more probable explanation is that, after having conferred with the Anti-Parnellite leaders, Davitt went down to Waterford prepared to put one or other of two plans into effect. If the situation seemed to be similar to that in Cork, that is, if the Parnellite threat was not unduly serious, he was probably empowered to further the candidature of Keane, which was the ostensible reason for his visit to the city. If, however, the Parnellites seemed likely to win the seat, Davitt may well have been authorised by the party to throw the weight of his name and reputation into the scale and to contest the seat in person. It must soon have become obvious to Davitt that the position was very serious indeed and the attack upon his person need only have been the

1. Irish Times, 14 Dec. 1891. This view was widespread: see, for example, the Cork Constitution, 14 Dec. 1891

culminating influence in his decision to fight the election.

Once that decision had been taken the importance of the occasion was greatly enhanced since the prominence of both Redmond and himself indicated that whoever was defeated would lose much prestige. Indeed, for the Parnellites, defeat might well mean annihilation. Waterford was reputed to be one of their strongholds and the loss of this seat would probably be fatal. The Anti-Parnellites, although in no danger of extermination, had also much to lose, for a Parnellite victory would undoubtedly mean an indefinite prolongation of disunity.

The polling was due to take place on December 24 and during the next ten days the city was in a fever of excitement. Scenes of violence were frequent but were, perhaps, less savage than in Cork since it gradually became apparent that here the Parnellite strength was better organised and controlled. As the struggle progressed it could be seen that certain factors which had militated against Redmond in Cork were operating in his favour in Waterford. In the latter city there was a vociferous Parnellite press, the lack of which in Cork had been one of Redmond's principal handicaps in the former election. Furthermore, the constituency was almost wholly urban and the country votes were of much less importance here than they had been in Cork. This in turn implied that there would be much less likelihood of clerical intimidation. Finally, since there was no Unionist candidate in Waterford, there was a strong presumption that this vote (such as it was) would go to Redmond; this was the more likely since Davitt had reaffirmed in one of his electoral speeches that he was "a deadly foe to landlordism in all its forms and phases."¹ The Irish Times, admittedly favourably inclined towards Redmond's candidature, considered his return to be the probable outcome of the election and commented:- "A feature of Mr. Redmond's

1. Irish Times, 16 Dec. 1891.

candidature is that the tradesmen, labourers and professional men almost to a man are with him and are working for him."¹

This view was undoubtedly exaggerated but it does indicate that Parnellism was very strong among all classes in Waterford. Not the least significant fact to emerge from the election was the discovery, after the votes had been counted, that, despite Davitt's often emphasised zeal for labour, the illiterates were reckoned to have voted for Redmond in the proportion of three to one.² The followers of Redmond were confident of victory but realised that every effort would be needed if they were successfully to combat the weight of Davitt's personal prestige. It was recognised that the contest would be close; how close was revealed only by the figures which were announced in the press on December 26. They were as follows:-

J.E.Redmond (P)	. . .	1,775
<u>M. Davitt (A.P.)</u>	. . .	<u>1,229</u>
<u>Majority for Redmond</u>	. . .	<u>546</u>

The implications of this result were quickly grasped by all sections of the press. The Irish Times, which had always stressed the fact that Davitt was a Labour almost as much as a Nationalist candidate, now summed up the situation thus:- "What is decided, then, is this, that the Irish workingmen, as well as the party politicians, consider themselves safest when they are not being used as the convenience of an English party."³ This view was undoubtedly coloured by the fact that, as a Conservative organ, the Irish Times seized any opportunity of discrediting the Liberal-Nationalist understanding concerning Home Rule, but it deserves notice none the less because it illustrates that the Unionists found encouragement and fresh energy from this most recent revelation of

1. Irish Times, 17 Dec. 1891.
 2. Ibid. 24 Dec. 1891.
 3. Ibid. 26 Dec. 1891.

disunion in the Nationalist ranks.

The other newspapers - whether Parnellite or Anti-Parnellite - were agreed in recognising that the victory of Redmond demonstrated conclusively that Parnellism was still a living force. How vital it was only the imminent General Election could show. But that the two sections of the party would oppose each other at that Election was now certain. That was the essential legacy of the Waterford election. There were other legacies also; hatred, suspicion, and jealousy had been sown so deeply that many years would pass before the bitterness aroused at Cork and Waterford would melt. Of such a reconciliation there was as yet no sign; just as the Parnellites had accused the victors in Cork of enlisting clerical intimidation, so now the Anti-Parnellites echoed the accusation of Michael Davitt and ascribed the victory of Redmond to a combination of "Toryism and Terrorism"¹. While charges and counter-charges such as these were the current coin of political controversy there would be no peace or unity in Ireland. Ten years of bitter fratricidal strife were needed before the passions now aroused could be finally be allayed.

1. The term was used by Davitt after the result of the elections had been announced - see Irish Times, 26 Dec. 1891.

Analysis of the General Election of 1910

P A R T I.

Pages

1. Analysis of the General Elections

16 - 21

I. The Election of 1892

II. The Election of 1895

21 - 24

III. The Election of 1900

24 - 28

IV. The Election of 1906.

29 - 34

V. The Elections of 1910.

34 - 40

The picture which thus emerges shows, as might be expected, that Unionism was at its strongest in the north. All of Antrim, all of Londonderry, all of Belfast, three-quarters of Down, two-thirds of Armagh, one-half of Tyrone and one-half of Fermanagh, had declared for the maintenance of the Union, while in the south the four Unionist seats were all situated in the Dublin area. It should however be noted

1. The figures upon which this and subsequent sections are based are taken from: Irish Directory, 1893 and succeeding years.

2. A Nationalist contested F. Antrim but was defeated by 2,639 votes.

I. Analysis of the General Election of 1892.¹

Anti-Parnellites:	71 seats
Parnellites :	9 "
Unionists :	18 "
Liberal Unionists:	5 "

From the above figures we see that Home Rule members numbered 80 and that Unionists numbered 23. Of the total gained by the latter 12 were uncontested. All four seats in Antrim were held.² two out of three in Armagh, (S. Armagh was lost to the Nationalists), three out of four in Down (S. Down was won by a Nationalist), two in Londonderry county, one in Fermanagh and two out of four in Tyrone. In the northern borough constituencies two important victories were gained. West Belfast was won from the Anti-Parnellite Nationalist, T.J.Sexton, by a narrow margin, thus completing a solid Unionist bloc of four seats in Belfast, and Londonderry City was won by only 28 votes from the Anti-Parnellite leader, Justin M'Carthy. In the south, Dublin University returned one Unionist and one Liberal Unionist, S. Dublin returned a Unionist, and, after a hotly-contested three-cornⁿered election, the St^y Stephen's Green division of Dublin was captured by a Liberal Unionist.

The picture which thus emerges shows, as might be expected, that Unionism was at its strongest in the north. All of Antrim, all of Londonderry, all of Belfast, three-quarters of Down, two-thirds of Armagh, one-half of Tyrone and one-half of Fermanagh, had declared for the maintenance of the Union, while in the south the four Unionist seats were all situated in the Dublin area. It should however be noted

1. The figures upon which this and subsequent sections are based are taken from Thom: Irish Directory, 1893 and succeeding years.

2. A Nationalist contested N. Antrim but was defeated by 2,639 votes.

that these calculations are based upon the number of seats won, not upon the number of votes cast. If the latter test be applied it will be found that strong Nationalist enclaves existed in W. Belfast and Londonderry City and that in Tyrone and Fermanagh the electorate was very evenly divided. The existence of such groups suggests that the solidity of the north was not so unquestionable as Unionist propaganda endeavoured to prove.

But Unionist activity was not confined to the North.

The schism between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites encouraged the Unionists to undertake a much wider campaign in the south than might otherwise have been attempted. We have already indicated the success which attended their strenuous efforts in Dublin; elsewhere, however, the challenge was more formidable on paper than in reality. The Unionists entered on three-¹cornered contests with the two Nationalist groups in six constituencies outside Dublin. Significantly, they came nearest to success in Newry, the most northerly of these, where they were second in the polls. In E. and W. Wicklow they were also second, but in Mid Tipperary they were heavily defeated, while in W. and S. Kerry neither Unionist candidate polled as much as 100 votes. The Unionist weakness in the country at large was more clearly revealed in those constituencies - of which there were 26 outside Ulster - in which they opposed either of the Nationalist groups in straight fights. In every one of these contests the results were decisively in favour of the Nationalists, and the Unionists were sometimes fortunate if they polled hundreds of votes where their opponents polled thousands. It is clear, from the magnitude of these defeats that the Unionists had no expectation whatever of winning the

1. The term 'Nationalist' has several connotations. It was generally used in Parliament to designate the Irish Parliamentary Party. While the Party remained sundered in two the terms Parnellite and Anti-Parnellite were generally used in Ireland as convenient and accurate terms to denote the respective sides which politicians had taken in the great struggle centring round Parnell.

majority of seats they contested, It is easy to deduce their motives in undertaking these contests, although these motives were never made explicit. On the one hand the more seats that were contested, the easier it would be to claim, if necessity arose, that Unionism was not merely a phenomenon limited to Ulster and Dublin. On the other hand, the more numerous the contests the greater the dispersion of, and the greater the strain upon, the Nationalist resources, and this in turn might be sufficient to tip the scales in favour of the Unionist candidates in those constituencies - such as W. Belfast or Londonderry City - where concentration and intensive preparation could mean the difference between defeat and victory. If justification were needed for this policy, it could be found in the increase of Unionist representation from 18 to 23 seats.

We have seen that the Nationalists, though forced to give ground to the Unionists in several important divisions, yet contrived to hold their own in the country at large. We have now to consider the second assault upon the Anti-Parnellite position, this time by their opponents of the Parnellite minority. On the eve of the election campaign the Parnellites still numbered 31 members; consequently their challenge to the Anti-Parnellites deserved to be taken seriously. Moreover they did not lack self-assurance if the assertions of their principal newspapers are to be believed: "- - - the confident aspirations of the Party will be disappointed unless Cork, Dublin, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny and Galway present an unbroken record of victories for their principles."¹ It will be seen from this that the Parnellites placed their trust primarily in the cities, probably in the well-founded belief that clerical influence would be less pronounced there than in the country districts.

It was however decided by the Party leaders that the challenge should be made over as wide an area as possible, and in all

1. Irish Daily Independent, 30 April, 1892.

some 43 constituencies were contested. In the north no very serious efforts were made; Parnellite candidates did indeed participate in three-cornered elections in S. Armagh, S. Down, Newry and Mid Tyrone. In these four constituencies they received respectively 59,42,123 and 54 votes - totals which reveal clearly enough their decisive weakness in Ulster. It is of course possible that Parnellites did exercise an indirect influence in some parts of Ulster by denying their votes to Nationalist candidates, but of this we naturally have no direct evidence.

Five further triangular contests in which Parnellites were defeated by Anti-Parnellites occurred in Mid Tipperary, S. and W. Kerry and E. and W. Wicklow, and in each case the margin of defeat was decisive. Of the remaining four triangular¹ elections, the Parnellites won two - North Dublin and the College Green Division - and in the other two they could reflect that, if they had been defeated, so too had their Anti-Parnellite rivals, since both seats were won by the Unionists.

The remaining contests between the two sections of the formerly united Party took place in 26 constituencies, scattered east, west, and south over the country. In the west the Parnellites were able to secure only one seat in N. Galway and another in S. Roscommon, Galway City and the three other Galway divisions, N. Roscommon and all of Mayo, Sligo, Leitrim and Donegal proved themselves to be solidly anti-Parnellite. In the south a similar situation was revealed. Of all the cities outside Dublin to which the Parnellites had laid claim, only Waterford fulfilled their expectations by returning John Redmond. In Cork City the two Parnellites who challenged William O'Brien and Maurice Healy were decisively beaten. Cork county was the most solidly Anti-Parnellite area in the country. Out of seven

1. There were in all 13 of these three-cornered contests of which the Anti-Parnellites won 9 and the Parnellites and Unionists 2 each.

constituencies no fewer than six were uncontested and in the seventh the Anti-Parnellite candidate had an easy victory. Limerick and Kerry told a similar tale and in the south midlands and the south-east, Anti-Parnellite superiority was equally well-defined. In the whole of the south only Clare - which returned Parnellites for both constituencies - and Waterford City, saved the minority group from apparent extinction.

In the midlands on the other hand the indications were that Parnellism received considerable support. In Louth, Westmeath, Kildare and Kilkenny, it is true, the Parnellites were defeated by heavy majorities, but the reality of these majorities is called in question by the outcome of the elections in Meath. In the northern division, Michael Davitt, whom one would suppose to be one of the strongest possible Anti-Parnellite candidates, could only secure a majority of 133 votes over the Parnellite, P. Mahony; in S. Meath the Anti-Parnellite, P. Fullam, obtained the even smaller majority of 83 votes. No sooner were these results known than they were challenged and before the year was out Davitt and Fullam had both been unseated on petition, on the ground that clerical influence had been used in their favour.¹ The example of Meath suggests that what was done in one constituency may well have been done in others, and that Parnellite defeats did not always carry with them the implication that Parnellism was a spent force, particularly where the voting was close. None the less the Parnellite group, if by no means extinct, was considerably reduced in effectiveness. The Anti-Parnellites, on the other hand, though weak by comparison with "the eighty-six of eighty-six", had none the less retained their grip upon the major part of the

1. See Irish Daily Independent, 12 July 1892, for a report of the Pastoral in which Bishop Nulty of Meath forbade his diocese to vote for the Parnellite candidates.

country, despite the determined opposition of the Unionists and the schism within their own ranks.

II. Analysis of the General Election of 1895.

Anti-Parnellites	:	70 seats
Parnellites	:	11 "
Liberal Home Ruler	:	1 "
Unionists	:	16 "
Liberal Unionists	:	5 "

The most striking feature of the General Election of July 1895, and the feature in sharpest contrast to that of 1892, was the very large number of seats which were uncontested. Out of a total of 103 seats no fewer than 59 were occupied without an electoral struggle, a situation which proved to be of most advantage to the Anti-Parnellites, though it also benefited the Unionists considerably. The latter lost two seats at this election but out of the 16 which they won they had only to contest three. Of the two seats lost, one was Londonderry City where the Unionist John Ross was defeated by an Anti-Parnellite Protestant, E.F. Knox, by a margin of 40 votes. The other defeat occurred in N. Tyrone where a Liberal, C.H. Hemphill, was victorious, the only "Gladstone Liberal" to win a seat in Ireland. Of the three seats held against opposition, N. Fermanagh was retained only by 76 votes, but N. Londonderry and S. Dublin provided respectively the more substantial majorities of 2,225 and 1,939. The Liberal Unionist representation remained constant - at five. H.O. Arnold-Forster and E.H. Carson were returned unopposed for W. Belfast and Dublin University respectively, and W. Kenny, Sir Thomas Lea, and T.W. Russell were successful respectively in

Dublin (St. Stephen's Green), S. Londonderry and S. Tyrone¹
 Thus, viewed as a whole, Unionist representation might have been regarded as having remained relatively stable; two seats had been lost it is true, but they had always been precariously held, and the solid bloc of Antrim, Belfast and three-quarters of Down, still remained as a bastion of Unionist strength.

In the country at large, on the other hand, the campaign of 1895 witnessed a definite relaxation of Unionist efforts. In 1892 they had contested 6 triangular elections and 26 straight fights; in 1895 the respective figures were 3 and 16. Moreover, the area in which most of these contests took place reveals a significant narrowing in the orbit of Unionist operations. Thus, out of the 16 straight fights, 1 was in Armagh, 3 in Tyrone, 1 in Down, 1 in Londonderry City, 1 in S. Fermanagh, 2 in Monaghan, 1 in Newry and 2 in Donegal - i.e. 75 per cent in the north. Of the others, 1 was in N. Dublin, 1 in Queen's County and 1 in N. Wexford. This very definite relaxation of effort is probably to be attributed to the fact that all the portents in 1895 pointed to a Conservative victory in England, an event which would automatically free the Unionists from that overriding fear which had stimulated their activities in the election of 1892, the fear of Home Rule.

The economy of effort which we have just observed among the Unionists, was reflected in the electoral arrangements of the two wings of the Irish Nationalists also. In 1892 the Parnellites had greatly embarrassed their rivals by putting

1. By majorities of 556 (over a Parnellite), 452 (over a Liberal) and 422 (over an anti-Parnellite) respectively.

forward candidates over a wide area; ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ 1895 they seemed to have resolved upon a policy of concentration, a policy which succeeded in increasing their representation from 9 to 11 seats, despite two defeats which were quite unexpected. In W. Clare, J.R. Maguire lost his seat to an Anti-Parnellite by 403 votes, and, more surprising still, in N. Galway the veteran Col. J.P. Nolan was defeated by a majority of 565 votes. The other 7 members elected in 1892 retained their seats; the three Dublin members were returned unopposed, and the other four¹ after facing opposition which, though considerable, was not quite so bitter and sustained as in 1892. In addition 4 new seats were won, though all with significantly low majorities. Kilkenny City was only secured by 14 votes, S. Meath by 43, N. Roscommon by 52 and E. Wicklow by 87. Elsewhere, the Parnellite challenge was much less formidable than at the previous General Election; in 1895 they only contested 3 triangular and 12 straight fights as compared with 8 and 26 respectively in 1892. Despite the undoubted improvement in their all-round position, it could not yet be said that the Parnellites had established a territorial bloc in the sense that north-east Ulster was a Unionist bloc. They were strong in Dublin and in the counties of Roscommon and Meath, but elsewhere they were dispersed and the majority of Parnellite seats were in the nature of footholds to which the minority clung precariously.

The Anti-Parnellites, despite internal troubles which we shall presently discuss,² were able to maintain almost all the ground they had held since 1892. It is true

1. They were J.J. Clancy in N. Dublin (2,240 majority), J. Redmond in Waterford City (501 majority), W.H.K. Redmond in E. Clare (58 majority) and L.P. Hayden in S. Roscommon (954 majority)

2. See below - the Section on Selection of Candidates.

that the actual number of seats which they controlled fell from 71 to 70 but the return of a Liberal Home Ruler for North Tyrone compensated numerically for this decline, while the winning of Londonderry City had a prestige value far greater than that of any other possible seat - with the exceptions of Belfast and Dublin. Moreover, this position was maintained with less expenditure of effort than that put forth in 1892. No less than 42 of the Anti-Parnellite seats were unopposed, as compared with 13 in the previous campaign. Even in the 28 seats which were challenged, the Anti-Parnellite majority seldom fell below 1000 and was usually considerably larger than that. These facts demonstrate beyond question that, although within the Party there might be major disagreements about policy, in the country at large the principles for which the Anti-Parnellites stood still commanded the allegiance of the great majority of voters.

III. Analysis of the General Election of 1900.

Nationalists	:	81	seats
Liberal Home Rulers	:	1	"
Unionists	:	16	"
Liberal Unionists	:	5	"

The dominant feature of the General Election of 1900 was the pre-occupation of the two great parties with schisms in their own ranks. The Nationalists had re-united early in 1900 and this re-union had coincided with the rise of the United Irish League, a body which had been originally founded by William O'Brien in 1898 to agitate for the improvement of conditions of life among the 'congested districts' of the west, but which, within two years had taken on a political aspect and which had spread far and wide through the country. We shall discuss the political influence of this body

later on,¹ here we need only note that it laid the greatest emphasis upon unity within the Party. Such unity had been almost, but not quite, attained in February 1900, but there still remained a dissident minority headed by T.M.Healy. Years later, William O'Brien passed this judgment upon the re-union of the Party: "The sudden and unconditional treaty of peace between the Parliamentary sections had one fatal flaw. It left the feud between the Dillonites and the Healyites wholly uncured."² O'Brien himself believed at this time that the expulsion of Healy from the Party was desirable, and although this did not actually take place until December 1900, yet open war was declared against him in the constituencies. By the time the campaign was over it was found that only Healy himself had survived the onslaught,³ his two brothers and others of his followers having been swept from their seats.

This being the background of the Nationalist campaign, it is easy to see how the results were obtained; so unassailable was the strength of the United Irish League that the Nationalist majority were able to obtain 58 of their 81 seats without a contest; in the remaining 23 seats, 16 of the contests were against dissident Nationalists. Thus only 7 Nationalist victories were obtained over their traditional opponents, the Unionists. Most of these were by comfortable majorities, viz:- S. Fermanagh (753), N. Leitrim (3,642), Limerick City (2,047), St. Stephen's Green (556), S. Dublin (504), and E. Donegal (453). The only narrow margin in the whole 7 contests was at E. Tyrone where the Nationalist candidate only won by 76 votes. Of the 16 contests with other Nationalists, 9 were easy victories, 7 more difficult. Of the 9 easy victories, 7 were won by majorities of over

1. See below - the Section on Selection of Candidates.

2. W.O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, p.126.

3. He retained N.Louth by a margin of 319 votes.

1000 votes in each case; most of these occurred in the south and south midlands. In the north midlands Healy's followers seemed somewhat stronger. In N.Meath his candidate was defeated by 137 votes, in N.Westmeath by 348 votes, in S.Loith by 308, in N.Kildare by 228, in S.Armagh by 385 and in College Green by 294.

This Nationalist pre-occupation with unity was, as we have seen, largely the outcome of the activity of the United Irish League, but it was stimulated also by signs of a schism among the Unionists, an event which offered obvious opportunities to the Nationalists to attempt to gain ground in those constituencies where the issue was always in doubt. The policy of the Unionist Government from 1895 to 1900 had been viewed with alarm by one section of the Unionists and with pleasure by another. During that period there had followed in close succession, the Land Act of 1896, the Local Government Act of 1898 and the Act of 1899 setting up a new Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; to the more conservative among the Unionists the slight compensation afforded by the Tithe-Rent Charge Act of 1899 was quite inadequate. The discontent felt by these Unionists found expression in an electoral campaign directed against Horace Plunkett, Vice-President of the new Department and, as member for S.Dublin, holder of one of the two surviving Southern Unionist seats outside Dublin University. Ostensibly the burden of complaint against Plunkett was that he had appointed, as Secretary to the new Department, T.P.Gill, formerly active in the Plan of Campaign, but long since retired from active politics though *without* having recanted his former views. This charge, however, was only a superficial illustration of the underlying discontent of the Unionists, and the attack on Plunkett was in reality an attack upon the conciliatory policy of the Government.¹

1. Irish Times, 19 September 1900.

The tactics of the dissident Unionists soon proved to be disastrous: "An organisation, headed socially and financially by Lord Ardilaun, and intellectually by Professor Bowden, was formed, and Mr. Plunkett having refused to give up the seat at their demand, Mr. Elrington Ball was started as an independent Unionist."¹ The result was that a Nationalist entered the field and was victorious in the triangular contest which ensued, with a poll considerably smaller than the combined figures of the two Unionists whom he defeated. The shock caused to Southern Unionism was further intensified by the loss of the St. Stephen's Green division of Dublin to the Nationalists so that - apart from Dublin University - there were now no Unionist representatives in Dublin.

In the north also there was discernible a slight weakening of Unionist solidarity. No seats indeed were lost and the capture of Galway City and the regaining of Londonderry City did something to compensate for the loss of the two Dublin seats, but, in the words of the observer whom we have already quoted: "- - - it was believed that two seats which might have been gained in Tyrone on the showing of the register were lost by abstentions due to divisions, and in several constituencies there were rival Unionist candidates. The lines of cleavage appeared to be mainly between the supposed interests of the landlord and tenant classes, and to some extent between Episcopalians and Presbyterians."² This latter division seemed to be most marked in Down and Armagh and it drew comment from the Irish Times: "The Presbyterians of North-East Ulster complained that they are deprived of their due share of representation, and their candidate has just carried N. Down as an assertion of their right."³ This was a dangerous omen for the future but it

1. Annual Register, 1900, p. 254.

2. Ibid. p. 255.

3. Irish Times, 15 Oct. 1900.

cannot be said to have been the main issue for northern Unionists in 1900. We shall discuss the issues of the Election later, and here we need only say that in Ulster the question of the land, and not religious differences, most divided public opinion.

Expressed in figures these stresses and strains indicated a preoccupation with internal politics similar to that of the Nationalists, though on a smaller scale. Of the 21 seats won by the Unionists, 13 were uncontested. Of the 8 seats which were contested, no fewer than 5 were fought against other Unionists, viz. in N. Armagh, N. Belfast, N. Down, E. Antrim and S. Antrim. All these were won by the official candidates by large majorities and they were still recognised by the Nationalists to be too solidly Unionist for intervention to be worth the expense of an electoral campaign. None the less, that constituencies which never ordinarily felt the stir and bustle of an election should be roused by inter-Unionist struggles, was an alarming portent. Of the three seats won against Nationalist opposition, all were obtained by very narrow margins viz: S. Tyrone by 90 votes, Galway City by 118 and Londonderry City by 42. No more fitting comment on the trend of the Election of 1900 could be offered than that supplied by the simple figures. Out of 103 seats, 71 were uncontested, 22 were fought by groups within the separate parties and only 10 formed the arena for the traditional conflict between Nationalists and Unionists. Indeed, of the Six General Elections held between 1892 and 1910, that of 1900 was the least representative of the real issues dividing the two major Irish parties.

1. Annual Meeting, 1909, p. 10.
 2. J. V. O'Connell's History of Ireland, p. 100.
 3. The Freeman's Journal, 2 Jan. 1900.

IV. Analysis of the General Election of 1906.

Nationalists	:	82 seats
Liberal Home Rulers	:	1 "
Unionists	:	11 "
Liberal Unionists	:	6 "
Independent Unionists	:	3 "

The General Election of January 1906 which for Great Britain "proved to be the most exciting and startling since 1880 if not since 1832",¹ did not result in any extraordinary change in the distribution of Irish seats. There were, however, cross-currents of unusual complexity, which gave the Election a special interest because of the revolt, or partial revolt, of a certain section of the Unionists against the strictest doctrines of the Irish Unionist Party. Amongst the Nationalists, on the other hand, there was scarcely any competition. They were, it is true, by no means united. William O'Brien and T.M. Healy still remained outside the Party and a few other members were suspected of holding unorthodox opinions. But, apart from this, the solidarity of the Party and the triumph of the Nationalist electoral machinery, may be seen from the fact that of the 83 seats won by Home Rule members² no fewer than 74 were uncontested. Of the 9 contested seats, 3 were fought against Nationalist opponents. In E. Kerry, E. O'Sullivan was defeated by a majority of 681 votes, and in N. Galway Col. J.P. Nolan, a former Parnellite and an active member of the House was defeated by a majority of 1,321 votes. His fault apparently lay in the fact that he still remained a supporter of the Land Act of 1903³ against which

1. Annual Register, 1906, p.1.
 2. i.e. 82 Nationalists and 1 Liberal
 3. See Freeman's Journal, 5 Jan. 1906.

the opinion of the majority of the Party had now turned. The third Nationalist to be unseated by the Party was P.G.H. Carvill, member for Newry. The reason for his dismissal was given by John Redmond in a letter to the executive of the United Irish League in Newry saying that: --"--- Owing to persistent absence [from the House] though resident in London, Carvill was quite useless as a Nationalist representative of Newry."¹

Of the 6 other contests in which Home Rule members were engaged, 4 were fought against Liberal Unionists, one against a Unionist and one was three-cornered. In the Harbour and St. Stephen's Green divisions of Dublin, the Liberal Unionist opposition was routed by majorities of 2,750 and 1,474 respectively. In S. Down another Liberal Unionist was defeated by the large margin of 3,044 votes. The three remaining Home Rule victories were all in Ulster and were all extremely hard fought. In E. Tyrone the Nationalist margin was only 31 votes, and in N. Tyrone the Liberal Home Ruler, C. H. Dodd, had a majority of only 9 votes. But the greatest triumph of all was Joseph Devlin's capture of W. Belfast with a majority of 16 votes.

When we turn to consider Unionist representation the situation is much more complicated. The 20 Unionist members elected were curiously divided. For example, the total includes T.W. Russell who since 1904 had dissociated himself from the Unionist Party and had many times spoken in support of Nationalist motions in the last Parliament. Although he did not expressly abandon the concept of the Union, he was naturally suspect in official Unionist circles,² and his seat was challenged in 1906. Having survived this challenge by a majority of 283 votes he announced that he would sit as an Independent Liberal.³ His unorthodoxy was not, however, a

1. Freeman's Journal, 11 Jan. 1906.

2. The Unionist attitude to him is clearly indicated in the leading article of the Belfast Newsletter, 29 Jan. 1906.

3. Belfast Newsletter, 27 Jan. 1906.

unique phenomenon. Elsewhere in Ulster there emerged individual candidates - usually taking the name of Independent Unionists - and directing their appeal primarily to the working-class and tenant-farmer vote. It is difficult to estimate the strength of the movement in the countryside because it became entangled with another element of revolt in Belfast, headed by T.H.Sloan (elected for S. Belfast in 1902) who had already achieved notoriety by his attempt to found Independent Orange Lodges.

The appeal of Sloan's movement seems to have been mainly to the townsmen¹, while that of Russell was primarily agrarian, though, as we shall see, they sometimes intermingled, with unexpected results. In July 1905 a tense situation had been created by the issue from an Independent Orange Lodge of what came to be known as the Magheramorne Manifesto. This document was signed by T.H.Sloan and others and it gave an outline of the attitude of this section towards contemporary politics.² Starting from the declaration that "Castle government stands condemned," the Manifesto pleaded for a greater degree of self-government for Ireland. The Devolution scheme of Lord Dunraven was indeed condemned, but condemned because the Council outlined in that plan depended too much on nomination and too little on election. The Manifesto continued:-

"In an Ireland in which Protestant and Roman Catholic stand sullen and discontented, it is not too much to hope that they will reconsider their positions and in their common trials, unite on a true basis of nationality." Towards the end of the Manifesto there occurred another passage, likely to alarm Unionist leaders: "We foresee a time in Irish history when thoughtful men on both sides will come to realise that

1. In fact it seems to have been limited to Belfast.

2. Belfast Newsletter, 1 Jan. 1906.

the Irish question is not made of Union and Repeal."

Such statements were sufficient to earn Sloan the strong hostility of official Irish Unionism and steady pressure was evidently brought ^{to bear on} him, for on 1 January 1906 the Belfast Newsletter published a letter of recantation from Sloan in which he wrote:- " - - - for the sake of unity in the ranks of the Unionists - - - I unreservedly dissociate myself from any portions of it [i.e. {the Manifesto}] which have been construed as antagonistic to the settled policy of the Unionist party in Ulster." Either the recantation was not intended to be binding or else Sloan had unloosed forces which he was no longer able to control, for events soon showed that what was coming to be known as "Orange democracy" was not to be so easily suppressed. On 2 January a great anti-Home Rule demonstration took place in Belfast. To the disgust of orthodox Unionists there was present a band of interrupters who were evidently well organised. Even the Duke of Abercorn, the acknowledged head of Ulster Unionism, received scant courtesy, while the two leaders of the Parliamentary Party - Col. E.J. Saunderson and William Moore - were actually shouted down. The cheers which greeted the entry of T.H.Sloan onto the platform seemed to indicate the direction in which lay the sympathies of the interrupters.¹ More was yet to come. On the following day the Belfast Newsletter announced that R. Glendinning, who had been about to contest W. Belfast, if T.H.Sloan were challenged in S. Belfast, had agreed to withdraw his candidature so as not to prejudice Unionist chances in what was recognised to be a very precarious seat. But the effect of this graceful withdrawal was completely negatived by the appearance of Glendinning in N.Antrim, where, standing as an Independent Unionist, he challenged, and subsequently defeated,

1. See the reports in Belfast Newsletter and Irish Times, 3 Jan. 1906.

William Moore by a margin of 788 votes. It was little wonder that an exasperated Unionist editor was driven to demand:- "what sort of unity game is this, breaking up a great Unionist demonstration, and agreeing to withdraw from one Unionist division a candidate who could only play into the hands of the Nationalists, to open the way for that same candidate opposing a Unionist candidate in another?"¹

From all this confused intriguing, the following facts emerge. The Unionists had yielded to schism to an alarming extent, But the revolt, serious as it was, had taken place largely on questions of internal politics. It was generally recognised that, despite the Magheramorne Manifesto, the maintenance of the Union remained the common purpose of all sections, so that the rift within the Unionist Party was not fatal. Moreover the dissentients were themselves divided into two wings - the "Russellites and the Sloanites" to use the jargon of the day. Of these two sections the former were more widespread and influential and their complaint was agrarian rather than political.

Turning now to the Unionist figures, we find that, out of 20 Unionist seats, only 7 were uncontested. Out of 13 contested seats, no fewer than 11 were fought between Unionists of various shades of opinion. The other two were fought against a Labour candidate in N. Belfast who was defeated by 291 votes, and a Nationalist in S. Dublin whom Walter Long defeated by a majority of 1,343.

Of the 11 inter-Unionist contests, T.W. Russell was, as we have seen, returned for S. Tyrone by a majority of 283 votes over the official Unionist candidate. In S. Belfast, T.H. Sloan successfully defended his seat against Lord Arthur Hill - the official Unionist by a margin of 816. In N. Antrim R.G. Tendenn- ing defeated W. Moore by 788 votes. In the remaining 8 divisions

1. Belfast Newsletter, 4 Jan. 1906.

the issue lay, with few exceptions, between those who supported Russell's views on land reform, and the orthodox Unionists. In mid-Antrim - uncontested for the last 20 years - the Hon. R.T. O'Neill easily defeated his Independent Unionist opponent by 790 votes. In E. Antrim, Col. J.M. Calmont gained an even greater majority (2,351 votes) over the Independent Unionist candidate there. In N. Armagh Col. E.J. Sanderson defeated R. Lindsay Crawford, one of Sloan's co-signatories to the Manifesto, by 3,795. In N. Down the "Russellite" candidate was defeated by 1,263, in E. Down a former Independent member, James Wood, was defeated by 670 votes and in N. Fermanagh another former member, Edward Mitchell was also unseated, though only by 88 votes. Finally, in N. and S. Londonderry, the Independent Unionist candidates were defeated respectively by 2,107 and 71 votes.

Thus, although the Unionists returned 20 members and were numerically not much inferior to their previous standards, they had gone through a serious crisis which had left them considerably weakened, even though the challenge of opposition groups had been repelled in all save three constituencies.

V. The General Elections of 1910

<u>Party</u>		<u>Jan. 1910</u>	<u>Dec. 1910.</u>
Nationalists	:	70 seats	73
Independent Nationalists		11 "	10
Liberals	:	1 "	1
Unionists	:	21 "	19

The General Elections, which aroused public feeling to such a pitch of excitement in January and December 1910, did not materially alter the relative strengths of the Irish parties, although the official Nationalists, numbering 70 in January and 73 in December, were sufficiently in a majority to control the Parliamentary situation. The situation was satisfactory but not wholly so, for the emergence of an Independent Nationalist group indicated that Redmond could not count upon the

unanimous support of the country. The rise of this new group is a phenomenon which requires some explanation. We shall discuss later the relations of William O'Brien with the Party;¹ here we need only state that he differed fundamentally from John Dillon in his attitude towards the Irish question. Whereas Dillon looked with suspicion towards social legislation as tending to weaken the demand for Home Rule, O'Brien held that such remedial acts as could be wrung from either British Party would be wholly beneficial in their effects; moreover, O'Brien, fired by the success of the Land Conference of 1902 and by the passing of the Land Act of 1903 pinned his faith to a policy of conciliation with the landlords. This led to a clash with Dillon and O'Brien left the Party in 1904. A truce was patched up in 1907 but the fundamental divergence between the views of John Dillon and William O'Brien reasserted itself within a year, and in 1909 O'Brien again resigned his seat. The attitude of the Irish Party towards the Budget² aroused his alarm to the extent of bringing him again into the political field with the formation of his All-For-Ireland League.³ This new body supplied the nucleus for the group known as the Independent Nationalists which consisted of men either devoted to the ideals of O'Brien or thrown into his camp by the force of circumstances.⁴ The movement never really spread further than Munster and its Parliamentary strength resided mainly in the Cork representatives who were almost all followers of O'Brien.

In the two electoral campaigns of 1910 the official Nationalists had therefore to contend with two groups of opponents. Yet, notwithstanding this fact, and despite the urgency of the situation, their grip upon the country as a

1. See below - Part III, Sections on the Irish members in Parliament 1900-6 and 1906-10.

2. See Part III below, and Section on the Parliaments of 1909 and 1910.

3. The genesis of this body is described in the last chapter of his Olive Branch in Ireland, and in the opening chapters of his The Irish Revolution.

4. D.D. Sheehan is an example of the first, and T.M. Healy of the second, type.

whole was not relaxed, as may be seen from the fact that, out of the 70 seats which they secured in January 1910 55 were uncontested. In the remaining 15, 8 of their opponents were Unionists, and the remainder Independent Nationalists. On the whole, the Unionists were less formidable rivals. In W. Belfast for example the Unionist vote was split and Joseph Devlin, who had only just won the seat in 1906, now secured a majority of 587. The other Unionist candidates were defeated in S. Dublin, by 635 votes, in Dublin Harbour by 662, in S. Fermanagh by 595, in Newry by 537, in E. Donegal by 1,213, in the College Green division of Dublin by 3,320 and in N. Monaghan by 1,472. The only really close contest with a Unionist occurred in E. Tyrone where T.M. Kettle had a majority of only 112 votes. Over the Independent Nationalists majorities were as a rule smaller. N. Kerry and E. Limerick were exceptions for here the official Nationalist candidates triumphed with majorities of 1,752 and 1,164 respectively. In E. Limerick however the margin was only 159, in N. Louth 488, in W. Waterford 354 and in N. Mayo only 40. (350) and S. Londonderry (307). In the whole of

In describing the Independent Nationalist victories one reservation must be made. Three of the successful candidates placed under this head were not followers of O'Brien. These men - L. Ginnell, J. M'Kean and E. O'Sullivan - were 'independent' because of private discontents and did not resign the Party yoke to exchange it for that of William O'Brien.¹ The remaining members of the group were followers of O'Brien, all save two being Cork representatives. William O'Brien himself was elected to one of the Cork City seats and in Cork county the following divisions were won by his supporters: N. Cork by 1090 votes, N.E. Cork by 1474, Mid-Cork by 825, W. Cork by 773, S.E. Cork by 543, S. Mayo by 441 and N. Louth (T.M. Healy's

1. E. O'Sullivan was not re-elected in December and the other two, though still classified as 'Independent' subsequently returned to the Party ranks.

constituency) by 99 votes.

The Unionist campaign of January 1910 was less complicated by internal disputes than that of 1906, but the main pre-occupation was still with opposition other than Nationalist. Of the 20 Unionist seats, 10 were unopposed. Of the remaining 10, 6 were fought against Liberals and 2 against Nationalists. The movement for "Orange democracy" which had seemed so important in 1906, scarcely figured at all in January 1910, its founder and sole representative, T.H.Sloan, being defeated in S. Belfast by the decisive majority of 2,220. The Nationalist opposition was only apparent in two constituencies, Londonderry City, where it was only defeated by 57 votes, and Mid Tyrone, where the division of the Nationalist vote among two candidates, allowed the Unionist to secure a majority of 405 votes. The assault upon the Liberal followers of T.W.Russell was overwhelmingly successful. Russell himself was dislodged from S. Tyrone by 284 votes. Liberals also met defeat in the following divisions:²- N.Antrim (384), S. Antrim (2,970), E.Down (974), N.Fermanagh (350) and S. Londonderry (307). In the whole of Ireland only one Liberal was returned - the Home Ruler, R.J. Barry for N.Tyrone with a majority of 102. Finally, the challenge of a Labour candidate in N.Belfast was defeated by 2,324 votes.

The Parliamentary situation was further strained - rather than eased - by the results of the General Election of January 1910, and the failure of the Constitutional Conference during the summer and autumn of that year rendered necessary a second General Election, which took place in December. In Ireland this involved only a slight change in the position of the rival parties. The Nationalists gained

-
1. The distinction between Unionist proper and Liberal Unionist was obliterated in Ireland at the two elections of 1910.
 2. Unionist majorities in brackets after the names of the divisions.

two seats at the expense of the Unionists, but their principal pre-occupation, as in January, was in combating the Independent Nationalist¹ group. They were so far successful that they decreased the number of the latter to 10,² but to achieve this result they were obliged to undertake a wider campaign than in the previous January. Then they had been able to occupy 55 seats without opposition, now the number fell to 49. In January they had fought 7 of their successful contests against the Independents; in December they fought 16. Exactly twice as many seats were fought by Nationalist against Nationalist as by Nationalist against Unionist. Moreover, although the Independents were numerically reduced in December yet the area over which the battle was fought suggests that the movement was spreading. The Independent victories were, it is true, still centred in Cork but the following list will show that Independent candidates, though defeated in each case, were able to secure some support in most of the counties of the south.² : S. Armagh (1,887), E. Cork (1,339)³ Dublin Harbour (2,613), S. Kerry (1,944), E. Kerry (1,253), S. Kilkenny (1,978), King's Co. Birr (1,499), Limerick City (1,770), W. Limerick (1,767), E. Limerick (2,334), W. Mayo (2,849), N. Louth 488), Mid Tipperary (524), W. Waterford (1,675) S. Wexford (2,414) and E. Wicklow (1,109). Of the Independent victories, two were unopposed and the rest won by margins varying from 600 to 160. Without exception, they were all won in Cork. The other two seats - S. Monaghan and N. Westmeath remained outside the orbit of either Nationalist group, though as we have already said, the sitting members, J. M. Kean

1. In reality 8, for 2 of the 10 subsequently rejoined the Party (J. M. Kean and L. Ginnell) and were not at any time followers of William O'Brien.

2. The figures in brackets after the names of the divisions signify the amount of the official Nationalist majorities.

3. E. Cork was the only Cork constituency to hold out against O'Brien. It was held by a veteran Protestant Nationalist, Capt. A. Donelan, in 1911 he was unseated on petition.

and L. Ginnell, later rejoined the Party.

The Nationalist-Unionist contests were few. The Nationalists won 8 seats against Unionist opposition, viz:-
 W. Belfast (373), S. Down (628), S. Dublin (138), St. Stephen's Green (829), Galway City (859), N. Monaghan (1,428), Mid Tyrone (723) and E. Tyrone (140). These margins were all fairly narrow and they included some notable Nationalist victories. Of these, much the most important was the capture of S. Dublin, thus leaving Southern Unionism with no representatives other than the two members for Dublin University.

The Unionist successes numbered 19, of which 11 were uncontested. Once more, the Liberals provided the principal opposition, 6 of the seats being fought against them and 1 each against Nationalists and Independent Unionists. The final defeat of the last named group seemed to be established when their candidate was defeated in S. Belfast by a majority of 2,863, an increase of over 600 votes on the figures of the official Unionist member in January. The only Nationalist opposition came from Londonderry City and here, after a struggle as hard fought as any in that division, Lord Hamilton retained his seat by a margin of only 57 votes. Elsewhere the contests were against Liberals and the results showed clearly enough that a party which welcomed reform but held aloof from Home Rule, could hope for little success in an Election in which the issue was pre-eminently that of the maintenance or repeal of the Union. The moderate policy for which the Liberals stood was not likely to have any wide appeal to electors whose interest had been concentrated throughout the year on the absorbing question as to whether or not the Liberals would have their way with the House of Lords and thus remove the last barrier to Home Rule. Liberal candidates were defeated in N. Antrim (1,583), E. Down (1,698), N. Londonderry (2,743), S. Londonderry (333), N. Fermanagh (347), and S. Tyrone (300)¹

1. Figures in brackets represent Unionist majorities.

It is significant that the only Liberal returned - R.J. Barry in N. Tyrone - was a declared Home Ruler and thus assured of Nationalist support.

Thus stood the Irish Parties on the eve of the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill. The Nationalists were numerically stronger than they had been in 1892, and although the Party was divided in 1911 as it had been 20 years earlier, yet the differences between Nationalists and Independent Nationalists were not so great, nor was the bitterness so intense, as those which divided the two sections of Nationalist opinion on the morrow of Parnell's death, in October 1891.

- (i) In 1892
- (ii) In 1895
- (iii) In 1900
- (iv) In 1906
- (v) In 1910

55
60
63
64
72

II. The Unionist Methods

The methods by which Unionists and Nationalists respectively selected candidates for election to Parliament naturally differed greatly, and it will be more convenient to consider P A R T I methods in separate sections.

Within each of the two major groups, however, there was a Pages
2. The Selection of Candidates.

I. The Nationalist Methods

(i) In 1892	42. - 49
(ii) In 1895	50. - 55
(iii) In 1900	55. - 60
(iv) In 1906	60. - 63
(v) In 1910	63. - 64

II. The Unionist Methods

64. - 72.

(i) In 1892.

While the power and authority of Parnell had been at their highest, he had perfected a system of selection of candidates which had resulted in the return to Parliament of an Irish Party better organized and better disciplined than any which had gone before. Briefly, this system consisted of a series of County (and Borough) Conventions which were called to meet in the various Parliamentary Divisions for the purpose of selecting candidates for forthcoming General Elections. The Convention was composed of the various members of the Nationalist organization (in Parnell's time it was the National League), of such clergy as chose to attend², and of such representatives of local influence as

1. I have purposely used the term "Nationalist" here, because, as we shall see the two sections of the Irish Party - Parnellites as well as Anti-Parnellites - used fundamentally the same methods.

2. Clergy of any denomination within the division could attend - in practice only the Roman Catholic clergy were present.

The methods by which Unionists and Nationalists respectively selected candidates for election to Parliament naturally differed greatly, and it will be more convenient to consider their different methods in separate sections. Within each of the two major groups, however, there was little variation during the period 1891-1910. This is particularly true of the Unionists. Among the Nationalists, although the broad principles remained the same throughout, there were certain important changes of method which deserve to be recorded in some detail. While, therefore, we can consider Unionist organisation as a whole, we shall examine Nationalist organisation in a series of sub-sections corresponding to the different General Elections which took place during the period.

I. The Nationalist Methods.¹

(1) In 1892.

While the power and authority of Parnell had been at their highest, he had perfected a system of selection of candidates which had resulted in the return to Parliament of an Irish Party better organised and better disciplined than any which had gone before. Briefly, this system consisted of a series of County (and Borough) Conventions which were called to meet in the various Parliamentary divisions for the purpose of selecting candidates for forthcoming General Elections. The Convention was composed of the various members of the Nationalist organisation (in Parnell's time it was the National League), of such clergy as chose to attend², and of such representatives of local influence as

1. I have purposely used the term "Nationalist" here, because, as we shall see the two sections of the Irish Party - Parnellites as well as Anti-Parnellites - used fundamentally the same methods.

2. Clergy of any denomination within the division could attend - in practice only the Roman Catholic clergy were present.

might be of value, e.g. Town Commissioners in country towns or Nationalist members of borough corporations. The chairman of such a Convention was always a Nationalist Member of Parliament, and while Parnell was in power, the chairman exerted all the influence he possessed to secure the selection of a candidate approved by the Party. A list of such approved candidates had usually been decided upon in advance ~~xxxx~~ ~~ix~~ by a group of the principal men in the Party meeting in Dublin. The actual business of selection was performed by the Convention, constituted on the lines suggested above, at a private meeting. After the choice of candidate had been made the meeting was thrown open to the public and only then was the Press admitted.¹

Such were the methods used by the Nationalists during the period of Parnell's ascendancy. We have now to examine how far the machinery thus created was able to withstand the shock of the disunion of the Party, initiated by the fall of Parnell and continued by the disputes which ensued after his death. His system had preserved a somewhat precarious balance between the freedom of the constituency to choose for itself and the discipline imposed from the centre. On the whole, the balance probably inclined in favour of the latter force but this is quite a usual occurrence when there is a clash between the ideal of freedom and the expediency of the moment. Expediency, in the organisation of a Party machine as in other spheres, can be a convenient cloak for a multitude of dubious actions.

Both sections of the Nationalists paid at least lip-service to the ideal of freedom when the campaign for the General Election of 1892 was begun. It was an Election of

1. For the details in the above paragraph I am indebted to an article by C. Cruise O'Brien entitled The Machinery of the Irish Parliamentary Party 1880-1885, and published in Irish Historical Studies, March 1946.

peculiar importance to all parties in Ireland¹ for it was known that if the Liberals were returned to power Gladstone was prepared to bring in a Home Rule Bill. But in addition to this issue, the General Election of 1892 provided the arena for the first large-scale struggle between Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites. It was of vital importance to both sections that they should at least superficially - gain the goodwill of the electors. At the outset, therefore, emphasis was laid upon the freedom of the constituencies. The chief Parnellite newspaper declared: "The constituencies are the masters of Ireland's fate."² The Anti-Parnellite organ was equally emphatic: "The people themselves have got to choose their men, fight and win. Home Rule is the prize of victory."³

In studying the activity of the Anti-Parnellite majority we are fortunate that there exists, in manuscript, rough notes of the proceedings of the Committee appointed by the Party to supervise electoral arrangements.⁴ The names of the Committee were published in the Freeman's Journal, 26 May 1892, and they were as follows:- John Dillon, T.M. Healy, W.M. Murphy, W.O'Brien, D. Sheehy (all members of Parliament) together with Michael Davitt who was not yet a member of Parliament. The following day this Committee published a list of County Conventions which were to be held at appointed dates in the chief towns of the various counties for the purpose of selecting candidates. In fact, several such Conventions had already been held and others continued to meet at intervals during the next six weeks.⁵

-
1. Out of 103 constituencies, 92 were contested.
 2. Irish Daily Independent, 4 May 1892.
 3. Freeman's Journal, 28 May 1892.
 4. The book in which these proceedings are recorded is among the collection of J.F. O'Brien Papers in the National Library, Dublin.
 5. Between 11 May and 1 July 1892, the Freeman's Journal published reports of 35 such Conventions.

15? ...
 170 ...
 Nationalist ...
 not the National ...
 see the report of ...
 22x2 ... 23 June ...

The Committee met 30 times between 31 May and 1 August and at the first meeting on 31 May, the following Resolution was agreed to:-

"That no mention shall be made in public or in private conversation with non-members of the Committee, of the comments or observations which may be made with respect to the persons or qualifications of candidates whose claims may be discussed at meetings of the Committee."

Following this Resolution, a series of articles ^{was} were passed, laying down the procedure to be followed by the Conventions. The close continuity of the Anti-Parnellite methods with those of the previous decade cannot be better illustrated than by quoting in full the various conditions laid down by the Committee:-

- (1) Conventions¹ were to be private until the selection of candidates had been made.
- (2) The following Resolution was to be proposed by the Chairman (who was himself to be a Member of the Party): "That the Convention binds itself to accept unanimously and to support at the polls any candidate selected by a majority of the delegates here present."
- (3) Votes were to be taken by a show of hands or by "ayes and noes" unless a poll were demanded.[¶]
- (4) A Resolution was to be put to the Convention pledging the Constituency to provide the necessary expenses for the election.
- (5) Candidates when nominated were to sign the Party Pledge in presence of the Convention.

1. Although it was not included in the notes of the Committee's proceedings the composition of the Conventions was similar to that in Parnell's day i.e. an average of about 35 priests and 170 laymen, the latter representing the local organs of the Nationalist movement which was now the Nationalist Federation, not the National League. For a typical example of a Convention see the report of the Longford Convention in Freeman's Journal, 23 June, 1892.

(6) The Press was to be admitted if a public meeting were held after the termination of the business of the Convention.

The notes of this meeting (31 May) thus provide us with valuable information as to the methods used by the Anti-Parnellites, but they still do not tell us in which direction the machinery was finally turned, whether to the service of local freedom in choosing candidates, or to the service of a central clique. Had we not got this first-hand information we might incline to the latter view. For example, T.M.Healy's account of the selection of candidates for Monaghan would suggest that local autonomy in the matter was virtually non-existent. Writing to his brother Maurice on 4 June, 1892 he says: "Davitt is getting me to run Diamond for N.Monaghan to D.P.'s disgust. M'Carthy has recommended Florence O'Driscoll for S.Monaghan and I am trying to get the Monaghan people to take both."² Immediately after this comes another glimpse of electoral policy: "T. Curran, a hotel-keeper in Sydney, came to our rescue by putting up £10,000 without security. We put up his son for Kilkenny City and himself for Sligo and both were elected."³ One more example may be selected. At the Wicklow Convention two candidates were selected. One was James O'Connor, a native of the county, but of the other, T.M.Healy, who presided, could find only this to say: "You have chosen as your standard-bearer Mr. John Sweetman, a resident of Meath, and a man recommended by the Irish Parliamentary Party."⁴ It did not, however, escape Sweetman's opponents that he had been a generous contributor to the funds of the National Federation.

If we relied entirely upon examples such as these it

-
1. i.e. the notes of the subsequent meetings held by the Committee.
 2. T.M.Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii, p. 378.
 3. Ibid. p. 379.
 4. Freeman's Journal, 3 June 1892.

would be difficult to avoid the conclusion that the freedom of the constituencies was largely illusory. But an examination of the proceedings of the Committee - especially during June - provides a ~~corrective~~ to this view point. If we take at random three meetings of the Committee - those of 4, 6 and 7 June - we shall discover the amount of co-operation which existed between the Committee and the constituencies. For example, on 4 June it ^{was} recorded that the local candidate for E. Cork "seems acceptable to the clergy there" and ^{was} therefore approved by the Committee. At the same meeting the secretary ^{was} asked to obtain information as to local feeling in S. Armagh. After this, two priests attended the meeting and recommended candidates to be put forward in Sligo and Mayo. In the afternoon of the same day (4 June) T. Dickinson, the organiser of Ulster Liberalism attend^{ed} the Committee and discuss^{ed} the general strategy of the Election in the north. After him, the Committee received a deputation from Kildare and sanctioned the choice of a local man, P. Kennedy, who had agreed to pay his own expenses. At the next meeting, on 5 June, letters from the priests in W. Clare were considered and the affairs of Limerick, S. Longford, Roscommon and Monaghan were debated. Jasper Tully was admitted and gave evidence to the Committee on the state of feeling in Roscommon, where Parnellism was strong. With regard to Monaghan, the Committee decided, as we have seen above, that, in the absence of any declaration from the constituency, candidates would be chosen from outside. On 7 June again, two priests attended to advise on Fermanagh, another priest gave evidence of the state of feeling in Sligo and a letter was read from yet another priest in Kildare, confirming the choice of Kennedy.

From these extracts we can see that there was a close liaison between the Party and the constituencies and that local wishes were being ^{continually} ~~continuously~~ consulted. The general picture which emerges is that of a Committee finding it difficult in

many cases to obtain suitable candidates, but yet careful to avoid offending local susceptibilities. In the negotiations with the constituencies, the most striking feature is the important part played by the priests. The Parnellites during the campaign complained bitterly of clerical influence used on behalf of their opponents. They were referring to the actual conduct of the elections and, exaggerated though these charges may have been they no doubt had some foundation in fact. Such influence, however, was probably less important than that exercised before the Election even began, when the initial selection of candidates to appear before the Convention was undertaken. The priests, as we have seen, were evidently regarded by the Committee as the best interpreters of local opinion and their activities before the Conventions met, very largely determined the choice of candidates with which the Conventions were to be confronted. This influence may be regarded as regrettable, but it was probably inevitable. For one thing, the priests were often the only men in remote districts who had the necessary qualifications for viewing the political situation as a whole and for breaking the current of purely local opinion. Also it must be remembered that, by the very nature of the Parnellite "split", the Anti-Parnellite group must necessarily be on the side of the Roman Catholic Church and must find in the priests natural allies.¹

To sum up - the Committee of the Party in its 30 meetings kept its finger constantly on the pulse of public feeling in the constituencies and sought to conciliate that opinion wherever possible. If a constituency wished to put forward a certain candidate the Committee closely scrutinised his career, enquired as to his readiness to share the financial burden of his election, and, if he fulfilled the necessary conditions of

1. The alliance was no doubt repugnant to some Anti-Parnellites but it was none the less a logical consequence of the political situation since 1890.

devotion to the Nationalist cause, he was usually approved. Sometimes the constituency - e.g. Monaghan - was unable to find the right type of candidate, and in such cases the Committee felt free to look elsewhere for suitable candidates. Again, there were a few cases - the Currans and Edward Blake for example -, where the Party was concerned primarily with securing safe seats for certain men whose presence in Parliament was desired for various reasons, and where the wishes of particular constituencies were ignored. There was not - and perhaps there never can be under any party system - complete freedom of choice for the constituencies but, on the other hand, the examples we have quoted from the day-to-day proceedings of the Committee show that the connection between the constituencies and the Party authorities was a very real one, and that public opinion was by no means starved of expression in 1892.

A word finally should be said as to the methods employed by the Parnellites in the selection of their candidates for the General Election. There was only one essential difference between the two Nationalist groups. Both held Conventions presided over by members of their respective Parties and both sets of Conventions were composed of local delegates of the Nationalist movements - the National Federation in the case of the ^{Anti} ~~Anti~~-Parnellites, and the National League in the case of the ~~Anti~~-Parnellites. But whereas the clergy were prominent in the Anti-Parnellite Conventions, they were absent from those of the Parnellites. This, of course, was a natural consequence of the stand taken by the Roman Catholic Church since the beginning of the "split." In general, the Parnellite Conventions were smaller in size, and they were certainly fewer in number,¹ but, apart from these differences, the principal of selection was precisely the same as that used by the Anti-Parnellites.

1. Between 25 April and 28 June the Irish Daily Independent published reports of some 20 Parnellite Conventions.

(ii) In 1895.

The procedure adopted by the two Nationalist sections did not differ substantially from that of 1892, but the General Election of 1895 is of interest because it reveals the stresses and strains to which the machinery of Convention was subject when the Party as a whole was not united on the line of policy to be pursued. During the Parliament of 1892-5 the effectiveness of the Anti-Parnellite majority had been crippled by the ill-concealed rivalry of T.M. Healy and John Dillon. This rivalry had originally been inflamed in 1891 when the two men fought for control of the Freeman's Journal, and it was not long before it obtruded into public affairs. Indeed, it was not even silenced during the crisis of the second Home Rule Bill.¹ Now, on the eve of the Election of ~~1905~~¹⁸⁹⁵, all the jealousy and suspicion which had so long been festering in the privacy of Party meetings, came to a head and was discharged in the public view.

The first move came from T.M. Healy who on 28 June addressed a meeting of the Mercantile Branch of the Irish National Federation, and attacked the conduct of the Election campaign by the Chairman and Committee of the Irish Parliamentary Party, declaring it to be contrary to the Constitution of that body.² This was a very grave charge and, before examining its validity, it will be well to recall the procedure which had been adopted in 1892. In that year, it will be remembered a Committee of the Party had been appointed to supervise the electoral arrangements - and Healy himself had been a member of that Committee. Lists of Conventions had been published by the Committee, together with the dates and places of their being held and the names of their chairmen. In 1895 precisely the same procedure was followed and on 28 and 29 June there duly appeared in the Freeman's Journal

1. For details of this quarrel see below, Part III, the Section on the Parliament of 1892-5.
 2. Freeman's Journal, 29 June, 1895.

for them to summon the lists of intended Conventions. The parallel appeared to be complete, and many echoed the despairing plea of the Freeman's Journal: "Is the instrument of Parliamentary Reform to be broken in the hands of the Irish nation?"¹

Healy's complaint appeared to have a two-fold basis. First, he considered that the disharmony in the Irish Party should be resolved at the centre, and that the Committee chosen to supervise the Election was unrepresentative. Secondly, he objected to the suddenness of the summons to the constituencies at a time when the clergy were on retreat in many parts of Ireland.² The solution which he proposed was the holding of a National Convention in Dublin which should be attended by delegates from the constituencies and which should decide between the merits of the rivals. The objections to the scheme were many, principally the impossibility of summoning such a gathering when the campaign had already begun, and it is difficult to believe that the suggestion was anything other than a tactical move to throw upon Dillon and his followers the onus of refusing to seek the verdict of such a representative gathering. The Anti-Parnellite view was temperately stated by Justin M'Carthy, still Chairman of the Party, but now almost effaced by his more tempestuous lieutenants. In a letter to the Freeman's Journal he wrote that: " - - - the Committee of the Party was charged by an overwhelming vote of the Party with the conduct of the Elections. The Committee was extremely anxious that the Constituencies should be in a position to meet the great emergency and that above all they should not be deprived of their right to freely choose their candidates."³ The suddenness of the dissolution, he explained, made it impossible

1. Freeman's Journal, 3 July 1895.

2. My italics.

3. Freeman's Journal, 4 July 1895.

for them to summon the Conventions earlier than they had done.

The quarrel was too keen to be assuaged by such a moderating influence, and the issue was carried into the constituencies where it threatened to dwarf in importance the necessity for a common front against Parnellites and Unionists. It is not necessary here to follow all the details of the struggle but mention must be made of two incidents, grave in themselves, but of added significance as a commentary upon the abuses to which the Nationalist electoral machine was liable. The first incident took place on 8 July at the Convention for East and Mid Tyrone which was presided over by John Dillon and at which T.M. Healy was present. To the consternation and indignation of many of those present, Healy rose and proceeded to read a letter written by Edward Blake on 18 June 1894 to T.A. Dickson, at that time chief organiser of the Liberal Party in Ulster. In this letter Blake apparently stated that the Irish Party could no longer afford to pay the costs of registration and other expenses in North and South Tyrone and North and South Londonderry, and that, at the next Election they should be considered the responsibility of the Liberals, at the same time, in view of the registration expenses already incurred in these areas by the Irish Party, it was suggested that the Liberals should pay to the Irish Nationalists £200 p.a. per seat. The effect of Healy's action was described in a letter to his brother Maurice on the same day: "I read Blake's letter and Dillon was livid with rage and hadn't a word to say."¹ Dillon's reactions indeed, were curious, so curious that they deepened the obscurity surrounding the unfortunate affair of the letter. He did not deny that the letter had been written, nor did he offer any explanation of its contents; instead he chose

1. T.M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, 11. p.422.

to upbraid Healy for making it public, thus further confounding the confusion.

Although the affair was ultimately explained away as a mere incident in the tactics of successful electioneering it seemed at one time as though the "Omagh scandal", as it came to be called, would bid fair to destroy the prospects of the Irish Party. The scars left by this controversy endured for a long time, and, as Healy himself remarked in his Memoirs,¹ it was episodes such as this which brought the Irish Party into disrepute. The bare suggestion that seats might actually be sold by one party to another was the very negation of all the progress which had been made in electoral morality since the eighteenth century. Moreover, it seemed that the constituents of the four divisions had been consistently ignored while these negotiations for their representation were proceeding,

The second incident centred round the Mayo Convention. William O'Brien has described² how in the opinion of the Party, the struggle was as much against Healy as against Redmond, and how it seemed at one time as though the majority of members returned would be 'Healyites':- "I remember vividly the final meeting, with Mr. M'Carthy in the Chair, at which we deliberated how to avert the disaster by an appeal to the Conventions which had not yet selected their candidates." It was decided - - - "by way of a last effort ---- to send delegates to the Conventions for E. Donegal, N. Mayo and E. Kerry, to appeal for their verdict as between the Healy candidate and our own, Mr. Dillon undertook to challenge Mr. A. O'Connor, the Healyite candidate in N. Donegal, where the Bishop was a devoted friend of his own, and the duty of arraigning Mr. Daniel Crilly before the people of Mayo was assigned to Mr. Blake and myself."

1. T.M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii. p. 423

2. W.O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, pp. 83 et sequ.

O'Brien and Blake then proceeded to ^{the} Mayo Convention whence, as soon as they had made known the purpose of their coming the Bishops and clergy departed by way of protest. None the less, in their absence, O'Brien secured the nomination of John Roche. Then came the moral of the episode. The Bishop protested to the Committee in Dublin, Roche was withdrawn and Crilly was triumphantly reinstated. Once again, the most striking feature of this episode is the way in which the wishes of the electors were subordinated to the intrigues which were carried on incessantly behind the scenes. First came the decision to appeal to the constituents. Then followed clerical disapproval of the appeal, defied for a moment by a public opinion hypnotised by the eloquence and authority of the two eminent members of the Party sent down from Dublin. But the spell was not maintained, and clerical opposition continued steadily and unobtrusively. As a result of this the verdict of the Convention was reversed and the clerical candidate was nominated.

The Parnellites in 1895 condemned the Conventions called by their rivals as "machined"¹ and, in view of the cases we have described, there was some foundation for the charge. But there were 39 Anti-Parnellite Conventions and it is hard to believe that all were content to accept the dictation of the Party. Indeed we know that many of them resented the abrupt summons of 4 or 5 days notice which they received, and some of them insisted on a postponement. Others again refused to accept the Chairmen appointed by the Party and numerous Resolutions were passed demanding the holding of a National Convention.² The general picture which emerges is that the Party had become so riddled with

-
1. The phrase is used in Irish Daily Independent, 11 July 1895.
 2. For reports of dissatisfied and suspicious Conventions see the reports of the Co. Wexford, S. Leitrim and Co. Cavan Conventions in Freeman's Journal, 9 July 1895.

faction and jealousy that it was beginning to abuse the carefully balanced system of local conventions inherited from the Parnell era. Some of the constituencies accepted this situation passively but others in various ways began to show their weariness of the bickerings of their representatives and their suspicion of the efficacy of Parliamentary action: their distrust was beginning also to embrace the electoral arrangements of the Party.

(iii) In 1900.

The turmoil of the Election of 1895, the divisions within the Nationalist ranks, and the subsequent Parliamentary weakness of the Party, all contributed towards the movement for re-union which actually bore fruit in February 1900. The principal agent in this reunion had been the United Irish League (whose founder was William O'Brien) and the constitution of this body suggested machinery whereby the method of selecting candidates for a General Election could be overhauled, even if the main principles of the system were left undisturbed. In the great National Convention of June 1900¹ - which registered the formal supersession of the National Federation by the new body - the Constitution of the U.I.L. (as we may term it for convenience) was expounded to the public.

The new League was to be open to all sections of Irish Nationalists. The smallest unit was to be the parish branch,² which would be controlled by a Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary and Committee - all to be annually elected. Each

1. Freeman's Journal, 20 June 1900. The Convention was summoned by a joint Committee consisting of an equal number of representatives of the League and of the Party. See O'Brien's Olive Branch in Ireland, p.125.

2. There could be more than 1 branch if the parish were considered sufficiently large.

branch was to elect annually 6 delegates to represent it on a Divisional Executive which was to be established in each Parliamentary Division and which was to include the clergy of all denominations as well as the elected delegates of the branches. Each of the Divisional Executives was to meet from time to time in some central town within the Division, and elect annually a President, Treasurer and Secretary. This Executive was entitled to hear and decide all complaints among the local branches. It was to receive 75% of all subscriptions collected by the branches, the latter retaining 25% for local expenses.¹ Each Divisional Executive was to elect annually one delegate to represent it on the Provincial Directory. The Directory for each Province was to consist of the delegates together with a President and Vice-President if the delegates desired to elect to either of these offices a person or persons not members of the Directory by direct election. As soon as the Provincial Directories were constituted, they, together with the Chairman and Officers of the Irish Parliamentary Party were to formulate a scheme for the appointment of a permanent National Directory as the supreme governing body of the League.

The keynote of the speeches in support of this plan was that it would provide for organised unity. William O'Brien himself wrote afterwards that the National Convention: "--- gave the country a constitution bestowing the largest self-government on every constituency and, save in questions of purely Parliamentary tactics, gave the people, in the widest sense of the word, a sovereign control over their representatives."² There was some feeling, voiced mainly by T.M. Harrington,

1. On the second day of the Convention it was decided that the Divisional Executives should only keep $\frac{1}{3}$ of this 75%; the rest was to go to the National Directory. See Freeman's Journal, 21 June 1900.

2. William O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, p.125.

that the Party was being subordinated to the League, and that the result would be disastrous.¹ But feeling had risen high against the Party and the new Constitution was carried. Continuity with the past was preserved by a Resolution moved by Edward Blake proposing that no candidate should be adopted by the Divisional Convention unless he first signed the Parliamentary Pledge 'to sit, act and vote with the Parliamentary Party.' He ended on this note: "I think it is of great consequence that we should lay down very clearly the absolute local control of the constituency itself by its proper organisation in the choice of a candidate."²

When Parliament was dissolved on 18 September 1900, the National Directory of the League took immediate action and met two days later in Dublin to set in motion the procedure outlined above. The following Resolutions were proposed by William O'Brien:³

- (1) That in each Parliamentary Division where there was a Divisional Executive of the U.I.L. as the recognised National Organisation, or where not less than 3 branches of the League had been affiliated, a Convention might be summoned for the purpose of selecting the Nationalist candidate to represent that constituency in the next Parliament. There followed a list of places and dates for Conventions
- (2) That the local arrangements for each Convention be made by the officers of the Divisional Executive. (Or, failing such, by the officers of the branch where the Convention is to assemble).

1. Freeman's Journal , 21 June 1900

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. 20 Sept. 1900.

(3) That each Convention be composed of:-

(i) The President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary and Provisional Director of the Divisional Executive (if any)

(ii) The clergy of all denominations.

(iii) 6 delegates from each branch of the U.I.L. within the Division.

(iv) 6 delegates from each branch of the Land and Labour Association within the Division.

(v) 6 delegates from each Trades Council within the Division, with whatever additional representation of trade and labour bodies the Executive might invite.

(vi) All Nationalist members of the County Councils representing districts within the Division.

(vii) All Nationalist members of Borough Councils within the Borough constituencies.

(viii) All Nationalist members of Urban District and Rural District Councils, Boards of Guardians, Town Commissioners and other popularly elected bodies within the Division.

(ix) 6 delegates each from each branch of the National Literary Society, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the National Foresters Society.

(4) Wherever there was a Divisional Executive, the President thereof was to be ex officio Chairman of the Convention. Where there was no Executive then the Chairman was to be elected by the Convention.

(5) The Provisional Directory was to appoint ^{one} representative to attend at each Convention. He was, however, to offer no advice as to the selection of candidates except at the invitation of the Convention.

- (6) All decisions of the majority at the Convention were to bind the minority.
- (7) That before the name of any candidate was submitted to the Convention, he should be required to sign the Party Pledge.
- (8) That, in the interests of Unity, the Conventions were urged to select no candidate "who is not an unequivocal supporter of U.I.L. and who has not given practical evidence of his determination to give a loyal adherence to the decrees of the National Convention.
- (9) That in any constituency where there were not 3 branches of the U.I.L. the Directory declined the responsibility of summoning a Convention where there could be no guarantee of its being representative.

Such was the very impressive machinery provided for the General Election of 1900. The framework of the old County Conventions was preserved but was expanded to allow as wide a representation of interests, political, economic and cultural, as could be desired. The democratic basis of the scheme could not be challenged and the provisions safeguarding the choice of Chairman for the Convention shows very clearly the distrust of the old system which had allowed the Party an undue influence over the selection of candidates where the Chairman was a persuasive or masterful member of Parliament. Domination of Conventions by the Party was no longer possible. Indeed, virtually the only concession to the Party was the retention of the Party Pledge as a condition necessary to the selection of a candidate.

The principal objection against the scheme was that the very recent growth of the League, remarkable though it was, meant that there was a danger of confusion in districts

where it had not been fully established. This did in fact happen, occasionally, and in a few instances rival Conventions were called. In N. Wexford, for example, Sir T. Esmonde was selected by a Convention, which was quite independent of the United Irish League.¹ Such cases were few and unimportant, however, and the system as a whole worked well, for out of the 81 members returned, only 2, T.M. Healy and J.L. Carew,² stood aloof from the new movement. It might, it is true, be argued that the clause advocating membership of the League as a condition of selection was in itself a form of intolerance.³ However, to a country exhausted by a decade of strife, the new system came as a relief and few were found to criticise the arrangements of the League in 1900.

(iv) In 1906.

The new machinery which had been largely created by William O'Brien continued to function, even though he himself was in 1906 no longer a member of the Party. The pattern of the Nationalist campaign of 1906 followed very closely that of 1900. First came a great National Convention summoned by the National Directory of the United Irish League, to meet in Dublin on 6 December 1905. At this Convention the future policy of the Party was laid down in a series of Resolutions with which we shall deal in some detail in the next section. A fortnight later there appeared the first list of Conventions to be summoned in the different Parliamentary Divisions for the purpose of selecting candidates. At the same time was announced the basis on which the Conventions were to be composed.⁴ That

1. Freeman's Journal, 25 Sept. 1900.

2. They were both expelled from the Party at a National Convention in December, see Freeman's Journal, 13 December 1900.

3. This was suggested in an article in the Irish Daily Independent, 24 Sept. 1900, accusing O'Brien of using the League as "a sort of Vehmgerichte", but it was a charge which at that time had few supporters.

4. Freeman's Journal, 20 December 1905.

basis was as follows:-

- (1) Clergy of all denominations within the Division.¹
- (2) The President and other officers of the Divisional Executive of the League.
- (3) 6 delegates from each branch of the League within the Division.
- (4) 4 delegates from the County Council and from each Urban or Rural District Council within the Division.
- (5) 6 delegates from each branch of the Land and Labour Association within the Division.
- (6) 4 delegates each from each branch of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and of the National Foresters within the Division.

The model of 1900 was thus closely followed in all its essentials by the Conventions of 1906.

The first list of Conventions contained the names of 20 Divisions, a second list in the Freeman's Journal of 26 December 1905, named another 29, and the issue of the same newspaper of 4 January 1906, gave the names of another 25. Thus altogether 74 Divisions were covered by the machinery of the League. It is not altogether coincidence that the number of uncontested seats won by the Nationalists was also 74, for, in the vast majority of cases, selection by the Convention resulted in election, and usually unopposed election, to Parliament. But not merely was the machinery of League Conventions operating over a wider area than in 1900, it was operating more efficiently. In 1900, it will be recalled, some confusion had resulted from the fact that the League was not everywhere known and established. In 1906 there were only three centres of disturbance worthy of notice. One was in N. Louth where T.M. Healy retained his seat despite the opposition of the Party. Another was in Newry and here the machinery of the Party was triumphant. The third was in N. Wexford

¹ as in previous Elections this meant in practice only the

where the Convention nominated Sir T. Esmonde and at the same time registered a protest to the effect that it had been summoned by Joseph Devlin on behalf of the Central Executive and not, as the Constitution of the League demanded, by the local Executive. This incident prompted a leader in the Freeman's Journal 28 December 1905 which asserted:- "The Conventions, under the rules of the United Irish League, are constituted on the widest basis of representation. They have an absolutely unfettered choice in their selection of candidates. There will always, and most properly, be the fullest consideration given to any suggestions that are made by the Central Organisation, but the choice, and the responsibility for the choice, rests with the Convention."

No doubt the freedom of the constituencies did remain largely unimpaired during the year 1906, but there were signs that the local autonomy granted in 1900 (or, more accurately, reaffirmed) was being modified by the National Directory. For example, it will be remembered that one of the Resolutions which William O'Brien had carried at the June Convention in 1900 had laid down the qualifications for the Chairmen of County Conventions in such a way as to preclude the occupation of these important posts by Members of Parliament. In 1906 this Resolution was being observed in the letter but not in spirit. The Constitution of 1900 had provided for the attendance at Conventions of representatives of the National Directory, but they were to attend as observers and were not to offer advice unless asked. Now in 1906 it is noticeable that many of the representatives of the Directory were also Members of Parliament. Since the actual deliberations took place in private, it is impossible to say how much influence these Members actually wielded, but it is safe to assume that some of them must have found it difficult to disentangle

the dual obligations which they owed to the League and to the Party.¹ On the whole, the machinery worked much as it had done in 1900, though the spontaneous enthusiasm which the re-union of the Party had evoked at the earlier Election was lacking in 1906.

(v) In 1910.

The fact that there were two General Elections in 1910 implied that in all probability those who were elected in January would be returned again in December. In fact there were only 9 new Nationalist members in January and 4 in December. The procedure in January 1910 was substantially the same as that in 1906 and 1910 and was described yet again in the Freeman's Journal of 17 December, 1909: "The representatives of the United Irish League and the various public bodies entitled to send delegates at first deliberated in private and their choice was subsequently announced to a public meeting." The procedure here reported was actually that of the E. Wicklow Convention but any other Convention would reveal a similar² course of action. As many as 64 Conventions were listed and the programme was duly carried out, though not without some opposition. William O'Brien has recorded the names of 19 Conventions where opposition was raised against the official candidate,³ and although his estimate was probably

1. It is only fair to record that in the majority of cases the Members probably preserved a proper degree of neutrality. Mr. J.P. Hayden (M.P. for S. Roscommon 1897-1918) in a letter written to the present writer says that "--- The Convention was not only theoretically but absolutely free and independent". He says also that -- "It was the League and not the Party that was represented at Conventions." And again: "I have myself represented the League at several such Conventions and can recall having presided at only one of them when I was requested unanimously to take the Chair."

2. Freeman's Journal, 11 December, 15 December, 18 December and 22 December 1909.

3. William O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, p.469.

exaggerated, there was considerable discontent in some areas, culminating occasionally in actual violence, as in S. Monaghan where J. M'Kean refused to withdraw his candidature and succeeded in winning the seat as an Independent candidate.¹

When the second Election occurred in December there was very little time for campaigning and for the first time for over 20 years the Irish Party decided to vary its procedure. A meeting of the National Directory of the United Irish League was held in Dublin under the presidency of John Redmond. At this meeting the following Resolution was passed: "That the National Directory, in view of the extraordinary and unprecedented nature of the emergency has decided that the usual Conventions for the selection of candidates shall be dispensed with except in certain instances and that decision the country is called upon loyally to accept and to abide by."² The decision was accepted and, as we have seen, very little change was made in the Nationalist representation. The activity of the Independent Nationalists suggests, however, that if Conventions had been called, the machinery of the League would have undergone a far greater strain than any to which it had been subjected since its inception in 1900

II. The Unionist Methods.

There existed no Unionist organisation comparable in scope and intricacy with the Nationalist machine either before or after 1900. This fact is due to several causes. First, the Unionists had far fewer seats to fill than had their Nationalist rivals. Usually they were in the proportion of 1 to 4 in Parliament,³ and, with the exception of 1892, they seldom embarked upon a wide campaign in constituencies where the Nationalists were known to be in a

1. Freeman's Journal, 29 December 1909

2. Ibid. 30 November 1910.

3. Very roughly, the Home Rule representation accounted for an average of 82 seats, the Unionists for an average of 21. But for a closer examination of this point, see the Section entitled Analysis of the General Elections.

majority. Secondly, the distribution of Unionist electors was such that except in a few areas, they were either in an overwhelming majority, or else in an equally decisive minority. In either case elaborate organisation was unnecessary. Thirdly, the types of Unionist electors were such that organisation would have been difficult. Unionist electors in the south consisted in the main of the landlord class with its dependents, and in the towns of a high proportion of the professional classes. These were not classes to whom the idea of elaborate machinery would commend itself. In Ulster, on the other hand, the numerically strongest group of Unionist electors was the labouring class, in town and country alike. The employers of labour in the north seemed to stand - politically, at any rate - in a kind of patriarchal relationship towards the workers, for we find that members of old families were constantly being returned to Parliament for the counties - e.g. the Hills, O'Neills, M'Calmonts and Hamiltons - and that in Belfast the large employers of labour were consistently returned, - e.g. Sir J. Harland, G.W. Wolff, Sir D. Dixon, J. Chambers¹. Finally, the leadership of the Irish Unionist Party was essentially aristocratic. It is difficult to conceive of the Duke of Abercorn in Belfast and Lord Ardilaun in Dublin participating in the procedure of Convention and touring the constituencies as did the Nationalist leaders.

These facts not only explain why there was no Unionist system comparable with the organisation of the Nationalists, but they point the way to the lines upon which Unionist selection was in fact carried out. The

1. T.H. Sloan, who represented S. Belfast as an Independent Unionist from 1902-1910 might be considered to be an exception to this generalisation because of his connection with the "Orange democracy" movement. But he too was an employer of labour, being a cement contractor on a large scale.

Unionist constituencies were, as we have seen, of two kinds, those where opposition was intense and those where it was negligible or even non-existent. Two different methods were evolved for dealing with these different situations. In the latter case, where opposition was of no account, the selection of candidates was usually left to the constituencies. In 1892 for example in S. Sligo, a local landowner, O. Wynne, was described as having been selected by a large and influential gathering of Unionists, and the very same words were used to describe the selection of Capt. Jas. Halpin as Unionist candidate for E. Wicklow. Similar examples of loose organisation might be cited from other electoral campaigns. In 1895 for instance, the Unionist candidate for Carlow was reported as being chosen "at a meeting of Unionists."² All the candidates we have just mentioned were representatives of areas where Unionism was in a minority but when we turn to Ulster we find much the same system prevailing though it was more usual for the Ulster electors to congregate in local organisations of their own. Thus, instead of the vague terms we have just quoted we find that candidates are selected at meetings of Registration, Constitutional, or simply Unionist Associations. The general procedure was well illustrated in 1906 in a speech made by the Chairman of the N. Londonderry Unionist Association when he was introducing H. T. Barrie to that body as the intended Unionist candidate for the constituency. He remarked that the Association had been founded 10 years ago for the purpose of selecting delegates from among the Unionist electors of the Division. These delegates numbered 99 and met together to select a candidate whom they then put before the electors as the official candidate.⁴ This was the nearest Unionist

1. Dublin Daily Express, 31 May, 1892

2. Ibid, 17 June 1892

3. Ibid, 5 July 1895

3. Belfast Newsletter, 2 Jan. 1906.

approach to the Nationalist County Conventions. The root principle is the same i.e. the representation of the people by a representative selected by delegates at one remove from the electorate as a whole, but the Unionist organisation differed very materially from that of the Nationalists. It was not so large, the representation of different local interests was not deliberately planned as in a Nationalist Convention, and finally the meeting of the association was not regulated to fit in with a wide-spread programme of other meetings and was not supervised by a prominent member of the Party.

Local wishes were probably respected under the Unionist system as much as under the Nationalist, but both parties reserved the right to intervene in the selection of candidates in exceptional cases. We have seen how the Nationalists exercised this right; we have now to consider the Unionist action in those constituencies where issues were at stake too important to be left in the hands of the local organisation. It is difficult to describe in detail the methods used by the Irish Unionist leaders on these occasions because much of the negotiations was carried on in private. Three examples will suffice to show the difficulty of penetrating behind the scenes in this matter. In 1892 the Unionists decided to contest Londonderry City, a seat then held by the Nationalists but which was always regarded by each side as a doubtful quantity. The candidate selected was a barrister, a native of Londonderry, John (later Sir John) Ross. As he himself recounted the incident many years later, it appeared that his candidature was warmly desired by a section of Londonderry Unionists. Yet his invitation did not proceed from them. Instead, Ross was summoned to Dublin to interview A.J. Balfour, then Chief Secretary, who urged him to accept the arduous task of contesting Londonderry.¹ This amounted to an official

1. Sir John Ross, The Years of My Pilgrimage, pp.63-72

command and indicated that, in 1892 at any rate, the fate of such 'border-line' constituencies was the concern not merely of Irish Unionists, but of Unionism as a whole. We have no means of knowing what negotiations had already taken place before the result could have been achieved; but the intervention of Balfour himself shows that such negotiations must have been in progress - and probably for a considerable time.

The selection of a candidate for the division of West Belfast at the same Election shows similar signs of private discussion. This seat also was one whose fate usually depended upon the casting of a few votes into either balance. It was important that the candidate selected should at the same time be acceptable to the Party leaders and to the local Unionists. Actually, as early as 1890 negotiations had begun, resulting in the ultimate selection of H.O. Arnold-Forster, one of the most prominent of English Conservatives. His wife has described how: - - - "Meetings to choose a representative were held by the Conservative, Liberal Unionist and Orange bodies, and his name was agreed upon as one acceptable to all parties."¹ Once again, the selection of a candidate for an important seat appears to have been made in private conference and only to have been publicly announced when the decision had been taken.²

The third case which we will cite reveals the same inaccessibility. In 1905 the Unionist Association of S. Dublin had agreed upon the selection of P. Bernard as candidate for the division in the coming General Election.

1. H.O. Arnold-Forster: a Memoir by His Wife, p.87

2. It is of course true that even in Nationalist Conventions the actual decision was taken in private. But at that private discussion there might be two or three hundred delegates. This was certainly not so in the Unionist cases we have been discussing.

On 15 December 1905 Bernard published a letter announcing his willingness to withdraw his candidature in favour of the eminent English Conservative, Walter Long, until recently Chief Secretary for Ireland. A few days later the Irish Unionist Alliance denied that it had invited Long to stand without having consulted the local Association.¹ None the less, the withdrawal of Bernard was accepted and Walter Long was ultimately elected. As in the previous cases it seems plain that the fate of the seat had been decided by private treaty.

Such were the methods employed by the Unionist leaders when the situation seemed to demand extraordinary action and if such were their only methods it might well be assumed that their relations with the constituencies were frequently strained. These, however, were exceptional instances, and machinery existed which was normally sufficient to resolve all the strains between the Unionist electors and the leaders of the Party. Two organisations were primarily occupied with electoral arrangements - the Irish Unionist Alliance and the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association. The latter body had been brought into being by the menace of Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill. Its object was to secure a due representation of Ulster Liberal Unionism in the Irish Unionist Party, and to achieve this end it worked in the closest co-operation with the Irish Conservatives; a joint Committee of Irish Conservatives and Liberal Unionists had been set up during the crisis of 1885-6² and a similar body continued to function in 1892.³ The Irish Unionist Alliance was an organisation of somewhat wider scope. It was the direct successor of the old

1. Irish Times, 18 Dec. 1905.

2. For the history of the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association, see Ulster Liberal Unionist Association; a sketch of its history, 1885-1914. Introduction by J.R. Fisher.

3. Irish Times, 1 April 1892.

Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union and took over most of the functions of that body. It received its new name in April 1891 when the sixth annual meeting of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union was held in Dublin.¹ The change was made to symbolise the reconstruction of the Union "on a wide and thoroughly representative basis." The following quotation from the Report read at the meeting will illustrate the scope of the new organisation:-

"Under the revised Constitution the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union may now be described as consisting of: 1st, a body of general subscribers; 2nd, local organisations in each polling district known as district branches; 3rd, councils in each constituency composed of representatives from the district branches in each polling district; with the General Council consisting of (a) Representatives from the branch council in each constituency and (b) Members of the Council already existing. Each branch of the Union is, within certain prescribed limits, entirely independent of the central body and the various district branches have absolute control of their own funds, subject to the payment of a small annual fee. Two objects are therefore attained; first, the I.L.P.U. as a national organisation derives its authority from and speaks in the name of loyalists in every part of Ireland; second, each constituency is furnished with an effective organisation, working upon uniform lines in the manner best calculated in the opinion of those belonging to the locality to obtain the most efficient results."

The Report then passed on to consider the recommendations of the joint Committee of Irish Unionists and Liberal Unionists, as a result of which it posited the following aims:-

1. See the report in Irish Times, 9 April 1891 for this and for the new constitution of the Alliance.

(1) In every constituency in Ireland there was to be a Unionist Association, each charged with seeing that there were effective local organisations e.g. Registration Associations within the polling districts.

(2) Each constituency should have a Divisional Council composed of regularly elected representatives or delegates from the various polling districts.

(3) The General Council of the body shall be composed of two representatives from each Divisional Council together with a certain number of members chosen from the present General Council of the I.L.P.U.

(4) Because it was desired to embrace other Unionist organisations the title of the body was changed to Irish Unionist Alliance.

Included in the Report was an account of the work done by the old Union between 1885 and 1891. Because the work of the Alliance was designed to be a continuation of the work of the Union we reproduce here a summary of the work done in the earlier period, viz:-

(i) The grant of financial aid to 48 contested elections in Ireland in 1885.

(ii) The grant of financial aid to 12 contested elections in Ireland in 1886.

(iii) Financial aid to several Registration Associations between 1886 and 1890.

(iv) The maintenance of a staff of speakers who, since January 1886, had assisted at 200 elections and spoken at over 1000 meetings.

(v) Publication of 5000 volumes, 1 million pamphlets, over 20 million leaflets, 250,000 broadsheets and posters, and a large periodical issue of Notes from Ireland.

(vi) The supply of information on every aspect of the Irish question.

Such were the aims and organisation of the principal Unionist body. There are certain obvious differences from the Nationalist organisation, the United Irish League, which was set up only a few months earlier.. The Unionists, it is true, adopted the same principles of building up a structure in pyramid fashion, from the small local cells at the base to the guiding Council at the top. But, not only were there fewer intermediate stages between the local and the central organisations in the Unionist than in the Nationalist system, but the different levels were far less elaborately organised. Moreover, the Nationalist body reserved as much power as possible for its central Directory and insisted on control of the finances. The Unionists, on the other hand specifically guaranteed the maximum of local autonomy and freed the finances of the subordinate Associations from the control of the General Council. Finally, the Unionist machinery was directed primarily towards subsidising local bodies and towards the dissemination of the propaganda. The United Irish League was less concerned with these objects than with organising the voting power of the countryside so as to obtain as solid and numerous a Parliamentary Party as possible.

It is thus true to say that the Unionist policy in the matter of selecting candidates was, on the whole, one of benevolent neutrality towards the constituencies. In general, local wishes were respected, and the strength of local feeling is reflected in the loose-knit constitution of the Irish Unionist Alliance. That the rights of constituencies could be overridden in emergencies, we have shown above, but it must be stressed that such action was the exception and not the rule.

I. The Issues in 1892

The election of 1892 was fought primarily upon the issue P A R T I fully realized by the competing

3. The Issues in the General Elections.

	<u>Pages</u>
	74. - 79
I. The Issues in 1892	
	79. - 83
II. The Issues in 1895.	
	83. - 88
III. The Issues in 1900	
	88. - 93
IV. The Issues in 1906	
	94. - 99.
V. The Issues in 1910.	

On the extreme right of the political spectrum were the Unionists, comprising both Conservatives and Liberal Unionists. For them the issue was positively theirs was in essence a laissez-faire policy, a policy negative rather than positive; they were content to upon the achievements of the Salisbury ministry and to point to a general increase of prosperity and to a decrease in the use of the much castigated system of coercion. Above all, they took their stand upon the value of the Union as an economic and political bond linking Ireland inextricably with Great Britain. The official Unionist view was expressly stated at the very impressive Ulster Convention, held in Belfast, 19 June, 1902.¹ It was echoed by Edward Carson when he addressed the electors of Dublin University: "I have ventured to state in my address that Home Rule everywhere is important in all other questions before the electorate."²

Yet, as we have said, other questions existed, chief among them being the two related problems of the land and the excluded tenants.³ Even amongst the Unionists there were some who were prepared to make concessions upon these

1. See report in Irish Times, 16 June, 1902.
 2. Irish Times, 9 July 1902.
 3. I.e. those existed in connection with the Plan of Campaign.

I. The Issues in 1892.

The election of 1892 was fought primarily upon the issue of Home Rule, a fact fully realised by the competing parties. Yet there were other issues involved which might easily become crucial in their turn if Home Rule failed to materialise. The attitudes adopted by the various parties towards these other problems differed considerably and reflected with accuracy the opinions of the classes and interests which they respectively represented.

On the extreme right of the political line were the Unionists, comprising both Conservatives and Liberal Unionists. For them the issue was perfectly plain. Theirs was in essence a laissez-faire policy, a policy negative rather than positive; they were content to rest upon the achievements of the Salisbury ministry and to point to a general increase of prosperity and to a decrease in the use of the much castigated system of coercion. Above all, they took their stand upon the value of the Union as an economic and political bond linking Ireland inextricably with Great Britain. The official Unionist view was expressly stated at the very impressive Ulster Convention, held in Belfast, 17 June, 1892.¹ It was echoed by Edward Carson when he addressed the electors of Dublin University:- "I have ventured to state in my address that Home Rule overshadows in importance all other questions before the electorate."²

Yet, as we have said, other questions existed, chief among them being the two related problems of the land and the Evicted Tenants.³ Even amongst the Unionists there were some who were prepared to make concessions upon these

1. See report in Irish Times, 18 June, 1892.

2. Irish Times, 5 July 1892.

3. i.e. those evicted in connection with the Plan of Campaign.

issues, for example T.W.Russell, who declared to his constituents that he was now in favour of compulsory sale although he had been opposed to it at the previous election¹. Perhaps not many Unionists were prepared voluntarily to endorse this policy with its obvious implications for the future of large estates, but the time had gone by when Unionists could afford to ignore the possibility of having to yield ground. Such reforms as they put forward in their election addresses were not very definite however and indicated that Unionist energies would be almost wholly concentrated upon the defence of the Union, and that other controversial questions would be temporarily relegated to the background.

If the Unionists occupied the extreme right the Parnellites were regarded as a centre party since each of the other two parties accused them of co-operation with the other. In fact, of course, they were ardent Nationalists whose programme differed only in one detail from the majority party. This detail was however of great importance since it embodied the principle of "independent opposition", a principle upon which the Parnellites laid great emphasis during the election campaign. Indeed they had clung tenaciously to this policy since the death of Parnell and it may truly be said to have been the rock upon which split all attempts at compromise in the interval. It was therefore essential for the continued existence of the Parnellites as a political force that they should receive confirmation of this policy from the constituencies. Since only nine Parnellites were returned to Parliament, the appeal of this programme cannot be said to have been widespread; but wherever Parnellites were numerous their

1. Irish Times, 1 July 1892.

conventions laid down the course of future Parliamentary action in words similar to those used by the Waterford convention: "We hereby declare our renewed and continued allegiance to the principles of independent political action both in and out of Parliament."¹

It was almost axiomatic that, given this principle, the Parnellites would adopt a much more critical attitude towards the imminent Home Rule Bill. Parnellite distrust of the Liberal party - or indeed of any other English party - was extreme and the same Convention at Waterford spoke for Parnellism as a whole when it demanded an "adequate" Home Rule bill which would include the control by an Irish Parliament of the police, the judiciary and of the land question. For the rest, the various Parnellite Conventions demanded of their candidates, ^dpledges to support in whatever way they could the causes of the evicted tenants and of the artisans and labourers, and also to work for the release of political prisoners.

The mandate given to the Nationalist majority by the county Conventions placed Home Rule in the forefront but, as reports of these Conventions reveal, other questions also were agitating the minds of the constituents. Indeed the resolutions of these Conventions were often severely practical in tone, regarding Home Rule as an objective worthy of all endeavour, but at the same time inserting demands to be satisfied if the Home Rule Bill were rejected. Since the Conventions represented the opinion of the country at large, their resolutions provided the essential background against which must be placed the Parliamentary record of the majority party. The issues raised at these ^Cconventions cannot be

1. Irish Daily Independent, 20 June 1892.

better illustrated than by quoting at length the resolutions passed by the ^Convention for South and East Tipperary,¹ resolutions which were typical of those passed at similar conventions all over the country. It was resolved:-

(1) "That we, the delegates appointed by our respective branches of the National Federation, now in convention assembled, do hereby renew our confidence in the Irish Parliamentary Party who remained faithful to their pledges."²

(2) "That as history shows no example of a divided nation ever obtaining its freedom and as the past records of our land indubitably attest the baneful effects which follow in the wake of a divided people, and as even now unscrupulous politicians do not hesitate to make an attempt to perpetuate internecine strife, we now from the heart of the premier country, appeal to the Irish people everywhere at this most crucial period of our country's struggle, to drive out the fiend of strife from amongst them, and, rallying all their forces under the banner of the National Federation, cease not their efforts until the nation's hopes are fully realised.

(3) "That the cause of the Irish tenants is one which appeals to the hearts of the Irish people and that no settlement shall be deemed satisfactory which does not include in its details the reinstatement of our wounded brethren beneath their own rooftrees."

1. Freeman's Journal, 10 June, 1892.

2. A reference to the pledge taken by all Irish members "to sit, act, and vote with the Irish Parliamentary Party," a pledge now ignored by the Parnellites.

(4) "That the cause of the artisans and labourers of Ireland to reap the full rewards of their skill and industry is one eminently calculated to enlist our warmest sympathies, and we hereby pledge ourselves to give it our fullest support."

(5) "That we again reiterate our demand for a general amnesty to all political prisoners now confined in England."

The programme outlined in these resolutions is a concise summary of the objectives of the Parliamentary Party at this period. As might be expected, in view of the imminence of Home Rule, the emphasis is laid first of all upon unity. The conception of unity embodied here, however, would not have been likely to attract the "unscrupulous politicians" reproached in the second Resolution, for it was preceded by a declaration of faith in the Anti-Parnellite Party. Then followed three resolutions calling attention to the three most urgent causes for which the constituencies demanded the action of the Party. The third of these was the plea for the release of political prisoners, particularly those who had been imprisoned for long periods. It was, as we shall see, urged periodically by the Irish Members in Parliament and was eventually successful. The other two Resolutions dealt with social problems. That referring to the Evicted Tenants had a special application to those who had been evicted under the Plan of Campaign. The resolution commending the cause of labourers and artisans was a logical extension of the plea for social amelioration; if the tenant class was to benefit, there was no reason

why the labouring class also should not agitate for better conditions of life. All these causes were faithfully presented by the Irish Party to the House of Commons on very many occasions, and the problems of the Evicted Tenants and of the labourers were still being debated 15 years later.

Such was the background to the Parliamentary action of the various Irish Parties. Stripped of the various supplementary objectives which each party sought to build into its programme, the issue in 1892 emerges as being, above all else, the question of Home Rule. To the grant of Home Rule the Unionists were inexorably opposed and the Anti-Parnellites fanatically devoted. Between them stood the Parnellites, eager for Home Rule no doubt, but still suspicious of the good intentions of English Liberalism.

II. The Issues in 1895.

The intensity with which the various Irish parties had fought for and against Home Rule in 1892 contrasts very strongly with ^{the} an almost aimless character of the struggle of 1895. It was as if Home Rule had been a magnet which attracted and held rigid the energies of Irish politicians; when the magnet was removed these energies swung away from concentration on a single purpose and ranged over the whole field of controversy presented by the Ireland of 1895. This is particularly true of the Anti-Parnellite Party. In 1892 they had pinned their faith to the Liberal party and, despite the resignation of Gladstone in 1894, they had continued to support his successors. The Liberal majority had been composed of a heterogenous mass of frequently antipathetic units and its variegated composition had been its undoing. This diversity of

opinion was clearly reflected in the electoral campaign of 1895. Lord Rosebery declared the issue of the election to be the question of the House of Lords, John Morley asserted it to be Home Rule, and Sir William Harcourt was prepared to appeal to the country on the much vexed question of the Local Veto.¹

Since their recent allies were thus divided in their counsels it is not surprising that the Anti-Parnellites themselves faced the campaign of 1895 with a confused programme. This confusion was increased, as we have seen, by the bitter rivalry which prevailed between the two sections of the party. Indeed, so largely did this issue of Healy versus Dillon bulk in the summer of 1895 that nowhere in the Anti-Parnellite press can there be found any clear-cut programme which the party was prepared to place before the electors. The Freeman's Journal, it is true, observed that: "Home Rule, Land Reform and justice to the Evicted Tenants are all in the balance."² But, although these objectives were all dear to Irish Nationalists the Anti-Parnellites in 1895 appeared to have no solution of the problems.

Nor were the constituencies a much better guide to public opinion during this election. In 1892 convention after convention had directed the attention of candidates to the urgent needs of the evicted tenants and of the artisans and labourers as well as reaffirming their enthusiasm for Home Rule. In 1895 no such unanimity was evident. The rivalry of Healy and Dillon ran through almost every constituency and, even where it did not obtrude, there was the rivalry of Parnellite and Anti-Parnellite to take its place. The general tenour of the resolutions passed by

1. These speeches are reported in the Annual Register, 1895, pp. 148, 150, 151 respectively

2. F.J. 26 June 1895.

conventions in 1895 may be judged by the following summary of three resolutions passed by the Carlow Convention.

(1) Delegates deplored the prevailing disunion and regretted that the Party had not summoned a National Convention.

(2) They reaffirmed their hostility towards Parnellism.

(3) They commented on the undue partiality of the Freeman's Journal.¹

As may be seen from the references to a National Convention and to the Freeman's Journal, this convention was Healyite in its sympathies, but, *mutatis mutandis*, it might equally well have been Dillonite in its pre-occupation with internal strife. Meanwhile, in the midst of this bickering, the broader interests of the country at large, the problems which awaited solution on every side, were momentarily obscured. Thus it was that the Anti-Parnellites, when returned to Westminster in 1895, were further removed than ever from the disciplined machine fashioned and controlled by Parnell ten years earlier.

The Parnellites presented an altogether more coherent programme to the electors. Time and again they reaffirmed their principle of "independent opposition" but, with characteristic realism, recognised that a change of government could be turned to Ireland's advantage. Thus the Parnellite newspaper wrote early in the campaign, - "We decline to regard the Conservative party as the bitterest enemies of Ireland."² The newspaper went on to point out that it was the Conservatives who had passed Catholic Emancipation and the only workable Land Acts, and who had endeavoured to give Ireland adequate railways. In the

1. F.J., 5 July 1895.

2. Irish Daily Independent, 26 June, 1895 (henceforth listed as Irish Independent.)

following issue the leading article again contained a similar statement:- "We think the hour has come for the friends of Ireland, Conservatives as well as real Nationalists, to understand one another."¹ There was no inconsistency in the Parnellite attitude, for their inclination towards the Conservatives was in inverse ratio to their distrust of the Liberals and did not in any way connote an alliance with the Conservatives. However, they were prepared to support any party which made a genuine effort to ameliorate the condition of Ireland, and the opportunist policy which they were prepared to pursue in Parliament was foreshadowed by Redmond in an interview in London when he stated that he did not think that the settlement of the land question or of education would be prejudicial^{ed} by the change of government.² The Parnellites, he implied, were ready to concentrate upon the social legislation which might be forthcoming from the new government and, for the moment, to recognise that Home Rule was not a practicable proposition. Indeed, when the election was over, they stated bluntly that - - - "the verdict of the polls has not been against Home Rule - because Home Rule has not been before the people."³ The programme of the Parnellites was therefore simple; they were to preserve a cool detachment withholding support when they pleased and sustaining the government if and whenever it should introduce legislation beneficial to Ireland.

The drift of opinion in England during the last months of the Liberal government had shown that a Conservative victory was very probable in the new election; the Irish Unionists were, therefore, content to hold their own

1. Irish Independent, 27 June 1895.

2. Ibid, 28 June, 1895

3. Ibid., 30 July, 1895.

without making any wide bid for popularity. None the less, like the Parnellites, they too realised that the fundamental issue of the 1895 election was not Home Rule. The interest of Ireland in the immediate future lay in the improvement of her social condition, above all in a new approach to the land question. If any issue could be said to dominate the election of 1895, it was the problem of the land. In this matter the Unionists showed themselves to be, on the whole, of a conciliatory temper. T.W. Russell, an acknowledged champion of the Ulster tenants assured his constituents that the Unionists would bring in a new Land Bill safeguarding tenants improvements and also that:- "The Unionist Government believed as strongly in Land Purchase as he did."¹ At the same meeting he hinted that the Poor Law might be reformed in the near future and even suggested the possibility of some form of old age pensions. The Unionist Press forbore to follow him into these speculations, but it did admit that:- "If there is anything clear and indisputable it is that a reactionary policy on the land question is a simple impossibility."² Thus Unionists and Parnellites alike had, for the moment, replaced the question of Home Rule by that of the economic problems confronting Ireland.

III. The Issue in 1900.

The Irish Times spoke for all parties when it declared: "There has not been a General Election for at least half a century which has been as little concerned with matters which affect Ireland."³ It was indeed true that the Election of 1900 - familiarly known as the

1. Daily Express, 11 July, 1895.
 2. Ibid., 13 July 1895.
 3. Irish Times, 20 Sept. 1900.

"Khaki Election" - was on all sides regarded as an appeal to the country to approve the foreign policy of the Unionist Ministry - in particular the conduct of the South African War. The Unionist Government had attempted little - except possibly its Education Bills - that was controversial in the domestic field. In Ireland, the supporters of that Government had in some cases - e.g. Sir Horace Plunkett - identified themselves enthusiastically with the policy of improving Irish local conditions which was popularly known as "killing Home Rule with kindness". On the other hand, the extreme right wing of Irish Unionism regarded this tendency with abhorrence and, as we have seen,¹ they succeeded in securing the defeat of Plunkett in S. Dublin. Their viewpoint was one of uncompromising conservatism and they regarded the questions of the hour - whether concerned with the land or with the establishment² of a Roman Catholic University - with unconcealed hostility.

The opposite wing of the Unionist Party was led by T. W. Russell and, as in 1895, it saw in the land question, the primary issue of the election. The attitude of this section towards the land problem could not but be disturbing, for it embraced the conception of compulsory sale and regarded the ultimate abolition of landlordism with equanimity. This was the burden of a very important speech made by Russell at Clogher, during his election campaign. The speech gained added significance because Russell was at that time a member of the Government.³ Although it was stressed that he spoke for himself alone, yet his remarks had a wide influence and although the

1. See above, Section in Analysis of the General Election of 1900.

2. The most consistent statement of this viewpoint is to be found in the files of the Daily Express during September 1900.

3. Irish Times, 21 Sept. 1900.

subsequent Land Conference of 1902 did not fully implement his views, yet the concessions made by the landlords at that gathering, indicated how far the more liberal of the Unionists had progressed from the strictest Conservative orthodoxy.

The Irish Unionists were thus able to present no clear-cut programme to the electors. One section declared its intention to follow the Government in its present beneficial course; the other was frankly hostile. This dualism in the Irish Unionist attitude was to recur constantly in the Irish debates during the next 5 years and was to complicate the task of the Government considerably.

It may be recalled that, at the 1895 Election, the Anti-Parnellite majority had presented virtually no coherent programme to the electorate and that this was in sharp contrast to the Election of 1892 where, although Home Rule was the dominant issue, other definitive resolutions had been passed by the County Conventions on such questions as the land, the Evicted Tenants and amnesty for political prisoners. The rise of the United Irish League which, as we have seen, resulted in a reorganisation of the electoral machinery of the re-united Nationalist Party, also helped to bring about the enunciation of a definite policy to be placed before the country. This programme was outlined at the important National Convention which met in Dublin on 19 and 20 June 1900, the same Convention which marked the emergence of the United Irish League as "the recognised official successor of the Land League and the National League."¹ The League and the Party were now to be regarded as two aspects of a single whole. The League "became the propounder of policy"² and the Party the chief instrument in the attainment of that policy. The details of policy were now formulated and

1. Freeman's Journal, 20 June 1900.

For Note 2, see back.

subsequent Land Conference of 1902 did not fully implement his views, yet the concessions made by the landlords at that gathering, indicated how far the more liberal of the Unionists had progressed from the strictest Conservative orthodoxy.

The Irish Unionists were thus able to present no clear-cut programme to the electors. One section declared its intention to follow the Government in its present beneficial course; the other was frankly hostile. This dualism in the Irish Unionist attitude was to recur constantly in the Irish debates during the next 2 years and was to complicate the task of the Government considerably.

It may be recalled that, at the 1895 Election, the Anti-Federalist majority had presented virtually no coherent programme to the electorate and that this was in sharp contrast to the Election of 1892 where, although Home Rule was the dominant issue, other definitive resolutions had been passed by the County Conventions on such questions as the Land, the Evicted Tenants and emergency for political prisoners. The rise of the United Irish League which, as we have seen, resulted in a reorganisation of the electoral machinery of the re-united Nationalist Party, also helped to bring about the emanation of a definite policy to be placed before the country. This programme was outlined at the important National Convention which met in Dublin on 19 and 20 June 1900, the same Convention which marked the emergence of the United Irish League as "the recognised official successor of the Land

Note 2

The phrase is used in a letter to the present writer from Mr. J.P. Hayden. It should, of course, be remembered that the Party leaders were also the principal figures in the League.

whole. The League "became the repository of policy" and the Party the chief instrument in the attainment of that policy. The details of policy were now formulated

put forward as the issues of the Election from the Nationalist viewpoint. They were ranged under the following heads:-

- (1) Full National Self-government for Ireland.
- (2) Abolition of landlordism "by a universal and compulsory system of purchase of the landlord's interest; and the re-instatement of tenants evicted in connection with the land war.
- (3) Putting an end to periodical famine and distress in the West by abolishing the grazier monopoly.
- (4) The appropriation to strictly Irish uses of £3 million a year, being the estimated excess of taxation endured by Ireland.
- (5) Complete educational equality for Catholics "including the establishment and endowment of an university."
- (6) The compulsory extension throughout Ireland of the law for providing agricultural labourers with cottages and one-acre allotments.
- (7) The present iniquitous system of ground-rents and terminable leases in towns to be abolished.
- (8) Abolition of the right of the Crown to challenge of organic jurors in political cases, unless for cause shown; and with this, the repeal of the Treason Felony Act "which seeks to confound political practical offences with ordinary crime."
- (9) The securing of the election of County (and Borough) Councils which "will represent the determination of the Nationalists of the country never to be content with less than Mr. Gladstone's measure of Home Rule as a minimum", and which will assemble once a year in a National Council to agitate for:-

1. See Freeman's Journal, 21 June, 1880.

- by the
 1/. Control of the police by the people's represent-
 atives.
- ii/. Transfer to County Councils of any funds allocated
 to Ireland for the development of agriculture and
 fisheries.
- iii/. Transaction of Irish Private Bill legislation in
 Ireland.
- iv/- The right of Rural District and County Councils
 to agitate for the use of public labour on the
 land.
- v/. Removal of interference by the Local Government
 Board in County Council decisions.
- vi/. Conferring on County Councils all other powers
 enjoyed by other similar bodies in Great
 Britain.

(10) A national agreement for the use of Irish manu-
 facturers.

(11) The preservation of the Gaelic language. ¹

(4) It is obvious that this programme far transcended
 the limits of a mere election manifesto. It was rather in
 the nature of a Nationalist Charter setting out the broad
 scope of the Irish demand as it had developed over 30 years
 of organised Parliamentary action. But, with the statement
 of the great issues was interwoven a series of protests on
 lesser grievances which were capable of immediate and
 practical alleviation. Clauses 1 and 2 for example set out
 the two demands which formed the two pillars of the whole
 Irish movement - the land and Home Rule. Clause 3 reflects
 the origins of the League in the grass lands of Mayo and
 the rural... Clause 4 was designed to enlist all that enthusiasm for
 compensation which had been aroused among all Irish parties

1. See Freeman's Journal, 21 June, 1900.

by the Report of the Financial Commission in 1896. Clause 5 ventilated another major problem - that of University education for Roman Catholics. Clauses 6,7 and 8 were pre-eminently practical and Clause 9 reflected the first stirrings of the spirit of self-government conjured up by the Local Government Act of 1898. Clauses 10 and 11 reverted again to topics of general importance to Ireland.

This emphasis upon the practical made the programme a particularly valuable one for the Irish Party because it allowed them to approach the many sided Irish problem - if they wished to do so - in a methodical manner, and to make each concession the spring-board for the next assault. The effect created in the country at large by this clarification of the issues was eminently satisfactory. A new mood of enthusiasm swept the country and it seemed - for a moment at least - as if faction had died.

(4) The Issues in 1906.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the General Election of 1906 is the fact that it was fought in Great Britain and in Ireland respectively on essentially different issues. In Great Britain there were many issues to confuse the minds of the voters and, according to one source, Home Rule was among the least of these:-

"It was long disputed which of all these issues was really most prominent in the minds of the electors.

Probably the first place must be given, especially in the rural constituencies, to the fiscal question in its most elementary terms, with 'Chinese Slavery' next, and then the modification of the Education Act of 1902; while

1
 it is improbable the Home Rule lost the Ministry many votes.¹
 The various electoral addresses and speeches in the New Year indicated this trend. Joseph Chamberlain, it is true, charged the Liberals with being dependent on Irish votes, and A.J. Balfour feared the re-introduction of Home Rule as a companion to Welsh Disestablishment and the destruction of voluntary schools, but there is nothing to indicate that the majority of English Unionists regarded the Irish question as of the first importance in 1906.
 2
 Nor did the Liberal spokesmen offer much ground of suspicion on this matter. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's address - issued on 6 January - contained no promise of Home Rule, Asquith, speaking at Huddersfield on 8 January, avoided the subject, and Sir Henry Fowler, at Wolverhampton on 12 January, actually asserted that the Government would not use a majority obtained for Free Trade to introduce a Home Rule Bill.³

In Ireland, on the other hand, the question of Home Rule dominated the political stage almost to the exclusion of all other issues. The reason for this is to be found in Campbell-Bannerman's speech at Stirling on 23 November 1905, where he declared that the Liberals were in favour of a measure of self-government for Ireland provided it was "consistent with and leading up to the larger policy." The significance of this phrase was not generally realised at the time, for it was not known that almost exactly the same words had been used by Campbell-Bannerman in an interview with John Redmond; the Liberal

-
1. Annual Register, 1906, p.2.
 2. They were now the Government actually in power, Balfour having resigned in December 1905.
 3. These views are all summarised in Annual Register, 1906, pp. 2-4.

leader had further declared that he was "stronger than ever for Home Rule."¹ Almost equally important was his assertion that he "felt quite independent of the Rosebery crowd," an assertion justified when at intervals during November 1905, the younger Liberals - Asquith, Grey, Haldane and Bryce, signified their agreement with the Stirling speech.

The Nationalists had thus some justification for excitement and the Unionists were quick to realise the danger. Very early in the campaign the Irish Times was urging that "the question put most prominently before the country is the maintenance of the Union."² The Unionists recognised also that their position could be undermined as effectually by a "step-by-Step policy" of Home Rule as by more direct methods, and throughout December 1905 the official organs of the Party constantly reiterated the hostility of Unionists to any scheme resembling Devolution.

This attitude of unqualified resistance to any form of Home Rule was the main plank of the Irish Unionist platform and its public avowal was the *raison d'etre* of the two demonstrations held in Belfast and Dublin respectively. However, in speeches and addresses to their constituents, individual members showed their awareness that other issues also were at stake. The land question occupied them ^{greatly} - especially the Ulster members. Most would have subscribed to C.C. Craig's remark that "almost all the Unionist members are pledged to compulsory sale" and most also would probably have agreed with him in his

-
1. See D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, p.115, and also below, the Section on Irish Members in Parliament, 1900-5.
 2. Irish Times, 16 December 1905.

view that it would not be necessary in view of the success of the Land Act of 1903.¹ Apart from these two major issues the Unionists members pledged themselves to support temperance legislation, and measures for the compensation of Town Tenants and for the protection of Irish cattle from foreign imports. Finally, they promised a rigid hostility to any project for the establishment of a new University for the convenience of Roman Catholics.²

When we turn to consider the specific issues on which the Nationalists went to the country, the full extent of the cleavage of opinion between the two major parties in Ireland is immediately apparent. Following the precedent of 1900, a National Convention was summoned and met in Dublin in December 1905. A series of Resolutions defining Nationalist policy were promulgated by this body; these Resolutions dealt with the following points:-³

- (1) Redmond's Home Rule motion of Feb. 1905 was reiterated. The Resolution concluded in the following terms:- --"we hereby solemnly assert that no new system of Government for Ireland will be accepted as satisfactory, or will prove effective, except a Legislative Assembly, freely elected and representative of the people, with power to make laws for Ireland, and an Executive Government responsible to the Assembly.

And this Convention declares that the Irish Nationalist Party cannot enter into alliance with, or give permanent support to any English party of Government, which does not make the question of granting such an Assembly and Executive to Ireland, a cardinal point in its programme."

1. Belfast Newsletter, 5 January, 1906.
 2. See the addresses printed in Belfast Newsletter, 10 Jan. 1906.
 3. Freeman's Journal, 6 Dec. 1905.

(2) The unity of the Party and the authority of the League were reaffirmed. Any proposals of Conference with any other groups in Ireland were condemned.

(3) A series of Resolutions condemned the Land Act of 1903 and demanded a new measure embodying compulsory purchase and the abolition of the zones.

(4) The distribution of untenanted land in the West was demanded.

(5) The Party was urged to secure an Evicted Tenants Act in the next Parliament.

(6) The need was expressed for an Act providing Agricultural Labourers' Cottages.

(7) The demand for a Town Tenants' Bill was also voiced.

(8) The thanks of the Nationalist movement were to be conveyed to the Irish abroad for their support and encouragement.

(9) The abandonment of coercion was urged.

(10) A Roman Catholic University for Ireland was demanded, together with a general overhaul of Irish education as a whole.

- - - - -

Such were the concrete and comprehensive demands of Irish Nationalism. The procedure was somewhat reminiscent of that of 1892. At that time Home Rule had undoubtedly been the dominant issue, but it had been reinforced by the demand for subsidiary

reforms. So with the National Convention of 1906. After making an elaborate plea for Home Rule, it set forth a number of specific issues on which Parliamentary action was invited e. g. the land question, the Labourers' Dwellings and Town Tenants questions and the University question.¹ The contrasts with the Unionist position are obvious, and even on the two issues upon which there appeared to be a measure of agreement - the land question and the Town Tenants question - the subsequent debates in Parliament revealed fundamental divergences. This speech at the Albert Hall on 10 December 1905, but it was not the primary issue for Great Britain.

This speech was a very important one for Ireland and its pre-history requires some explanation. The position of the Irish Party had become very difficult during 1905. The Liberal promises of an advance towards self-government, made during the Election of 1904, had not borne fruit; instead, the Liberals had become involved in deadly conflict with the House of Lords. The measure which precipitated open warfare was Lloyd-George's Budget of 1906. In Ireland, the Budget, with its new taxes on the liquor trade, was extremely unpopular and the Irish Party had striven throughout the summer, with only varying success, to obtain concessions for Ireland. Then, in November, the House of Lords rejected the Finance Bill and Redmond was forced to decide whether, in view of the imminent dissolution of Parliament, he would support the Liberals together with

1. For the electoral speeches and addresses of the leading English statesmen see Annual Register 1909 pp. 264-7.

1. For the electoral speeches and addresses of the leading English Statesmen see Annual Register 1909, pp. 264-7.

(5) The Issue in 1910.

Even in 1906, as we have seen, the issue for Ireland had been recognised by Nationalists and Unionists alike to have been the repeal or maintenance of the Union. In 1910 the issue stood out above all others more clearly than ever. But if this is true of Ireland, it is not so true of Great Britain. There the primary issue was undoubtedly the question of the Veto of the House of Lords, though other important issues crowded close behind it, e.g. Imperial Defence and Free Trade versus Tariff Reform.¹ It is perfectly true that Home Rule was an issue and it was referred to as such by the Liberal Premier, Asquith, in a speech at the Albert Hall on 10 December 1909, but it was not the primary issue for Great Britain.

This speech was a very important one for Ireland and its pre-history requires some explanation. The position of the Irish Party had become very difficult during 1909. The Liberal promises of an advance towards self-government, made during the Election of 1906, had not borne fruit; instead, the Liberals had become involved in deadly conflict with the House of Lords. The measure which precipitated open warfare was Lloyd-George's Budget of 1909. In Ireland, the Budget, with its new taxes on the liquor trade, was extremely unpopular and the Irish Party had striven throughout the summer, with only varying success, to obtain concessions for Ireland. Then, in November, the House of Lords rejected the Finance Bill and Redmond was forced to decide whether, in view of the imminent dissolution of Parliament, he would support the Liberals together with

1. For the electoral speeches and addresses of the leading English Statesmen see Annual Register 1909, pp. 264-7.

their obnoxious Budget, or abandon them. If he was to support them he must have some definite assurance that Home Rule would follow the abolition of the Lords' Veto. Such was the burden of a letter written by him to Lord Morley, for Cabinet perusal:-

" The political conditions in Ireland are such that, unless an official declaration on the question of Home Rule be made, not only will it be impossible for us to support Liberal candidates in England, but we will most unquestionably have to ask our friends to vote against them."¹

This letter brought a reply from Augustine Birrell, then Chief Secretary: "Complete agreement as to necessity for a declaration ---- it is to be made plain that Home Rule is the live policy of the Party without limitation or restriction other than the old tag about the supreme control of the Imperial Parliament."² This declaration was then made by Asquith in the speech to which we have referred, when he said: " --- the solution of the problem can only be found in one way, by a policy which, while explicitly safeguarding the supreme and indefeasible authority of the Imperial Parliament, will set up in Ireland a system of full self-government, in regard to purely Irish affairs -- . In the new House of Commons the hands of a Liberal Government, and of a Liberal majority will [in this matter]³ be entirely free."

This was the declaration for which Redmond had been seeking and, at a great meeting in Dublin a few days later, he carried the following Resolution: "That we have

-
1. D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, pp. 166-7.
 2. Ibid. p. 168.
 3. Freeman's Journal, 11 December 1909.

read with great satisfaction the statement made by the Prime Minister on Friday last, that full self-government for Ireland in all Irish affairs is the policy of the Liberal party, and that the Liberal party claims a mandate from the electorate to deal with the Irish question as soon as the Veto of the House of Lords is cleared out of the road.¹

For Redmond and his followers, secure in the knowledge of the negotiations outlined above, the safeguards for Home Rule seemed adequate enough. It was natural that the other parties in Ireland, with less knowledge of the facts should view the situation differently. William O'Brien, for example, was convinced that the Irish Party had sacrificed Irish interests by supporting a Liberal Budget which they knew to be harmful to Ireland without sufficient guarantees for Home Rule. For him, therefore, the hardship imposed upon Ireland by the Budget was the issue which overwhelmed all others, and his Election campaign was based upon this belief.² The Unionists also concentrated their attacks upon the Budget, pouring scorn upon the Liberal promise of Home Rule. Their attitude was tersely summarised by the Irish Times when, in a leading article, it described Redmond's price for a problematical Home Rule as being:

"... the amalgamation of the Nationalist party with the Liberal party; the abandonment of fiscal reform for Ireland; the acceptance 'unaltered, unmodified and unamended in any particular', of a Budget which increases our annual taxation by £2,000,000."³ None the less, however much the Unionists

1. Freeman's Journal, 15 December 1909.

2. The principal instrument for the propagation of his views was the newspaper, the Cork Accent, which he founded in January 1910 for this specific purpose.

3. Irish Times, 16 Dec. 1909.

might direct attention to the details of the Budget in order to weaken the popularity of the Nationalists, the imminence of Home Rule was a fact very clearly realised among them, as may be seen from the speeches of individual candidates,¹ the manifesto of the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association and the remarks of Walter Long and others at a great Unionist rally held in Belfast under the auspices² of the Ulster Unionist Council.

The result of the General Election showed that the two great English parties were almost numerically equal and that, in consequence, the Irish Party occupied a position of virtual dictatorship. Redmond was in a position to press the Liberals hard and in an important speech at Liverpool on 20 March 1910 he declared: "With us the question of the Veto is the supreme issue. With us it means Home Rule for Ireland."³ The Budget was shortly introduced and passed through the House of Commons. The final crisis seemed at hand when, suddenly, King Edward VII died and a hush fell upon the controversy. Soon after this the two great parties met in Conference on the constitutional issue. The Conference continued until November 1910, but when its failure was finally announced there was no alternative to another General Election. It is suggested by Lord Newton that the Conservatives broke off the Conference because they could not agree to the Liberal determination to pass Home Rule.⁴ However this may be, it is certain that, in responsible quarters, Home Rule was recognised as a major

1. e.g. that of Capt. Bryan Cooper in S. Dublin, who admitted that Home Rule rather than the Budget was the primary issue in Ireland - Irish Times, 9 Dec. 1909.

2. Irish Times, 5 Jan. 1910.

3. Quoted in D. Gwynn, *op. cit.* pp. 173-4.

4. Lord Newton: Lord Lansdowne, pp. 401-4.

5. Irish Times, 10 Nov. 1910.

issue in December 1910. One observer commented: "The contest ... was probably not much affected by any issue but the Veto, Tariff Reform and Home Rule." ¹ The Nationalist viewpoint was clearly stated in the Manifesto of the United Irish League:-

"For the first time the cause of Home Rule is the cause of democratic freedom in Great Britain. In the present struggle the liberties of Ireland and of the masses of the British people are alike involved. The one obstacle standing between Ireland and her just demand for the right of self-government is the Veto power of the House of Lords. If the House of Lords is defeated, the path to Home Rule is open and clear." ²

The Unionists too recognised the clarity of the issue and made no secret of their intention to oppose Home Rule at any cost. The Irish Times stated the situation in terms very similar to those of the United Irish League Manifesto, though from a very different viewpoint:-

"Everybody knows that the dissolution has been forced by Mr. Redmond and that the House of Lords is being attacked ³ only ⁴ because it stands in the way of Home Rule."

Coherent expression was given to Unionist sentiment at a largely attended rally held in Belfast, where Resolutions to the following effect were passed:-

- (1) Ulster "will not have Home Rule."
- (2) The Union had made Ireland prosperous.
- (3) The United Irish League was to be regarded as an object of special distrust.

1. Annual Register, 1910. p. 249.
 2. Freeman's Journal, 30 Nov. 1910.
 3. An assumption which would certainly not have been accepted in England.
 4. Irish Times, 10 Nov. 1910.

- (4) The attempt to disguise Home Rule under an attack on the Veto was denounced.
- (5) The present attack on the Lords was regarded in Ulster as equivalent to a demand for a Single Chamber.
- (6) The British electorate was asked to reject the Liberals.
- (7) The firm attitude of 1886 and 1892 ^{was} ~~is~~ reasserted.

Illogical and irrelevant some of these Resolutions may have been, but there was no mistaking the uncompromising hatred of Home Rule which underlay the Unionist declarations. Equally ardent in support of Home Rule were the Nationalists, confident of the support of the Liberals. Thus, at the end of 1910, the lines of cleavage had been drawn beyond any possibility of confusion, and Unionists and Nationalists stood face to face in unconcealed hostility. The fundamental divergences, always implicit in Irish politics, but somewhat obscured latterly by the obtrusion of other issues, were once more stated explicitly with a clarity which had only been matched in 1886 and 1892.

P A R T II

THE PERSONNEL OF THE IRISH PARTIES.

pp100-158

1. Age and Experience of Members. pp. pp.102-109

2. Education of Members pp.109-118

3. The Occupations of Members. pp.118-130

4. Members and their Constituencies. pp.131-137

5. Payment of Nationalist Members. pp.138-155

6. Two Contrasting Types of Representation. pp.155-158

We have just completed a survey of the electioneering aspect of Irish Parliamentary Representation, and presently we shall consider the activities of the different Irish Parties in Parliament itself. Between these two studies we now place a third - the study of the social environment of the Members, whether Unionist or Nationalist, together with an examination of the amount of change within each party and the rate at which that change took place. For convenience, these various aspects have been ranged under the following heads:-

1. Age and Experience of Members.

2. Education of Members.

3. Occupation of Members.

1892

43.52

45.69

1895

4. 4 Members and their Constituencies.

1900

43.80

30.40

1906

40.27

73.77

1910

6. 5 Two Contrasting Types of Representation.

The term 'Nationalist' includes all Irish Home Rule Members (except 1 Liberal) i.e. it includes Parnellites and anti-Parnellites in 1892 and 1895, and Independent Nationalists as well as Party Members in 1900. Similarly, the term 'Unionist' includes Liberal Unionists and Conservatives.

The biographical details in this section are taken from Deb. Parliamentary and THE IRISH PARLIAMENT, each for the appropriate year.

1. Age and Experience of Members.¹

In determining the average age of the Irish Members of each party the following method has been used. On six occasions during the period 1891 - 1914 there were General Elections i.e. in 1892, 1895, 1900, 1906 and January and December, 1910. On these occasions the Irish Parties underwent a general reshuffle and the ages of Members have been reckoned at each of these dates when the re-shuffle was complete. Since there were two elections in 1910 one average has been struck for the year 1910 as a whole. The averages can be expressed in the following Table:-

TABLE 1.

	<u>Nationalist Average</u>	<u>Unionist Average.</u>
1892	43. 52	46.65
1895	47. 03	51.00
1900	45. 80	50.40
1906	40. 25	53.57
1910	50. 30	50.91

The term 'Nationalist' includes all Irish Home Rule Members (except 1 Liberal) i.e. it includes Parnelites and Anti-Parnelites in 1892 and 1895, and Independent Nationalists as well as Party Members in 1910. Similarly, the term 'Unionist' includes Liberal Unionists with Conservatives.

¹ The biographical details in this section are taken from: Dod, Parliamentary Companion and Thom's Irish Directory, each for the appropriate years.

These figures do not show any very marked trends over the whole period. For example, it might have been expected that in those years where there was the greatest numerical change in a Party's membership there would be a drop in the average age, due to the retirement of some old members and the entry of new and fresher men. Such, particularly, might have been the expected result in the Nationalist party of 1900 for it was in that year that there was the greatest emphasis upon the need for younger and fresher men and when, in fact, there was an entry of 38 new Members. Yet the Nationalist average was 45.8, the third highest in the whole period. It is impossible, therefore, to draw any safe deductions from the figures of either party - if considered in isolation.

There are, however, two conclusions to be drawn if the two sets of figures are considered as a whole. One is the youthfulness of the Irish Members, irrespective of party. The House of Commons of the Edwardian era did, it is true to say, produce a number of young men of the first rank, but the average Member was still probably nearer 60 than 40. Compared with this, both Irish parties presented a very low average. The second conclusion is that the Nationalists had a consistently lower average than the Unionists. Only once did the former go as high as 50 and 45 represents more nearly their average for the period as a whole. Generally speaking, the Unionist Average approximated to 50 though in 1906 there was a gap of 13 years between the average ages of Nationalist and Unionist members. The difference may perhaps best be explained by the fact that the Nationalists, having so many seats to fill, were continually receiving

¹ They were roughly in the proportion of 4 to 1.

an influx of new members, while the Unionists, although they had far fewer seats to fill, controlled the majority of those seats so completely that the same members were able to sit on Parliament after Parliament, without even having to contest an election.

Consideration of the ages of Members leads naturally to a consideration of the degree of experience which existed in either Party at any given time. This too can be expressed by means of Tables. Let us take the Nationalist party of 1892 first. The Parliament elected in 1892 endured until 1895 and during that time, owing to subsequent by-elections after the General Election of 1892, 87 Nationalist Members passed through the House of Commons. Of these 87, 35 were elected during the period 1892-5, 16 were elected during the previous Parliament, i.e. during the period 1886-92, and the remainder (36) were elected up to and during the year 1885. This is illustrated together with the figures for the periods subsequent to 1895 in the following Table.

TABLE II A

THE NATIONALIST PARTY

Date of First Election.

Period	Up to 1885	1886-92	1892-5	1895-1900	1900-6	1906-10	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910	Total
1. 1892-5	36	16	35	-	-	-	-	-	87
2. 1895-1900	31	15	26	15	-	-	-	-	87
3. 1900-6	21	9	16	10	38	-	-	-	94
4. 1906-10	16	8	11	7	31	19	-	-	92
5. Jan. 1910	13	7	7	5	22	14	13	-	81
6. Dec. 1910	13	7	6	6	21	12	11	11	87

1 The party strength, of course, remained constant during

In this Table the left-hand vertical column represents the successive Parliaments during the period 1892-1910. The figures opposite each of these headings give the different degrees of experience of Parliamentary life which went to make up the Party at any given time.

From this Table several interesting facts emerge. For example, we can see that throughout the whole period there remained a considerable number of Members who had shared in the events of the Parnellite decade of 1880-90. This number was naturally largest in Period I which was closest to that era; altogether, there were 52 survivors from the Parnellite days. At the same time, some idea of the magnitude of the change which took place at the General Election of 1892 can be gathered from the fact that 35 new members were returned. Of the surviving Members from the Parnellite days 13 were elected before 1885, 23 during 1885 and 16 between 1886 and 1892. There was thus a very considerable measure of continuity - so far as personnel is concerned - between the Party of 1892 and that of 1886. Moreover, this continuity persisted throughout the entire period for in Period VI, out of a total of 87, no fewer than 20 were pre-1892 Members. It is significant that among these 20 were almost all the Nationalist leaders, whether "Independent" like T. M. Healy or William O'Brien, or "Orthodox" like John Redmond or John Dillon. Virtually the only influential Nationalist member who had not been trained in the Parnellite school was Joseph Devlin. The continued existence in the Party of these veterans must inevitably have influenced policy and strategy in a high degree. Indeed, to the very end, the official policy of the Party was one of independence of all English parties, a policy carried over from the period of Parnell's supremacy, upheld by Redmond when leader of the Parnellite minority 1891-1900 and triumphantly applied in the exciting days of

1910 when Redmond occupied a position ^{perhaps} as strong as Parnell's had ever been.

It was this predominance of the more senior members of the Party which provoked most of the contemporary criticism to which the Party was subjected. In 1892 it is hard to see how this predominance could have been avoided for the influx of 35 new members was a very heavy strain on the Party organisation and made the task of assimilation very difficult. By 1895, however, it might have been expected that the members who had been elected during Period I, would have acquired sufficient experience to admit of their being entrusted with more say in the direction of Party policy. This was far from being the case, for many of the new members had proved unsatisfactory. Thus when 15 new members were admitted in Period II (1895-1900) only 6 of the pre-1892 members retired as compared with 9 of the members elected during Period I. The reaction which set in after the Reunion of 1900 has been described elsewhere;¹ in terms of figures it resulted in a sharp decline in the number of pre-1892 members and in the entry into the Party of no less than 38 new members, the highest figure during any of the Periods with which we are concerned. The balance was altered in Period III in favour of the newer members and the pre-1892 members never recovered their numerical superiority. Their total indeed shrank steadily from 30 out of 94 in Period III to 24 out of 92 in the Period IV, and finally to 20 out of 81 and 87 respectively in Periods V and VI. Yet, as we have seen, these old and experienced members retained their control of the Party's fortunes right up to the end of our period and the fact that they continued to do this when their numerical superiority had long since disappeared, must be considered

¹

See the section on Selection of Candidates.

one of the factors which ultimately estranged so many young Irishmen from the Party and its methods.

Yet, viewed as a whole, perhaps the most striking feature of the Party figures is the way in which they were distributed so evenly over the different groups. The balance did, as we have seen, swing from the older to the newer members, but it did not do so very suddenly. The Party renewed itself gradually and no single group was ever unrepresented at any given time. Except for the two very unusual occasions of 1892 and 1900 (the first General Elections after the "split" and the Reunion respectively) the intake of new members averaged about 15 per period. This constant, quiet, and almost unnoticed replacement of members ultimately had the effect of creating a middle bloc of members half-way between the pre-1892 members and the newer ^{ones} members. This central body of members consisted mainly of men whose experience of Parliament would average about 10 years. Such men were very valuable. They had proved their reliability, else they would not have been retained, and had gained experience of Parliamentary technique which made them an excellent striking force for executing whatever tactics had been decided upon at any given time. Led by the veterans of pre-1892, reinforced from time to time by new members, they formed the third element in a Party which, even in its worst days, was by no means so contemptible as its detractors subsequently alleged.

When we turn to the Unionist Party we can devise a Table on precisely the same lines:-

TABLE 11.B

THE UNIONIST PARTY

Date of First Election.

Period	Up to 1885	1886 -92	1892 -5	1895- 1900	1900 -6	1906 -10	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910	Total
<u>I.</u> (1892 -5)	10	4	9	23
<u>II</u> (1895 -1900)	9	4	6	8	27
<u>III</u> (1900 -6)	6	2	3	7	10	.	.	.	28
<u>IV</u> (1906 -10)	4	1	2	3	7	6	.	.	23
<u>V</u> (Jan. 1910)	1	0	2	3	4	4	7	.	21
<u>VI</u> (Dec. 1910)	1	0	1	2	4	4	5	3	20

The Unionist figures are so small compared to the Nationalists' that it is difficult to generalise in the same way. However, we can see that the continuity of the Parliament 1892-5 with the preceding ones is clearly marked by the proportion of 14 pre-1892 members to ⁹ 8 new ones. In Period II this predominance of the older members was already broken and in Period III only 8 pre-1892 members remained. The number continued to shrink until in 1910 only 1 remained. That is to say that by 1910 the Party had virtually been recreated; even of the 9 new members in Period I there remained in 1910 only 1. Indeed from the Periods I - III there remained only 3 altogether in January 1910.

Two considerations are suggested by these facts. One, that the Irish Unionist Party, although the average age of its members was greater than that of the Nationalists, yet actually ended the period with a lower level of experience than did the Nationalists. In December 1910, out of a total of 20, no fewer than 12 were elected during or after 1906. The second consideration follows from the first

and it is this - that the leadership of the Unionist party shifted steadily away from the older members towards the younger. Even in 1910, as we saw when we considered the Nationalists, their leaders were almost all survivors from the pre-1892 era. None of the Unionist leaders had been members at that time. Carson was elected in 1892, William Moore in 1895; neither of these men had the same length of experience as the Nationalist leaders. These then are the principal points of contrast between Unionists and Nationalists. Where the latter preserved a strong representation of pre-1892 members, the Unionists discarded all but one of their pre-1892 members. And where the power of the Nationalist party was centred in the pre-1892 group, among the Unionists the younger men had gained control.

2. Education of Members.

Turning from the age and experience of members to their social background, we consider first the levels of education within the Irish Parties. At the outset we find that it is impossible to proceed as heretofore by means of direct comparison between Nationalists and Unionists, because amongst the Nationalists there was one group of members who had received only a National School education. For these there was no Unionist parallel. If we take the Nationalists we find the Party composed of several different groups according to the standard of education they had received. One group, as mentioned above, received only a National School Education, another received a Secondary School education, and a third consisted of men who had gone on to a University or University College. There were two

¹
The following sources have been utilised for this and subsequent sections:- Dod, Parliamentary Companion, Vacher, Parliamentary Companion. Thom's Irish Directory, Thom's Irish Who's Who, Dictionary of National Biography, Who's Who, Who Was Who 1897-1915 and 1916 - 1928.

other groups, those described in general terms as 'privately educated' and those whose education cannot be precisely ascertained. This last group exists because details of education, which are found in the sources listed in the footnote, were supplied by the members themselves and on this particular subject many were either remiss or reticent. In considering these two groups we have to decide whether they are more likely to belong to the first or to the second of the three groups we have mentioned; it is extremely unlikely that any of them should have belonged to the University group for any member whose education had been prolonged to the University stage would almost certainly have included such information among the autobiographical details in the various directories already listed. We shall, therefore, sub-divide each of the categories already mentioned (i.e. 'Private' and 'Unknown') into Private A and Private B, and Unknown A and Unknown B, A corresponding to primary education and B to secondary education. In deciding which of the dubious cases shall go into which category we must be guided by such other biographical evidence as is available - chiefly, by the occupation and subsequent career of the individual.¹ The following Table will illustrate these points:

-
1. For example - if a member described himself as privately educated and we found that he was a solicitor we should place him under the category of Private B; if a member gave no details of education but proved to be a tenant farmer we should place him under the category of Unknown A. And so as to the other individual cases.

TABLE III A. NATIONALIST EDUCATION.

Period	National School	Secondary School	University	Private A.	Private B.	Unknown A.	Unknown B.	Total
<u>I.</u> 1892-5	12	35	29	2	2	5	2	87
<u>II.</u> 1895-1900	10	34	29	3	2	5	4	87
<u>III.</u> 1900-6	10	38	28	5	3	8	2	94
<u>IV.</u> 1906-10	8	42	24	4	3	10	1	92
<u>V.</u> Jan. 1910	6	37	24	4	2	7	1	81
<u>VI.</u> Dec. 1910	5	43	23	4	2	8	2	87

NOTE: These members listed under the heading 'University' are assumed to have received a secondary education and are not included under the heading 'Secondary'. Thus, each member is listed under the final stage of his education.

The figures for the Nationalists thus obtained show several interesting trends. They establish that in any given period the largest single group consisted of those members who had received an ordinary ^{secondary} education. In Period I this group provides 35 out of a total of 87 (39 if we include the possible additions from the categories 'Private B' and 'Unknown B'). In Period IV the proportion was 46 (including possibles) out of ~~92~~⁹² i.e. 50% of the whole. In Period VI the proportion was 48 out of 87 - or rather more than 50%. Thus, the preponderance of this group remained a constant factor throughout the period as a whole.

But on either side of this middle group stood the two extremes - inadequately educated men on the one hand, university graduates on the other. The former group was surprisingly large even leaving the possible additions out of account. Those who laid claim to a simple National School education numbered 12 in Period I, 10 in each of the next two periods, 8 in Period IV and 6 and 5 in Periods V and VI respectively. And it must be remembered that some, at least, of the 'Unknowns' and the 'Privately Educated' must be attributed to this group. For example, in Period III it is possible that the figure of 10 quoted just now, might have to be increased to 23 if we were in full possession of all the facts. This may be regarded as exaggeration but it is almost certain that the number in this category in Period III exceeded 10, for this, it will be remembered, was the period of democratic revival with its insistence upon the replacement of many former members by men new, untried, and virtually unknown. From Period III onwards the effect of this influx continued to make itself felt and, although we have been careful to attribute a primary education only to those of whom we have certain knowledge, it is all too probable that the average for this category

over the whole period was much nearer 20 than 10.

by the This high proportion may be viewed in two aspects. On the one hand it could be argued that, since the educated system of the country was demonstrably at fault,¹ these men were in fact true representatives of the people and were much more in a position to understand their wants than their better educated colleagues could be. This is an arguable proposition but it is scarcely sufficient to outweigh the other argument - that so high a proportion of ill-educated members was a serious threat to the efficiency of the Party as a Parliamentary force. It is not contended here that any particular kind of education was in itself conducive to Parliamentary efficiency; the subsequent rise of the Labour Party, and the number of able yet self-educated men which it produced, would be sufficient to refute that argument. But it is true that the Parliaments of the late Victorian and Edwardian eras were still largely the preserve of University men or men of the University class. Period VI:- 14 Irish: (4 Queen's Colleges, 4 Catholic University, 2 St. John's College, Dublin, 3 Others: (2 Oxford, 2 London, 1 Cambridge, 1 Glasgow, 1 St. Andrew's, 1 Edinburgh). A member who had little or no systematic education could not fail to be at a disadvantage in an atmosphere so fundamentally different from that to which he was accustomed.²

Period VII:- 14 Irish: (4 Queen's Colleges, 4 Catholic University, 2 St. John's College, Dublin, 3 Others: (2 Oxford, 2 London, 1 Cambridge, 1 Glasgow, 1 St. Andrew's, 1 Edinburgh).

¹ See Part III below for the frequent attacks by Irish members upon the system of education in Ireland.

² It is significant that Irish members of this category never did make any great impression in Parliament.

1. As "University" we have included all training institutions recognised as secondary education by the Board of Education and approved by the Board.

2. This was

represented by

24 of the

The situation was, however, to some extent redeemed¹ by the proportion of University men among the Nationalists. This proportion remained fairly constant throughout the period. In Period I there were 29, and the same number in Period II. In Period III there were 28, in Period IV 24, in Period V 24 and ²³22 in Period VI. The following lists will give an idea of the distribution of these members among the various Universities:-

Period I:- 20 Irish: (8 Queen's Colleges, 6 T.C.D.,
5 Catholic University, 1 Maynooth)
9 Others: (3 Oxford, 2 London, 2 Germany,
1 Toronto, 1 Sandhurst).

Period II:- 18 Irish: (6 Queen's Colleges, 7 T.C.D.,
4 Catholic University, 1 Maynooth)
11 Others: (2 Oxford, 2 Cambridge, 2 London,
2 German, 2 Sandhurst, 1 Toronto)

Period III:- 19 Irish: (6 Queen's Colleges, 4 Catholic
University, 9 T.C.D.)
9 Others: (3 London, 2 Sandhurst, 1 Oxford,
1 German, 1 Toronto, 1 Quebec)

Period IV:- 16 Irish: (5 Queen's Colleges, 3 Catholic
University, 1 Maynooth, 7 T.C.D.)
8 Others: (4 Oxford, 1 London, 1 Sandhurst,
1 Toronto, 1 Quebec)

Period V:- 15 Irish: (4 Queen's Colleges, 4 Catholic
University, 7 T.C.D.)
9 Others: (3 Oxford, 2 London, 1 Cambridge,
1 Sandhurst, 1 Glasgow, 1 St.
Andrews.)

Period VI:- 14 Irish: (4 Queen's Colleges, 4 Catholic
University, 5 T.C.D., 1 University
College, Dublin ²)
9 Others: (3 Oxford, 2 London, 1 Cambridge,
1 Glasgow, 1 St. Andrews,
1 Sandhurst).

From this list it appears that Irish Universities supplied much the larger proportion of the Nationalist graduates. Of these Irish Universities the Queen's Colleges accounted for the majority together with the Catholic University; on the other hand Trinity College produced a ²higher single total than any of the others on several

1. As "Universities" we have included all colleges or other training institutions involving study beyond the limits of recognized secondary schooling. Such diverse institutions as Sandhurst and Maynooth have been included.

2. This was a very recently established body; its single representative was John Redmond's son, W. A. Redmond, aged 24 at the time of his election.

occasions - particularly in Periods III, IV and V. Of Universities other than Irish, Oxford and London were the most frequently quoted; Cambridge was evidently less popular. Very few completed their University education abroad.

On the whole, therefore, there was an even balance in the educational standards attained by Irish ^{Nationalist} members. The majority of members received an ordinary secondary education which fitted them adequately for a Parliamentary career. Below them was grouped a proportion of members who, as we have seen, were insufficiently educated and who were the most serious blemish upon the Irish Nationalist Party's membership. Finally, there was the University group. It is significant that the directors of policy, the Nationalist leaders were, under only two exceptions, University men. The exceptions were Joseph Devlin and T. M. Healy; the first was a man of undoubted ability and a recognised orator, while no one could maintain that the lack of a University education hindered the Parliamentary efficiency - one might almost say genius - of Healy.

If we turn now to the Unionist Party we find a different set of standards. True, there are still some "Privately Educated" and a few "Unknown" but it is certain that these all received a secondary education. We discard also the category of National School education. We are left therefore with four categories viz. Secondary, University, Private and Unknown. For these we can construct the following Table (see over-leaf), which will present a very different picture from that shown by the Nationalist Table.

The difference in standards, training and outlook between the educational systems of Christian Brothers Schools in Ireland and public schools in England needs little emphasis. These figures, however, reveal the patent source of the

1. Mostly in public schools.

TABLE 111 B - UNIONIST EDUCATION.

Period	Secondary School	University	Private	Unknown	Total
<u>I</u> . 1892-5	6	15	1	1	23
<u>II</u> .1895-1900	9	15	1	2	27
<u>III</u> .1900-6	10	12	3	3	28
<u>IV</u> . 1906-10	7	7	3	6	23
<u>V</u> . Jan. 1910	6	10	2	3	21
<u>VI</u> Dec.1910	6	10	1	3	20

One obvious difference between the Unionists and the Nationalists has already been mentioned - the complete absence from the Unionist party of any category even approximating to the National School category of the Nationalists. But there were other important differences as well. Among the Nationalists a secondary education implied, for all except a very few, education at Irish schools. This was not the case among the Unionists. We have not shown the following facts in the table but they serve to accentuate the difference between Unionists and Nationalists. In Period I out of a total of 21 whom we know to have been at a secondary school or a University, 12 had been to English or Scottish schools.¹ In Period II the proportion is 14 out of 24. In the third Period it is 13 out of 22. In Period IV 11 out of 14. In Period V it is 8 out of 16 and in Period VI it is 9 out of 16. Thus, during the whole period 1891-1914, the proportion of Irish Unionist members whose education was received outside Ireland was nearly always over 50% of the whole and was sometimes considerably more. The difference is atmosphere, training and outlook between the educational systems of Christian Brothers Schools in Ireland and public schools in England needs little emphasis. These figures do however reveal one patent source of the

1. Mostly to public schools.

divergent views held by Unionists and Nationalists on so many different subjects connected with Ireland.

The third striking distinction between Nationalist and Unionist educational standards lies in the very high proportion of University graduates found in the Unionist party. The proportion fluctuated it is true - it was very low in Period IV - but it averaged about 50% and was sometimes more e.g. 15 out of 23 in Period I. And the differences which we have just been tracing between Nationalist and Unionist views of secondary education repeated themselves in the sphere of University education also, though to a lesser extent. The detailed figures for Unionist University graduates are as follows:-

<u>Period I:-</u>	<u>8 Irish</u> : (7 T.C.D., 1 Queen's College, Belfast).
	<u>7 Others</u> : (6 Oxford, 1 Berlin and Brussels)
<u>Period II:-</u>	<u>9 Irish</u> : (All from T.C.D.)
	<u>6 Others</u> : (5 Oxford, 1 Berlin and Brussels)
<u>Period III:-</u>	<u>8 Irish</u> : (7 T.C.D., 1 Queen's College, Belfast).
	<u>4 Others</u> : (3 Oxford, 1 Berlin and Brussels)
<u>Period IV:-</u>	<u>5 Irish</u> : (4 T.C.D., 1 Queen's College, Belfast).
	<u>2 Others</u> : (Both Oxford)
<u>Period V:-</u>	<u>8 Irish</u> : (5 T.C.D., 3 Queen's College, Belfast).
	<u>2 Others</u> : (1 Cambridge, 1 Woolwich)
<u>Period VI:-</u>	<u>8 Irish</u> : (4 T.C.D., 4 Queen's College, Belfast).
	<u>2 Others</u> : (1 Oxford and 1 Cambridge).

It will be remembered that the Nationalists came largely from Irish Universities, and that the majority of them were students of the Catholic University or of the Queen's Colleges of Cork or Galway, though Trinity College also produced a considerable number. Amongst the Unionists also, Irish Universities predominated but the only two Universities frequented were Trinity College, Dublin and Queen's College, Belfast. It is noteworthy that the proportion of English Universities is much higher among the Unionists than among the Nationalists. Many Unionists went to Oxford but very few

to Cambridge or to the Continent. London University does not figure at all in the Unionist list, whereas several Nationalists attended it.

On the whole, examination of the two University lists confirms the evidence already gathered from a survey of the other categories. The whole tendency of Unionist education was, as we may say, outward, that of the Nationalists inward. The Unionists would be scarcely distinguishable from any other party in the House of Commons in respect of their educational background. The Nationalists, on the other hand, were quite unique in this respect; they stood absolutely apart from all other parties in the House, not merely by reason of their political views, but also by reason of their completely different educational environment.

3. The Occupations of Members.¹

(i) The Nationalist Members.

So many and varied were the occupations of the Nationalist members that it is difficult to group them all under appropriate heads. However, the following Table, constructed on a model similar to the earlier ones, will illustrate the principal occupation groups.

¹ The sources for this Section are the same as for the previous one.

TABLE IV A.

Period	Barristers	Solicitors	Doctors	Journalists	Larger Business	Local Merchants	Land-owners	Farmers	Tenant Farmers	Labour Leaders	Miscellaneous	Total
I 1892-5	16	6	7	13	9	11	6	4	4	2	9	87
II 1895-1900	14	5	7	17	6	9	8	6	4	3	8	87
III 1900-6	17	6	5	16	7	12	7	9	2	2	11	94
IV 1906-10	17	4	2	14	5	13	7	13	3	2	12	92
V Jan. 1910	16	5	2	15	1	11	6	12	3	2	8	81
VI Dec. 1910	15	8	3	13	3	13	6	10	2	3	11	87

These groupings perhaps require some explanation.

There are 11 all told and are arranged, reading from left to right under the following heads:- Barristers, Solicitors, Doctors, Journalists,¹ Larger Business, Local Merchants, Landowners, Farmers, Tenant-Farmers, Labour-Leaders and Miscellaneous. The first four groups explain themselves. The next - Larger Business - is designed to include those members who were in business on a large scale; it includes such men as J. McCann stockbroker, Samuel Young and Maj. J. E. Jameson, Whiskey distillers, E. McHugh, Linen Manufacturer, John Morrogh, former director of de Beers and later Woollen Merchant in Cork, Samuel Morris coal and timber importer and exporter - and various others. In contrast to these are the Local Merchants,² men owning shops in county towns, active in local affairs and the natural choice where local representatives were required, but, so far as occupation is concerned, in business on a much smaller scale than the previous groups.

The next three groups are agricultural and correspond to the main divisions still existing in the countryside at that time. The 'landowners' as the term is here used, were not landlords on the great scale. They rather resembled gentleman farmers and corresponded roughly to the English squire. They were differentiated from the Farmer group not so much by the amount of land they owned,³ as by the fact

¹ The term 'Journalists' is here taken to include proprietors, managers and editors as well as contributors.

² The shops were usually general stores but sometimes drapers or butchers are particularised.

³ A prosperous farmer might quite conceivably farm more land than an impoverished "landowner".

that their education was generally superior and their social standing considerably higher. The Farmer group, indeed, is not so very different from the Tenant-Farmer group; there is scarcely any social distinction. The difference is primarily economic, the Farmer having achieved that degree of independence which was the ultimate goal of the Tenant-Farmer.

Of the two remaining groups, that entitled 'Labour-Leader' is so small that it might be argued that it scarcely deserves a separate grouping. On the other hand its members were so devoted to the cause of the organisation of Irish Labour that this can truly be said to be their occupation. Two of the most prominent - Eugene Crean and Michael Austin - were respectively a carpenter and a printer's compositor, but have, none the less, been included under the "Labour-Leader" heading. Finally, the "Miscellaneous" group contains those who could not be conveniently grouped under any of the previous headings but who were not themselves sufficiently numerous to be grouped under further occupation groupings. They are, in general, either salaried workers or engaged in minor forms of business not coming within the categories we outlined above. They are for the most part insurance managers, commission agents, hotel proprietors; there were 2 civil engineers but, apart from them, none of this group approached the status of a profession. In social standing they approximated most closely to the Local Merchant group. They would rank low also in any computation of income levels, for most of them received annual allowances or "indemnities" from the Party funds.

¹
The actual Tenant-Farmer Representatives can scarcely all have combined farming with their political duties; the careers of D. Kilbride and P. McDermott, for example, were so chequered by imprisonment, agitation and foreign tours, that they deserve to be classed as Tenant-Farmers by origin rather than by occupation.

²
See Section on Payment of Members below.

Before considering these various groups in detail we can attempt to classify the members as a whole under two main social groups - Group A representing a higher social stratum and Group B a lower. This arrangement is of course open to objection and could be drastically modified. It can be shown for example, that several of those whom we would class in Group A had their origin in Group B. Thus, D. D. Sheehan whom, as barrister and journalist, we would place in Group A, actually came of Tenant-Farmer stock,¹ Again, this grouping must not be taken to indicate an economic gulf between Group A and Group B. On the contrary, many members of Group B were far more prosperous than many members of Group A. For an examination of this point see the section below on the Payment of Nationalist members.

If these qualifications be made it is possible none the less, to arrive at a rough estimate of the proportions of these two Groups in the Party at any of the six periods which we have adopted as our framework throughout this part of the thesis. In Group A we shall place the various "Professions" viz: barristers, solicitors, doctors and journalists, and with them we ^{shall} ~~should~~ group the landowners and the larger businessmen. In Group B we shall place the remainder, i.e. the local merchants, the farmers and tenant-farmers, the Labour leaders and that group which we labelled "Miscellaneous". It must be admitted that this is an arbitrary division but it does correspond as closely as possible to the social divisions within the Party and it certainly corresponds to the educational grouping which we outlined in the previous section. The following Table illustrates these divisions:-

1. See his account of the eviction of his family - in the opening chapters of his Ireland Since Parnell.

TABLE IV B.

Period	Group A	Group B	Total
<u>I</u> 1892-5	57	30	87
<u>II</u> 1895-1900	57	30	87
<u>III</u> 1900-6	58	36	94
<u>IV</u> 1906-10	49	43	92
<u>V</u> Jan.1910	45	36	81
<u>VI</u> Dec.1910	45	42	87

The most interesting feature of this Table is the change which, beginning in Period III, slowly transformed the social groupings within the Party. Group A, indeed, always remained in the majority, but this majority shrank almost to nothing by the end of the period. In Period I Group A numbered nearly twice Group B and even in Period III its majority was substantial though just beginning to decline. In Period IV the difference is really apparent - only 6 separating the two groups. In Period V the levelling process was arrested, though only temporarily, since Period VI found the two Groups with only 3 between them.

This tendency corresponds with the course of that democratic movement to which we have already referred; beginning with the foundation of the United Irish League in 1900, its influence persisted during the remainder of the period. When we remember that some of those included in Group A probably sprang from the classes which compose Group B, it is evident that the Party could claim always to have been representative of the various interests in the country at large and particularly of those interests which were numerically the largest - those of the small farmers and country shopkeepers.

Yet, if representation of various interests and classes

was evenly spread over the period as a whole there were curious disparities amongst different occupation groups within the major social divisions chartered^{ed} by the last Table. This is most marked in Group A. For example, the legal profession appears to be consistently over-represented. In Period I it accounts for over 25% of the whole i.e. 22 out of 87. In Period II the proportion is 19 out of 87, in Period III it is 23 out of 94, in Period IV 21 out of 92, in Period V 21 out of 81 and in Period VI 23 out of 87. It is obvious that barristers - and, to a lesser extent, solicitors - must be represented among the Party members, for a legal training was extremely valuable as preparation for a Parliamentary career and the Law, then as always, was a recognised avenue of approach to politics. It is true that some of the best Parliamentarians in the Party were barristers¹, but it is also true that many barristers in the Irish Party made negligible contributions to debate and seemed to have been included in the Party purely as "safe" men, easily controlled and directed. The number of solicitors was never large in comparison to that of barristers but remained fairly constant throughout the period. For the most part they were local men, playing an important part in the affairs of the larger country towns and obvious nominees for County Conventions.

¹ The group was a fairly small one. It included the following:- the Redmond brothers, J.J. Clancy, T. M. Healy, and - a little later - T. Mooney.

The other very numerous class in Group A was that of the journalists¹, of whom there were never less than 13 at any time. This Group too contained its proportion of inefficient members but it also had a very valuable contribution to make for several of its members were newspaper proprietors. If the Party was to obtain the support of the country as a whole it was necessary that it should have the support of the Press in other places besides Dublin and Cork.² The importance attached to this aspect of journalism in politics by the Party leaders is witnessed by the fact that in Period I the journalist group included 4 proprietors; there were 7 in Period II, 6 in Period III, 3 each in Periods IV and V, and 2 in Period VI. The others of this class were mainly London and Dublin journalists, men valuable either through the power of their pens, or convenient because of their accessibility and central position.

Compared with these two large groups, the others in Group A seem unimportant - but there are two exceptions. Nothing illustrates more clearly the changed character of the Home Rule movement than the steady decline in the Nationalist Party of the representation of the landowning class. From being very numerous in the days of Butt, they had shrank in the period we are now considering to be one of the smallest sections in the Party. Their maximum representation was 8, a figure attained in Period II. The other class of interest in Group A was that designated 'Larger Business'. Of such businessmen there were 9 in the Party in Period I, only 3 in Period VI. This was a serious

¹ The term, as we have pointed out before, is given its widest connotation here.

² Wm. O'Brien's failure to secure a wide publicity for his All-for-Ireland League in 1909-10 was one of the contributing factors to the isolation of that movement in Munster. See the last Chapter of his Olive Branch in Ireland.

decline. It is true that the major Irish industries were concentrated in Ulster but, if development were to proceed in the South, businessmen should have been attracted to that Party which promised hopes of such development. To put the matter at its lowest, the Party should have made every effort to secure the support of prosperous traders and industrialists to reinforce its over-strained finances. Yet this was not done and the number of representatives of business in the Party declined steadily between 1892 and 1910. This was perhaps the gravest aspect of Nationalist representation.

There are two significant features revealed by the categories which compose Group B. One ^{is} to the contrast in the agrarian representation between the low number of landowners and the large and increasing number of farmers. If we group farmers and tenant-farmers together we find that they only numbered 8 in Period I, and 10 in Period II. In the next 3 Periods they numbered respectively 11, 16 and 15. In one sense, of course, the cause of agriculture was represented by the Party as a whole since the struggle for the Land was one of the primary objectives of the Nationalist movement. But apart from this the specialised representation of farmers by farmers shows an impressive increase over the period as a whole. It would be too much, perhaps, to attribute this increase to an awakening sense of political importance among the more secure and well established farmers, but it ^{certainly} ~~actually~~ points to an appreciation by the Party leaders of the wide influence possessed by this class.

The other significant feature of Group B is the high proportion of Local Merchants represented. Indeed, ^{there} ~~there~~ is consistently the highest single group throughout the period. They were nearly all men who had been actively concerned in

¹ That is to say the highest in Group B.

the various Nationalist organisations in their localities and they were par excellence the type of local representative put forward at County Conventions. They were a strong and influential section of the population and the Party leaders seldom attempted to displace them from those constituencies which were accustomed to elect such men. Indeed it would have been contrary to the interests of the Party to do so, since these men formed a valuable link between the higher and the lower levels of authority in the Nationalist movement.

(ii) The Unionist Members.

We have seen in the previous section how much simpler was the study of Unionist education compared with that of the Nationalists. This same simplification is at once apparent when we consider the Unionist occupation groups. This is illustrated by the following Table:-

TABLE V. UNIONIST OCCUPATIONS.

Period	Barrister	Solicitor	Business	Land-owner	Miscellaneous	Total
I 1892-5	11	0	3	9	0	23
II 1895-1900	12	0	3	11	1*	27
III 1900-6	9	1	7	10	1*	28
IV 1906-10	5	0	9	9	0	23
V Jan. 1910	8	0	6	7	0	21
VI Dec. 1910	8	1	4	7	0	20

* The single entry in this column designates W. H. Lecky the historian who could scarcely be included among the other groups.

No clearer illustration could be given of the different social backgrounds of the Unionist and Nationalist parties than a comparison of these two Tables of Occupations. Five groups are used in the Unionist Table for the sake of accuracy, but in fact only three are of importance. The Land, the Law and Business - this was the tripod which supported Unionist representation.

All the legs of this tripod were not of equal length. The group with the consistently largest representation was that of the barristers who, in Periods I and II, accounted for almost 50% of the Unionist Party. They provided the intellectual leadership of the party also, for they numbered among them at different times - Sir Edward Carson (as he then was), ^J F. H. M. Campbell, William Johnston, William Moore, J. A. Rentoul and W. G. E. Macartney, to name only a few.

It might be thought that this strong legal representation in a Party where seats were so few, would ^{that} argue many Unionist constituencies were represented by absentee members. Yet this was not so. We shall examine this point in the next section rather more closely; here it is only necessary to say that although some Ulster ¹ constituencies were represented by Englishmen or by barristers resident in Dublin yet the strongholds of Unionism in Co. Down, in Co. Antrim and in parts of Armagh and Tyrone continued, as always, to be represented by members of the old county families. Many of the barristers elected, indeed, found seats in one or other of the Dublin constituencies. During the whole period only ^{four} ~~three~~ non-legal representatives sat either for for Dublin University, S. Dublin or the St. Stephen ² Green Division of Dublin.

¹ e.g. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.W. Belfast 1892-1906.

² They were W. H. Lecky, Walter Long, and Horace Plunkett, and Capt. B. Cooper.

The landowning element in Irish Unionism, although numerically smaller than the legal element, continued to occupy a position of vital importance for, in the last analysis, it was representative of the countryside of North-East Ulster where such families as the M'Calmons and the O'Neills represented constituencies large parts of which they themselves owned. The accord between these landowners and their tenant-voters was scarcely ever ruffled by a contested election and to the end of the period this was the group which supplied the majority of 'safe' seats in the Unionist party. One other feature of this group is noteworthy. It retained something of the nature of a military caste. In Period I 5 out of 9 landlord members (and one of the barristers) had been in the Army. In Period II the proportion was 7 out of 11, in Period III 7 out of 10, in Period IV 7 out of 9, in Period V and VI, 7 out of 10. This was a consistently high proportion.

Finally, we turn to the representation of industry and commerce in the Party. It was one of the accusations of Sir Horace Plunkett¹ that both parties, particularly the Unionists, neglected to win the allegiance of industrialists or shipping magnates. At the time at which he was writing (about 1904) the position was beginning to improve. Only 3 business representatives² appear in Periods I and II. In Period III this increases to 7 and to 9 in Period IV. Thereafter there is a recession and the figure has fallen to 4 by the end of the period. All these representatives were Belfast businessmen; shipbuilders and linen manufacturers provided the great majority, though there were also bankers and one corn merchant. Undoubtedly, the men who did become members were in business on a very large scale. But it is noteworthy that in politics their influence was not commensurate with their economic importance. It

1 See H. Plunkett, Ireland in the New Century, p 68.

2 Among them the two founders of the shipping firm of Harland and Wolff.

is not too much to say that, as a class, they were perhaps the most important in Ireland. They, and they alone, conducted business on a scale sufficiently large to stand comparison with other countries and the prosperity of Ulster at least - if not of all Ireland - depended very greatly on their endeavours. Yet none of their representatives ever attained to leadership of the Irish Unionist Party which passed from Col. E. J. Sanderson in 1907 to a succession of lawyers.

If we were to attempt a division of social strata as with the Nationalists we might find in this fact the basis of such a division. There was no social difference between the barristers and the landowners; their backgrounds were very similar. The businessmen, on the other hand, were largely self-made¹ men and were thus in a somewhat different relationship with the other two groups. There may have been some consciousness of this social difference which prevented the representatives of industry and commerce from taking the lead in the Irish Unionist Party. Added to this of course was the fact that, of all the groups, they had least leisure² for politics.

¹ Self-made^d in the sense that they had created large businesses by their own endeavours.

² Sir Horace Plunkett regarded this severance of industry and politics as the most serious weakness of Irish Unionism - "For the lack of the wise guidance which our captains of industry should have provided, Irish Unionism has, by too close adherence to the traditions of the landlord section, been the creed of a social caste rather than a policy in Ireland". (Ireland in the New Century. p. 68)

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Total
Y Jan. 1900	40	22	8	3	81
VI Dec. 1909	27	18	8	2	67

¹ Group A only was self-made in the sense used as the criterion. It could be called a mixed interpretation if, because a man represented, say, St. Dunston, but lived in St. Rosedown, he were held to have no connection with his constituency.

4. Members and their Constituencies.

In the previous section we examined the social background of the Irish Parties. In this section we attempt to estimate how far the various Irish members were representative of the various parts of Ireland, - in short, what connection existed between members and their constituencies. Members could be said to be connected with their constituencies if they fulfilled one or both of two conditions - if they had been born or bred in the country which they subsequently represented, or if they lived there.¹ We can now apply these tests separately to the Nationalist and Unionist parties.

(i) The Nationalist Members.

If we consider the question of birth qualifications, there are 4 obvious categories into one of which every member will fall. The first - which we call Group A - will consist of men born in the counties they subsequently represented; Group B will consist of men born elsewhere in Ireland, and Group C of men whose birthplaces are not specified in the sources available; Group D will consist of men born in England or elsewhere overseas. They are illustrated by the following Table:-

TABLE VI A.

Period	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Total
<u>I</u> 1892-5	34	45	1	7	87
<u>II</u> 1895-99	36	44	2	5	87
<u>III</u> 1900-6	54	32	4	4	94
<u>IV</u> 1906-10	50	29	9	4	92
<u>V</u> Jan. 1910	48	22	8	3	81
<u>VI</u> Dec. 1910	51	25	8	3	87

¹ County rather than constituency is used as the criterion. It would be rather a narrow interpretation if, because a man represented say, S. Roscommon, but lived in N. Roscommon, he were held to have no connection with his constituency.

From this it appears that the number who possessed birth qualifications for the constituencies they represented was always high, and that it became very high indeed after 1900. At the end of the period, indeed, it had become much the most numerous group. The corresponding decline in Group B - those born elsewhere in Ireland - from 45 to 25 over the whole period is most striking. It is possible, indeed, that the number in Group A was actually greater than that recorded here. It will be observed that under Group C - those of whom we have no precise knowledge - there are placed 9, 8 and 8 respectively during the last three periods. But, from other evidence,¹ it seems probable that of the 9 in Period IV 6 are entitled to be placed in Group A and 1 in Group B. In Period V 4 should probably be added to Group A and 1 to Group B and in Period VI 5 should probably be transferred from Group C to Group A and 1 To Group B. In general, it may be assumed that the vast majority of members representing Irish constituencies were born in Ireland.

The mere fact of having been born in the county or lived in Ireland other than those who lived in the borough one subsequently represented need not in itself imply any close knowledge of or sympathy with the needs of one's constituency. Perhaps more important is the qualification of residence. Of those born in their constituencies the great majority also lived there as the following list will show:-

Period	Number	Out of	Number	lived in the counties they	represented
In Period <u>I</u>	27	out of	34	lived in the counties they	² /
" " <u>II</u>	26	" "	36	" " " " " "	" "
" " <u>III</u>	42	" "	54	" " " " " "	" "
" " <u>IV</u>	42	" "	50	" " " " " "	" "
" " <u>V</u>	37	" "	48	" " " " " "	" "
" " <u>VI</u>	39	" "	51	" " " " " "	" "

1. i.e. residence, local activity, the holding of local offices and other similar evidence.

2. Borough is to be understood as being included.

The majority is in each case beyond dispute. Some members, however, lived in their constituencies although they had not been born there. Others lived elsewhere in Ireland, other than Dublin. Some lived in Dublin and some lived in England or Scotland, or elsewhere overseas. To ^{clarify} classify the situation the following Table has been constructed:-

TABLE VI B.

Period	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
<u>I</u> 1892-5	32	23	15	17	87
<u>II</u> 1895-1900	31	24	14	18	87
<u>III</u> 1900-6	50	13	11	20	94
<u>IV</u> 1906-10	54	9	14	15	92
<u>V</u> Jan. 1910	47	8	14	15 12	81
<u>VI</u> Dec. 1910	50	11	11	15	87

In this Table Group 1 represents those members who lived in the counties they represented, Group 2 represents those who lived in Ireland other than those who lived in Dublin who are represented by Group 3. Group 4 represents those who lived overseas.

Those who lived in the counties or boroughs which they represented are thus the largest single Group. The majority, which is only 7 over Group 2 in Period II, increases suddenly to 30 over the next largest Group (Group IV) in Period III. Once again, therefore, we observe the influence of the United Irish League, which we have already noticed in other spheres. The clear majority gained by Group 1 at this time was not disturbed from 1900 onwards. Group 2, by contrast, shrank steadily from 23 in Period 1 to 8 in Period 5.

Groups 3 and 4, on the other hand, remained more or less constant throughout and this suggests an interesting peculiarity of Irish representation, viewed from this terri-

torial aspect. It seems that in the majority of cases where local opinion was strongly in favour of a local candidate that man was usually accepted by the Party and duly elected. Where, on the other hand, local opinion was indifferent or divided, the Party leaders very often secured the selection at the County Convention, and the ultimate election, of men for whom they wished to find seats. Some of these men lived in other parts of Ireland but the majority lived in Dublin or in England. It is thus that seats were found for those numerous barristers and journalists whom we listed in the previous section. If we compare Group 2 with Group 3 and 4 combined we see how this worked out in practice. In Period I Group 2 accounted for 23 members, Group 3 and 4 for 32. In Period II Group 2 numbered 24, the other 2 Groups 32 again. In Period III the difference was more marked. There were 13 in Group 2, 31 in Groups 3 and 4. In Periods IV and V the difference is clearer than ever. Group 2 has 9 and 8 in these two Periods respectively. Groups 3 and 4 have 29 in each. In Period VI Group 2 numbers 11, Groups 3 and 4 number 26. These figures show very clearly that the great majority of the constituencies habitually held by the Nationalists were divided between local members i.e. those living in their constituencies and those who lived either in Dublin or in England. This partition of representation corresponds very closely to the two main centres of influence in the Party. As might be expected, most of the leaders and most of the active Parliamentarians lived in Dublin or in England. But, important as they were, more important still was the voice of the constituencies. It may not always have received due attention but at least it spoke through a sufficient number of representatives. The fact that so many Irish Nationalists were either born in or lived in their constituencies is one of the most effective refutations of the charge sometimes made that the Irish Party was unrepresentative.

(ii) The Unionist Members.

In determining the connection of the Irish Unionist members with their constituencies we may pursue exactly the same method as in dealing with the Nationalists. As before, we consider first the birth qualifications of the members over the whole period:-

TABLE VII A.

Period	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Total
<u>I</u> 1892-5	9	9	0	5	23
<u>II</u> 1895-1900	12	9	1	5	27
<u>III</u> 1900-6	12	10	2	4	28
<u>IV</u> 1906-10	8	7	2	6	23
<u>V</u> Jan.1910	7	8	2	4	21
<u>VI</u> Dec.1910	9	7	2	2	20

Although in most of the six Periods the Group representing those born in their constituencies is the highest single Group, it is followed very closely by Group B i.e. those born elsewhere in Ireland. Group A was always less than 50% of the total and its members usually belonged to families which had lived in the counties they represented for generations. The M'Calmonts in County Antrim and the Hills and O'Neills in County Down are the most obvious examples of this Group. Group B - which in Period V was the largest single Group - reflects the proportion of barristers in the Party, men whose interests were not directly connected with their constituencies but for whom seats were found wherever possible. Group D was large in proportion to the totals though scarcely large enough to warrant any contention that Irish Unionists were ready to supply seats for English politicians who had difficulty in finding them elsewhere.

The number of such members was actually very small¹ and the majority of Group D were Irishmen who happened to have been born abroad e.g. Capt. Bryan Cooper (S. Dublin, Jan:- Dec. 1910) who was born at Simla when his father was on active service in India.

On the whole it must be conceded that proportionally fewer Unionists than Nationalists were born in the counties or boroughs which they subsequently represented. In explanation of this it should be remembered that so many of the Unionist seats were compressed into so small an area that it would have been difficult to find sufficient local men of ability to find them.

The residential qualifications possessed by Irish Unionists may be gauged from the following Table:-

²
TABLE VII B.

Period	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
<u>I</u> 1892-5	10	3	5	5	23
<u>II</u> 1895-1900	15	1	5	6	27
<u>III</u> 1900-6	13	2	4	9	28
<u>IV</u> 1906-10	8	3	3	9	23
<u>V</u> Jan.1910	6	3	5	7	21
<u>VI</u> Dec.1910	7	2	4	7	20

The most remarkable feature of this Table is the fact that in every Period the majority of members are divided between Groups 1 and 4, that is to say, between those who lived in the constituencies they represented and those who

¹
The principal ones were Sir Thomas Lea (S. Londonderry 1892-1900) H. O. Arnold - Forster (W. Belfast 1892-1906) and W. Long (S. Dublin 1906-10).

²
This Table is constructed on the same basis as the equivalent Table for the Nationalists - see Table VI B.

lived out of Ireland altogether. Group 4 is actually the largest from Period IV to Period VI. Groups 2 and 3 account for comparatively few of the total. Group 2 consists largely of landowners who lived in counties other than those they represented, e.g. Col. E. J. Saunderson M.P. for North Armagh until 1907 although his estates were in County Cavan, and the Marquess of Hamilton, M.P. for Londonderry City 1900-13 whose family home was in County Tyrone. Group 3 consists largely of barristers practising in Dublin.

The fact that so many Unionists lived away from Ireland altogether is to be explained by the operation of three factors. One was the limited number of Englishmen who belonged to the Party: it was only at election time that they visited Ireland - if then.¹ A second factor was the tendency for successful Irish barristers to transfer their households and their practices alike to England; of this the best example was Edward Carson who, from 1892 onwards divided his time between London and Sussex. The third factor is the chance which sometimes occasioned the election of younger sons to the family seats. Of these, admittedly a very small class, the prototype was Capt. Arthur Hill who represented W. Down from 1898 to 1906. But the fact that this last class did live in England need not be stressed too much. They had an intimate acquaintance with the history and needs of their constituencies and were often the most suitable representatives for them.

1

In 1900 Arnold-Forster was abroad and was re-elected during his absence. See H. O'Z. Arnold-Forster: A Memoir by His Wife p.149-50.

5. The Payment of Nationalist Members.

In seeking to establish the social and economic background of the Irish Nationalist Members of Parliament one obvious approach is to ascertain how many of these members were sustained by party funds during their attendance at Parliament. Unfortunately, no complete record of these allowances - or "indemnities" as they were called - is yet available, so that it is impossible to provide a picture exact in every detail. One valuable source there is, however, the collection of the papers of J. F. X. O'Brien¹, who was one of the Treasurers of the Party from 1886 until his death in 1905. Even these are not complete and it has only been possible to assemble isolated fragments of information about these transactions which were always regarded as being of the utmost delicacy and which were handled with the maximum of secrecy.

The O'Brien papers fall under four heads, which may be listed briefly as follows:-

- (1) An Account Book and a Ledger covering the payments made during the period 1892-5. Also two letter-books containing copies of letters (both official and private) written by O'Brien during the period 1894-1905.
- (2) Several boxes of loose, unsorted letters received by O'Brien from various sources; most of them are from other members of the Party e.g. Alfred Webb^b, associated with him in the early period of his Treasurership, John Dillon, Justin M'Carty, Michael Davitt, John Redmond and others. These letters

¹ Now in the National Library. The papers are not yet fully arranged and I am greatly indebted to Mr. J. Carty for permission to use them as they are.

range from 1886 to 1905.

- (3) Blocks of cheque counterfoils indicating the amounts paid to individuals. These counterfoils begin at 1897 and continue - with intervals - until 1904.
- (4) Two loose sheets of paper in the back of the ledger referred to above containing a report of the Treasurers of the Party; it is dated - London, 13 August, 1895.

This last source is extremely valuable in that it gives us the key to the period 1892-5 which ~~X~~ covers the first Parliament in our period. The paper seems so important that I reproduce its points one by one:-

- i Of the 35 Members of the Party in receipt of allowances¹ towards expenses before the election just concluded 21 were Members at the time of the Split in November 1890 and have been continued since at the same amount. 3 who were then on the list have had their salaries² increased.
- ii 9 were added after the election of 1892 - by agreement before the election; all save one were added at the uniform rate of £200.³
- iii 2 out of the 35 have been added to the list since 1892; ~~4~~ two have been refused.
- iv 1 of the 35 has not been returned at the present election.
- v 1 has now sufficient means to manage without an allowance.

¹ i.e. The Election of July 1895

² Two of them were Party officials.

³ The exception was paid £208 in weekly instalments of £4. The general rule was to pay quarterly instalments of £50 each. Sometimes, when funds were scarce, quarterly payments were split into two or even three separate payments.

vi No one has ever been removed except by non-election to Parliament.

The second sheet of paper contained the names of the members and the details of their allowances. It is not proposed to reproduce the names here but the details are of interest. Of the 35 members, 26 received what may be regarded as the standard allowance of £200, one other, as we have seen, receiving £208. 3 more members received £300 p.a. each; of these, two were apparent cases of hardship and one was a party official whose salary had been increased by £100 in 1892. One other official received £350, his salary also having been increased by £100 in 1892. Two further members - men who devoted their whole time to party affairs - received £400 each. Finally, one other, member - very eminent in the party - received £500.

If we consider the occupations of these members we find a variety of interests represented, though as is natural, the lower income-groups predominate. There were 7 journalists, 4 representatives of the tenant farmers, 4 farmers and 2 who describe themselves as landowners. There were 2 doctors, 5 barristers and 1 solicitor. There were 3 Labour Leaders and 2 party officials, with 1 hotel proprietor. The remainder were all general merchants in

¹ The account-books show that the number of members actually receiving payments varied from session to session. From 7 Dec. 1890 - 31 Dec. 1891, 28 members were paid at the above rate; between 1 Jan. and 30 Sept. 1892 it was 33; from 1 Oct. 1892 to 31 Oct. 1893 it was 37; from 1 Nov. 1893 to 17 Nov. 1894 it was 35; from 17 Nov. 1894 to 4 April 1896 it was 29.

² Dod. Parliamentary Companion, 1892

³ Each of these men had originally been connected with small trade establishments but had become so thoroughly identified with various aspects of the organisation of Labour that they have been classified as 'Labour leaders.'

country towns. It should be remembered that the official term for these payments was "Indemnity" and that such payment was, for some members, probably only a recompense for money which might easily have been earned if they had stayed at home. On the other hand, the numerous letters which O'Brien received when funds were low indicates that, for the majority, their allowances were actually a means of livelihood.

For the next period - 1895 to 1900 - sources are not so satisfactory. For 1896 we have no data whatsoever and it is possible that the finances of the Party, which were certainly very strained at the time, may have been unequal to the payment of members during that year. - Indeed, this possibility becomes almost a probability when we consider the letter written by one member to O'Brien. O'Brien had already written to Dillon on 21 December 1896 deploring the state of the finances. Immediately after this he heard from the member already mentioned that his attendance in 1896 had caused him to run into debt and that unless he received some money he would be unable to attend in 1897. To this O'Brien was obliged to reply in a letter dated 9 Jan. 1897 "..... the Treasurers are not in a position at the moment to issue any money to the Members." This was a situation which could not long endure without seriously impairing the Parliamentary efficiency of the Irish members. Thus, in February 1897, O'Brien received a copy of the minutes of a meeting of the Party where an order was made that an allowance be issued to 21 members of six monthly payments of £20 each. These figures reveal very clearly the state of the Party finances. The 'standard' payment of £200 is abandoned, so are also the exceptional salaries of the earlier period.²

¹ This member - a journalist - was paid all the other years when payments were made: if he was not paid in 1896 it is quite likely that neither was any other Member.

² It is significant that, apart from the 2 party officials, only 1 of those who received more than £200 in 1892-5, remains on the list.

And not only this, but the number of members receiving these reduced salaries is itself diminished to 40%.

This scheme was carried out month by month - as we can see from the cheque counterfoils - from February to July 1897. It is noteworthy that almost all the recipients were either local merchants or were connected with the land, or with labour movements. There were only 2 lawyers and 2 journalists. In 1898 the position altered for the worse again. Although the number of members receiving allowances was reduced to 20¹ the amount of each of the six monthly payments was decreased to £15. During 1899 the position deteriorated yet again. The list of members remained the same but it was only possible to vote £1000 to be distributed among them for the whole year. This took the form of 3 payments of £15 each in February, March and April, and 1 payment of £10 each in August. On 25 January, 1900, before the Party was re-united, the same 20 members received a further payment of £10 each.

For the third period - 1900-6 - (the final period of O'Brien's Treasurership) the sources are less satisfactory again. It is true, however, that we possess a copy of a Resolution of the Party passed on 28 February 1900, to this effect:-

"That £400 be placed by the Treasurers to the Sessional Indemnity Account and that, pending the settlement of a permanent scheme of distribution, this amount be allocated equally among such of the members as shall, before March next, intimate to the Treasurers, either directly or through the Chairman, whips or Secretaries, that they intend to give a substantial attendance, but are unable to do so without indemnity."

¹ By the voluntary surrender by one member of his allowance.

To this Resolution 35 replies were received, but from the evidence of the cheque counterfoils it appears that only 33 cheques were sent out on 10 March, and these were for £12-2-5 each. After this, unfortunately, there is a hiatus. The next payment of which we have evidence is one of £13-6-8 to 31 members;¹ this may actually have been the second payment of 1900 - but we have no means of knowing. The last payment of which we have knowledge for 1900 occurred on 13 July; this time 28 members received £10-14-3 each. It is thus quite impossible to determine what total each member received during 1900 though we have evidence (from the written replies to the Resolution quoted above) that 35 Members were anxious to be included in the list, although at no time do all 35 appear to have been paid simultaneously. The 35 may be divided into the following occupation groups:- 7 journalists, 4 barristers, 2 doctors, 3 landowners, 4 farmers, 5 tenant-farmers, 3 Labour-leaders, 2 party officials, 1 Civil Engineer and 4 Local Merchants. The emphasis remains - as before - upon the representatives of land, labour and the small localities.

For the years after 1900 we have only fragmentary evidence, provided, for the most part, by bank pass-books found among the miscellaneous letters of the J. F. X. O'Brien papers. Yet, although no complete statement is possible, we know enough to show a sudden and unprecedented increase in the number of members receiving allowances. The first indication of this provided by the pass-books is a list of payments to 47 members made in January 1902. But two pieces of evidence suggest that this list is incomplete. First, there exists a letter written by T. M. Healy to his

¹ All the cheques were originally made out at £12.18. 0. It is possible that a sudden accretion of funds enabled a larger sum to be paid out.

brother Maurice in February 1901 in which he says: "Redmond is embarrassed by having received 51 applications for £. s. d from his 80 followers." ¹ Now Healy had been expelled from the Party in December 1900 and his information may be at fault, though very little escaped his observation in most details of party politics. Our second piece of evidence, however, supports his statement, for the bank pass books give us figures intermittently for 1902, 1903 and 1904. Apparently in January and February 1902 the number of members paid was 47. In March it had dropped to 39. In April it had risen to 49 and continued at that strength for the three remaining months of payment. Moreover, during this six months period the old system of paying each member £20 per month seems to have been revived. In 1903 on the other hand the figure has increased to 53. ² In January in 1904 it is identical - with one addition - and thereafter remains stable throughout 1904. Since we have no lists for 1905 or after we must be content with making this as the limit of expansion within the period known to us. If we may generalise at all on this admittedly scanty evidence we may say that, between 1900 and 1906, the average payment of members had reverted to £120 p.a. and that the average number of members receiving such payment was nearer 50 than 40, i.e. was over 50% of the Party Strength.

Of the 54 members who mark the maximum expansion of which we have knowledge, the great majority pursued occupations on the same lines as those already noted for the earlier period. Thus there were 12 journalists, 10 farmers, 9 local merchants, 7 barristers and 2 solicitors, 6 who describe

¹ T. M. Healy, Letters & Leaders of My Day, ii, p.454.

² According to a list of August 1903; bank pass-book in the name of MacDonnell and others. (After the reunion Dr. M. A. MacDonnell, J. Mooney and J. F. X. O'Brien were the Party Treasurers until O'Brien's death in 1905).

themselves vaguely as "in business",¹ 3 party officials, 2 Tenant-farmers, 1 doctor, 1 school-master and one whose business is not known. The emphasis here is unmistakably upon the lower income groups for, of all the "professions", journalism and the law are surely the most precarious for the purposes of earning a living. Naturally, we cannot go beyond 1904 in our examination of the facts; it may be permissible, however, to add that, of the 54 mentioned above, 47 were re-elected in 1906 and 31 remained after the electoral chaos of 1910. It is possible therefore that at no time between 1900 and 1914 did the number of members requiring assistance fall below 31. Indeed it was likely to be much greater since no account has been taken of new members elected after 1906.

It remains to explain the reasons for the increase of penurious members after 1900. Two main factors account for this increase. One was the Re-union of the Party which, for a time at least, restored its prestige and with it the willingness of Irishmen at home and abroad to contribute to the expenses of its members. The other factor was the domination of the Election of 1900 by the United Irish League, of which William O'Brien was the leading spirit. In its political aspect the League provided elaborate machinery whereby the people should, through their local, divisional, provincial and central delegates, control effectively the selection of Parliamentary candidates and the conduct of those candidates when returned to Parliament. This implied the freedom to choose representatives from every walk of life and with it the obligation² to contribute to their support.

¹ Dod, Parliamentary Companion, 1904. The 'business' was usually of a restricted nature and not, presumably, very lucrative.

² This obligation was clearly brought out by the discussions at the National Convention in Dublin in June 1900, held to secure the acceptance of the League as the "official" Nationalist organisation. See F.J., 21st June, 1900.

if these members were too poor to support themselves. The number of members who received such indemnity indicates how freely this new opportunity was availed of.

Before passing to a review of the sources of the Nationalist income, mention should be made of the financial position of those other members of the Party who did not receive payments. We have, of course, very little direct evidence upon this point but we may reasonably infer the circumstances of some of these members from other information which we possess about them, e.g. their careers and their manner of life. The proportion of unpaid members varied from Parliament to Parliament and even from session to session. Taking a rough average, we can say with reasonable certainty that between 1892 and 1900 the number of unpaid Irish Nationalist members varied from 50 to 60, and between 1900 and 1910 it remained stable at about 30. During the first of the two periods just mentioned (1892-1900) it is almost certain that very many of the members elected would have welcomed the financial relief of the payment of even £100 during the Parliamentary year. There were among them a very large number of journalists, barristers and local merchants, men whose incomes were just sufficient to allow them to attend Parliament but not large enough to enable them to do this without strain. There must have been many who refused to apply for the "indemnity" from patriotic motives but who were none the less very near to poverty.¹ On the other hand there were a few very wealthy men in the Party who were in a position either to lend money direct to the funds or to guarantee loans. Between 1892 and 1900 there were probably not more than about 12 or 15 members who were absolutely free from financial worry,² and only about 8 who possessed really large incomes.

1 For one such case see M. M. Bodkin, Recollections of an Irish Judge, p.179.

2. Of these 8, one had made his money in S. Africa, another in Australia and a third in Canada.

In the second period, i.e. after 1900, the number of unpaid members dropped to about 30 and the very fact that the Party was able to afford to pay so many members suggests that those who were not paid were those who had no need to apply. It remained true that there were very few wealthy members of the Party but, as we shall see in a moment, the response to the frequent appeals for funds made by the Party leaders, made the inclusion of wealthy, or even comparatively wealthy men, far less necessary than it had been in the years of the "Split." On the whole, it may be said that, throughout the period 1892-1910, and even during the darkest years, the Party contained a great majority of men who were dependent upon the funds subscribed by Irishmen at home and abroad. At no time can it be said with justice that financial pressure drove the leaders of the Party to exclude men of merit who were unable to pay their way. Even in the years when only 20 were receiving salaries, all the evidence suggests that, had there been more funds, there would have been more applicants for payment of indemnities.

When we turn to consider the sources from which these funds were gathered we meet at the outset an almost insuperable difficulty. Although J. F. X. O'Brien remained a Treasurer of the Party until his death in 1905 the account-books which survive among his papers in the National Library in Dublin cease at April 1896, just over three years after the commencement of our period. For the whole of the rest of the period we are forced to rely upon the acknowledgements in the Freeman's Journal of the responses to the successive appeals launched by the Party, a source which is reliable so far as it goes but which naturally does not provide the detailed information which only the account-books of

succeeding years could disclose.

With this reservation we may proceed to examine such figures as are available. The account-books in the O'Brien papers contain 4 Balance sheets covering the periods 7 Dec. 1890 - 30 September 1892; 1 October 1892 - 31 October 1893; 31 October 1893 - 19 November 1894; 19 November 1894 - 4 April 1896. It will be convenient if we first set out in general terms the total receipts and expenditures of these periods:-

Period	Receipts	Expenditure
1890-1892	£14,012. 5. 0	£13,733. 17. 9
1892-1893	£10,564. 6. 10	£10,299. 0. 7
1893-1894	£ 9,590. 5. 6	£ 9,515. 12. 5
1894-1896	£ 7,121. 7. 0	£ 7,100. 3. 9

These figures show very clearly the decline in the Nationalists (or, more strictly, the Anti-Parnellite) fortunes in the years immediately following the "Split." The receipts of the Party had shrunk steadily during these years until by 1896 they were almost half what they had been in 1892. Moreover the balance in hand had correspondingly declined. In 1892 there had been a favourable balance of £278. 7. 3, not a large sum, but at least indicating that the Party was well within its means. In the second period the balance was £265. 6. 3; in the third the strain was beginning to be felt and the balance had fallen to £74. 13. 1. Finally, in the fourth period (corresponding with the time of greatest dissension within the Party) the balance was only £21. 3. 3 and this although expenditure had been cut to a minimum.

There was one other ominous feature about these figures. The receipts seemed almost all to be from Irish

or English sources. There were no large-scale contributions from America or Australia at this time. For example, in the period 1890-1892 the chief part of the Party revenue came from the National Federation¹ - £3,100 and from the Trustees of the Irish Parliamentary Fund £5,650. Other items came from the Irish National League of Great Britain and from miscellaneous sources which had been the property of the Party as a whole before the "Split" and which were now taken over by the Anti-Parnellites. In the second period (1892-3) the same is true. The largest revenue came from the Irish Parliamentary Fund £9075 and from the Home Rule Fund £1,142. 8. 6. These funds were collected from all available sources and were acknowledged week by week in the Freeman's Journal. There were some individual contributions from the Irish overseas but the greater proportion by far was collected in Ireland and Britain. The Home Rule Fund was a special fund operating during 1893 and was an attempt to turn the enthusiasm for Gladstone's Second Home Rule Bill ^{into} ~~with~~ practical channels. In the third period (1893-4) besides the £4,254. 14. 7 collected for the Irish Parliamentary Fund, Justin M'Carthy launched an urgent appeal for further subscriptions, this time to a new fund to be called the Parliamentary Fund of 1894.² This brought in £4,460. The same technique was repeated in the fourth period and these two funds provided the great proportion of the amount collected between 1894 and 1896.

1 See M. Davitt, Fall of Feudalism in Ireland Chap. LIV. for the foundation of the Federation in March 1891.

2 Freeman's Journal. 25 May 1894.

In 1896 by no means the lowest point was reached.

The next great effort to overcome the financial difficulties which threatened to overwhelm the Party was made in October 1896 when the National Fund for 1897 was launched.¹ By the following September O'Brien as Treasurer was able to write to Dillon (now Chairman of the Anti-Parnellite Party) that the response to the fund had amounted to £5,171. 9. 9.²

This was the lowest figure yet reached and the affairs of the Party were still in a precarious state. Immediately after this letter the Irish Parliamentary Fund for 1898 was launched and Edward Blake went back to his native Canada to stimulate overseas contributions once more. From the Letter-books³ we have a statement of how this particular Fund was subscribed. Since details of the sources are included it is given in full below:-

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY FUND 1898

RECEIPTS

	£.	s.	d.
Balance of National Fund of 1897:	1,486.	17.	3
From the United States ⁴	7.	15.	6
From Australia	72.	0.	0
From Great Britain	29.	5.	6
From Ireland	146.	4.	0
From Canada	1,562.	16.	10
	£3,304.	19.	1

¹ This was really the Parliamentary Fund under another name

² See J. F. X. O'Brien: Letterbooks 29 Sept. 1897.

³ Ibid, 3 Nov. 1898.

⁴ This rather misleading figure does not represent a separate contribution but rather the remittance of a sum left over by accident from an earlier collection.

Thus, despite the efforts made, the position showed no sign of improvement at the end of 1898. The meagre contributions from overseas show very clearly the evil effects of discussion upon the revenues of the Party. Even Edward Blake, a man of the highest influence in Canada, could raise little more than £1,500.

In 1899 yet another Parliamentary Fund was initiated. We have not the same access to the sources as for 1898 because by a resolution of the Party "the sources whence the receipts have come were to be omitted" when the receipts were published.¹ The final receipts from this fund were £2020. 11. 0, so that the decline had not been checked. It had, however, ~~not~~^{now} reached its lowest limits for, with the reorganisation and reunion of the Party in 1900 the fortunes of the movement revived.

The first tangible² evidence of this revival was the response to the General Election Fund which had been launched in June 1900 at the first great Convention of the United Irish League. By December it was announced that no less than £8,491. 9. 4³ had been collected. At the second National Convention of that year - on 12 December - it was announced that the amount had been collected mostly from branches of the United Irish League, an indication in itself that the Party's finances were directly dependent on its prestige in the country. At the same meeting it was announced that a Parliamentary Fund for 1901 would be opened. The Trustees were to be John Redmond, Dr. P. O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe and Alderman Stephen O'Mara. A similar procedure was adopted year by year for the remainder of the period, the

1. J. F. X. O'Brien, Letterbooks, 14 March 1899.

2. From 1900 on, unfortunately, we have to rely upon the Freeman's Journal for details of the Party finances.

3. Freeman's Journal, 1 Dec. 1900.

only change being that from 1909 onwards J. Fitzgibbon took the place of O'Mara as a Trustee. The amounts collected are shown by the following Table:-

TABLE 1X

Freeman's Journal ¹	Name of Fund	Amount Received.
3 December 1901	United Irish Parliamentary Fund 1901	£10,576.11. 4
31 " 1902	Ditto 1902	£13,255.14. 3
7 January 1904	Ditto 1903	£12,915.10. 0
5 " 1905	Ditto 1904	£ 8,838.12. 7
9 December 1905	Ditto 1905	£12,648. 4. 8
30 January 1906	General Election Fund 1906	£ 6,367.11. 9
5 " 1907	Parliamentary Fund 1906	£14,056.15. 9
4 " 1908	Ditto 1907	£ 7,396.19. 4
2 " 1909	Ditto 1908	£ 7,641. 0. 8
29 " 1910	Ditto 1909	£10,028.14. 2
31 December 1910	Ditto 1910	£14,987. 9. 3

These figures show with complete clarity the change in the position of the Irish Parliamentary Party after 1900. The continual calls upon the local organisations naturally resulted in wide variations in revenue over different years. In 1905 and 1909, for example, it was as low as £7000 but that these were reserves which could be tapped in times of crisis is clearly shown in the two momentous election years of 1906 and 1910 when the receipts of the Fund were respectively £14,000 and almost £15,000. It is not, unfortunately, possible to give the detailed sources of

¹ The entries in this column denote the issues of the Freeman's Journal wherein these amounts were acknowledged.

these revenues but the lists of acknowledgments in the Freeman's Journal make it plain that the very great majority of these subscriptions came from the local branches of the various Nationalist organisations in Ireland, and particularly from the United Irish League. There were occasional subscriptions from overseas but the great mass of Irish contributions from abroad came in response to specific missions undertaken by members of the Irish Party and will be considered in a moment. The only other source near at hand was the United Irish League of Great Britain whose branches contributed some hundreds of pounds each year.

It is impossible to gauge exactly the overseas contributions during these years though we may arrive at a rough estimate. We have seen how poor were the responses to appeals made during the "Split." After 1900 the sympathy of the Irish abroad was reawakened and contributions began to flow in. Davitt calculated that £1,200,000 was contributed by the Irish Race to the various Irish funds during the 25 years ending in 1904. Of this sum he credited the United States with £500,000. And of this latter sum, he estimated that £30,000 was contributed during the time of the National Federation i.e. 1891-1900.¹ He thought that the amount contributed by the Irish in the United States from the Reunion in 1900 to the time of his writing (1904) was £12,000. Of this sum a tour by Dillon and himself in 1902 contributed £10,000.² From that time onward the tours of prominent Irish Nationalists in America and Australia were by

¹ Most of this was contributed early in the nineties Davitt himself mentions (op. cit. p. 673) a sum of £8,000 contributed by Dr. T. A. Emmett.

² M. Davitt, Fall of Feudalism in Ireland p.697 and p.p. 713-4

far the most productive source of revenue. Three missions in particular deserve special mention. First there was that carried out in Australia by Joseph Devlin during 1906. The sum raised by this mission was estimated to be £20,000.¹ The other missions were those of T. P. O'Connor to Canada in 1909 and John Redmond, Joseph Devlin and Alderman Boyle to the United States. The combined total of these missions was believed to be 200,000 dollars or about £40,000.² Thus within the last five years of our period overseas contributions totalled £60,000 and it is probable that, for the whole period 1900-1910, a figure of £80,000 would (at a rough estimate) represent the contribution of the Irish Race overseas.

It is obvious that the Irish Parliamentary Party was in a very strong financial position by the end of 1910. Not only was it receiving large sums from abroad but it was also drawing regular and substantial contributions from the Irish at home and in Great Britain. Indeed the sums collected at home were sufficient to pay the ordinary expenses of the Party and the increased number of members receiving salaries itself indicates the easier circumstances of the Party. When to this regular revenue was added the immense contributions from Australia and the United States, the true strength of the Party in 1910 can be appreciated. The change in the position of the Party was aptly summarised by the circular published in January 1911 to the effect that thanks both to the American contributions and to the amount collected in Ireland during 1910, it had been unnecessary to inaugurate a General Election Fund for that year, even though it had involved two General Elections.³ So far had

¹ Freeman's Journal, 30 January 1907.

² Annual Register, 1910, p.226.

³ Freeman's Journal, 30 January 1911.

the Party travelled from the penury of the nineties.

6. Two Contrasting Types of Representation

Having examined each Party from a series of different viewpoints we are now in a position to attempt a comparison between the two. We saw in the first section that the Nationalists had a decidedly lower average age per member than had the Unionists but that the average experience per member was longer. We noted, in particular, that the leaders of the Nationalist Party at the end of the period were men of greater Parliamentary experience than the leaders of the Unionist Party.

We then turned to consider successively the educational and social groupings of the two parties, and here the differences between the two were most marked. The Nationalists were drawn from every kind of occupation and represented every type of education. The Unionists, on the other hand, were drawn for a few occupations and represented one particular type of education. Next, we found that the Nationalists were closely linked with their constituencies and that many of them were either born or lived in the counties or boroughs which they later represented. In this respect the Unionists appeared to be less representative than their opponents for we saw that a considerable number lived away from Ireland altogether.

These differences might seem to point to one conclusion - that the Nationalist party was more representative of Ireland than was the Unionist Party. Yet this proposition, put so baldly, ignores certain factors. Above all it ignores the fact that the Nationalists were never even able to attempt to contest at least 12 of the Unionist seats i.e. about an average of 60% of the Unionist total over the whole period. If the Unionist Party were so unrepresentative as the above proposition suggests it is difficult to believe that

they would have been left in undisturbed possession of so many seats for so long. This is brought out still more clearly when it is recalled that the constituencies, through their local Unionist Associations had a means of expressing their wishes.¹ True, this electoral machinery was not so elaborate as the Nationalist system of County Conventions and it is probable that the Unionist leaders were more arbitrary in their treatment of the constituencies than the Nationalists would ever have dared to be, but the Ulster constituencies were by no means servile or indifferent.² For these reasons it would be unjust to say that the Unionist constituents accepted unquestioningly whatever candidates were presented to them because they had no means of doing otherwise. On the contrary, they accepted candidates whose views were in harmony with their own and did not regard themselves as the victims of misrepresentation.

It may be asked how this is to be reconciled with the undoubtedly broader basis of representation on which the Nationalist Party rested. The answer is not to be found in any direct comparison of the two parties, nor is it of value to attempt to determine which reflected more exactly the opinions and wishes of the constituencies. We believe rather that the evidence here cited points to the conclusion that there existed in Ireland two distinct types of representation, or even representation at two different levels. That this was so was partly due to the fact that the Nationalist Party controlled many more seats than did the Unionist Party and that this in turn implied the representation of a vastly greater area. Within this area there was room for the most diverse conditions to exist - social, political, economic and religious, - and the Nationalist

¹ See Part 1 - on the Selection of Candidates.

² The temporary success of Robert Glendinning in No. Antrim sitting as an Independent Unionist (1906-10) shows that even the most Conservative constituencies could upset the calculations of the Unionist leaders.

Party, in reflecting in its membership these diverse conditions, was truly representative of that part of Ireland which it dominated. The Unionist seats on the other hand were concentrated, with very few exceptions, in the north-east corner of Ulster where there was no room for such variation. The political scene was still dominated by the landed families whose relations with farmers and tenant-farmers alike were, on the whole, harmonious. This harmony was further promoted by the identity of religion between the Unionist members and their constituents. Only one Unionist member, so far as can be ascertained, was a Roman Catholic during the whole period.¹

The other section of Unionist voters was made up of the industrial workers of Belfast and, to a lesser extent, of Londonderry. Yet here too there seemed a fundamental harmony between the lower and the upper social groups. Labour was not politically organised in Ulster as is shown by the collapse of T. H. Sloan's movement for "Orange Democracy" and also by the fact that the one Labour candidate who did go forward for election, was uniformly unsuccessful.³

These two groups - the industrial workers and the farming community made up the great majority of Ulster voters. They were represented, as we have seen, by some businessmen and by landowners and barristers whose social background was identical. Moreover, this representation was unchanging over the whole period. It was, so to speak, static. In fact it corresponded much more closely to the eighteenth century conception of representation than to the modern conception.

¹ Hon. Martin Morris (later Lord Killanin) Member for Galway City. Significantly, this seat was outside the Ulster bloc.

² See Section on Selection of Candidates.

³ S. Walker who contested N. Belfast in 1906 and 1910.

The Unionist members represented "interests" much more than they represented individuals.

Here we have the essential point of contrast between Unionists and Nationalists. The latter were more elastic, more readily adaptable to changing conditions.¹ They were dynamic where the Unionists were static. They rated each constituency on its own merits and could absorb into their organisation members of different views, different social backgrounds, even of different religions. Between 1892 and 1910 from 20 to 30 Protestant Nationalists were elected to the Irish Party and the average in the individual periods was from 8 to 10. This general elasticity of attitude was referred to by Mr. Stephen Gwynn in a letter to the present writer. Mr. Gwynn's words are: "If a man had made himself conspicuous for Home Rule, it was rather an advantage to him as a candidate to be a Protestant.

Constituencies liked to say - 'See how broad-minded we are'.²"

Such facts as these prompt the conclusion that the Nationalist representation was at a different level from that of the Unionists. The Nationalists had abandoned the old conception of representation of interests. Each constituency was studied carefully and appropriate men chosen, so far as practicable, while the continued influx of new members and displacement of old reveals a Party constantly in motion.

For these reasons we believe that the two representations can only be contrasted and not compared. Each was full of vitality, each served faithfully the causes in which it believed, each retained its hold upon the particular area it represented, until the very end of the period.

¹ Vide the change in the Party after 1900.

² Information about the religious beliefs of members is difficult to obtain. Nationalists who were also Protestants usually revealed the fact in such biographical dictionaries as Dod's Parliamentary Companion. In other cases such information may be deduced from the family and backgrounds of members.

Table of Contents and Index.

The official reports of the Parliamentary Debates from 1892 to 1910 occupy over 200 volumes of Hansard. In order to obtain a picture of the activity of the Irish members it is obvious that a selective selection was necessary.

P A R T III

The following plan was adopted:-

Note on Method and Sources. p. 159a

1. The Irish Members in Parliament pp.159b-174
(1892-1895)
Further special sections were added e.g. on the Home Rule debates of 1893 and on the Parliament of 1910.
- I. The Irish Members and Home Rule, pp.159b-159h
but within the framework the treatment differed slightly.
- II. The Irish Members and Irish Business. pp.160-163
example, attention was focussed largely on broad issues.
- III. The Irish Members and other Business. pp.164-167
In the sections on the two later Parliaments, on the other
- IV. Note on the Attendance of Members. pp.168-174
losser debates which were continually being raised by Irish members of all parties. In this way an attempt has been made to preserve a continuity of treatment and yet to exhibit the different aspects of Irish intervention in debate.

The choice of this book has been based primarily upon Hansard. Newspaper reports have not been utilized, although the general content of the same has been employed where necessary. Important speeches have also been quoted in order to illustrate the progress of legislation.

The work of the author has been assisted by the staff of the Public Record Office, Dublin, and the staff of the Public Record Office, London.

/

Note on Method and Sources.

The official report of the Parliamentary Debates from 1892 to 1910 occupies over 200 volumes of Hansard. In order to obtain a picture of the activity of the Irish members it is obvious that intensive selection was necessary. The following plan was adopted:-

The debates of each Parliament were split up into sections dealing respectively with the Irish Members and Irish Business, the Irish Members and Other Business, and a Note on the Attendance of Irish Members; where necessary further special sections were added e.g. on the Home Rule debates of 1893 and on the Parliament of 1910.

The same framework was thus maintained for each Parliament, but within the framework the treatment differed slightly for each period. During the first two Parliaments, for example, attention was focussed largely on broad issues of policy and upon major pieces of legislation.

In the sections on the two later Parliaments, on the other hand, considerable space has been given to the various lesser debates which were continually being raised by Irish members of all parties. In this way an attempt has been made to preserve continuity of treatment and yet to exhibit the different aspects of Irish intervention in debate.

The whole of this Part has been based primarily upon Hansard. Newspaper reports have not been utilised, although the Annual Register has also been employed. Where necessary, contemporary Memoirs have also been quoted in order to elucidate the groupings of parties.

The next 9 pages have been numbered 159 a, 159 b, etc. owing to an error in typing.

I. The Irish Members and Home Rule.

Since, as we have seen, Home Rule was the dominant issue in the 1892 election it is natural that any estimate of the performance of Irish members in Parliament should begin with their contribution towards the long and strenuous debate which was fought out in the spring and summer of 1893. It is not possible to gauge with accuracy the influence exerted by any individual member because there exists no standard of measurement which can be applied; for example, a brilliant speech which might sway the House on one occasion might, in other circumstances, be far less effective than a steady attendance in the division lobbies night after night. On the other hand an examination of the debates, even if it does not give precise information about individual influence, does reveal a sufficiently clear picture of the general tactics of each party in this vital contest.

If we take the Nationalist majority first, as being the largest body, we find them in an unaccustomed role, as almost silent witnesses of the debate, a unique phenomenon which attracted the attention of that experienced observer, Sir Henry Lucy. "Nothing", he wrote, "since the date of the Union has been more remarkable than the attitude preserved by them (the Irish members) from the day the Home Rule Bill was introduced. On the second reading one or two men selected by their colleagues took part in the debate. In the committee stage, they have hitherto heroically refrained from speech-making."¹

1. Sir Henry Lucy, Diary of the Home Rule Parliament. p.148

The reasons for this silence were three-fold. First, it soon became obvious that the Unionist policy was to obstruct the debate at every stage and to delay the passage of the bill as long as possible; if, therefore, the Irish Nationalists expressed themselves with their usual freedom and at their usual length, they would be playing into the hands of the opposition. Secondly, the Gladstonian majority was so heterogeneous and contained elements which were, to say the least, so lukewarm towards Home Rule that self-effacement was the safest policy for the Irish members, since undue nationalistic ardour would have aroused qualms in the breasts of many friends as well as foes. Finally, within the party itself there was no real unity. The schism between John Dillon and T. M. Healy which had originated in a struggle for control of the Freeman's Journal had now pervaded the parliamentary life of the party and threatened to disrupt the majority forces within sight of their goal. Many years later William O'Brien made public the unseemly wrangles which took place in the innermost councils of the party; he described how, when the debate on the Second Reading of the Home Rule bill was at its most crucial stage, the old controversy over the Freeman's Journal broke out afresh with the result that T. J. Sexton actually resigned from the party.¹ It is true that the next day he withdrew his resignation but that such an action was even conceivable illustrates all too clearly the intensity of feeling which existed in the party at that time. It was therefore a counsel of prudence for the Nationalists to refrain from large-scale intervention in the debates.

¹ W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, pp.73-4.

Such being the policy of the party, it remains to be seen how far it was carried out in practice. Of the seventy-one members of the party, only twenty-four made any contribution whatsoever to the Home Rule debates, and of this number ^{few} ~~then~~ concerned themselves only with isolated sallies in the Committee and Third Reading stages of the Bill.¹ When Gladstone first sought leave to bring in the Bill - in February 1893 - only four Irish Nationalists were heard in his support i.e. E. Blake, M. Bodkin, T. M. Healy and T. J. Sexton. For the Second Reading there were only five speeches - from Edward Blake, Michael Davitt, Justin McCarthy, T. J. Sexton and S. Young.² All these speeches with the exception of Sexton's and Davitt's were short. Blake drew an analogy with Canada; McCarthy contributed a brief and colourless benediction; Young deprecated the alleged resistance of Ulster. Sexton spoke at greater length and traversed much of the ground later to be taken by the Irish Party as a whole. He welcomed the bill but criticised its financial clauses, expressed his disbelief in the strength of Ulster indignation and demanded that a full representation of Irish members should be retained at Westminster. Probably the most interesting contribution was the maiden speech of Michael Davitt, which combined restraint with evident sympathy for the cause of the evicted tenants and others of the "depressed classes."

When the Bill entered the Committee stage the Nationalists somewhat relaxed their self-imposed restraint and all but four out of the twenty-four were frequently involved in the strenuous and close argument which took

¹ These figures are based on an examination of the debates on the Home Rule Bill in H. C. Debates 4th series vols. 11-16.

² To be found respectively in H. C. Deb. 4 S. Vols 11 pp 408-23; Vol 11, pp 41-62; Vol. 10. pp 1858-62; Vol. 11, pp. 758-824; Vol. 11, pp. 495-9.

place around each of the clauses which were debated and also over the hotly-disputed question of the ~~closure~~^{closure}; such contributions could scarcely be called speeches but were rather interventions ranging from interjected remarks to brief comment. Some of the Irish members were extremely active; T. J. Sexton, for example, intervened fourteen times between 3 May and 1 June (1893), forty-seven times between 2 June and 25 June; twenty-seven times each between 26 June and 19 July and 10 August. On the whole however there is no reason to modify the view that the part played by the Irish members was extraordinarily subdued.

The Parnellites suffered from none of the inhibitions of their former colleagues and although they were always to be found in the same division lobby as the majority party, they were regarded with scarcely concealed hostility by those colleagues. William O'Brien, writing many years after the breach had been healed, still cherished bitter memories of the Parnellites' conduct at this time. He went so far as to suggest that:- "There is no resisting the evidence that he (Redmond) and his followers, throughout the Parliament of 1893-95, devoted themselves, **in** scarcely disguised concert with the Unionist opposition to sowing tares in the seedground of the Home Rule Government **and** discrediting and obstructing the Home Rule bill."¹ Immediately afterwards he adds the caustic comment that:- "Nevertheless Mr. Redmond and his friends pursued the Home Rule bill through all the battles and ambuscades of the passage through the House of Commons with that species of fatal friendship which is the deadliest of Parliamentary weapons."² As a proof of these charges

¹ W. O'Brien, "An Olive Branch in Ireland." p. 68

² Ibid, p. 69.

he cites the incident of 10 July when "an amendment of Mr. Redmond's insisting that Irish representation must remain at 103, instead of 80, went within an ace of wrecking the Home Rule Bill and the Home Rule government with it."¹

In fact, O'Brien's strictures^{ures} proceeded from a natural, but none the less mistaken, view of the situation. The precise difference between the Nationalists and the Parnellites lay in just that fact, that the latter, by virtue of their policy of independent opposition, held themselves free to criticise the Bill as they pleased. Certainly, this criticism was extensive and persistent. All but one of the Parnellites took part in the debates on the bill, four out of nine speaking on the Second Reading. Their reception of the measure was, to say the least, lukewarm. William Redmond announced his intention of voting for the second reading in order that the bill might be amended in committee. John Redmond thought the bill was "offered as a compromise and accepted as such"¹; in his view the ultimate solution lay in the direction of federalism. The Parnellites were also extremely active in the Committee and Third Reading stages and showed signs of increasing dissatisfaction with the bill, and their final attitude was aptly summed up in John Redmond's speech on the Third Reading. The Bill was, he said, "a toad, ugly and venomous, yet wearing a precious jewel in its head."²

The Unionist policy was free from the complications and undercurrents of intrigue which made the task of the Nationalists so difficult; their duty was plain, to oppose the Bill at all costs, and, until the closure was applied

¹ Annual Register, 1893, p.(123).

² Quoted in T. M. Healy's Letters and Leaders of my Day,
ii p.399.

their opposition was frequent and vociferous. It will be convenient to treat the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists as one body, although one political observer discerned three lines of attack marked out by the Opposition as a whole, whereby the English Conservatives were to deplore the unfairness of Home Rule to the English taxpayer, the Liberal Unionists the danger to the Empire, and the Irish Unionists the injury to Irish Loyalists.¹

Out of a combined force of twenty-three Unionists, no less than nineteen participated in the debate. Of these nineteen, eight were heard on the motion for leave to introduce the Bill and fourteen were heard on the Second Reading;² in this vital phase speeches (as distinct from mere interventions) were heard from Arnold-Foster, D. P. Barton, Edward Carson, Sir Thomas Lea, W. G. E. Macartney, D. R. Plunkett, H. Plunkett, J. A. Rentoul, J. Ross, T. W. Russell and Col. Sanderson, i.e. all five Liberal Unionists and nine Unionists. In the Committee stage, so bitterly fought out that on one notorious occasion, members came to blows on the floor of the House, the Unionists were very active despite the application of the closure, all save one being engaged in the fray. Certainly, if, as Sir Henry Lucy remarked: "The Irish Voter's esteem for his Parliamentary representative has ever been measured by the length to which the Hon. member in his place in the House was prepared to go 'agin the Government'"³, the Unionist members must never have stood so high in the esteem of their constituents. Although the struggle went against the Unionists and the

¹ Annual Register, p.(39).

² H. C. Deb. 4. S. 10 pp.489-91, 1704-24, respectively for the speeches of H. O. Arnold-Foster and D. P. Barton and Hansard. 4. S.11.pp.824-39, 499-508, 662-82 for the speeches of E. H. Carson, Sir Thomas Lea and J. A. Rentoul respectively.

³ Sir Henry Lucy. Diary of the Home Rule Parliament, p.408

Bill finally passed through the House of Commons, yet two purposes had been served by the Unionist resistance. On the one hand, they had shown that the opposition to the measure in Unionist circles in Ireland was a very real factor in the situation, and on the other hand they facilitated the action of the Lords, who, when they summarily rejected the Bill in September 1893 were able to contend that they were doing a service to the nation in refusing to pass so controversial a measure into law. In this course it may be admitted they had some justification, for the action and reaction of forces among the Irish parties, as we have reviewed those forces, showed all too clearly that there were elements of discord in Ireland which would make it difficult, probably impossible, to put the Bill of 1893 into operation.

II. The Irish Members and Irish Business.

It might be expected that those Irish members who had not spoken in the Home Rule debates might have compensated themselves by an active participation in the discussion of other Irish affairs. Superficially, this did seem to be what occurred for in the session of 1893 we find that out of seventy-one members of the Nationalist party no fewer than¹ sixty-eight are recorded in the Parliamentary debates, which ranged over a wide field of Irish affairs. There were discussions during this session, of the report of the Evicted Tenants Commission which had recently sat in Dublin; on the condition of Ireland; on Lawlessness in Clare; on Crime in Clare, Kerry and Limerick; and finally, there was a debate on an Evicted Tenants Bill introduced by P. A. McHugh,² a bill which, though subsequently dropped, offered opportunity for effective intervention. Yet here, as in the Home Rule debate we find that the burden lay upon a few shoulders only: out of the sixty-eight members recorded in the Parliamentary debates for this session, only nine spoke at any length in the subjects mentioned above; and even on Irish bills of less importance, such as the Rathmines and Rathgar Water Improvement Bill, few Nationalists were anxious to intervene.

The great majority of the Irish Nationalist members were happier in using the Parliamentary question rather than in intervening in debates. Such questions could be local or general in their interest. It is significant that slightly over 50% of the Irish Nationalists confined themselves entirely to questions of purely local interest

¹ Hansard 4. S. Vols 8 - 16. In 1893, the bulk of

² Hansard. 4. S. 8 p. 16 Set. Seqn.

or else their attachment to such questions overbalanced their contributions to Irish affairs in general. Where local interests predominated, the most usual themes were postal facilities and transport for remote rural districts, the behaviour of magistrates, the actions of the police, the plight of evicted tenants, and the possibilities of local improvements. Questions of general Irish interest would refer to the government of Ireland, concessions to Irish trade or agriculture, the state of Irish education, and the condition of the various Irish services - whether civil, medical, or military. Seventeen Irish Nationalist members introduced private bills of a more or less local character, and although few of them were ever carried forward, they too indicated a preoccupation with local affairs.

If we extend the range of our survey to include the period 1894-5 this view of Nationalist Parliamentary activity is confirmed. During that period the number of Nationalists who passed through the House was 74¹; the principal Irish debates during that time were - a new Evicted Tenants Bill, an Irish Land Bill and a Bill to repeal the Crimes Act of 1887. Yet only seventeen Irish Nationalists were heard at length on these measures. It is true that some of those seventeen - particularly T. M. Healy and T. J. Sexton - were tireless, but the great mass of Irish members seemed to be in Parliament primarily to record their votes. There was a slight improvement in the debates on Irish bills of less importance, bills such as the Poor Law and Municipal Franchise measures when twenty-four Nationalists took part; but even twenty-four out of a possible seventy-one cannot be regarded as a very high percentage. Once again, as in 1893, the bulk of

¹ There were of course only 71 at any given time.

Nationalist members directed their attention to Parliamentary questions. These questions fall under three general heads - those concerned exclusively with members own constituencies, those concerned with the affairs of other localities, and those of general interest. Thirty-nine out of seventy-four members might be said to have concentrated their attention primarily upon questions in the first two categories; almost all the remainder balanced more or less evenly between local and general questions while very few - the ubiquitous Healy and Sexton among them - genuinely showed a wide interest in the affairs of Ireland as a whole.

The Parnellites, being so obviously a minority, were obliged to exhibit a considerable degree of versatility. In 1893 for example all but two of them took part in one or other of the debates mentioned earlier in this section, all but the same two either introduced private bills themselves or spoke on the private bills of other Irish members; all were assiduous in asking questions but - a notable difference from the Nationalists - their attention was concentrated more upon general than upon local affairs, indicative no doubt of the fact that, proportionately, fewer of their members were residents in their constituencies. These tendencies are seen even more fully ^{developed} ~~displayed~~ in the period 1894-5 where in all spheres Parnellites ^{displayed} ~~developed~~ continuing activity. Their policy of independent opposition may have made their actions appear capricious and unpredictable to the other major parties, but it certainly did nothing to impair their activity. All but one of the Parnellites participated in the various important Irish measures already referred to; indeed, the debate on the repeal of the Crimes act was originated by Col. ¹ J. P. Nolan ² one of the most

¹ T. M. Harrington and L. P. Hayden.

² See Hansard. 4.S.23 pp.749-52 for his speech on the Second Reading of this bill.

prominent Parnellite members.

Among the Unionists there was also evidence of a wide range of interest in Irish affairs, though this interest tended to be attracted by general rather than by local affairs. In 1893 twenty-two out of twenty-three Unionists are recorded as intervening in the proceedings of Parliament, and, of these, nine made contributions to the debates already mentioned while sixteen spoke on private bills. As might be expected the majority of questions asked in the House by the Unionists were of a general nature. This activity was continued throughout the period 1894-95 and, although Unionist hostility to the government remained implacable, on one measure, Morley's Land Bill, criticism was restrained and sympathetic.

In conclusion, it would probably be fair to say that the Unionist and Parnellites both displayed a more evenly diffused energy than did the Nationalists. Among the latter there was indeed a dynamic group which generated energy on particular occasions through what must otherwise be considered the inert mass of the party. The Parnellites being so few, could not afford the luxury of idleness, while the Unionists, though they contained perhaps five inefficient members, being integral parts of the two major opposition parties, found themselves of necessity involved in continued Parliamentary action.

III The Irish Members and Other Business.

Although the Irish Members were first and foremost representatives of Ireland, they were also members of an assembly controlling the affairs, not merely of the British Isles, but of a world-wide empire. No estimate of the Parliamentary record of the Irish members would therefore be complete without including an account of the part played by them on the larger stage of English and Imperial concerns.

If we take the Nationalist party first, we find once again certain well-defined characteristics. Only thirty-eight out of seventy-one members contributed anything to non-Irish business and even of the thirty-eight most contented themselves with seeking for factual information through the medium of the Parliamentary question. It is no exaggeration to say that on none of the great controversial English measures of this Parliament did the Nationalists deliver speeches in any way calculated to influence the debates. Some of them, it is true, did intervene in the Employers Liability Bill, directing their criticism against the Lords' amendments which had crippled the Bill; since the Lords had also rejected the Home Rule Bill it did not require much penetration to see that this debate was being used as a vehicle for the expression of Nationalist views on the Upper House.

Although Nationalist contributors to innocuous measures such as the Factory and Workshops Bill were often sound and valuable yet towards the end of what was admittedly a very exhausting Parliament their interventions tended to become fractious and quarrelsome. The change really dates from the accession of Lord Rosebery in March 1894 and it became very obvious in May of that year when the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill was seriously delayed by Irish

In this Section 'Nationalist' must be taken to mean Anti-Parnellite.

Nationalists as a protest against what they considered to be the neglect of Irish business¹; and this was only one of several examples which could be cited.

The Nationalists were somewhat happier in the role of questioners, displaying a keen and critical interest in a wide variety of matters. These questions fall under three main heads according as they dealt with English affairs, with those of the Services, or with those of the Empire. Questions concerning English affairs were asked on such topics as postal arrangements, labour conditions, transport, civil service appointments, health and education. Interest in the Services was less pronounced, there being a slight bias in favour of naval information. Of greater significance was the Irish interest in the affairs of the Empire. It will be remembered that several members of the Party had ties with Australia and Canada² and they showed special interest to Imperial problems. The following list of places will give some idea of the variety of problems attracting the attention of the Irish members:-

Australia, Samoa, the Hawaiian Islands, Dominica, the W. Indies, Uganda, India, Chili, Matabele land, New Zealand, Fiji, Canada, Newfoundland, S. Africa, Bechuanaland, the Bahamas. Queries concerning these places were usually in search of information which might reveal maladministration or else sought concessions for the development of backward areas.

The Parnellites, pursuing their policy of aloofness, played an even less distinguished part in English affairs. All nine participated but only William Redmond and William Field were assiduous in their attendance, the latter indeed leaving himself open to the suspicion of displaying too exclusive an interest in his own professional affairs;

-
1. See H. C. Deb. 4.S. Vol. 24 for T. M. Healy's interruptions.
 2. e.g. The Currans father and son, and J. F. Hogan with Australia and Edward Blake with Canada.

by trade he was a victualler and his questions showed a lively interest in such specialised subjects as the railway rates for cattle transport, the progress of the T. B. commission, and the possibilities of competition from Canadian cattle. William Redmond's interest lay rather in Imperial affairs and he sought information about Australian living conditions, about riots in Montreal, the alleged ill-treatment of British subjects in Siam and the position in Egypt. The contributions of the other Parnell¹ members were scattered and unimportant though the debate on Uganda elicited the information that J. R. Maguire showed himself an enthusiastic disciple of Rhodes and a supporter of his "forward" policy in Africa, a somewhat ironical commentary on the later attitude of the Irish party towards British conduct in Africa.

Turning finally to the Unionists, it appears that out of twenty-three members no less than nineteen took some interest in non-Irish affairs, and of these nineteen only five played a wholly insignificant part. In matters of legislation the Unionists as a whole displayed much greater interest than either of the other two Irish parties; for example the following list of measures upon which Edward Carson spoke in the period July 1893 - July 1894 is typical of many:- the Criminal Evidence Bill, the Employers Liability Bill, the Local Government Bill, the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, the Steam Trawlers (Scotland) Bill, the Finance Bill (1894), the Education Act Amendment Bill and the Building Society (No. 2) Bill. In the sphere of Parliamentary questions less attention was paid to domestic English subjects than to military and Imperial affairs. Ten out of nineteen members sought information on the latter subject while on the former the proportion was thirteen out of nineteen. In general, the Unionist record

¹ H. C. Deb. 4.S. Vol.18, pp.568-72.

was higher in this respect than that of either of the other parties.

It is impossible to judge with accuracy the attendance of members of Parliament from a survey of the Division Lists of any given period, but the amount of any member's participation in the proceedings of Parliament, and also of his, or the party, as a whole, that members of Parliament are judged by their various parties, is of importance and should be examined the performance of the various such members on the numerous divisions which they take part in during the period 1892-1905, a period during which the Government enjoyed an absolute majority and often considerably large.

The total number of divisions in the House of Commons - from January 1892 to July 1905 - was 1,000. The average Nationalist attendance was 10.5 per cent. That of the Parliamentarians was 12.5 per cent. Unionists was 11.5 per cent and the Liberal Unionists was 10.5 per cent. From these figures it will be seen that the Nationalists, although they were often absent from the House in attendance and were not present at the Liberal Unionists' one-quarter of the divisions.

1. The figures in this table are based on the Division Lists of the House of Commons, 1892-1905.

IV. Note on the Attendance of Members.¹

It is impossible to gauge with complete accuracy the attendance of members in Parliament but a survey of the Division Lists of any given period can reveal the amount of any member's participation as a voter in the proceedings of Parliament. And since it is, in the last analysis, as voters that members of Parliament are reckoned by their various parties, it is of interest and significance to examine the performance of the various Irish members in the numerous divisions which took place in the House of Commons during the period 1892-95, a period of particular strain when the Government majority was seldom more than 40 and often considerably less.

The total number of divisions in the whole Parliament - from January 1893 to July 1895 - was 836. For this period the average Nationalist attendance was 57.2% of the whole. That of the Parnellites was 25.8%. That of the Liberal Unionists was 41.4% and that of the Conservatives was 45.9%. From these figures it will be seen that the Nationalists, although they were often silent in debate, were assiduous in attendance and fulfilled their pædge of support to the Liberals with fidelity. The Parnellite figure of just over one-quarter attendance demonstrates very clearly their steadfast adherence to the policy of independent opposition. The two Unionist groups exhibit a general similarity - there is only a 4.5% difference between them - and the figures indicate the steady and continuous opposition which, as we have seen in the previous sections, they practised unrelentingly.

1

The figures in this section are based upon the lists in the Constitutional year Books for the years 1894, 1895, 1896.

1

The sessional figures show even more clearly the different interests which impelled the concentration and dispersion of Parliamentary forces during this period. There were four sessions. The first - from January to September 1893 - was dominated by the issue of Home Rule although Gladstone, under pressure from the Non-conformist wing of his heterogeneous majority, introduced two other controversial measures, the bills for the disestablishment of the Welsh and Scottish Churches. The second session, from November 1893 to 5 March 1894, was occupied with the introduction of important English measures e.g. the Parish Councils Bill, the Employers' Liability Bill, the Local Government (England and Wales) Bill. The end of the session, and indeed the end of an era, was marked by Gladstone's retirement from the House, after the Employers' Liability Bill had been dropped in the face of the crippling amendments insisted on by the Lords.

The third session extended from 12 March 1894 until 25 August 1894 and the accession of Lord Rosebery as Prime Minister heralded a new phase, a phase ominous to the Irish members whose anxieties were aroused by Rosebery's speech of 12 March in which he described England as the

1
The following Table conveniently illustrates the figures which represent the average per cent attendance per member.

Date	Anti-Parnellites	Parnellites	Unionists
1893	81.8	62.7	64.0
Winter 1893	49.1	7.5	24.7
1894	52.8	19.4	30.9
1895	45.2	13.6	64.2

"Predominant partner" and announced that his government would ~~next~~^{not} introduce another Home Rule Bill. The Parnellites lost no time in defining their attitude of hostility to the new government and John Redmond spoke for his party when he declared that: "To say that Ireland must not have Home Rule when she had a Parliamentary majority unless she had a majority of English votes as well was preposterous and insulting."¹

Some concession was obviously necessary to hold the Irish vote and in April 1894 an Irish Land Bill, originally introduced by D. Kilbride was taken up by the government and pressed through its second reading, only to disappear thereafter. More important than this was a government measure designed as the best possible substitute for Home Rule. This was a Bill for the relief of the Evicted Tenants, which, after lengthy debate, was carried on the Second Reading by 259 votes to 227. The committee stage was closed and the Third Reading passed on 7 August 1894 by 199 votes against 167. A week later it was rejected by the House of Lords by a majority of nearly 300. From then until the end of the session the Irish Nationalists, baulked of their compensation, contented themselves with harrying the government by direct and indirect attacks on the Upper House.

What was to be the last session of the Parliament opened inauspiciously for the Government with the Parnellites openly declaring their intention of voting with the opposition. Although the Queen's speech contained a reference favourable to the Evicted Tenants, John Redmond moved an amendment to the Address, demanding a dissolution

¹ Hansard 4.3. 22 pp.290-4

² Hansard. 4. 3. pp. 49 et seqn.

and another general election on the Home Rule issue.¹ Undismayed by the fractious temper of the Irish parties, John Morley on 4 March 1895 introduced an Irish Land Bill which met with wide approval - even among the Unionists. On 2 April this bill was read a second time without a division and in May the second reading of the bill to repeal the Crimes Act was passed, though with more opposition. Neither of these bills was, however, destined to pass into law for on 21 June the Government was defeated on the celebrated " cordite amendment."

From this brief analysis of the course of events in Parliament during the period 1893-5, it can easily be seen that for Irish members interest was most intense in 1893, was at a low ebb in the second session, revived in the third under the stimulus of the Evicted Tenants Bill and relaxed again in 1895 since the Land Bill was not a very contentious measure.

The figures for the separate sessions support this contention. Thus the Nationalists in 1893 registered an attendance at divisions of 81.8% - easily the highest of the whole session. For the second session the figure drops sharply to 49.1%; for the third session there is a rise to 52.8% but in the last session the lowest figure was reached, 45.2%. The comparatively low figure for the third session suggests that many members regarded the Evicted Tenants Bill as doomed from the outset for 22 of them were absent from the division for the application of the Closure and 25 from the Third Reading. By 1895 they were evidently disillusioned and vented their displeasure in criticisms of the Lords and desultory obstruction of English measures.²

¹ Hansard. 4.3. 30 pp. 482 et seqn.

² e.g. the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill.

The Parnellite figures show an even greater degree of indifference to the general course of Parliamentary business. In 1893 the average Parnellite attendance was 62.7%; in 1893-4 it fell to 7.5%. It recovered slightly in the third session to reach 19.4% but by 1895 had dropped again to 13.6%

The Unionist figures are less consistent than are those of either of the Nationalist wings. In 1893 they mustered an average of 64%; in the second session the average was 24.7%; in the third it was 30.8% and in the last it was 64.2%, indicating perhaps that the Unionists suspected the Liberal government to be drifting towards defeat. The Liberal Unionists on the other hand presented no such revival; in 1893 they averaged 68.8%, in 1893-4 24.3%; in 1894 36.7% and in the last session 35.8%. From these figures it is obvious that, once the Home Rule Bill had been rejected, the interest of the Irish members perceptibly waned, only the Unionists retaining the ardour of the chase. One more test however has yet to be applied - the attendance of Irish members at divisions on important English measures.

In 1893 for example the Welsh and Scottish Disestablishment Bills were debated; upon one important division on the former, in February, thirteen Irish members did not vote, and in April twelve were absent from a division on the Scottish Bill. On the same divisions the Parnellites lacked two each time and the Unionists lacked six for the first and eight for the second. In the second session one of the most vital divisions for the Government was that on the "Contracting Out" clause of the Employers Liability Bill in which the Government majority was only 18. Twenty-one Nationalists were absent from this division which occurred in November 1893, two months after the rejection of Home Rule. Eight out of nine Parnellites

perfectly plain to us here. They were absent from this division. For the opposition, only thirteen out of twenty-three attended. In 1894 the Government was again in difficulty, this time with the Electoral Qualifications Bill, a Conservative amendment being rejected by only 14 votes. On this critical occasion all but seventeen of the Irish Nationalist members were present, though eight out of nine Parnellites were absent; in support of the Amendment all but six of the combined Unionist forces were present. Even in 1895 when the second reading of the long delayed Welsh Church Bill was decided upon, all but eighteen Irish Nationalists supported the government, as did six Parnellites; seventeen Unionists opposed the measure.

In conclusion we might fairly state the situation thus. The Irish Nationalists fulfilled their pledge of support to the Liberal party as long as Home Rule remained a possibility, and even after that hope had paled they were mindful of their constituents needs and supported the various measures introduced during the life of this Parliament for the improvement of Irish conditions. Moreover they did, as we have just seen, continue to lend valuable support to the Liberals in measures which were introduced by the Gladstone and Rosebery governments. None the less, as the figures show, there was a distinct decline in the average percentage of Nationalist attendance, a decline most marked in the second and fourth sessions, both periods critical for the Government. Indeed the majority Irish party could not afford to link their fortunes too closely to those of the Liberals; such a course would only confirm the suggestions, sedulously propagated in Ireland by the Parnellites, that the Nationalists were the unresisting tools of the Liberal party. As for the Parnellites themselves, their course of action lies

perfectly plain to be seen. Once Home Rule had failed they gave full rein to their hostility towards the English parties and gloried in their independence. Among the Unionists, finally, **we** have to note a steady though unspectacular opposition which eventually achieved its purpose by the unseating of the Liberal ministry in June 1895.

- I. The Irish Members and Irish Business. pp. 170-184
- II. The Irish Members and Other Business. pp. 185-190
- III. Note on the attendance of members. pp. 190-192.
-

I. THE IRISH PARLIAMENT III

2. THE IRISH MEMBERS IN PARLIAMENT. pp.175-192

(1895-1900)

I. The Irish Members and Irish Business pp.176-184

II. The Irish Members and Other Business pp.185-190

III. Note on the attendance of members. pp.190-192.

I. The Irish Members and Irish Business.

Both by reason of its numerical superiority and of the ability of its individual members, the Unionist ministry of 1895-1900 was recognised, even by contemporaries, to have been one of the strongest of the nineteenth century. The Conservatives alone numbered 340 while the Liberal Unionists added a further 71 to the ministerial strength. Against this, the Liberals possessed only 177 seats supplemented by the presence of 82 Irish members whose attitude in this Parliament was still something of an unknown quantity. Thus, the overall majority of the Unionists was 152 and by virtue of this majority they were able to dominate the proceedings of Parliament without reference to the wishes of any minority. In the face of such strength the Irish members were helpless to influence the course of events. Indeed, had the Unionists decided upon a policy of unremitting coercion, it is possible that the prestige of the Irish Parliamentary Party, already considerably diminished, would have disappeared altogether and the appeal to force come twenty years earlier than it did. In fact, the Unionists adopted an entirely different policy and in the course of time passed two fresh measures - the Land Act of 1896 and the Local Government Act of 1898 - of first-rate importance as well as several other acts of considerable benefit to Ireland. The Irish Nationalists were thus saved from the fate of having to witness a regime of coercive methods without power to prevent it, but their position was still sufficiently difficult. They had repeatedly pledged their word to the amelioration of Irish conditions and, often in the very same speeches, they had reviled the Unionists as being the one effective barrier to progress.

¹ Daily Express, 13 July, 1895.

When, therefore, the Unionists initiated their policy of conciliation the Nationalists found themselves in the irksome position of having to accept favours from the party which they had always regarded with hatred and suspicion.

But, even if the Unionist majority had been more vulnerable, even had the Irish Parliamentary Party been able to hold the balance as in former times, it is still only too probable that it would have been unable to intervene effectively. That disunity, which had been so amply demonstrated during the elections, reappeared when Parliament assembled. That close observer, Sir Henry Lucy, diagnosed the disease of Irish politics, accurately if elaborately:- "The blazing comet which, under the stern discipline of Mr. Parnell, flashed across the horizon for the space of ten years, has, after the manner of comets when the central power is withdrawn, been breaking off into pieces large and small." ¹ The division between Parnellite and Anti-Parnellite was an accepted fact but that between Healyite and Dillonite was still comparatively fresh and did much to lower the prestige of the Party in the eyes of experienced observers. In fact, the consequences of this disunity were not so serious as they might have been, since the Irish measures of the government were so obviously beneficial that opportunities for effective opposition were few.

Despite these disabilities the Irish members contrived to take an active part in the proceedings of Parliament. The first important measure affecting Ireland was the Land Bill, introduced in April 1896 by the new Chief Secretary. Gerald Balfour, who expressed his sympathy for the principle of protecting tenants' improvements,

¹ Sir Henry Lucy, Diary of the Unionist Parliament.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Committee stage was the so-called "revolt" of a section of the Irish Unionists headed by Carson, Colonel E. Saunderson and Colonel T. Waring, all violent opponents of the Bill.¹ On 13 July, 1896, Carson, having vehemently upheld the landlords' cause, concluded that the interests of that group were being neglected and, by way of protest, walked out of the House.² Lucey regarded the revolt³ as serious and so it might have been had the Government majority been less; even so it revealed an unwonted spirit of independence in the Irish Unionist party.

Among the Irish Nationalists there was little cohesion. Since the measure was so obviously beneficial the Dillonites dared not oppose it openly although they strove to alter it clause by clause. By contrast, the Parnellites and Healyites were anxious for it to pass. T. M. Healy was assisted, according to Sir Henry Lucy, chiefly by his brother Maurice and by E. F. V. Knox. The ~~same~~^{same} observer could not praise too highly Healy's contribution to the debate. "As an exhibition of inborn and long-trained Parliamentary skill, dauntless courage and illimitable resource, the House of Commons has not seen anything excelling Tim Healy's battle round the Land Bill in Committee."⁴ After the Bill had been passed in the Commons it was amended in some particulars by the Lords. The Commons, having accepted some of the amendments, returned the Bill to the Lords who finally passed it early in August 1896.

¹ Except the debates on the Home Rule Bill in 1893.

² Hansard. 4. S. 43 pp. 206 et. seqn.

³ See Sir H. Lucy: Diary of the Parliament of 1895-1900, p. 98.

⁴ Lucy, Diary, pp. 98-9

The other Irish measure of importance was the Local Government Bill announced by Gerald Balfour in May 1897 and actually laid before the House in 1898. This measure also evoked great enthusiasm. In the course of the debate no fewer than 40 Anti-Parnellites, 8 Parnellites and 10 Unionists intervened, for the most part in Committee. On 21st Feb. 1898 Balfour introduced the Bill. In brief, he proposed to set up County Councils, Urban District Councils and Rural District Councils to be elected every three years on a franchise including women and peers. These bodies were to take over the fiscal and administrative duties of the Grand Juries, but not their criminal functions. No aldermen or clergy were to sit on the Councils. The rates payable by tenants were to be lightened, the Government undertaking to pay half the County and half the landlords' poor rates.¹ When the second reading was debated in March 1898 the general tone of the Irish members' comment was enthusiastic. True, there were exceptions. Dillon was querulous, Davitt thought the measure "lame, halting and dishonest,"² but Healy welcomed it, as did such prominent Unionists as Col. E. Saunderson and W. H. Lecky.³ The Committee stage was carried through slowly during the summer; debate was prolonged, not because of opposition, but because so many members had improvements to suggest. Not until July did the Bill go to the Lords who passed it rapidly and with little debate. By the end of that month it had become law.

¹ Hansard. 4. §. 53. pp. 1227 et. seqn.

² Quoted in the Annual Register, 1898 p. 69

³ See debate in Hansard, 4. S. 55. pp. 775-80 for Dillon's speech and the following pages for the remainder of the Second Reading debate.

In addition to these two measure of major importance numerous other pieces of Irish Legislation were enacted between 1895 and 1900. Acts were passed extending the powers of the Belfast and Dublin Corporations, a department for Agricultural and Technical Instruction was set up in Dublin, a Tithe-Rent charge Act was passed for the relief of landlords and other measures of less importance were carried through. All the measures here listed were thoroughly debated and sufficiently indicate the new method of approach to Irish problems which the Unionists were adopting with success.

Hitherto we have ~~only~~ discussed matters on which Irish opposition could only be spasmodic. Yet, Irish Nationalists could not afford to allow session succeed session of a Unionist Parliament without in some way expressing their independence. The undoubted talent for criticism which they possessed was, as we shall see, exercised to the full in the broader sphere of Imperial affairs, but it was also applied to government conduct on Irish questions which the Nationalists believed to have been neglected or ignored. The best opportunities for the ventilation of such grievances were afforded by the debates on the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech at the beginning of each session. Thus in 1895, when the newly elected ^{Parliament} assembled for the first time, John Redmond moved an Amendment demanding a declaration of policy from the Government on Home Rule, the Land Question, Compulsory Purchase, the reinstatement of Evicted Tenants and the industrial development of Ireland.¹ Following upon Redmond came John Dillon with an Amendment demanding a definite promise on the Land Question.² Both Amendments were

¹ Hansard 4. S. 36. p. 102 et seqn.

² Hansard 4. S. 36. pp. 119-28.

discussed at length - chiefly by the Irish members - and both were rejected by over 100 votes. Similarly, in 1896, Dillon moved an Amendment demanding a declaration on Home Rule, and was seconded by Redmond.¹ The Government was unsympathetic and the Amendment was negatived by 276 to 160 votes. On 14 February 1896, T. M. Harrington moved a time-honoured Amendment seeking the release of the dynamiters; this was supported by various Nationalists but is of more than ordinary interest because it evoked the maiden speech of W. H. Lecky who spoke in favour of the Amendment as "a matter of clemency but not of politics."² In 1897 there were Amendments calling for the establishment of a Roman Catholic University in Ireland and for the relief of Irish Peasants.³ In 1898 Redmond, somewhat maliciously, moved an Amendment demanding Home Rule, largely with the purpose of bringing the Liberals to a declaration of policy.⁴ At the same time Davitt moved an Amendment calling for the relief of the Irish peasantry,⁵ while Dillon again demanded a Roman Catholic University, a plan in which he was supported by Edward Carson and W. H. Lecky, the two members for Dublin University. In 1899 Redmond moved yet another Amendment demanding "legislative independence for Ireland."⁶ By 1900 the country was in the throes of the Boer war but, none the less, there were Irish Amendments seeking relief from over-taxation and advocating compulsory sale.⁷ This list is by no means complete but it

1. Hansard, 4. S. 137. p.169 et seqn.

2. Hansard. 4. S. 37. p.494.

3. Hansard 4. S. 45. pp. 257 et seqn. and 157-61 respectively.

4. Hansard 4. S. 53. -p.371 et seqn.

5. Hansard 4.S. 53. pp.152-9

6. Hansard 4. S. 66

7. Hansard 4. S. 78 pp.1003 et seqn. and 1486 et seqn.

indicates both the nature and the persistence of Irish demands. There was never the slightest possibility of any of these amendments being accepted, nor were they moved with any serious expectation of their success. In part they served to advertise to the rest of the House that the Irish question could not be solved by a few isolated conciliatory measures, and in part they demonstrated to the constituencies that their representatives had not by any means capitulated to either of the great English parties.

Apart from the Amendments there were other occasions also when the Irish members could assert their independence. In 1896, for example, J. J. Clancy introduced a very moderate Evicted Tenants Bill whose chief feature was that the cost of reinstatement would be met by public money and not by the landlords.¹ J. A. Rentoul, for the Ulster Unionists, was by no means antipathetic to the Bill but depreciated the use of public funds;² this was the line adopted by the Chief Secretary who could not sanction the use of public money to restore tenants, many of whom had been evicted under the Plan of Campaign. Rentoul's Amendment against the Bill was carried by 271 to 174 votes and the measure was dropped. A more fruitful occasion for intelligent debate was the discussion initiated by Edward Blake³ in March 1897 on the report of the Commission appointed to consider the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland. The report, issued in 1896, had seemed to show that Ireland had been

¹ Hansard, 4. S. 37 pp.1145-52.

² Ibid pp. 1155-60.

³ Hansard. 4. S. 47 pp.1577-98.

consistently overtaxed since the Union; during the recess of 1896 Nationalists and Unionists alike had thrown aside all differences of opinion in their determination to secure a speedy revision of the financial position. In the debate of 1897 the House witnessed one of the most remarkable displays of unanimity between all sections of the Irish representatives that had ever taken place. Among the Nationalists both in discussion and in the division lobby were to be found several Irish Unionists - e.g. H. Plunkett and R. M. Dane - while several of the most conservative of the Irish Unionist party - men such as Col. Saunderson and Sir Thomas Lea - abstained from voting. It is a measure of the strength of the ministry that, despite such formidable protest, the Government was able to secure the rejection of Blake's motion by 317 to 157 votes.

Even from this brief summary it may be seen that the Irish members remained **active** even though they no longer held a commanding position as in former times. Out of 82 Home Rule members (including Parnellites) only 13 took no part in the various debates on Irish affairs during this period; out of 21 Unionists, only 1 abstained from such intervention. In addition to this it should be remembered that all these members maintained a continual flow of questions upon every possible aspect of Irish life and administration. On the whole questions of local and particular interest ^{pre-} dominated but many members were as curious about the general state of the country as they were about the affairs of their own constituencies. All in all, when T. M. Healy wrote to his brother Maurice in Feb. 1897 that:- "Never has Parliamentary action sunk so low," he may be considered to have taken an unduly pessimistic view

1. Hansard 4 S. 47.

2. T. M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii.430.

II The Irish Members and Other Business.

Where the emphasis of the Liberal ministry of 1892-5 was laid upon domestic measures, that of the Unionist ministry of 1895-1900 fell almost entirely upon foreign affairs. Each session of the latter Parliament had, it is true, its programme of domestic legislation but such programmes were, for the most part, half-heartedly pushed forward and some bills were even abandoned in the face of determined opposition, despite the strength of the Government majority. Such was the fate of one of the Government's most cherished projects - the new Education Bill. The Bill passed its second reading in 1896, a Liberal Amendment being defeated by 423 votes to 156. Opposition hardened however during the next few months and by June of 1896 the Government, despairing of rushing it through Committee, abandoned it altogether. In 1897 an alternative measure, the Voluntary Schools Bill was passed in its stead; this bill, like the earlier Education Bill received Nationalist support because it seemed to offer protection to denominational schools. In the previous year (1896) an Agricultural Rating Bill was passed with some difficulty, several Nationalist members obstructing its passage by demanding a similar measure for Ireland. During the debate on the Second Reading several Irish members were suspended among them Dr. C. K. Tanner, John Dillon, D. Sullivan and J. O'Connor.¹ Numerous other measures attracted the attention of Irish members, as many as 39 Nationalists (including Parnellites) and 11 Unionists participating in debates on English legislation. On the whole such intervention was not of any great significance frequently taking the form of obstructive speeches or of

¹ On 21 May 1896, Hansard 4.S. 41.

demands that Irish business should receive a greater proportion of Parliamentary time.¹

For most Irish members greater interest lay in foreign and imperial affairs. The period 1895-1900 was one of great international strain and tension. War was often near at hand and in many parts of the world fighting was actually in progress at one time or another during the Salisbury ministry. In Europe the difficulty of maintaining the old balance of power was becoming increasingly clear and the efforts of Salisbury to preserve the decaying Turkish regime aroused suspicion abroad and caused considerable searchings of conscience at home. Several times the subject of the Cretan revolt against Turkey was raised in the House of Commons and in February 1897 John Dillon spoke for the majority of Nationalists when he declared that the Cretans were struggling for political and religious liberty and deserved the support of every Christian nation.² In the western hemisphere, as in Europe, problems of diplomacy abounded. First came the question of the Venezuela border when Britain was obliged to submit to the peremptory arbitration of the United States. Next came the Spanish-American war where a delicate policy of neutrality was pursued. The tact and patience of Great Britain during these incidents did something to mitigate the boisterous diplomacy of the ~~limited~~^{United} States and allowed the two powers to approach the problems of the Far East from a more or less common viewpoint. For here also problems existed, problems arising out of the foreign

¹ These figures are based upon a survey of Hansard, 4th series, vols 35-87.

² Hansard, 4. S. 46. pp. 405-8 and 1146-9.

exploitation of China and the natural resentment of the Chinese which was to culminate in the Boxer rising of 1900. In India and Africa also the prospect was disturbed and threatening. In the former there was recurrent plague and famine with intermittent rioting in Bombay. In the latter, although British influence in the Soudan had been restored by Kitchener, there was continued danger of a clash with France, danger realised in the ^Jashoda incident at the end of the period. Worst of all was the speedy realisation that all was not well in South Africa. Members had come to Westminster in 1895 with the echoes of the Jameson Raid still resounding in their ears; they departed in 1900 in the midst of the Boer war. Between these two dates there stretched a miserable record of jealousies, suspicions and recriminations.

All these matters engaged the attention of the Irish members and in almost every case the tone of their comment was critical, if not actually hostile. They were suspicious of Britain's attitude on the Venezuelan question and were vehement for neutrality during the Spanish-American war. As early as 1896 John Dillon moved a reduction of £100,000 as the Army estimates on the ground that the Ashanti¹ war was unjustified. The motion was of course rejected but it was a protest against "imperialism" and, as such, reaffirmed the traditional Irish attitude of suspicion towards all British colonial ventures. It is, however, only just to add that not all Nationalist criticism was hostile for a few members were sufficiently well informed to be regarded as specialists in their subjects. Such a one was J. F. Hogan who throughout this period was constant in his

¹ Hansard, 4. S. 38. pp. 1537-42.

review of the affairs of Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the various islands of the South Pacific. His questions covered every aspect of colonial administration, sometimes with critical intent but often drawing information from the Government which revealed the Colonial office in a very favourable light.¹ Questions apart, few Irish members made any notable contribution to full-dress debates on foreign and imperial affairs. For example, the most important colonial measure of the whole Parliament was the Commonwealth Act of 1900 linking the Australian States into a federation; to this debate only one Irish member spoke at length and he was the former Canadian statesman - Edward Blake. Even his congratulations to the Government were bitter-sweet; after expressing his pleasure at the emergence of an Australian Commonwealth he contrasted the happy state of the new Dominion with that of South Africa and with that of Ireland, concluding his speech with the hope that the Government "may see fit to apply at home the principles which have ruled their treatment of Australia to-day."²

By 1900 however, the Irish party, now reunited, was in little humour for complimentary speeches to the Government. The outbreak of war with the Boer republics in October 1899 aroused in Ireland the widest hostility to Britain and gratitude for recent gains was momentarily eclipsed by hatred for a war which the mass of Irishmen believed to be vicious and imperialistic. When Parliament was recalled for a second session in October 1899 in order to approve the policy which had issued in war and to vote supplies for the prosecution of that war, the Irish Nationalists were vehement in their denunciations. John Dillon at once proposed an Amendment to the Address, denying that Britain had any right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Boer republics and demanding that she should submit her claims to arbitration. "I am proud," he

1. It was, at this period, virtually transformed into a major cabinet post by Joseph Chamberlain.

2. Hansard, 4. S. 83 p. 784.

said, "to be in the position of declaring that in Ireland the overwhelming majority of the people condemn this war¹ as unjust, unnecessary, and cowardly." He ridiculed the idea that the war was one for franchise or for liberty but described it rather as one "for gold and territory". Equally powerful was the language of Michael Davitt who, in an impassioned speech later in the session, characterised the war as "a war for the meanest and most mercenary of ends and aims which ever prompted conquest or aggression, and it will rank in history as the greatest crime of the nineteenth century."² As a protest, he thereupon resigned his seat. Altogether 17 Nationalists spoke against the war, all pledging the hostility of their constituencies and all condemning it as an essay in greed and aggression. Five Irish Unionists supported the Government but did so with moderation.

Once the conflict had begun the Irish members did not intervene extensively in debate,³ although many of them asked numerous questions on the conduct of the war, taking a malicious pleasure in laying bare the confusion and mismanagement at the War Office and elsewhere. Indeed, not all of these were absolutely consistent and a few were to be found condemning the war with one breath and with the next demanding why there was not more honourable mention of the Irish regiments.⁴ On the whole, however, the general effect of the war was to throw the Irish party back once more into

¹ Hansard, 4. S. 77. P.93.

² Hansard 4. S. 71 to 77. P. 620.

³ As a ~~best~~ ^{last} expression of Irish opinion John Redmond moved an Amendment to the Address in 1900 demanding independence for the Boers. It was rejected by 368 - 66 votes. Hansard. 4. S. 78 pp.830 - 42.

⁴ e.g. J. C. S. MacNeill.

isolation. The Liberals, although they had attacked the policy of the Government which had led to a breakdown of negotiations, were bound - with the exception of a few extreme "pro-Boers" such as Lloyd George and Labouchere - to support the national war effort. The Nationalists were bound by no such consideration and hung upon the flanks of the English parties as a perpetual reminder that enthusiasm and war fever were not universal. It is not too much to say that by the end of 1900 the Nationalists had taken upon themselves the role of keepers of the Parliamentary conscience.

III. The Attendance of Irish Members.

Although, as we have seen, the Irish members were far from inactive during this Parliament, the fact that the Unionist majority was so decisive, relieved them from the necessity of a constant attendance in Parliament, the same was true, although to a lesser extent, of the Irish Unionists, whose 21 members formed an insignificant fraction of the Unionist majority. In the Home Rule session of 1893 the Anti-Parnellites had registered an average attendance per head as high as 80% and the Unionists and Parnellites had each maintained an average of over 60%. How great was the contrast in 1895 - 1900, the following figures will reveal:-

Party	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900
² Parnellites	15.7	12.5	21.5	7.2	-
Anti-Parnellites	25.2	24.5	20.3	18.6	19.8
Unionists	34.5	44.5	45.4	38.3	40.3

(Each figure represents the average percentage attendance per head of the respective parties during the period).

The figures which follow are based upon the summary of the division lists contained in the Constitutional year-books for 1895-1900. They do not give precise figures of attendance but are accurate as regards the participation of individual members in divisions.

² The Parnellites in 1900 had become merged in the re-united Irish Parliamentary Party.

Two considerations are suggested by these figures.

One is the relatively high average of the Unionists. This is partly to be explained by the duty imposed upon them of supporting their own Government in office, but partly also by the fact that several of them held minor posts in the ministry and were therefore compelled to attend regularly - thus raising the sessional averages of the party.¹

The other consideration is that the years 1896 and 1898, the years respectively of the Land Act and the Local Government Act, did not stimulate the Irish Nationalists to any high level of attendance. Once again the numbing effect of the Government's majority is discernable.

The falling-off in Irish attendance at divisions is evident even when those divisions were of direct Irish interest. For example, Redmond's Amendment of 1898 demanding a declaration of policy on Home Rule was defeated by 233 votes to 65. Of these 65 the Anti-Parnellites made up 52 (out of a total of 70), the Parnellites 9 (out of 11) and there was one Irish Liberal Home Ruler.² Thus, out of a possible 82 Irish Nationalists 62 were present at this division. So little importance did the Unionists attach to the Amendment that only 14 out of 21 were present to vote against it. The other two Amendments were both protests against the war. In the second session of 1899 Philip Stanhope removed a vote of censure against the government. The motion was defeated by 362 votes to 135. Of this 135 only 36 were Anti-Parnellite and 4 Parnellite. Against the motion were 20 out of 21 Unionists. When Parliament reassembled in 1900 and Redmond moved his Amendment asking that Britain submit to arbitration, 60 Nationalists were found to support it. Thus, even these

1. e.g. J. Atkinson, Attorney-General for Ireland, W. Kenny, D. P. Barton and W. Kenny successively Solicitors-General for Ireland, W. G. Macartney, Secretary to the Admiralty, T. W. Russel, Secretary to the Local Government Board and Lord Arthur Hill for a short time Controller of the Household.

2. Sergeant C. H. Hemphill, M.P. for N. Tyrone.

critical moments found the Irish members relaxed and reluctant to spend more time at Westminster than was actually necessary. When the dissolution came in July 1900 and with it the knowledge of a new General Election in October many of the Irish members were already in their constituencies.

2. THE IRISH MEMBERS 1897-1907

(1890-1902)

- I. The Irish Members and Irish Business. pp. 194-220
- II. The Irish Members and Other Business. pp. 221-226
- III. Note on the Attendance of Members. pp. 226-227

I. The Irish Members and Irish Business.

P A R T III

3. THE IRISH MEMBERS IN PARLIAMENT pp.193-227

(1900-1906)

I. The Irish Members and Irish Business. pp.194-220

II. The Irish Members and other Business. pp.220-226

III. Note on the Attendance of Members. pp.226-227

1 D. Deane, *Parliamentary History of Ireland*, p. 131.

2 See Part I, Section 2, of the *Constitution of the United Kingdom*.

3 See the discussion of the *Irish Question* in the *Parliamentary History of Ireland*, p. 131.

I. The Irish Members and Irish Business.

The participation of the Irish Nationalist Members in the Parliament of 1900-1906 did not begin until January 1901, since, although there was an autumn session to consider the need for further supplies for the South African War, only T. M. Healy attended, and he was expelled from the Irish Parliamentary Party while he was actually at Westminster. When the main body of the Irish Nationalists returned to London in January 1901, they did so with the intention of forcing a debate on the Government's continued use of coercion in Ireland.¹ In fact they initiated a series of debates securing discussion of several different aspects of the Irish question. Events outside Parliament had shown quite clearly that the remedial legislation of the previous Parliament, so far from killing Home Rule with kindness, had only stimulated the Nationalist movement to fresh activity. The chief agent in the revival of agitation was undoubtedly the United Irish League, which, as we have seen,² had dominated the recent General Election. The League itself had not been proved to be an illegal organisation and its principal aim was the settlement of the Land Question by peaceful means.³ It is, however, certain that individual supporters of the League were prepared to use violence under cover of its name and reputation and that a widespread campaign of intimidation and cattle outrages had taken place. This in turn had provoked the inevitable resort to coercion by the Government, which had inflamed the Nationalist members and thus had again completed the vicious circle.

¹ D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, p. 101.

² See Part I, Section 2, on the Selection of Candidates.

³ See the discussion of W. O'Brien's amendment to the Address below.

The attack was soon launched. On 21 February John Redmond moved an amendment to the Address, stating that compulsory sale was the only satisfactory solution of the Land Question.¹ To one observer it appeared that "his proposal was supported by 95 per cent of the representatives of that country."² His amendment was seconded by T. W. Russell who at that time was still a Liberal Unionist.³ Several Nationalists and two Unionists - J. Lonsdale and J. Gordon - supported the amendment which was defeated by 235 - 140 votes. The only prominent Irish Unionists to oppose the amendment were Col. E. J. Saunderson and W. G. E. Macartney.

Two days later William O'Brien moved another amendment setting forth the aims of the United Irish League and demanding that the Government withdraw its measures of coercion.⁴ He was supported in this by three other Nationalist members and answered by J. Atkinson, Attorney-General for Ireland, who admitted that the League as a whole had not been proclaimed, but asserted that individual members were guilty of illegal conduct. This amendment was negatived by 203 votes to 109 and discussion of Irish affairs was for the moment at an end. The Irish Nationalists, however, did not consider that the grievances of their country had received a sufficient hearing and within a few days they had involved the House in a campaign of ^{ab} destruction which, says Redmond's biographer, "recalled the stormiest days of Parnell's leadership."⁵ After the Address had been passed, A. J. Balfour moved the sessional orders allotting the time for

¹ Hansard, H. C. Deb. 4. S. 89. pp 711-28.

² Annual Register, 1901, p. 36.

³ He was to become an Independent Unionist before the Parliament dissolved.

⁴ Hansard, 4. S. 89. pp.905-22.

⁵ Life of John Redmond, p.101.

different business during the coming session in order to facilitate the work of the House. Such organization of Parliamentary time was most necessary, for Government after Government had been obliged to jettison important measures owing to lack of time. The Nationalists themselves had suffered many times from this congestion of business for when a harassed Government was considering which measures could with least risk be dropped from its programme, Irish legislation was very frequently selected. Nevertheless, the Nationalists, maintaining that insufficient time was to be given to Irish business, set themselves to balk the Government in obtaining sanction for its sessional orders, and contrived to hold up the business of the session for a week. Nor did the obstructionism of the Nationalist members cease there. On 5 March an orderly debate on educational policy was coming to an end when A. J. Balfour moved the closure of the debate. The Irish members (that is to say - the Nationalists) refused to leave their places and enter the division lobbies. Thereupon ensued "a scene of extraordinary and scandalous violence."¹ M. J. Flavin cried out that "it was necessary to make a protest" and the uproar grew. Twelve Irish members were "named" by the Speaker, but they remained obdurate. Order was only finally restored when the police were called in to remove one by one, and still volubly protesting,² nine Nationalist members.

As a result of the scene Balfour was obliged to lay before the House a new set of resolutions imposing much more

¹ Annual Register 1901, p. 58.

² They were: W. Abraham, E. Crean, J. Cullinan, Capt. A. Donelan, P. C. Doogan, M. Flavin, J. Gilhooly, W. London, P. M'Hugh - Hansard, 4. S. 90. pp. 691 et. seqn.

² Hansard, 4. S. 90. p. 662.

severe punishment s than hitherto upon those members who persisted in defying the Speaker's authority. This elicited a speech from John Redmond which was at the time regarded as "an authoritative statement of 'Ireland at Westminster'."¹ We quote it here at some length because it does in fact give a very clear view of the position of the Nationalists at this time:-

"....The Irish Members, brought as they are to this House, are a foreign element in this House.... a body to whom the ancient glories and the great traditions of this House have no meaning. So long as we are forced to come to this House to endeavour, in the midst of a foreign majority, to transact our Irish business, we will use every form of this House, every right, every privilege, every power which membership of this House gives us - we will use these things just as it seems to us to be best for Ireland, quite regardless of the opinion and so-called dignity of British members, and absolutely careless of the penalties you may devise for our punishment."²

The incidents of these early weeks of the session have been dwelt upon at some length because they provide the key to Irish Nationalist participation in Parliamentary business, not merely during 1901, but until the dissolution at the end of 1905. Throughout this period - always with the exception of the debates on the Land Act of 1903 - they adopted the tactics of a sort of running warfare with the Ministry. There was, indeed, no repetition of the deliberate destruction of February and March 1901, but, if the debates of this Parliament are compared with those of the last, it will be

¹ Annual Register, 1901 p. 60.

² Hansard, 4. S. 90. p. 862.

seen how much more critical and how much less co-operative, the Nationalists had become. A wide and varied selection of Irish debates resulted from this policy, but - again excluding the Land Act of 1903 - they were peculiarly barren of legislation. A brief summary of some of the debates for the remainder of 1901 should help to illustrate this more clearly. We know from our previous summary of the Nationalist election programme that the project of establishing a Roman Catholic University in Ireland ranked high among their aims. On 19 April 1901, in the debate on the Civil Service Estimates, J. Roche raised this question, being supported by John Dillon and also by the one Irish Unionist member who was also a Roman Catholic, the Hon. Martin Morris, member for Galway City.¹ The debate was quite fruitless, for although Sir Edward Carson admitted the need for some such relief, the determined opposition of the extreme right wing of Irish Unionism - e.g. Col. Edward Saunderson and W. G. E. Macartney - was sufficient to prevent the motion even going to a division.

Meanwhile in Ireland dissatisfaction was growing.

The country was in that state where agitation is often most effective. It was prosperous compared with the numbing poverty of the middle years of the nineteenth century and this taste of prosperity had stimulated the desire for further advance, a desire inevitably accompanied by impatience with the existing order. The more extreme of the Nationalist members identified themselves with this impatience, thereby courting disaster. The first to suffer was P. A. M'Hugh whose journal the Sligo Champion advocated views which were condemned as seditious libel and which secured for him a sentence of six months imprisonment.² This case was discussed

¹ Hansard 4. S. 92. pp.933 et. seqn.

² He had accused the law officers of the Crown of sanctioning - if not of encouraging - jury - packing in Sligo.

at length in the House of Commons with the sole result of generating friction between the Nationalists and the Government. On 10 May another - if somewhat similar - grievance was ventilated when John Dillon moved the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to the seizure by the police of the journal, the Irish People¹. His motion was rejected by 252 votes to 64 and once again irritation had been aroused without any compensating advantage having been gained. We have only considered three cases - one a demand for social legislation and two seeking the relaxation of coercive measures - where Nationalist wishes were disregarded, but they illustrate the continual friction between the Nationalists and the Government and also the eternal dilemma which continually confronted Nationalists pledged to Home Rule and a Government pledged to the maintenance of the Union.

The situation in Ireland was even darker in 1902 than in 1901 and the bitterness of the Irish Nationalist members in Parliament was correspondingly more intense. Intimidation and boycotting had increased considerably and by April 1902 the following Areas had been proclaimed under the Crimes Act of 1887:- The counties of Cavan, Clare, Cork, Leitrim, Mayo, Roscommon, Sligo, Tipperary and Waterford, and the cities of Cork and Waterford. By September the proclaimed areas had increased so as to cover an area roughly half the total of Ireland and including Dublin.² When Parliament met in January 1902, John Redmond moved an amendment to the Address deploring the failure of the Government to deal with the Land Question and condemning the reversion once again to coercion on the large scale. With him were associated 6 other Nationalists - a larger array of speakers than usual

¹ Hansard 4. S. 93. pp.1333-40.

² Annual Register, 1902 pp.246-7.

in a debate upon an Irish amendment to the Address; Col. E. J. Saunderson and W. G. E. Macartney provided the usual Unionist opposition and the amendment was negatived by 237 votes to 134.

The grievance of coercion continued uppermost in the minds of the Nationalist members and was again introduced, this time by John Dillon, when the Civil Service Estimates were under discussion. Four other Nationalists spoke on this occasion; they were opposed by two Unionists and the motion was negatived by 184 votes to 96. There was a brief interval of a few days¹ before the Nationalists returned again to the problem of coercion, when John Redmond moved to reduce the salary of the Chief Secretary because of the continuance of coercive methods. He hinted that the continuance of such a policy might result in a sudden explosion of violence. His argument, and it was supported by T. W. Russell, was that there was little ordinary crime in Ireland but that there was intense political and agrarian discontent; the solution, in his opinion, lay in a settlement of the Land Question.²

Almost simultaneously came an Irish amendment to the Civil Service Estimates regretting the slow progress of the Congested Districts Board; this was a popular cause among the Nationalists and as many as 10 of them participated in this debate. Both these motions were lost by large margins.

This flow of criticism was momentarily checked by the introduction of Wyndham's first, and abortive, Land Bill, a measure which the Nationalists received sympathetically

1.

Even this interval contained an incident calculated to inflame English opinion against the Irish members - see the section on English business, infra.

2

Hansard 4. S. 104 pp.1037 et. seqn.

2

Hansard 4. S. 110. pp.1093-1098.

3

Hansard 4. S. 113. pp. 37 et. seqn.

but which did not long divert their attention from the question of coercion. On 17 April 1902 John Redmond moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the operation of the Crimes Act in those areas which we have listed above.¹ The debate attracted many Irish members from both sides of the House and in all 9 Nationalists and 5 Unionists were heard on the subject. As usual, the motion was defeated (by 253 - 148 votes) and the later parts of the debate degenerated into an exchange of personalities between Nationalists and Unionists. Soon after this, the Government abandoned its Land Bill and turned to considerations of finance and foreign policy. Only one more Irish coercion debate took place during the session; this was John Dillon's motion to reduce the annual vote for the R.I.C. and, in common with the other Nationalist protests, it met with inevitable defeat.²

A special autumn session of Parliament was summoned in October 1902 and at this the Irish Nationalists attended for the purpose of making yet another protest against the proclamation of large parts of the country. The protest was made by William O'Brien and six other Nationalists who moved the adjournment of the House to consider "the danger to the public peace caused by the conduct of the Executive in Ireland."³ The motion was of course defeated by the usual margin of about 100 votes, and the Nationalists, with a few insignificant exceptions, departed en masse for Ireland.

The session of 1903 opened with a much brighter prospect in view. During the recess much had happened in

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 106. pp.554 et seqn.

² Hansard 4. S. 110. pp.1393-1408.

³ Hansard 4. S. 113. pp. 39 et. seqn.

Ireland. The Land Conference, summoned on the initiative of Capt. J. Shawe-Taylor, had met, and, to the astonishment of the country, representatives of the tenants and of the landlords had agreed upon the principal conditions necessary to a satisfactory settlement of the Land Question.¹ A happier era seemed to have dawned when the Address in reply to the King's Speech at the beginning of the 1903 session was allowed to pass with the minimum of interruption from the Irish members. There was, it is true, an Irish amendment, but it was one which produced a display of unanimity among Irish members very rare in the House. On 25 January 1903, John Redmond moved an amendment asking that the Government should implement the Land Conference proposals. Five other Nationalists spoke in support and George Wyndham (Chief Secretary) was sympathetic on behalf of the Government. Most interesting of all was the support given to the amendment by the Irish Unionists - particularly by Col. E. J. Saunderson, J. Gordon and T. W. Russell. So obviously favourable was the feeling of the House that the amendment was withdrawn without a division.² Further unanimity was apparent when representatives of the different Irish sections agreed in support of a bill - the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor (Ireland) Bill - designed to check the widespread drunkenness prevalent in Ireland, and introduced by a private member, the Independent Unionist, T. H. Sloan.³ At last - on 25 March 1903 - George Wyndham introduced his promised Land Bill and, in view of the attacks

¹ See W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, chap. ix, for a first-hand account of the Conference.

² Hansard, 4. S. 118. pp.805-10.

³ Hansard 4. S. 119. pp.27 et. seqn.

subsequently made upon this measure, it is interesting to note that it was warmly welcomed by representatives of all shades of Irish opinion. Discussion was not lengthy but tributes were paid by John Redmond, T. W. Russell, T. M. Healy and Col. E. J. Saunderson.¹ The second reading debate was commenced on 4 May and in the interval a National Convention had met in Dublin to consider the terms of the Bill and to suggest amendments. In May, therefore, John Redmond, while still completely cordial, gave notice that he would press for the amendments laid down by the Convention. This apart, the second reading progressed as swiftly as the first.² On May 7 it was passed by 433 votes to 26.

It was not until the middle of June that the Committee stage was reached. By that time Nationalist criticism had hardened into firm dislike of the 'zone' system. Wyndham held that in cases of estates sold under the Act, the price should be so fixed as that the amount of instalments to be paid by the purchasing tenants to the State, which should pay off the landlord, should show a reduction of between 10 and 30 p.c. in cases of second term and between 20 and 40 p.c. in first term rents. He would not raise the minimum limit of reduction but did agree to increase the range of exceptions to these zones - for example, he agreed to exempt non-judicial tenancies ultimately. Wyndham permitted free bargaining altogether outside the zones. These debates occupied the 15, 16 and 17 June; after this, the committee stage ran more smoothly. By 17 July the Report stage had been reached and 4 days later the Third Reading was passed. In the Lords the Bill underwent minor amendment which met with little opposition in

¹ Hansard, 4. S. 120. pp.208-14 for Redmond's speech.

² Hansard, 4. S. 121-2.

the Commons and by early August 1903 the greater part of the Land Conference recommendations had become law as the Land Act of 190~~2~~¹. As evidence of the keen interest displayed by the Irish Nationalists in this measure it may be mentioned that of 82 Nationalists in the House no fewer than 48 participated in the debates on the various stages of the Bill. Of 21 Unionists, 12 participated. Naturally, almost all these interventions took place in Committee for only 6 Nationalists and 4 Irish Unionists spoke on the Second Reading.

The session of 1903 thus closed in an atmosphere of conciliation and good-will. Before describing the sudden chill, the bleak hostility, which fell upon the last two sessions, we must turn for a moment from consideration of purely Parliamentary tactics to the state of the rival Irish parties. Within the Nationalist party there were already signs of stress. If we recall the circumstances under which John Redmond became the leader of the re-united Irish Party we find that he did so at the expense of John Dillon who had since 1896 led the Anti-Parnellite majority and who now, none too graciously, acquiesced in Redmond's assumption of leadership. We know also that an important factor in the reunion of the Party had been the rise of the United Irish League. The moving spirit in this enterprise had been William O'Brien who had thrown all his considerable influence on the side of Redmond and who had himself ridden on the ~~wave~~^{wave} of popular enthusiasm into a high place in the counsels of the Party.² Finally, we know that T. M. Healy, the fourth Irish member of outstanding personality, was excluded from the Party in December 1900. To this last fact

¹ Hansard, 4. S. 123-5.

² The peak of his popularity was probably reached at the National Convention in Dublin in June 1900. See Freeman's Journal, 20 June, 1900.

we owe several important glimpses of the state of the Party at this time. Coloured by prejudice no doubt they are, but the letters written by Healy to his brother Maurice at this time have a degree of freedom and detachment which would have been impossible had he been on terms of intimacy with those who decided the policy of the Party.

During 1901 Redmond was consolidating his position and little of importance occurred. But on 24 January 1902 we have a letter written from Healy to his brother Maurice in a mood of disillusionment.... "I see no hope for the country from the present Party and feel I am wasting my time here." Then he adds that Dillon and T. P. O'Connor are not reconciled to Redmond's leadership,¹ and a little later he sets down (not, this time, in a letter) why this should be.... "As long as Redmond led the Parnellite minority he was, like myself, in favour of trying to harness the Tory government to schemes of reform for Ireland. From the moment, however, that he became leader of the United Party, Dillon, who was a convinced Liberal,² dominated him, and strove to thwart concessions to Ireland by the Conservative government." Now this is a statement in which several different ideas are confused but it does contain a clue to the events of the next two years. We need not here concern ourselves with either proving or disproving the charge of Dillon's Liberalism, the fact that some Irish members thought him to be a Liberal is more important. The second fact of importance is that some Irish members believed Redmond to be under the domination of Dillon. Actually, this is a highly controversial point and seems to have been very much a matter of opinion. For example, in conversation

¹ T. M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii . p. 456.

² My italics.

with the present writer, Mr. Stephen Gwynn (member for Galway 1906-18) while admitting that Dillon was the more assertive of the two at Party meetings, yet held that Redmond had reserves of authority upon which he could draw if he wished. This view, however, does not accord with those of two other members expressed in their reminiscences. These men, William O'Malley and Arthur Lynch, while regarding the principal leaders of the Party in very different ways, reached somewhat similar conclusions. O'Malley says of Redmond: "During the twenty years I sat in the Imperial Parliament... no man impressed me more, or caused me to admire him so much as John Redmond."¹ Yet he says later: "Whenever questions of policy arose at the Party meetings it was always John Dillon who 'cleared the air'.² Arthur Lynch, on the other hand could only say of Redmond that he... "has always seemed to me the character in whom duplicity was deepest",³ but he described a Party meeting in terms similar to those used by O'Malley. He described how, at these meetings, Redmond would make "a non-committal introductory address... After a few speeches John Dillon would rise... and instantly one could feel the expectancy that now we were going to have the policy of the Party announced."⁴

There is thus some support for Healy's statement that Redmond was, to some extent at least, dominated by Dillon, but even if this were not so the belief that it was so and the effect of that belief upon the relations with each other of the various members of the Irish Party is our immediate concern. Moreover, Dillon's attitude towards the Land Act of 1903 further strengthens Healy's case. It seems clear

¹ W. O'Malley, Glancing Back, p. 58.

² Ibid. pp. 125-6.

³ A. Lynch, My Life Story, p. 225.

⁴ Ibid., p. 263.

now that, after first welcoming the Act, Dillon later criticised it severely. The reason for this change of front only became plain to the supporters of the Act by degrees. The stages of this disillusionment are clearly set out by William O'Brien in his Olive Branch in Ireland. At first he thought the hostility of Dillon due to some personal cause; then it occurred to him that it might be due to some radical defect in the Land Act. Only later did he become aware that he and Dillon were doomed to inveterate hostility because they had come to represent two entirely different approaches to the solution of the Irish Question. Both were concerned for the future of Home Rule but O'Brien passionately believed that the path towards it would be made easier by the acceptance of any casual benefits which could be wrung from British ministries of either party. To this Dillon was unalterably opposed since he held that social legislation would weaken the demand for Home Rule, and thus a clash became inevitable.¹

What was only gradually revealed to O'Brien seems to have been plain to Healy from the summer of 1903 if not earlier. For example, during the debates on the Land Bill he wrote: "The Wyndham Act is as much the O'Brien Act as Wyndham's. His colleagues however were jealous and Davitt sided with Dillon and Sexton in hostility."² On 3 April 1903 he wrote to his brother Maurice: "The Government are in a shaky condition. Enthusiasm for them there is none and none for the Purchase Bill.... Dillon, Davitt, and Sexton are hostile to O'Brien and if I were to join them the Bill would be killed and William dished, but

¹ See W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, chaps. xii-xiii for an account of the newspaper campaign against the Act, the growing difficulty of his own position and his consequent resignation from the Party in 1904.

² Healy, Letters and Leaders, ii, p. 461

I could not be guilty of such faction as to oppose it."¹
 This may be only sublime egotism but it seems to correspond very closely to the subsequent course of events which led up to O'Brien's resignation in 1904 and to the reopening of a split in the Party.

Amongst the Unionists also there were signs of discontent. One section seemed to have cut itself away altogether from its background by meeting the Nationalists at the Land Conference and by producing in concert with them a scheme based ultimately on the extinction of landlordism. Not content with this, the liberal wing of the Irish Unionists was beginning to show itself favourable to the establishment of a Roman Catholic University. The suspicion and hostility of the extreme right wing had already been aroused by the appointment of Sir Anthony MacDonnell as Under Secretary for Ireland. MacDonnell had had a distinguished career as an Indian Civil Servant and only took his Irish office on the understanding that he should have a considerable voice in the shaping of policy. He made no secret of his Nationalist sympathies and was in fact a² brother of the Nationalist member, Dr. M. A. MacDonnell. Irish Unionists had already secured the displacement of Sir Horace Plunkett at the General Election of 1900 because of his liberal policy of co-operation with Nationalists in social legislation; it was possible that the extremer Unionists, if sufficiently provoked, would aim higher still in the future.

In England, meanwhile, events were running against the Conservative ministry. The Report of the Royal Commission on the South African War had greatly lowered the

¹ Ibid, p. 462.

² All these facts were made known to leading Nationalists at a meeting with MacDonnell - see W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, p. 154.

prestige of the Government. Worse still was the Fiscal controversy which had been opened by Joseph Chamberlain in the summer of 1903. The gulf once opened in the Unionist ranks proved impossible to close and during the recess Chamberlain and several other Ministers withdrew from the Government.

When Parliament reassembled on 2 February the Nationalists were once more prepared to resume criticism of the Government, though the ground of the attack had now shifted from the Land Question to that of education. This formed the burden of Redmond's speech of 3 February 1904 when he moved an amendment to the address "strongly reasserting the Nationalist demand for Home Rule."¹ His speech was followed by those of 6 other Nationalists and was also supported by T. W. Russell, who, in the course of this session was to transfer his political allegiance from Liberal Unionism to Liberalism. The amendment, of course, defeated. Closely following this general demand for Home Rule came an amendment reflecting the views of that section of the Party which was already hostile to the Land Act of 1903. This was moved by P. A. M'Hugh who demanded the abolition of the zone-system; he was supported chiefly by Redmond and by the two Irish Liberals, T. W. Russell and C. H. Hemphill. This amendment was negatived by 219-124² votes.

The next significant intrusion of Irish affairs into the general course of business was ill-omened for the Government. In the middle of March 1904 the House was debating the Civil Service Estimates when John Redmond suddenly introduced a "snap" motion censuring the Government for limitations imposed in Irish schools upon the teaching

¹ Annual Register, 1904, p.23

² Hansard, 4. S. 130 pp.262-79.

of Irish. Amid excitement the motion was carried by 141 votes to 130.¹ There was, of course, no question of the Government resigning after defeat upon so minor a question but the incident served to reveal very clearly how far the Conservatives had travelled from the assured grip they had had upon the House a few years earlier. Apart from a protest by J. G. S. ~~MacNeill~~^{MacNeill} and W. Redmond against police activities a few days later, the Irish members remained quiescent until the Budget was debated. It was a heavy Budget and it included a tax on tea which was fiercely assailed by the Nationalists who declared - in vain - that it would bear most hardly upon the poor.

The last third of the session of 1904 was notable more for the signs of revolt among the Irish Unionists than for any outstanding Nationalist contributions, but before considering the Unionists' situation we shall consider very briefly the principal debates in which Nationalists participated. One of the most interesting of these was a motion introduced by J. P. Boland for the repeal of the Crimes Act of 1887. The motion was of course defeated but its main interest lies in the fact that it elicited from Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader, a speech in support.² Even more significant was the debate which arose on the vote for the Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, of which Sir Horace Plunkett was Vice-President. His policy was freely criticised but far greater bitterness was aroused by his recent book, Ireland in the New Century. The thesis of this book was that the future of Ireland lay in economic regeneration rather than in political agitation. This viewpoint might be described

¹ To describe the affair as "an Irish question case." The Hansard 4. S. 131. pp. 1142 et seqn.

² Hansard 4. S. 130⁴. - see pp. 38-49 for Col. E. J. Sanderson's defence of Plunkett.

See pp. 460-3 for Boland's Speech.

as an enlightened Unionism, a viewpoint which endeared itself as little to the Nationalists as it had to the Unionists four years previously. The motion was defeated by 146-76 votes after 8 Nationalists had joined in the attack - an unusually large number of Irish members for a mid-session debate.¹ The following day an Irish measure, the Labourers Bill, was allowed to pass its second reading without a division; it was designed to improve the lot of labourers on the land - as distinct from tenants - and was recognised by all parties to be so inadequate to the purpose as to be beyond the dignity of criticism; it never became law.

Until the last week of the session the time of Parliament was occupied very largely with English business. In the last week, however, occurred an eruption among the Irish Unionists revealing how greatly the more reactionary among them had been alienated from the Wyndham-MacDonnell regime. On 3 August Col. E. J. Saunderson, perhaps the most unyielding of the Irish Unionists, moved the reduction of the Chief Secretary's salary to call attention to the dismissal of Constable Anderson of the R. I. C. The details of the case need not concern us here but Saunderson alleged that Anderson had been accused of conduct unbecoming to his service and had been acquitted and that, some time later, at a second hearing he was dismissed the service upon evidence supplied by a Roman Catholic priest. The Irish Unionists were loud in their denunciation of the Chief Secretary and of his assistant; they had always feared the appointment of Sir Antony MacDonnell and now their fears were justified. Col. Saunderson himself did not hesitate to describe the affair as "an Irish Dreyfus case." The

¹ Hansard 4. S. 136. see pp. 38-43 for Col. E. J. Saunderson's defence of Plunkett.

motion was not pressed to a division but the session closed with the unpleasant fact established that the Administration in Ireland had succeeded in antagonising all sections of Irish opinion.¹

This incident has been related at some length because it provides the background for the almost tragic events which occurred at the beginning of the session of 1905. During the recess Lord Dunraven, who had been the most liberal-minded of the landlord representatives at the Land Conference, carried his landlord associates into a new body, the Irish Reform Association, whose object was soon shown to be the attainment of a greater degree of self-government for Ireland. It issued a preliminary sketch of its intentions to the press on 31 August 1904, and on 23 September published a Report which outlined the Association's policy of "Devolution". This Report envisaged Irish control over purely Irish expenditure, exercised by an Irish Financial Council, whose decisions should be reversible only by the House of Commons and even then by a majority of not less than one-quarter. Of this Council, the Lord-Lieutenant should be President, the Chief-Secretary Vice-President, and twelve members should be elected by groups of county and borough council and Parliamentary constituencies, and eleven nominated by the Crown. Of these members, one-third should retire in rotation at the end of every third year, though they were eligible for re-appointment or re-election. Various suggestions were made as to the revenue which might be handed over to this Council, as well as to the extent of the control to be exercised over expenditure; the powers of the new Council in such matters

¹ Hansard, 4. 3. 139 p. 738.

as private bill legislation or local government were also¹ optimistically discussed in the Report.

Almost immediately a series of misunderstandings arose. In Ireland, Dillon and others of his following regarded the whole scheme as a plot to cheat Ireland of Home Rule. Redmond, on the other hand, who was then in America, cabled home that....²"This announcement is of the utmost importance. It is simply a declaration for Home Rule and is quite a wonderful thing. With these men with us Home Rule may come at any moment." The position was further complicated by the fact that the scheme had been known to Sir Antony MacDonnell and, probably, also to Lord Cadogan, the Lord-Lieutenant.³ The Reform Association believed that Wyndham also knew of it, and was favourable to, ~~to~~ their scheme. MacDonnell maintained afterwards that he had written to Wyndham - who in September was away on holiday - apprising him of the conversations he was having with Dunraven. Wyndham denied all knowledge of the scheme and wrote - on 27 September - a letter to The Times repudiating any connection with the Report and saying that the Government was averse to any multiplication of legislatures within the British Isles. His denial did not satisfy the extremer Irish Unionists whose suspicions were now acutely aroused.

The prospect awaiting the Ministry when Parliament reassembled on 14 February was bleak indeed. Greatly weakened by internal dissensions on the fiscal question, they had now to face a storm of abuse and criticism from the Irish Unionists. On 16 February Wyndham was subjected to a

¹ Annual Register 1904, pp. 242-3

² D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, p. 106.

³ Such is Gwynn's view and such was certainly the belief at the time.

stream of questions from C. Craig and other Ulster Unionists seeking to determine the part played by MacDonnell in the early stages of the "Devolution scheme" as it was now generally called. Next, on 20 February 1905, John Redmond moved an amendment comprehensively denouncing the existing system of Government. There followed the rare spectacle of a Nationalist amendment being virtually annexed by Irish Unionists and pressed to a division against a Unionist Ministry. Seven Unionists and ten Nationalists contributed to the torrent of criticism which now burst upon the Chief Secretary's head. The amendment was only defeated by 286-236 votes, seven Irish Unionists abstaining.¹ Even after this Wyndham had still to answer, day after day, a constant flow of questions probing the relations between the Chief Secretary and MacDonnell. In the course of this ordeal Wyndham admitted that Sir Antony had been appointed "as a colleague rather than as a subordinate." At once (22 February) John Redmond moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the conditions under which MacDonnell had been appointed, and although this was defeated by 265 to 223 votes, the pitiless pressure continued. There was a slight lightening of the gloom when both Irish parties found themselves at one in supporting (1 March) an amendment moved by Capt. A. Donelan, complaining of the inadequate provision made for the Irish labourers. But the situation had become impossible. MacDonnell refused to resign, and, since he and Wyndham could no longer remain together, Wyndham's resignation was announced on 1 March.²

¹ Hansard 4. S. 141. pp. 622-32.

² Hansard 4. S. 141-2. The crisis impressed Sir Henry Lucy as being exceedingly grave. In 30 years experience, he said, "I have not seen anything exceeding the virulent passion, the personal hatred, displayed this week by respectable-looking Ulster members, denouncing a Unionist Chief Secretary, accused of having trafficked with the accursed thing, Home Rule." The Balfourian. Parliament p. 362.

The storm gradually died down when Wyndham was removed, but for the remainder of the session criticism rather than co-operation was the characteristic of the Irish debates. On 7 March, for example, Kendal O'Brien moved a Resolution expressing deep concern at the failure of the Executive to reinstate evicted tenants. J. Atkinson defended the Government but received very rough handling from the Nationalists.¹ On 14 March J. P. Hayden moved a Resolution condemning the Government for not anticipating the prevalent distress in the West of Ireland. The following day P. J. O'Shaughnessy forced the Government to accept a Resolution condemning excessive Irish railway rates.² On 20 March the Estates Commissioners were extensively criticised during the debate on the Irish Estimates on Edward Blake's motion to reduce the vote for the Land Commission. The following day P. Ffrench moved and D. Kilbride seconded, a Resolution condemning the zone-system; this was only defeated by 139-104 votes, a margin of 35.

About this time also occurred one of those exasperating debates on Irish affairs which served to accentuate the unhappy state of affairs then existing by showing what, under more fortunate conditions, might have been achieved. On 20 March P. O'Brien moved the second reading of a Town Tenants Bill, designed to improve the lot of tenants in towns as the Land Act had been designed to improve the lot of agricultural tenants. It was a subject upon which Irish members felt deeply, and 13 Nationalists besides O'Brien and 3 Unionists spoke in its favour; the Government was not

¹ Hansard 4. S. 142. pp.657-9

² Hansard 4. S. 143 pp.146 et seqn.

unsympathetic but, owing to pressure of time the measure was never passed into law and the Irish members reverted to the familiar round of criticism and complaint.¹ There was one further occasion on which Nationalist and Unionist forces were joined but since it was on a point of criticism and not on a constructive measure little resulted from it. The Nationalist, John Hammond, was joined by Nationalists and Unionists alike "in pressing upon the attention of the Treasury the doubtful solvency of the Irish National Teachers Pension Fund."² The Government promised amelioration but Redmond forced a decision on the issue and this resulted in the defeat of the motion by the extremely narrow margin of 24 votes.

This discussion of Teachers' Salaries was followed by what appeared to one observer to be a "profoundly unsatisfactory debate on the subject of higher education."³ A Resolution demanding a Roman Catholic University for Ireland was moved at the outset of a debate on the Civil Service Estimates by J. Murphy and seconded by E. H. Burke. It was opposed by the Presbyterian John Gordon on the usual grounds that it would lead to enhanced control of Irish public life by the Roman Catholic Church, but the most significant feature of the debate was Balfour's "speech of impotency and despair,"⁴ in which he admitted his own predilection for the scheme but confessed his inability to carry the country or the Cabinet with him.⁵ Against a Government thus divided and weakened the Irish attack was pressed with renewed ferocity. In the debate on the

¹ Hansard 4. S. 143. pp. 1082 et. seqn.

² Annual Register, 1904 p. 128

³ Annual Register, 1904, p. 130.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Hansard 4. S. 145 pp. 91-9 for Murphy's speech.

Finance Bill J. J. Clancy moved an amendment on the now familiar theme of the over-taxation of Ireland; the amendment, whose principal supporters were Dillon and J. G. S. MacNeill, was defeated by 83 votes.¹ A further opportunity for harassing the Government was offered when the vote for the Chief Secretary office was debated. John Redmond moved the reduction of the vote, stigmatising W. H. Long's appointment as Chief Secretary, as a concession to the "ascendancy party." This also was defeated, by 145 votes to 98.²

The next eruption occurred in July when John Redmond moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the conduct of the Irish Executive in proclaiming Galway under the Crimes Act and substituting special for ordinary juries, a motion vehemently supported by Joseph Devlin and as vehemently opposed by J. Gordon and Col. E. J. Saunderson. The motion was defeated by only 40 votes.³ Later in the same month - on the vote for the Land Commission - John Redmond moved to reduce the vote by £100 as a condemnation of the Land Act of 1903. Nine Nationalists and T. W. Russell joined in this condemnation of the only constructive legislation passed by this Parliament for Ireland. This, the last of the Irish critical debates in this Parliament, ended on a note of ironic justice for when a division was taken the Government was defeated by 200 votes to 196.⁴ Earlier it had been possible to ignore such a defeat; the situation of the Government was now so serious that such a course would have been unthinkable. The next day (23 July)

¹ Hansard 4. S. 146 pp.307-21.

² Hansard 4. S. 146 pp.1422-5.

³ Hansard 4. S. 148 pp.989 et seqn.

⁴ Hansard 4. S. 149 pp.1416-25

a special Cabinet Council was held and it was decided to continue in office for a few days more and then to dissolve, a decision denounced by Redmond as contemptible but accepted none the less.

The policy of the Irish Nationalists between 1900-6 should now be quite clear. The period was devoid of any large-scale legislation for Ireland, with the single exception of the Land Act of 1903 and even this, as we have seen, seemed to have fallen into disrepute by 1905. Other measures in which the Irish members were interested, such as the Town Tenants and the Labourers' Bills, were either not passed or were inadequate for their purpose. There was, of course, Irish legislation of a minor character e.g. several railway Bills, a Public Offices Bill, a Belfast Harbour Bill, a Sale of Intoxicating Liquor Bill, a Bill for the Registration of Clubs. But none of these measures touched any of the vital aspects of the Irish Question. These urgent problems - the land, the evicted tenants, education, over-taxation, were, as we have seen, the subjects of repeated amendments and Resolutions moved by the Irish members. Criticism and not co-operation, it must be stressed, was the keynote of the attitude of the Irish Nationalists in this Parliament.

That the policy of the Party should have been destructive and not constructive at this time was particularly unfortunate because the many new members who had been elected in 1900 contained among them a high proportion of able speakers and men expert on the various problems of the country they represented. Formerly the burden of debate fell upon 3 or 4, or at the most 6,

1

This is particularly true of the Land Question since many of the new members were either farmers or small country shopkeepers, and were thus in direct contact with the problems of the countryside.

Irish members; now the figure had risen to 10 or 12. Indeed the bulk of the Party was capable of participating in debate. While the number of Nationalist seats remained constant at 82, 90 Nationalists actually passed through Parliament during this period. Of this total no fewer than 71 took part in the debates on the Irish Bills which were introduced between 1900 and the end of 1905, while as many as 56 intervened in those miscellaneous critical debates which we have already enumerated. In addition to these numerous debates the Irish members directed day by day a ceaseless flow of Parliamentary questions examining in detail every conceivable aspect of the state of Ireland both as regards the central administration and their own individual constituencies. Such activity as this scarcely seems to merit the comment attributed by T. M. Healy to Eugence Crean ... "they are the worst party ever elected and should be starved out."¹

For the Irish Unionists the record of this Parliament was extremely unsatisfactory. Although Sir Antony MacDonnell had been appointed Under Secretary as early as 1902 in the face of their hostility they had remained quiescent and had co-operated in the passing of the Land Act of 1903. The deterioration - as it must have seemed to them - of the situation after 1903 fulfilled their worst fears, culminating in the Anderson case and in the Devolution crisis. Their part in securing the dismissal of George Wyndham was a hollow victory. Throughout 1905 they saw the Unionist Government sinking steadily under accumulated stresses, with the corresponding probability of a Liberal triumph at the next General Election becoming steadily plainer. Fearful of a Liberal movement towards Home Rule, resentful of a

¹ T. M. Healy, Letters and Leaders, ii p.473.

Conservative recession from the strictest canons of Unionism, the Irish Unionists looked out at the end of 1905 upon a gloomier prospect than that of any other group in Parliament.

II The Irish Members and Other Business.

Until 1902 the primary topic of interest in the House of Commons was foreign policy - more particularly the conduct of the war in South Africa and the situation in China. On the war the views of the Irish members were well known and when a special autumn session was held in 1900 to vote further supplies for the prosecution of the struggle, the Irish Parliamentary Party did not attend. Only T. M. Healy attended this session and he attacked the South African policy of the Government in a characteristically brilliant speech.¹ Even when the Nationalists returned to Westminster the war situation still dominated the scene. Some Nationalists made brief pro-Boer speeches but the only major Irish contribution came - as so often in foreign affairs - from John Dillon, who attacked the policy of the concentration camps.² The ten days following this were, as we have seen, occupied by the struggles of the Irish members to secure a larger proportion of Parliamentary time for the discussion of Irish affairs. Before the House proceeded to domestic business, Dillon again seized the opportunity of attacking the war policy in a debate on the Supplementary Estimates for the Army.³ From then until the Easter recess the Government allowed business to drift, thus foreshadowing the wastage of time and of their majority which distinguished this Parliament

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 88.

² Hansard 4. S. 89. pp.1239 et seqn.

³ Hansard 4. S. 90 p. 233

Little of importance was discussed during this time with the exception of a debate on colonial policy which was enlivened by some Nationalist interventions, following the usual practice of illustrating evils anywhere in the world by analogy with those existing in Ireland.

After the recess the principal ministerial measure was the Education Bill, introduced 7 May and coolly received on all sides as being merely a stop-gap measure.¹ From this the House moved on to discuss the Finance Bill embodying the proposals of what had been regarded as a heavy Budget. This debate drew heated protests from the Nationalists on the theme of over-taxation, culminating in the withdrawal of many of them from the Chamber. When Parliament reassembled after Whit Balfour was obliged to move (11 June) that the Government have precedence for its own business i.e. the Finance and Loan Bills, a Rating Bill, the Education Bill and a Factory and Workshops Amendment Bill. Apart from discussion of these matters the only other debate of first-rate importance was Lloyd-George's motion for the adjournment of the House to call attention to conditions alleged to be prevailing in the concentration camps in the Transvaal. A second Education Bill was introduced, the first having been allowed to lapse, and, of all the debates just mentioned, this was the only one which attracted much Nationalist intervention. The general trend of their intervention was critical and although a Conservative Education Bill, being favourable to denominational and therefore to Roman Catholic schools, was expected to receive Nationalist support, the Irish Party chose to demonstrate its independence by voting frequently against the Government.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 93 pp. 970 et. seqn.

² Hansard 4. S. 95-98.

Indeed, the Bill only passed its Third Reading by 200 - 142 votes although at the beginning of the session the Government's overall majority was reckoned at 134.¹

Early in 1902 the Nationalists obtained yet another opportunity to vent their disapproval of British policy in South Africa. On 20 January a Liberal amendment was moved condemning Government policy but not the war itself; Dillon amended this amendment to include the war as well as the "barbarous" policy of the concentration camps. His amendment was negatived by 283-219 votes. One further excursion into Imperial affairs was made by Nationalist members when J. P. Boland moved an amendment to the effect that Malta was being denied her civil rights. This, however, provoked a crushing reply from Joseph Chamberlain, and the amendment was withdrawn.²

The greater part of 1902 was occupied with discussion of the Finance Bill and of the various Estimates. Scarcely any legislation of importance was passed, and apart from more or less expert contributions by J. C. Flynn on the proposed loan Duty and by Dr. R. Ambrose on the Midwives Bill³, the chief employment of the Irish Nationalists lay in criticising the war, or, since peace was announced in June, in attacking the proposed grant to Lord Kitchener. The House usually listened to these attacks with complacence but on one occasion the Nationalists overstepped the limits of propriety; on 5 March the House heard the Secretary for War announce the defeat and capture of Lord Methuen at Tweebosch; instantly, laughter and cheering broke from the

¹ Hansard 4. S. 95-99.

² Hansard 4. S. 101-4 for both these debates. See Hansard 4. S. 101 pp.400 et seqn for Dillon's speech and Hansard 4. S. 100 p.1168 for J. P. Boland's speech.

³ Hansard 4. S. 111. p. 38.

Nationalist benches. Even Sir Henry Lucy, whose diaries abound in sympathetic references to Irish members, wrote that in thirty years experience of scenes in the House.... "I do not recall any that made so painful an impression as that created to-night when the Irish members broke in with shouts of jubilation on Mr. Brodrick's story of the capture of the wounded Methuen."¹ Incidents such as these prevented any real development of cordial relations between English and Irish parties whatever negotiations might pass between their respective leaders.

The winter session of 1902 produced, as we have seen, a Nationalist protest on the subject of coercion, after which they withdrew to Ireland leaving yet another Education Bill to its fate, despite its promise of favourable conditions for Roman Catholic schools.

In 1903 the Land Bill occupied most of the energy and attention of the Irish members, and their participation in English and Imperial Affairs was negligible. Apart from J. C. S. MacNeill's amendment to the Address demanding that members of the Government should not continue to hold Company Directorships,² there was virtually no Irish intervention of importance in English debates during the session. Indeed, apart from a few minor pieces of legislation there was very little English intervention either. And this for a very important reason. In May of this year the first signs of the great issue of Tariff Reform appeared; no one could as yet guess that this difference between the leaders of the Government would grow until it caused the fall of the Ministry, but from the moment that the issue was stated publicly, the legislative initiative of the Government,

¹ Lucy, The Balfourian Parliament, 1900-5 p. 139.

² Hansard 4. 3. 1903 pp. 1043 et seqq.

³ Hansard 4. 3. 118 pp. 381 etc.

Hansard 4. 3. 193 The bill was withdrawn near the end of the session.

never strong, almost ceased altogether.

By the opening of 1904 the issues of Tariff Reform had been clarified. Joseph Chamberlain and several others of the Cabinet had resigned and on 8 February John Morley moved a Liberal amendment to the Address demanding assurances that Free Trade would continue. Gerald Balfour, replying for the Government, made the first of those vacillating speeches which were to become the stock-in-trade of Government spokesmen and which contributed materially to their ultimate downfall. The Government, he said, was not Protectionist, but, at the same time held itself entitled to impose 'defence' or retaliatory duties, while not committed to Chamberlain's scheme of colonial preference.¹ The Nationalists watched the situation closely and John Redmond defined their position. They declined to commit themselves doctrinally, but would vote for the amendment as a vote of want of confidence in the Government; the amendment was only lost by 51 votes. Difficulties thickened round the Government as the session wore on. Several Nationalists, among them W. Redmond, attacked it on the subject of the recent Somaliland expedition, while the Liberals repeatedly condemned it for the use of Chinese Labour in the Transvaal mines.² The Budget and the subsequent Finance Bill attracted further criticism from many Irish members who attacked the tea-duty as an undue burden on the poor. Of the Government measures, the only one to interest Irish ~~members~~ ^{members} was the Aliens Bill, which they opposed since it seemed to threaten ³ disabilities towards homecoming Irish emigrants.

The last, and most humiliating, session of this Parliament commenced on 14 February 1905; on 15 February

¹ Hansard 4. S. 129.

² Hansard 4. S. 130 pp.1049 et seqn.

³ Hansard 4. S. 133 The Bill was withdrawn near the end of the session.

H. H. Asquith moved an amendment demanding a Government declaration on the issue of Tariff Reform and the feeble replies of the ministerial spokesmen only served to reveal once more the vacillation of the Cabinet between Free Trade and Protectionism. In general the Irish members, now as in 1904, concentrated upon purely Irish grievances with the exception of J. G. S. MacNeill who, together with the English Labour member¹ Keir Hardie, moved the adjournment of the House as a protest against the appointment of Lord Selborne to succeed Lord Milner as High Commissioner in South Africa. The amendment was rejected by 226 to 178 votes. It is unnecessary to follow the Conservative Ministry through the last phases of its decline and we have already demonstrated the part played by Irish affairs in its final defeat.

Certain general features may be observed in this brief account of Irish members and English business. We have seen that there was very little major English Legislation and that - as in Irish affairs - the Irish members were able to concentrate upon criticism. Some 63 Nationalists intervened in these English and Imperial debates, but, with the exception of the examples we have already named, their contributions were negligible. The emphasis was more on foreign and Imperial affairs than upon purely English debates. It is noticeable also that the Irish Unionists did not make any large-scale contribution to these varied discussions; eleven of them indeed intervened in these debates, but ~~these~~ ^{their} interventions were fragmentary and of little importance. On the whole, therefore, it may be said that Irish contributions to subjects which lay outside the

¹ Hansard 4. S. 142 pp. 201 et seqn.

range of their own immediate wishes and demands, were slight and of very little significance.

III Note on the Attendance of Members.¹

Date	Unionist	Nationalist
1901	49.4	64.5
1902	34.5	36.1
1903	38.0	18.4
1904	47.9	44.1
1905	47.1	55.5

In the above Table the columns of figures under the headings - 'Unionists' and 'Nationalists' refer to the average percentage attendance per member during each of the sessions 1901 to 1905. For example, in 1901 the average attendance of the Unionist member was 49.4% of the whole, that of the Nationalist 64.5% - and so on during the remaining sessions.

The relative indifference to any but Irish measures or debates which was exhibited by both Irish parties during this Parliament is reflected in the figures given above. The highest figures for both Irish parties come during the first and last sessions which is to be expected. The year 1903 which witnessed the peak of Irish achievement yet shows the lowest level of attendance of all five sessions for the Nationalists and the second lowest for the Unionists. However, when the second reading of the Land Bill went to a division 74 Nationalists and 16 Unionists were there to support

¹ The figures in this Table are based upon the lists published in the Constitutional Yearbooks, 1901-6.

it. This contrast between the close attendance of Irish members in divisions concerning Ireland and their laxity in those concerning other spheres of Parliamentary interest may be further illustrated by the following comparisons. In 1901 on the vote for the grant to Earl Roberts 55 Nationalists opposed and 12 Irish Unionists supported the motion. In 1902, on John Redmond's amendment to the Address 65 Nationalists attended, only 10 Irish Unionists opposed it. In 1904, on Morley's Fiscal amendment, 71 Nationalists supported the Liberals and 15 Irish Unionists opposed it; 2 Irish Unionists voted for the amendment. In 1905 73 Nationalists and 2 Irish Liberals supported Redmond's Home Rule amendment and only 6 Unionists opposed it. Thus the Irish members were consistently more frequent in their attendances upon Irish than upon other business. Furthermore the Irish Nationalists had on the whole higher average attendance than had the Irish Unionists.

1. Irish Members and Irish Business

The Liberal majority at the General Election of 1906 was so overwhelming as to make them independent of any other group, or combination of groups, in Parliament.

P A R T III

4. THE IRISH MEMBERS IN PARLIAMENT pp.228-278.

(1906-1910)

I. Irish Members and Irish Business. pp.229-259.

II. Irish Members and other Business. pp.259-271.

III. The Parliament of 1910. pp.271-276

IV. Note on the Attendance of Members. pp.276-278.

(1) Campbell-Bannerman was "stronger than ever" for Home Rule. It was "only a question of how far they could go in the next Parliament."

(2) Campbell-Bannerman's own impression was that it would not be possible to pass full Home Rule; but he hoped for something "which would be consistent with and would lead up to the other."

1. They had a majority of 84 over all other parties combined. See R.C.K. Seeley, England 1870-1914, p.296.

2. T. M. Healy, Letters and Lectures of Mr. Healy, p.10.

1. Irish Members and Irish Business.

The Liberal majority at the General Election of 1906 was so overwhelming as to make them independent of any other group, or combination of groups, in Parliament.¹ Normally, this would have been a situation very unfavourable to Irish interests but on this occasion the Irish leaders were not unduly perturbed. True, T. M. Healy wrote to his brother Maurice (12 December 1905) before the Election, in a somewhat pessimistic strain: "The best of my judgement about the new government is that they want to bury Home Rule, and will do nothing that they are not forced into."² But Healy was still outside the Party and was not to know that the process of 'forcing' had already begun. How far advanced it was may be seen from the following memorandum made by John Redmond after he had had a meeting with the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, before the General Election. Redmond placed the results of this interview under three heads:-

- (1) Campbell-Bannerman was "stronger than ever" for Home Rule. It was "only a question of how far they could go in the next Parliament."
- (2) Campbell-Bannerman's own impression was that it would not be possible to pass full Home Rule; but he hoped for something "which would be consistent with and would lead up to the other."

¹ They had a majority of 84 over all other parties combined - see R.C.K. Ensor, England 1870-1914, p.386

² T. M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii. p.475

(3) Campbell-Bannerman "felt quite independent of the Rosebery crowd."¹ (i.e. that section of Liberals which followed Lord Rosebery in his repudiation of Home Rule).

This was a satisfactory assurance but it was only made at a private meeting. The situation was put upon a more secure basis a few days later when Campbell-Bannerman made his now-famous declaration of policy at Sterling, using almost the same words as he used to Redmond when he repeated that he hoped for a measure of Irish government "consistent with and leading up to the larger policy."² Thereafter, as we have seen, Home Rule became a cardinal issue of the election campaign in Ireland. When Parliament met early in 1906 great interest was aroused by the Government's statement of policy in Ireland. The passage referring to Ireland ran as follows:-

"My ministers have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies in the system of government in Ireland, and for introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs. It is my desire that the government of the country, in reliance upon the ordinary law, should be carried on, so far as circumstances permit, in a spirit regardful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people."³

This statement was indeed not very explicit but it

¹ This document is printed in D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, p. 115.

² Ibid. p.116.

³ Annual Register, 1906, p.17.

satisfied John Redmond speaking for the Party as a whole. William O'Brien also accepted it while stressing the need for a solution of Irish problems according to the methods of conference and conciliation. Significantly enough, the only Irish amendment to the Address came from the Unionists, when ^{Col.} E. J. Saunderson moved that many in Ireland viewed with alarm the statement that changes were contemplated in Irish government. His speech consisted largely of variations upon the familiar theme that Home Rule implied Rome Rule.¹ Walter Long, supporting the amendment, complained of vagueness in the Government proposals. Of more interest to the Government than Unionist protests was the attitude of the Nationalists, and Dillon's speech was as satisfactory as could have been expected. He declared that: "He and his friends accepted those words (i.e. the passage from the king's speech quoted above) as a broad declaration of principle - - - They were quite prepared to give the Government reasonable time to work out the details."²

This tolerant, and even friendly, attitude of the Nationalists towards the Government did not however preclude them from playing their usual role of critics in general of Irish administration. There were many such critical debates, arising either from ordinary discussions on the Irish estimates, or from Resolutions on specific subjects moved by Irish members, or even from occasional motions for the adjournment of the House moved by them. It would be

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 152, pp.372-9.

² Ibid, pp370-1.

See pp. 972-81, 984-8 and 998-1001 for the speeches of John Redmond, John Dillon and H. P. Barris respectively.

tedious and unnecessary to give a detailed account of these debates since many of them were concerned with the same or similar subjects. We shall, therefore, follow our usual custom in these surveys of Parliamentary activity, of selecting those debates which exhibit most clearly the problems which most occupied the Irish members and the methods by which they sought to obtain solutions of these problems. Before describing these debates, however, we must first consider the principal legislation affecting Ireland which came before Parliament during the two sessions of 1906.

Three measures of importance were passed during this year - the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors Act, the Labourers Act and the Town Tenants Act. Of these, by far the most important - and by far the least controversial - was the Labourers Act which passed its Second Reading on 13 June "amid a chorus of approval."¹ The object of the Bill was to promote the building of labourers' cottages by the local authorities and to establish a loan procedure to enable them to do this. Although some of the interest on the loan was to be paid from Irish sources, Irish members of both parties welcomed the scheme as a whole. The Bill had a peaceful passage through the House of Commons, but its financial clauses were subjected to some amendment by the House of Lords. These amendments were debated in the Commons on 1 August and two of them were rejected when the Speaker called attention to the fact that they constituted

¹ Annual Register, 1906, p.151.

² Hansard 4. S. 158. See pp. 972-81, 994-8 and 998-1002 for the speeches of John Redmond, John Dillon and H.T. Barrie respectively.

Hansard 4. S. 158, pp. 1563-70 for Sloan's speech on the Second Reading.

intervention in the Commons control of finance and were thus a breach of privilege.¹ A crisis might well have developed on this point but the Lords were already embroiled with the Commons on the subject of the Education Bill and they shrank from further extending the area of conflict; thus, by the end of the summer, the Bill became law. In all, 7 Nationalists, 1 Liberal and 6 Unionists spoke on the First and Second Readings. In Committee and on the Third Reading 7 Unionists, 1 Liberal and 14 Nationalists intervened. Both the other measures were in some degree controversial. The Sale of Intoxicating Liquor Bill was designed to reduce the amount of drunkenness in Ireland.

It was introduced by the Independent Unionist, T. H. Sloan, and supported by several other Ulster Unionists (5 in all), whose pledges on the subject of temperance legislation had formed an important part of their election programmes. The Bill was opposed vigorously by some of the Nationalist members (7 spoke on the Second Reading), partly on the ground that it would damage the liquor trade, partly on the ground that temperance legislation was generally ineffective.² The Second Reading was passed by 243 to 46 votes; the Bill was then referred to the Standing Committee on Trade and became law later in the year.

Greater heat was aroused by the Town Tenants Bill which received its Second Reading on 18 May 1906. In the previous Parliament a Town Tenants Bill had been debated and had been approved in principle by all parties. It had, however, been sacrificed in the usual "massacre of the innocents" at the end of the session. The new Bill carried

¹ Hansard 4. S. 157.
Hansard 4. S. 162.

² Hansard 4. S. 165.
Hansard 4. S. 158, pp. 1565-70 for Sloan's speech on the Second Reading.

the objects of the old one very much further and it was correspondingly unpopular with the Unionists. Its principal objective was the safeguarding of tenants' improvements and the regulation of the rules governing compensation for disturbance - the achievement, in short, for Town Tenants of some of the earliest goals of the tenants on the land. The Unionists held that the new Bill was too heavily weighted against the landlords, but their protests were unavailing for the Second Reading was passed by 244 to 54 votes,¹ after 5 Nationalists, 1 Liberal and 1 Independent Unionist had spoken for it, and 4 Unionists against.

The struggle in Committee was keen and protracted² and only in November did the Bill emerge from the Commons. On arrival in the Lords it at once became involved in the crisis in the relations of the two Houses which was, even at this early date, impending - "The Education Bill set up an acute conflict; the Plural Voting Bill intensified it; so, in a lesser degree did the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, the Land Tenure Bill, and the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill."³ However, in the pressure of so much business the Bill did not suffer unduly and the few modifications introduced in the landlords' favour were not sufficient to prevent the Bill passing into law in December.

Thus the Irish members obtained three substantial measures of legislation for Ireland in 1906, no mean achievement when it is remembered that a very heavy and contentious programme of social reform for England had been set on foot by the Liberal Government at the same time.

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 157.

² Hansard 4. S. 166.

³ Annual Register, 1906, p.225.

However, these achievements did not represent the sole Parliamentary activity of the Irish members. The Nationalists, in particular, though expecting substantial benefits from the Liberal Ministry, did not relax their critical examination of Irish administration. Innumerable Parliamentary questions were put to the Chief Secretary at this time seeking detailed information as to the progress of the Land Act of 1903, and also as to the speed with which evicted tenants were being restored. Both these matters were debated at length during the year. When the Irish estimates were being discussed John Redmond moved the reduction of the vote for the Land Commission to draw attention to the reappointment of some 22 Estates Commissioners of whom the Nationalists disapproved. The incident itself was unimportant, but it provided an opportunity for Redmond himself and for Dillon, together with 7 other Nationalists, to voice their growing dissatisfaction with the working of the Land Act.¹ The only two Unionists who spoke - H. T. Barrie and G. Fetherstonhaugh - defended the Act of 1903, though it appeared that Government sympathy was with the Nationalists.

The other - and closely related - question of the evicted tenants was raised by John Redmond during the autumn session, when he censured the Government in very sharp terms for its failure to accelerate the pace of reinstatement of tenants. He was supported in this protest by his brother W. Redmond, by W. J. Duffy, J. C. Flynn, W. Delany and Sir Thomas Esmonde. The Unionist viewpoint was expressed by Walter Long, H. T. Barrie and T. L. Corbett; once again,² the Government was conciliatory and the debate lapsed.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 154 pp. 323-30.
Hansard 4. S. 156, pp. 748-9 et sequ.

² Hansard 4. S. 157 pp. 1061 et sequ.
Hansard 4. S. 113, pp. 53 etc.

If the Land and the evicted tenant questions were the traditional subjects of debate for the Irish members, those of education and coercion had become in recent years almost as familiar to the House. In 1906 there were two debates on Irish education which were of exceptional interest. One, it is true, was of no intrinsic importance; this was the motion by W. J. Duffy, demanding that the funds of Trinity College, Dublin, should be applied to the educational benefit of Ireland as a whole.¹ Duffy was supported by John Redmond, J. G. S. MacNeill and J. J. Clancy, while Trinity College was defended by its own representatives - J. H. M. Campbell and Sir Edward Carson. The debate was significant, not because of the original proposal, which was purely hypothetical, but because it gave utterance at a very early stage *in this Parliament* (March 1906) to that demand for a Roman Catholic University for Ireland, which was to be answered fully and satisfactorily in 1908. One other aspect of Irish education engaged the attention of the Nationalist members, when T. O'Donnell moved that the House refuse to sanction the rules for the Irish Intermediate Education Board on the ground that the facilities provided for the teaching of Irish were inadequate.² The motion was defeated after 4 Nationalists and 2 Irish Liberals (C. H. Dodd and T. W. Russell) had supported it and 3 Irish Unionists opposed it. The Nationalist attitude to Irish Education - whether primary, secondary or higher - was that, apart from being inefficient it took too little account of Irish nationality, and the authorities responsible must therefore be continually attacked in Parliament.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 154 pp.323-30.

² Hansard 4. S. 157 pp.1061 et sequ.

One more debate may be mentioned here, to illustrate the range of Irish activity. This was concerned indirectly with the familiar subject of coercion. In March, W. Delany rose to call attention to the law of contempt in Ireland, instancing several cases of what he considered to be unjust imprisonment for infringement of the law. He described the power of the judges as "arbitrary and unlimited," and his Resolution demanding a revision of the law was passed without a division; altogether, 3 Nationalists and 1 Liberal spoke in favour of the Resolution and 4 Unionists opposed it.¹

During 1906 the Nationalists had accepted the three remedial measures of social legislation which have been described, but at the same time they were pressing the Government hard to fulfil the promise of self government implicit in the King's Speech. All through the year there had been negotiations with James Bryce - then Chief Secretary. In October, Redmond and Dillon met Bryce to hear the details of a projected scheme of reform, but found it unsatisfactory in several ways.² Later (1 November) Redmond met Lloyd-George who asked his opinion of the following scheme for the session of 1907.

(1) Next year's king's Speech to contain a promise of an Irish Land Bill and also a Bill for the better largely government of Ireland.

(2) The Government to concentrate on an English Land Bill and take it first.

(3) If the Lords cause the hanging-up of the Education Bill and reject the Plural Voting Bill this year

Ibid. p.135.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 155. pp.579-84.

² D. Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, pp.134-5.

and reject the English Land Bill, then dissolve and go to the country, on the House of Lords question Redmond records that he "expressed no opinion" on this plan; he might well be non-committal for the proposals indicated that Irish measures would probably be delayed until the Liberals had settled their quarrel with the Lords.

Meanwhile, Augustine Birrell had succeeded Bryce as Chief Secretary (in January 1907) and Redmond was soon in contact with him as to the proposed scheme of reform. It transpired that this was to take the form of a Council of from 80 to 90 members; three-quarters of these were to be elected, the remainder nominated. The Chief Secretary was to be ex officio a member of the Council. Through the Council, the Lord-Lieutenant was to control the following Irish departments - the Local Government Board, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Public Works, the Primary and Intermediate Education Boards and the Congested Districts Board. Any matter allegedly ultra vires was to be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; The main provision for finance lay in the creation of an Irish fund from money paid over by the Imperial Exchequer, this last presumably being an attempt to redress the oft-expressed grievance of over-taxation. Redmond demanded that, for the election of members of the Council, the present Parliamentary constituencies should be largely retained, but to this Birrell would not agree, postulating constituencies approximating to those which now elected the members of the borough and county councils.

¹ Ibid. p.135.

² See Gwynn, op. cit. pp. 142-3.

¹ Annual Register, 1907, p.18

² Hansard 4. S. 169 pp.89-104.

In due course Parliament reassembled and the King's Speech contained, in addition to a heavy programme of English legislation, proposals for the reform of University Education in Ireland and "for further associating the people of Ireland with the management of their domestic affairs."¹ This declaration was welcomed by Redmond who stressed that nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of the fulfilment of "the larger policy". The essentials of his speech are contained in the following passage:

"We regard them (i.e. the Government) as being pledged to deal with it (i.e. Home Rule) this session and to deal with it on lines which will lead to what I may call complete self-government but it is desirable that I should repeat, although some Hon. Members may be tired of the repetition, that we on these benches stand in exactly the same position as we have stood for the last twenty-five years. We believe that they can settle this question and we believe nothing can bring peace and prosperity and contentment to Ireland short of the concession of a Parliament to Ireland with executive responsibility."²

This speech contained within it a warning to, as well as a profession of faith in, the Government. In one other direction the Nationalists showed that their hopes for Home Rule did not blind them to the existence of more immediate problems.³ On 14 February, J. P. Hayden moved an amendment to the Address, representing that the promises made by Parliament in 1903 to the evicted tenants had not been fulfilled and demanding that the powers of the Estates Commissioners be increased to meet the situation. He was

¹ Annual Register, 1907, p.12

² Hansard 4. S. 169 pp.89-104.

supported in this protest by several other Nationalists - notably John Dillon, John Redmond and H. A. Law. Birrell promised remedial action and the motion was withdrawn.

It was significant that in fact the only two important pieces of Irish legislation introduced by the Government during this session, were concerned with the issues which had been debated on the Address. The first of these was the Irish Council Bill, introduced by Birrell on 7 May 1907, "in a House whose aspect and crowded condition reminded some of the scenes when Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills were introduced in 1885 and 1893."¹ The provisions of the Bill closely resembled the particulars of the scheme we have already described. The new Council would consist of the Chief Secretary (with no vote), 82 elected members and 24 nominated members. The former to be chosen (every three years) by the electors who at present returned the local government representative; the latter to be nominated in the first instance by the Crown and, after the first period, by the Lord-Lieutenant. The Council was to have complete control by resolution of those departments mentioned above. The Lord-Lieutenant was, however, entitled to reserve any resolution; he might either confirm it or annul it, or remit it for further consideration by the Council; his interference was to be capable of being criticised in the House of Commons. The Council would delegate much of its work to Committees. A new Education Department would be set up which would be responsible to the Council and which would embrace primary and secondary education. An Irish fund was to be established to bear the expenses of the new Council.²

¹ Annual Register, 1907, pp.117-18.

² Annual Register, 1907, pp.117-18.

The Unionists attacked the scheme vigorously, scenting in it a resemblance to the ill-fated Dunraven scheme which had aroused so much bitterness in the previous Parliament.¹ Five Unionists spoke but only John Redmond replied on behalf of the Nationalists. He was described as giving the measure "qualified approval";² in fact, he was definite in his insistence upon the inadequacy of the measure; "What they offer us to-day is not Home Rule What we mean by Home Rule is a freely elected Parliament with an executive responsible to it."³ The fact was not known at the time but he and Dillon had already largely decided against the scheme as it stood. It has sometimes been assumed that Redmond supported the Bill in Parliament and suddenly abandoned it in confusion when he was confronted with a hostile public opinion at the National Convention which met in Dublin in May to consider the Bill, and this abrupt change of front is taken to mean that Redmond was out of touch with the run of opinion in Ireland. To a certain extent this latter charge may have been true, but the publication of correspondence which passed^d between Redmond and Dillon in the early days of May, disposes of the legend that Redmond went over to Dublin prepared to place a Resolution favourable to the Bill before the Convention, and that he substituted for it one hostile to the Bill when he realised the temper of the delegates. In fact, as early as 13 May, Redmond had written to Dillon expressing dis-

¹ See especially the speech of J. H. M. Campbell in Hansard. 4. S. 174. pp.167-8.

² Annual Register, 1907 pp.118-19.

³ Hansard, 4. S. 174 pp.112-28.

⁴ e.g. Sir James O'Connor, History of Ireland, 1798-1924 11. p.171.

satisfaction with the measure which had been outlined by Birrell in the House of Commons, six days previously, and saying that he thought it a Bill "which is not calculated to promote a settlement of the Irish question." Dillon replied very much in the same sense and even suggested that the Convention (which was to be held on 21 May) would call for the rejection of the Bill, though he personally would have preferred the responsibility for the abandonment of the measure to have been laid at the door of the House of the Lords. He also warned Redmond that the Convention might be difficult to handle. In addition to Resolutions expressing gratitude to the Government for promises on the subjects of University education and the reinstatement of evicted tenants, there were to be others deploring the condition of primary and secondary education and demanding a Bill to amend the Land Act of 1903. Apart from these incidental Resolutions Dillon's letter was concerned largely with the procedure to be adopted towards the Irish Council Bill. We have already quoted a sentence from the draft of Redmond's Resolution; another passage from it will serve to show his attitude towards it. The Resolution was to "express the deep disappointment that the present Government have declined to propose a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, even at a time when all the world applauds their concession of autonomy to the Boers." To this Dillon replied "Your draft resolution is a very strong one and would, I assume, involve the immediate abandonment of the Bill, for this session at all events. I am not prepared to say it is a bit too strong for the situation."¹ From these extracts we can see clearly that the two leaders of

¹ Gwynn, Life of John Redmond, pp.143-6

the Party were consistently opposed to the measure and that the outburst of hostility against the Bill, shown at the Convention, was neither unexpected nor repugnant to them.

When the Convention did meet, Redmond was deprived of the support of Dillon,¹ and found that feeling was running very high indeed. Adapting himself to the temper of the meeting he denounced the Bill as "utterly inadequate in its scope,"² and a Resolution demanding its abandonment was passed by the Convention. In face of this formidable protest it was clearly useless for the Government to proceed any further with the measure and on 3 June the Prime Minister formally announced the discontinuance of the Bill. In its place he announced an Evicted Tenants Bill, which was introduced by Birrell on 27 June. It contained the important provision that where necessary the Estates Commissioners should be empowered compulsorily to acquire land for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. The Second Reading was taken on 8 July and provoked vigorous criticism from the Unionists to whom the principle of compulsion was now, as ever, abhorrent. The most prominent among them were W. H. Long,³ W. Moore, H. T. Barrie, and J. H. M. Campbell. The Independent Unionist, T. H. Sloan, supported the Bill though disapproving the principle of compulsion. In all, 5 Nationalists intervened in favour of the Bill while 6 Unionists opposed it.

Later in July the Bill passed through Committee with much opposition from the Irish Unionists. Their amendments were directed towards four main aims:- (1) To limit the

¹ The death of his wife at this juncture withdrew him from active politics for some days.

² Gwynn, op. cit. p.148.

³ Hansard 4. S. 177 pp.1214-26.

amount of land which could be compulsorily acquired. (2)
 To limit the number of evicted tenants to be restored. (3)
 To secure a public hearing before any 'planter' was dis-
 possessed. (4) To alleviate the hardships of such dis-
 possession.¹ All these amendments were rejected by large
 majorities and the Third Reading was passed on 23 August
 after 4½ hours debate.² Between 9 and 15 August the Bill
 was debated in the Lords and was returned to the Commons in
 a very mutilated condition. These amendments were debated
 on 21 August; among them were proposals to limit the
 compulsory powers of the Estates Commissioners, to restrict
 the number of tenants to be restored to 2000, to set up
 appeal machinery and to reserve sporting rights. All these
 amendments were rejected in the first instance by majorities
 averaging about 120 but the Lords insisted on concessions
 and the Government, as yet unwilling to embark on a definite
 challenge to the Lords, was obliged to yield the major part
 of the Lords' demands.³ They abandoned compulsory powers
 for the Estates Commissioners, accepted the 2000 limit for
 reinstated tenants and the reservation of sporting rights.
 The Nationalists left the House in a state of high indigna-
 tion after Redmond had condemned the Bill and warned the
 Government that they were courting an outbreak of violence
 in Ireland.³ The Evicted Tenants Bill of 1907 thus took
 its place as one of the many measures which strained the
 relations of the Lords and Commons; indeed, it may be
 ranked as one of the more important of such measures, be-
 cause it brought home to the Nationalist Party as a whole,
 what was already known to its leaders, that the struggle

¹ Hansard 4. S. 178.

² Hansard 4. S. 179.

³ Hansard 4. S. 180-2.

for Home Rule could be involved in, and might be preceded by, a struggle with the House of Lords.

In the intervals of these debates the usual round of criticism continued, some of it emanating from Irish Unionists, some from Nationalists. In the first weeks of the session, for example, W. Moore moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the appointment of C. H. Dodd, former Irish Liberal Home Rule member, to an Irish judgeship. Moore's accusation of jobbery was repelled by the Government and the motion was easily defeated by 264 votes to 63.¹ In March, the subject of coercion was once more introduced when two Nationalists, M. Hogan and J. Nolan, moved a Resolution calling upon the Government to repeal the Crimes Act of 1887. This was opposed by J. Gordon who argued that "no law-abiding subject had anything to fear from the statute."² None the less, Birrell pledged the Government to repeal the Act and the Resolution was carried by 252 to 83 votes. This debate was followed - on 23 March - when John O'Connor condemned the prevailing system of Primary education in Ireland, a condemnation in which he was supported by 7 Nationalists and 3 Unionists; so obviously at one on this issue were the two Irish parties that no vote was taken.

How consistently the thoughts of the Irish members revolved round the same subjects was shown by the next debate of importance. This was a Land Bill introduced by a private member, M. Hogan, which passed its Second Reading and was referred to a Standing Committee from which it did not again emerge. Its importance lies in the extent to which it foreshadowed the Act of 1909 and in the extent of

¹ Hansard 4. S. 169 pp.1269 et sequ

² Annual Register, 1907, p.57, and Hansard 4. S. 171 pp.126-8 et sequ.

its difference from the Act of 1903. The objects of the Bill were stated concisely by John Dillon to be three - viz. the abolition of the zone-system, redistribution of the bonus and compulsory purchase.¹ All these provisions were repugnant to the landlord representatives and all were destined to re-appear, in one form or another, in the Act of 1909.

Following our usual practice, we shall select two more from the various Irish debates of the session, to illustrate further the chief aspects of Irish Parliamentary activity. The first of these was a debate on the Irish Local Government Board which was made the occasion for a critical survey of the conduct of the Irish executive as a whole. Criticism was extensive and came as much from the Nationalists (of whom 7 spoke) as from the 5 Irish Unionists who intervened. On this occasion however the Irish Members were unable to draw any promise of improvement from the Chief Secretary.² The other debate of interest, in view of the legislation of the following year, took place on 4 July when the vote for the Queen's Colleges gave T. M. Kettle the opportunity of raising once more the question of a Roman Catholic University for Ireland.³ The debate was carried on in a temperate manner and was chiefly notable for Sir Edward Carson's departure from the strictest canons of Irish Unionism in assenting to a suggestion thrown out by S. L. Gwynn, that Trinity College should be left in its present isolation and that a separate College be established for Roman Catholics.⁴

¹ Hansard 4. S. 172 pp.1284-99.

² Hansard 4. S. 173.

³ Hansard 4. S. 177 pp.889-903.

⁴ Hansard 4. S. 177 pp.919-19.

The end of the session saw the Nationalists in a mood of some dissatisfaction, heightened by the fact that their prestige in Ireland had suffered from their inability either to hold the Government to the terms of its original Evicted Tenants Bill, or to extract from them any measure of Home Rule other than the abortive Irish Council Bill. Possibly, sensitivity towards this feeling of frustration in the country prompted the second re-union of the Party; at any rate, such a reunion took place in November 1907 when William O'Brien and T. M. Healy, together with Sir T. Esmonde, D. D. Sheehan, J. O'Donnell and J. Roche, rejoined the Party. O'Brien was most insistent that Healy should rejoin with him and pressed him to accept Dillon's interpretation of the Pledge which was that it bound a member to conformity with the Party viewpoint outside, as well as inside, Parliament. As a safeguard for his own well-known views on the proper method of solving Irish problems, O'Brien insisted on the following conditions:-

- (1) No man or party has authority to circumscribe the inalienable right of Ireland to the largest measure of self-government it may be in her power to obtain.
- (2) Pending Home Rule, the Party should work for "every measure of practical amelioration which it may be possible to obtain for our people from either English party."
- (3) Co-operation of all classes and creeds of Irishmen¹ is to be cordially welcomed.

¹ W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, pp.428-31.

Contained in these clauses was the essence of O'Brien's attitude to politics at this time, i.e. his belief in the value of social legislation and his corresponding belief that co-operation, and only co-operation, could solve the Irish Question. How deeply he and Dillon differed on these points, we have seen when we considered the history of the Party after the Land Act of 1903. Whether that fundamental difference could now be reconciled, whether the present treaty marked a permanent peace or merely a truce, the coming sessions would show.

Although the King's Speech for 1908 contained proposals for the reform of Irish University education and for the amendment of the Land Act of 1903, the Irish Nationalists returned to Westminster in the least conciliatory temper which they had yet displayed in this Parliament. Their attitude was summed up by John Redmond in his speech in the general debate on the Address. After a word of recognition of the proposed University legislation he warned the Government that the Irish Nationalists were not prepared to wait indefinitely for satisfaction while the Lords and Commons fought over the details of controversial English legislation:-

".....Although my colleagues and I are most anxious to give any assistance in our power to the democracy of this country in obtaining reform, following thereby the traditions which have come down to us from the Nationalist representatives since the days of O'Connell, at the same time we feel that our real business here, I had almost said our only business, is not to promote measures of reform for Great Britain, but to obtain measures of reform for Ireland."¹

¹ Hansard 4. S. 183 pp. 547-57.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 183 pp. 151-64.

The Unionist attitude remained severely critical towards the Government and soon after Redmond's declaration, Walter Long moved an amendment to the Address, deploring the omission of any reference in the King's Speech to the increase of agrarian crime in Ireland; the amendment was seconded by J. B. Lonsdale. The charges were denied by Birrell and by William O'Brien and the amendment was defeated by 414 to 115 votes.¹

During 1908 three measures of importance relating to Ireland were debated; of these, by far the most considerable was the Irish University Bill which was passed into law by the end of the summer. We have seen now, for many years, the grievance of Irish Roman Catholics who had no University of their own, was expressed by the Nationalist members with almost monotonous regularity. It made no difference that the regulations governing entry into Trinity College had been relaxed; that institution was still suspect to the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the demand for a separate University did not slacken. When Bryce was Chief Secretary in 1906 he had been in conference with the Nationalist leaders on the subject, but lapsed.² Of all the problems which confronted Birrell when he succeeded Bryce as Chief Secretary, this one was the most congenial to him, and during 1907 he worked out the details of the scheme which he introduced in the House of Commons on 31 March 1908. He had decided not to alter the status of Trinity College Dublin but instead to create two new universities - one in Belfast and one in Dublin. The former would supercede the old Queen's College in Belfast

¹ Hansard 4. S. 183 pp.547-67.

² For the negotiations see Gwynn, op. cit. pp.128-9.

and the latter would consist of three University Colleges - a new institution in Dublin and the two old Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway. The Royal University would be abolished. There would be no religious tests in the new Universities.¹ When the Second Reading was taken in May four Nationalists - John Redmond, John Dillon, T. M. Kettle and J. M'Kean - spoke in favour of the Bill, but most interest centred on the attitude of the Irish Unionists who soon proved to be divided in their opinions. Significantly, the two members for Trinity College spoke in favour of the measure.² On the other hand, three members, W. Moore, J. Gordon, and T. H. Sloan, opposed the measure on the familiar grounds that it would only result in the control of a large part of the intellectual life of Ireland by the priesthood. Despite these protests, the Second Reading was passed by a majority of over 300 votes.

On 23 and 24 July the Report stage was reached, revealing a similar alignment of forces. The extreme right wing of Irish Unionism resumed its attack when W. Moore, supported by W. Long, moved an amendment demanding that three quarters of every governing body in the new Universities should consist of laymen. No sooner had this been rejected by 219 to 71 votes, than Capt. J. Craig moved another amendment asking that the new Dublin College should be safeguarded against denominational influences; this too was rejected - by 273 to 32 votes. On 25 July the Third Reading was taken and one more effort was made by the extreme Unionists to secure the defeat of the Bill when H. T. Barrie and J. Gordon moved its rejection on the grounds that it perpetuated religious influence. The Third Reading was

¹ Hansard 4. S. 187.

² See Hansard 4. S. 188 pp.802-14 for J. ^HX. M. Campbell's plea for tolerance on this question, and pp.840-5 for J. Gordon's representation of the other Unionist viewpoint.

however carried and the Bill went to the Lords who passed it with exceptional rapidity. Altogether, 7 Nationalists and 7 Unionists had participated in the debates on this, one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation obtained by the Irish Party for many years.¹

Meanwhile, a Bill for the better housing of the working-classes in Ireland, had been passing steadily through the Commons. Originally a private member's Bill - it was introduced by M. Hogan - it received its Second Reading in March;² 9 Nationalists and 5 Unionists spoke in favour of the measure, and, since the tone of the debate was so generally cordial, Asquith later announced that the Government would take it up and would concentrate upon passing it into law, together with the Irish University Bill. This was subsequently done and another piece of extremely useful Irish social legislation was added to the Statute-book.

The third Irish measure was only introduced in the autumn session (on 24 November) and it did not have so smooth a passage. It was "a complicated and contentious Bill to expedite Land Purchase."³ It was rendered necessary by the break-down in the financial provisions of the Act of 1903 due to the unforeseen decline in the value of Government stock. We need not dwell here on the particulars of the measure since they were to be largely reproduced in the Bill introduced in the next session. It is sufficient here to note that the bonus payable to landlords was to be decreased, the annuities payable ^{by} tenants were to be increased, and

¹ See Hansard 4. S. 193 for the later stages of the Bill.

² Hansard 4. S. 186 pp. 917, et sequ.

³ Annual Register, 1908 p. 230.

² Hansard 4. S. 186 pp. 1415-16.

³ Hansard 4. S. 187 pp. 114-15.

the Congested Districts Board was to receive greatly augmented powers. The Bill was welcomed by 3 Nationalist speakers - John Redmond, W. M. Kavanagh, and John Dillon and opposed, or at least criticised, by William O'Brien.¹ Owing to the pressure of business the Bill for 1908 got no further but the debate on the measure had shown conclusively the fundamental divergence of opinion on the merits of the Act of 1903 between Dillon and O'Brien, and which was to drive the latter into opposition again in the near future.

Turning from the legislation of 1908 to the critical debates of these sessions we find, as usual, a wide and varied array of subjects from which we may select three as typical. On 10 March yet another attack on the administration of the law was launched when a revision of the rules of contempt of court was demanded, with special reference to the case of L. Ginnell; who had been committed for contempt during the recess. The matter was raised by P. A. M'Hugh and N. J. Murphy, supported by John Redmond and T. M. Healy. The motion was opposed as a matter of course by the Irish Unionists, four of whom, W. Long, G. Craig, J. Gordon and J. A. M. Campbell, intervened. The last-named admitted the need for a more precise definition of the rules but held that the Nationalist motion could only serve to undermine the power of the judges.² The motion was none the less carried by 181 to 66 votes.

Only a few days after this a much graver debate was initiated by John Redmond who, on 30 March 1908, moved a Resolution denouncing the existing system of government in Ireland as inefficient costly and universally unpopular; the situation was one which could only be rectified by the grant of Home Rule.³ He was supported in this debate by

¹ For the speeches of Dillon and O'Brien respectively, see Hansard 4. S. 196, pp. 1899-1908 and 1861-70.

² Hansard 4. S. 185 pp. 1415-18.

³ Hansard 4. s. 187 pp. 115-33.

275

Capt. A. Donelan (who rarely intervened in debate) and by T. M. Healy. The latter, writing to his brother Maurice on the following day, said that he had been deputed by the Party to reply to Asquith and had attacked him warmly; significantly, he added that this approach had been approved by the Party leaders, an indication of the anxiety and impatience which they felt at this time.¹ The main object of the debate was to stimulate the Liberal Ministry but their response was unsatisfactory and an amendment to the Resolution, reaffirming Imperial Sovereignty was carried by 313 to 157 votes. Yet the Nationalists dare not attack the Liberals whose majority was still much too large to allow the Irish Party to hold the balance of power as they had done in the past and were to do again in the future. The difficulty of the Nationalist position was explained in a letter from John Redmond to Alderman Stephen O'Mara, one of the staunchest supporters of the Party: "I would like to point out to you how utterly impossible it would be for us to take the responsibility of endangering the Government's University Bill; of the Bill for the Housing of the Working Classes in Towns - a bill introduced by us and which is a most valuable measure; and also of deserting the Catholic schools in this country."²

All the Irish Party could do was to continue their attacks upon the minor aspects of the Irish Executive. In this they were usually opposed by the Irish Unionists but sometimes they received unexpected support. For example, during the debates on the Irish estimates, both parties joined in condemning in the strongest terms the meagre

The Second Reading of the Bill was moved by Russell on 20

¹ March 1903. The resolution was immediately proposed by T. M. Healy, Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii, p.482.

² Gwynn, op. cit. pp.155-6.

grant for Irish education as a whole. Twelve Nationalists and 5 Unionists joined in the attack which, though no apparent gain resulted, at least proved that the grant of new facilities for University education to Ireland by no means exhausted the problems presented by the educational system as a whole

The year 1908 thus ended, like 1907, on a note of frustration. True, two valuable measures had been passed, but the essential goal, Home Rule, had evoked little response from a Liberal ministry which was even then bracing itself for the decisive conflict with the House of Lords.

The two sessions of 1909 were overshadowed by the struggle with the Lords, hinging upon the highly controversial Budget introduced by Lloyd-George in April 1909. This Budget concerned Ireland very closely and indeed played an important part in the subsequent election campaigns of 1910, but since it was a United Kingdom rather than a purely Irish measure, it will be considered in the next section. Since so much time was occupied in discussion of the Budget and of the subsequent Finance Bill, it was obvious that there could be very little legislation in the broad sense during the year. So far as Ireland was concerned only one measure of the first importance was passed, but it was extremely controversial and aroused bitter and prolonged debate. This was the Land Act of 1909 which contemplated the amendment of the Act of 1903 on the general lines sketched above viz. the reduction of the landlord's bonus, the increase of the tenants' annuities and the granting of compulsory powers to the Congested Districts Board for the acquisition of land. The Second Reading of the Bill was moved by Birrell on 30 March 1909. Its rejection was immediately proposed by J. H. M. Campbell who denounced the lowering of the bonus and the

conferment of compulsory powers upon the Congested Districts Board.¹ Five other Unionists - Sir Edward Carson, C. Craig, H. Barrie, J. Gordon and J. B. Lonsdale - supported Campbell in this general line of argument. For the Nationalists² W. M. Kavanagh, T. M. Healy and John Redmond, ^{supported the Bill} though the latter regretted the proposed increase in tenants' annuities. The most striking absentee from the debate was William O'Brien, whose brief re-union with the Party had foundered upon this very question of the land problem late in 1908. During that year the Government had, as we have seen, disclosed the main outlines of its proposed land policy. Already, in April 1908, O'Brien had proposed a Conference with the landlords similar to that which had had such happy results in 1902. John Dillon at once opposed the suggestion and his policy of non-conciliation was ratified by the Party by 42 votes to 15.³ From that time onwards O'Brien's position in the Party became even more difficult, and as his hostility to the Act of 1909 hardened, he grew increasingly unpopular with his colleagues. The breaking-point was reached in February 1909 when he and his followers were refused a hearing at the Convention held in Dublin to consider the terms of the new Bill which had been communicated in advance to the Irish leaders by Birrell.⁴

Although the Second Reading was passed by a comfortable majority (275 to 102 votes) it was announced that the Committee stage of the Bill would have to be debated under

Carson moved the rejection of the Bill, giving as his

¹ Hensard, 5. S. 3 pp.204-20.

² Ibid. p.238 et sequ.

³ W. O'Brien, An Olive Branch in Ireland, p.433

⁴ See O'Brien, op. cit. for his description of the so-called "Gaton Convention" pp.450-1.

closure, owing to the lack of time, and on 9 July the first of the 8 days allotted for this stage of the Bill was taken. It was remarkable chiefly for an attempt made by J. B. Lonsdale, an Ulster Unionist, to divide the Bill into two parts - one to determine the amount of State contribution to purchase and one to deal with what he held to be a separate problem - the relief of congestion.¹ This proposal was defeated by 120 to 40 votes. It was followed by an amendment moved by John Redmond to alleviate the burden of increased annuities likely to be thrown on the tenant purchasers. This too was rejected, but only by 184 - 149 votes. During the next few weeks the Bill was closely debated in Committee, the Irish Unionists fighting hard to retain even some of the concessions of 1903 for the landlords. They demanded, for example, that the landlords bonus of 12 per cent should be retained, (C. Craig's amendment), but this was rejected.² Throughout August the debate continued, resulting in numerous clashes not only between Unionists and Nationalists but between those Nationalists who condemned and those who in part approved, the Act of 1903. Not until mid-September was the Report stage reached when Walter Long succeeded in drawing from the Government the concession that the 12 per cent bonus should still be paid to those landlords whose arrangements for sale had reached a certain stage by 24 November 1908.³ On 17 September the Third Reading was taken and Carson moved the rejection of the Bill, giving as his grounds the belief that the Bill would retard rather than

¹ Hansard 5. S. 7 pp.1535 et sequ.

² Hansard 5. S. 8.

³ Hansard 5. S. 10.

facilitate progress. The Bill was then passed by 174 to 51 votes.¹

The Bill was radically transformed by the House of Lords which proposed numerous amendments. We need not give them in detail but in general they were designed as far as possible to prevent the complete break-up of large estates and to allow the possibility of the creation of new large farms. In November the Commons ~~deleted~~^{debated} these amendments and, since the Nationalists found them highly objectionable, Birrell took the unusual course of moving their rejection en bloc on 5 November.³ This was passed by 219 votes to 54 and a deadlock seemed to have been created. Continual negotiations were carried on with the House of Lords and since the Liberal Ministry did not wish to precipitate the crisis with the Lords over a purely local measure, they conceded those of the Lord's demands which limited the compulsory powers of the Congested Districts Board and which left the way open for the creation or survival of large farms. In this form the Bill passed into law. As evidence of the extreme interest taken in this measure by the Irish members we may cite the following figures. While on the Second Reading only 3 Nationalists and 6 Unionists spoke, on the subsequent stages no fewer than 28 Nationalists (roughly a third of the total) and 11 Unionists (more than half of the total) intervened.

The arduous debates on the Land and Finance Bills naturally limited, but did not entirely preclude, the

¹ The consistently low divisions on this Bill indicate how purely local a measure this was; it was regarded by most English members as an opportunity to recover from the fatigues of the Finance debates.

² A convenient summary will be found in the Annual Register 1909, pp.216-19.

³ Ibid. p. 242.

exercise by the Irish members of their exceptional powers of criticism. From several such debates we shall select one which again provided a measure of unity among both parties and which therefore came as a welcome contrast to the acrimonious debates on the Land Bill. On 22 April, T. F. Smyth¹ and P. A. Meehan, two of the less active Nationalists, moved the need for a comprehensive scheme of arterial drainage for Ireland and the motion was supported by 11 Nationalists and 2 Unionists. Birrell was however, unable to promise satisfaction and the Irish members remained dissatisfied.

At the end of an exhausting year the Nationalists were able to look back at least upon the achievement of the Land Act. Indeed for them the Parliament now drawing to its close had been in many ways a fruitful one. True, Home Rule had once more eluded all their efforts, but the Labourers' Act, the Evicted Tenants Act, the Housing of the Working Classes Act, the University Act and the Land Act were no mean trophies with which they could return to Ireland. Moreover, the exertions which had obtained these benefits had not been confined to a few men, for, although broad lines of policy were usually enunciated by a chosen few, yet as many as 76 Irish Nationalists had participated in Irish debates, and of these interventions, the greater part had taken place in Committee.

The Unionists too displayed energy and perseverance, though to less purpose. They had been much on the defensive in these years. They had obtained some concess-

¹ In later years, of addressing the House, when Edmund Hansard 5. S.3 pp.1684-7.

² Seventeen of them took part in the various debates i.e. all but about 3 of them.

ions on the Evicted Tenants and the Land Acts, and Home Rule had been postponed. But these were slight gains to set against the fact^s that the current was setting steadily towards Home Rule and the House of Lords, once regarded as an impregnable defence against that fate, was now itself in danger of eclipse.

11. The Irish Members and Other Business.

The interest of the new Liberal majority of 1906 was centred primarily upon the Government's projected plans for social legislation and, although foreign affairs were in due course to become very prominent, it is to the domestic sphere that we turn first. It may be said at the outset that now, as in previous Parliaments, the Irish members as a whole - and this applies to Unionists as well as to Nationalists - remained aloof from the debates on English and Imperial affairs. Very few members of either party made significant contributions to these discussions, and although as a mere matter of arithmetic we can record that between 1906 and 1909 44 Nationalists and 15 Unionists intervened in other than Irish debates, and that 62 Nationalists and 17 Unionists asked questions in Parliament concerned with the affairs of the Empire and of the United Kingdom, yet it remains true that such interventions were largely fragmentary, and that the bulk of Irish contributions were made by a few outstanding figures on either side. This has indeed been admitted by one of the Nationalist members:-

"The rank and file had few opportunities, especially in later years, of addressing the House, When Redmond, Dillon and Devlin spoke there was no necessity, and often

¹ Actually between 1906 and 1909 Joseph Devlin did not intervene very often in large-scale debates. It would be more accurate if the name of J. G. S. MacNeill were substituted.

no occasion for other Irish speakers. And then the Party never concerned itself about British or Foreign affairs.....It would have been better for Ireland's cause had the Irish members occupied the time of the House in discussing all questions that came before it. But it was impossible to interest them in any subject outside Ireland."¹

From time to time, however, certain measures were debated in Parliament which necessitated an exposition of the Irish viewpoint. Pre-eminently such a measure was Birrell's Education Act of 1906.² The Bill was designed to remove non-conformist grievances, but it aroused the anxiety of those groups who demanded the retention and protection of denominational schools. Of these groups, the Roman Catholics and the Established Church, were the two most important, and they both condemned the Bill. The controversy closely affected the Nationalists because the Irish vote in Great Britain was of great importance as an electoral weapon - particularly in the industrial North. At the last Election this vote had been swung onto the Liberal side on the understanding that the Liberals were favourably inclined to Home Rule. But if the Nationalist party supported an Education Bill which had been condemned by the Catholic hierarchy they might well lose control of this vote at the next Election. On the other hand this was a Bill upon which the Liberals set great store and if the Nationalists opposed it, certain sections of the Liberal majority might retaliate by opposing Home Rule. The position was thus very delicate, but Redmond decided to brave

¹ W. O'Malley, Glancing Back, p.58

² He was then, of course, President of the Board of Education.

the hostility of the Liberals which his opposition to the Bill would surely arouse. He defined his position in the following terms:-

"So long as we are forced to remain at Westminster against our will, and so long as Scotchmen and Englishmen interfere in Irish questions, we must in fairness be allowed to endeavour to establish our own principles whenever they are called in question on the floor of the House of Commons."¹

He and his followers spoke and voted consistently against the Bill. This was indeed probably the wisest course, tactically as well as ethically, which they could have pursued, because the Bill was ultimately wrecked in the House of Lords upon whom, and not upon the Nationalists, fell the onus of thwarting one of the most cherished of Liberal measures.

One other measure of this year demanded some statement of the Irish viewpoint. This was the Trades Disputes Bill, designed to free the Trades Unions from the disabilities imposed upon them by the Taff Vale Judgement. This was supported by the Nationalists and elicited from J. J. Clancy an expression of the attitude of Irish Nationalism towards that new phenomenon in the House, an organised Labour party. In the debate on the Second Reading he said that his party would support the Bill because: "They recognised that they had in the Labour Party in this House and in the country, a body of men friendly towards the political aspirations of Ireland."² The Irish Unionists

¹ Gwynn, op. cit. p.131.

² Hansard 4. S. 155 pp.39-43.

opposed the Bill partly because it was their ordinary duty as an Opposition, but partly also because they feared its effects in Ireland. This was brought out in a speech by Charles Craig on the Third Reading, in which he expressed the fear that in Ireland the measure would tend to legalise boycotting.¹ The Bill was passed in the Commons and subsequently, rather surprisingly, allowed to become law by the House of Lords.

Apart from these two measures of primary importance Irish intervention was fitful and may most conveniently be surveyed in chronological sequence. In the debate on the Address, J. G. S. MacNeill moved an amendment repeating his plea that flogging in the Navy should be abolished; on being informed that it was already suspended, he withdrew his amendment.² A few days later John Redmond gave the approval of his Party to a Resolution proposing that at some future date members should be paid a salary of £300 p.a. at the same time he said that Irish members, preferring to remain independent,³ would forego the benefits of the scheme. In April, J. G. S. MacNeill intervened in the debate on the vote for the Colonial Office, in order to criticise the administration of Natal where a native rising had recently broken out.⁴

Soon after this the Budget was debated and although the Nationalists were quiescent, the Irish Unionists were persistent in their opposition, Walter Long, C. Craig and Sir Edward Carson being particularly prominent. Early in

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 164 pp.861-6. The Bill was also attacked by Sir E. H. Carson and Walter Long.

² Hansard 4. S. 152 pp.371 et. sequ.

³ Hansard 4. S. 153 p.556.

⁴ Hansard 4. S. 155 pp.792-6.

July the subject of Natal was again broached, this time by John Dillon.¹ Side by side with these interventions went a steady flow of Parliamentary questions dealing with every conceivable aspect of British and Foreign affairs. It is unnecessary to detail the minor interventions of Irish members into English debates for the remaining sessions. The examples which we have just quoted show how casual and how largely unimportant such interventions were. This applies to Unionists as well as to Nationalists - with two major exceptions, Walter Long and Sir Edward Carson. The former had long been an English Conservative of the first rank and now led the Irish Unionists simply because he had secured a seat in South Dublin in 1906 after having been defeated at Bristol.² His interventions were frequent and important in all the major issues before this Parliament, but since they were made from the viewpoint of an English Conservative, they do not immediately concern us here. Carson, on the other hand was an Irish Unionist by birth and by upbringing. His success at the English Bar, however, had been so complete that he lived altogether in England at this period and his interventions in English debates were mainly in the character of a law officer for the Opposition. His contributions on the legal problems raised by much of the social legislation before the House were invaluable to the Conservatives; it is not too much to say that his pre-occupation with English affairs at this time outweighed his interest in all but the most important Irish debates. Certainly, there was little sign as yet of the enormous force he was to become in Irish affairs in a few years time.

¹ Hansard 4. S. 170 pp. 157-8.

² Hansard 4. S. 159.

Hansard 4. S. 170 pp. 156-57.

³ He had been Chief Secretary during the last year of the last Unionist Government i.e. in 1905.

The early months of 1907 saw a declaration by W. Redmond of the favourable attitude of the Irish Party towards the question of Women's Suffrage, though the Bill which he was supporting did not pass beyond a Second Reading.¹ There were other minor interventions, but a more important debate was initiated when, on June 1907, the Prime Minister introduced a Resolution declaring that the power of the other House to alter or reject Bills must be so restricted as to ensure that within the limits of a single Parliament the final decision of the Commons should prevail. If any particular Bill caused a deadlock then that Bill should be the subject of three separate conferences to obtain a solution; if this failed then such a Bill would pass into law without the assent of the Lords. This was supported for the Nationalists by J. G. S. MacNeill who outlined the numerous occasions when Irish legislation had suffered at the hands of the Lords.² For the Irish Unionists, J. H. M. Campbell suggested that the recent Liberal measures had been deliberately designed to provoke a conflict with the other House.³ These speeches indicated the viewpoints of the respective parties but had little other significance, since neither Irish Unionists nor Nationalists were yet in a position to influence the struggle between the Liberals and the House of Lords, which now impended.

The session of 1908 saw an intensification of the hostility between the two Houses. The conflict centred round the Old Age Pensions Bill and the Licensing Bill, the

¹ Hansard 4. S. 170 pp.1157-8. *MacNeill-Buchanan as Prime Minister in April 1906.*

² Hansard 4. S. 176 pp.1286-93. *Gwynn, op. cit. p. 100.*

³ Ibid. pp.19-20.

former being passed and the latter rejected by the Lords after lengthy debate. The Irish members eagerly supported the Old Age Pensions Bill but were less affected by the Licensing Bill. However, the situation had become so strained that individual measures were regarded as important, less because of their intrinsic merits, but according to the effect which they had upon the relations of the two Houses. Thus, even if neither of the measures mentioned had touched Ireland in any particular, the Irish members would still have had to take an interest in their course because they so drastically modified the constitutional crisis. And in fact, during this year Redmond was continually urging the Government to place Home Rule on the same level with the Veto of the House of Lords at the next General Election. How far in agreement with him he found the Cabinet may be judged from the following memorandum preserved among Redmond's papers: "The Master of Elibank read me a telegram which he had sent to Bowles (Liberal candidate at an impending by-election) in which he said Asquith, Lloyd-George, Churchill, Harcourt and the Whips authorised him to say that they all thought Bowles should say he was "strongly of opinion that Home Rule should be an issue at the next General Election."

In foreign affairs at this time the menace of war, which the Algeciras Conference seemed temporarily to have dispelled, approached once more with the Austrian annexation of Bosnia - Herzegovina and with the subsequent tension between Austria and Russia, which was only relieved by the

¹ Asquith had succeeded Campbell-Bannerman as Prime Minister in April 1908.

² *Standard* 4. 5. 190. p. 148-9 for Kettle's speech.
Gwynn, op. cit. p.159.

German support of Austria resulting in a diplomatic reverse for Russia. This fresh indication of German power was accompanied by the discovery in England that recent departures from the Cawdor programme of naval building threatened to impair British naval superiority. During the summer, several debates took place on this subject, as a result of which British naval building was accelerated. Early in the following year this "naval scare" called forth a speech from John Dillon in which, laying aside Party politics, he spoke gravely on the theme of the armaments race. Declaring the armaments race to be "a menace to Germany" he considered that these debates were "....most ominous, most grave, most terrible...These are the methods and this is the language by which are heralded the mutterings of the storm between two great nations."¹ Moreover, the Anglo-Russian agreements of 1907 still aroused distrust among certain sections of the Liberal party and was frankly disliked by the Labour and Nationalist members who saw the Tsar as a barrier to democratic advance in Russia. This dissatisfaction was voiced by the two Nationalist members - J. G. S. MacNeill and T. M. Kettle - who, next to Dillon, might be considered most familiar with questions of foreign affairs.²

The session of 1909 brought with it the Budget and the weary summer's debates over the details of what was then regarded as a revolutionary Finance Bill. In broad outline the principal objects of the Budget may be summarised in Lord Newton's words "....the Chancellor of the Exchequer required 16 millions to provide mainly for the requirements

¹ Hansard 5. S. 2. pp.1106-12.

² Hansard 4. S. 190. pp.226-9 for Kettle's speech.

of Old Age Pensions and of the Navy, and he proposed to find the money by additional taxation upon landowners, income-tax payers, and the liquor trade."¹ The Nationalists were again in a dilemma. Either they must submit to the Budget and incur the displeasure of the very influential liquor trade in Ireland or else they must vote against the Budget and thus imperil their relations with the Liberal Party with all the fatal consequences to Home Rule which might follow from that course. In fact they resolved the dilemma by doing each of these things at different times. When the Budget was introduced in April there did not seem to be any sign of conciliation in Redmond's attitude towards it: "I should not have spoken at all to-night were it not that I desired at the earliest moment to declare that we will oppose this Budget."² Throughout the summer, Redmond and others of the Party (principally J. Clancy, J. Dillon, J. Devlin and J. Mooney) were in constant negotiation with the Government to obtain concessions for Ireland, particularly on the liquor and license duties.³ The meetings with Lloyd-George were by no means completely satisfactory but enough had been gained for Redmond to change his ground when the Third Reading of the Finance Bill came before the House in October. Describing the history of the Party's attitude to the measure, he explained they had always disliked parts of it, but that they had been in favour of the land-taxes. They had, however, demanded that agricultural land be

¹ Lord Newton: Lord Lansdowne: a Biography, p. 374.

² Hansard. 5. 3. 4. p.582.

³ The negotiations are described in some detail in Gwynn op. at. pp.162-5.

exempted from the new duties and that revenues from the land taxes should go to the local *authorities* and not to the Treasury. On both these points they had obtained concessions and although the license duties were still very much disliked by them, they recognised that in view of the larger issues involved they would have to make sacrifices. Redmond concluded with these words:-

"I am not, by reason of the fact that I am opposed to the increase of taxation, going to be cajoled into taking a course that would array me on the side of the House of Lords in the coming crisis, and therefore I and my colleagues will abstain from voting in this division."¹

This was tantamount to expressing Nationalist acquiescence in the Budget and it was a courageous policy for the new duties were bitterly disliked in Ireland. Indeed, the principal plank in the platform of both the Unionists and William O'Brien's Independent Nationalists, was to be the charge that Redmond had sold the interests of Ireland to the Liberal Party without having received adequate guarantees of Home Rule in return. O'Brien himself was not returned to Parliament again until 1910 but in his absence the Nationalist policy on the Budget was subjected to continual criticism from T. M. Healy, whose hostility to the measure was intense.² Some idea of the interest aroused among the Irish members by the debates on Finance during the period 1909-10 may be conveyed by the figures illustrating the number of members who took part in these debates. Altogether, 24 Nationalists and 12 Irish Unionists

¹ Hansard. 5. 3. 12 pp.2027-33.

² T. M. Healy. Letters and Leaders of My Day, ii pp.485-6.

intervened, this being the highest proportion during this Parliament with the single exception of the Land Act of 1909.

While these arduous debates were proceeding, other matters had of necessity to be considered, though discussion often reverted to the dominant issue of the relations of the two Houses. There was in fact an amendment to the Address urging that the Government take steps to see that the will of the Commons should prevail within a single Parliament. John Redmond urged the reorganisation of the Upper House on a democratic basis while J. G. S. MacNeill in a typically sweeping fashion demanded the creation of 400 or 500 new peers.¹ Amid such urgent problems a Resolution moved by Capt. James Craig that the Government should adopt a protectionist system seemed like an echo of the comparatively uncomplicated days of the last Unionist ministry;² the tide still ran in favour of Free Trade, however, and the Resolution was defeated by 227 to 42 votes. About this time (the last week in March) on the vote for the Civil Service Estimates, John Dillon made one of his more elaborate incursions into the field of foreign politics. His speech was a logical extension of that Russo-phobia which has already been shown to exist among the Irish members. He expressed doubt as to the success of the Anglo-Russian agreement, particularly with regard to Persia, and demanded a restitution of the Persian constitution.³ One other measure of foreign rather than domestic interest, attracted attention at this time; this was the Indian Councils Bill which in April was going through Committee and which received the support of W. M'Caw an Irish Unionist who had business connections with India.

¹ Hansard. 5. S. 1 p. 516 et seqn.

² Hansard. 5. S. 3 pp. 257-66.

³ Hansard. 5. S. 2. pp. 1829-33.

In May, after the Budget had been introduced, two Irish Nationalists, William Redmond and W. M. Kavanagh, moved the Second Reading of the Removal of Roman Catholic disabilities Bill, which, if passed, would allow a Roman Catholic to hold office as Lord Chancellor or Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. The Government was sympathetic to the Bill but the usual pressure of time forbade its fuller progress.¹ The remaining Irish interventions were of no importance, with the possible exception of a Resolution moved by Charles and James Craig demanding that the two-^{power} naval standard be retained, i.e. the standard which ensured that Great Britain should have a preponderance of 10% over the combined strength in capital ships of the next two strongest powers; the Resolution was, however, negatived by 270 to 114 votes.²

The outline which has just been presented of Irish intervention in other than Irish affairs, thus shows clearly how fragmentary and disconnected this intervention was. Whenever important pronouncements of policy were to be made, the task was undertaken by three or four of the principal members of each party. Apart from the debates on the Finance Bill and on the Veto of the House of Lords, there were not many such questions which appealed to the Irish parties as being worthy of their attention. We have seen that for the Unionists, W. H. Long and Sir Edward Carson were exceptions to this rule, and to their names we might add those of the two Nationalists John Redmond and John Dillon. But, apart from these men, we

¹ Hansard. 5. S. 4. pp.2165 et. seqn.

² Hansard. 5. S. 5. pp.1277 et. seqn.

reach the same conclusion in 1909 as in every other Parliament, that the great majority of Irish members remained positively aloof from the general business of the House of Commons.

III The Parliament of 1910.

We have described elsewhere the course of the elections in which, although Redmond could secure only 70 pledged seats out of 82, he achieved none the less a position of "absolute dictatorship,"¹ since the two great English parties were so evenly matched, the Liberals securing 275 seats and the Unionists 273. The Labour Party of 40 members was not sufficiently strong to outweigh the Nationalist vote and the latter were thus in a supremely strong position.

The Parliament of 1910 was, of necessity, completely dominated by the question of the relations of the two Houses, and the King's speech of January 1910 contained no mention of any legislation, English or Irish, apart from "proposals to define the relations between the Houses of Parliament, so as to secure the individual authority of the House of Commons over Finance and its predominance in legislation."² The debate which followed was of particular interest in view of the narrow majority of the Government. John Redmond's speech was received with the attention which his unique position commanded. He made it clear that Irish support for the Budget of 1909-10 was contingent upon a Veto Bill to deal with the House of Lords being passed first:-

"At the last election we supported the Government heart and soul.... We regarded the abolition or limitation of the Lords' Veto as tantamount to Home Rule."³

¹ Gwynn, op. cit. p.172.

² Annual Register 1910. p. 30.

³ Hansard. 5. S. 14. pp.63-74.

The other section of Nationalist opinion was represented by William O'Brien. He concentrated entirely upon the Budget and repeated his now familiar argument that Redmond by acquies^{cing}_{ing} in the Budget was acting contrary to the best interests of Ireland.¹ The vulnerability of the Irish Nationalist Party was stressed by the Irish Unionist, W. Moore, who emphasised - and indeed over-emphasised - the divisions within the Party. He followed O'Brien in his condemnation of the Budget. Home Rule was, he admitted, "...a big question for us..." but "... it is not the question of the hour. The question of the hour is how we are to escape^s from this iniquitous, unjust and disproportionate Budget."² Walter Long, following him, and speaking for English as well as for Irish Unionists, said that his party would facilitate the reform of the Lords but oppose its destruction.

The other major debate on the Address was on the subject of Tariff Reform, and was initiated by Austen Chamberlain who moved an amendment demanding that the Government adopt a Protective policy. This was countered by T. M. Kettle who charged Chamberlain with nailing not his colours but his captain to the mast, a reference to the tardy and incomplete conversion of Balfour to Tariff Reform.³ A new Irish Unionist member and a Belfast mill-owner, J. Chambers, expressed the growing demand in Ulster for some form of protectionism, but the Amendment was negatived by 285 to 254 votes.

The overriding question of the Lords' Veto was again brought to the fore when on 21 March, Asquith's three Resolutions to deal with the question were announced - although they were not debated until 29 March. Briefly the terms were as follows:-

¹ Ibid, pp.107-116.

² Ibid. pp.124-32.

³ Hansard. 5. 3. 14. pp 240-9

- (1) The House of Lords was to be disabled from rejecting or amending any Bill certified by the Speaker to be a Money Bill.
- (2) The House of Lords was to be limited by law respecting other Bills so that any such Bill which had passed through the Commons in three successive sessions and had been three times rejected, should become law without the consent of the Lords, the Royal assent having been obtained. Two years must elapse between this and the first introduction of such a Bill.
- (3) Parliaments were henceforth to be of five years¹ duration. On 29 March debate on these Resolutions began and Asquith's introductory speech received the support of John Redmond who pressed for the immediate creation of sufficient peers to overwhelm the Lords if they would not accept these Resolutions. Further debate was postponed until 4 April. Thereafter the Resolutions were debated at intervals until all were passed (with majorities varying from 98 to 106)² by 14 April. There was considerable opposition and, in the debate on the Second Resolution, an Ulster Unionist, J. Chambers, moved to exempt Bills delegating administrative or legislative powers to subordinate Parliaments within the United Kingdom.³ This was rejected by 351 to 245 votes.

On 18 April there occurred a curious debate which revealed the mists of suspicion and hostility in which the two Nationalist parties were now enveloped. William O'Brien made a speech alleging that he had negotiated in private with Lloyd-George to obtain further concessions on

the Budget for Ireland, and that Lloyd-George had promised

1. Hansard. 5. S. 2.

2. R. C. K. Ensor, England, 1870-1914, p. 420

3. Hansard. 5. S. 16. pp. 1469-72.

some remedial action if John Redmond endorsed O'Brien's demands. O'Brien then said that Redmond had refused to co-operate with him and charged him with betraying the true interests of Ireland. These accusations were indignantly denied by both Lloyd-George and Redmond. The former admitted that he had had an interview with O'Brien but denied that he had committed himself to anything. Redmond for his part took the occasion of declaring that he would implicitly follow the Government in its present course and that he would support the Budget, which he regarded as a trivial issue compared with the prospect of Home Rule¹ which was now so near at hand.

The Finance Bill remained the centre of Parliamentary attention during the Spring of 1910 and all other debates were an appearance of unreality so long as the crisis in the constitutional history of the country remained unsettled. Since the Finance Bill had been so exhaustively debated during 1909 it was passed very rapidly through the House of Commons in the weeks immediately preceding the adjournment for Easter. So far as the Irish members were concerned there was little cause for intervention since the whole issue had been transferred to a plane transcending the details of taxation. The Independent Nationalists, however, continued to criticise the proposed duties and to castigate their former colleagues for their present silence. The only considerable reply drawn from the Nationalists was the speech of Joseph Devlin in which he redefined the attitude of the majority in terms similar to those which Redmond had several times already used.²

All these arguments and quarrels were suddenly cut short by the news that, early in May, King Edward VII had died. A completely new situation was created by this

¹ Hansard. 4. S. 16. pp.1759-64.

² Hansard 5. S. 17 pp.503-9.

event. There was a general feeling abroad that the new reign should not be made to coincide with a constitutional crisis, and very soon there were suggestions that a conference should be held to seek a means of breaking the deadlock which had ensued between the two Houses. The situation was very grave for the Nationalists, because if the two major English parties should agree upon a reform of the House of Lords, then the commanding position which Redmond and his followers now held in the Commons would be undermined. It was not impossible that the Liberals confronted with the choice of continued schism in the Constitution or the abandonment of Home Rule, would choose the latter course. They were able to maintain contact with the proceedings at the Conference through the agency of the Chief Secretary, Birrell, who was one of the four Liberal representatives. The period of suspense was lengthy because the Conference continued to meet at intervals from 16 June until November. That it failed to reach a solution of the problems confronting it was probably due to several factors, but it is reasonable to assume that the Liberal insistence upon the need to fulfil the pledge of Home Rule was one of the principal rocks upon which hopes of a reconciliation¹ foundered.

While these negotiations were going on Parliament continued to meet. Its business was, however, greatly curtailed and it is undoubtedly time to say that for most of 1910 the centre of interest was the Conference. Redmond himself recognised this for he and Devlin spent part of the summer in America whence they returned with contributions

1

See Gywnn, *op. cit.* pp.175-86 for the course of these negotiations. See R. C. K. Ensor, England 1870-1914, pp.423-4, for the part played by the Home Rule issue in the failure of the Conference.

to the Party funds of some 200,000 dollars. We need not, therefore, linger over the details of these months. There were a few isolated interventions in debate by the usual Irish members e.g. T. M. Kettle's defence of Egyptian Nationalism¹ and MacNeill's attack on the Regency Bill,² but these were not important and all business seemed in suspense until the outcome of the Conference was known. This, as we have seen, lasted until November, and a winter session was necessitated. By that time the failure of the Conference had become known and the dissolution of Parliament took place on 28 November 1910. Thus a second election was fought on the issue of the Lords' Veto. For the Nationalists the situation, though still delicate, was more hopeful than it had been during the summer. The Liberals had withstood the temptation to compromise with the Conservatives and there was good reason³ to believe that it was their devotion to Home Rule which had caused the failure of the Conference. For the Irish Unionists, the future was dark and uncertain. Although they might still concentrate their propaganda upon the Budget, yet it must have been obvious to them that this had already become merged in the larger issues at stake and that of these issues, the reduction of the power of the Lords seemed the one most likely to be brought to fruition. If this barrier were removed then the Constitution held no other obstacles which could be placed in the path of Home Rule.

1 Hansard. 5. S. 17. pp.1366-70.

2 Hansard. 5. S. 18. p. 205 et seqn.

3 See Lord Newton, Lord Lansdowne - a Biography, pp.401-4

IV Note on the Attendance of Members 1906-10.

The following Table will illustrate the attendance of the members of the two major Irish parties session by session during the Parliaments of 1906 to 1909, and 1910. The figures represent the average attendance per cent per head of the two parties.

Date	Nationalist	Unionist
1906	51.77	36.95
1907	30.29	35.10
1908	27.78	36.04
1909	22.72	33.90
1910	42.32	42.89

These figures do not reveal very much about the general policy of the two parties though a few conclusions may be drawn from them. The Nationalist attendance was high in 1906, when the expectation of a speedy grant of Home Rule was brightest. Thereafter the attendance of the Nationalist members dwindled steadily during the rest of the Parliament of 1906-9. Fairly obviously, the Irish Party only attended when their support was needed for some of the social legislation for Ireland under discussion, e.g. the University Bill of 1908 and the Land Act of 1909. Apart from such measures as these they held aloof from the majority of divisions. But if the Nationalists were consistent in this respect, the Unionists were not, for their figures rise and fall irrespective of the course of parliamentary business. This was probably because Party

¹ The duty of opposing the Education Bill probably also increased their attendance.

discipline was less strict and members attended or not largely as they pleased since the size of the Liberal majority of 1906-9 precluded a Unionist victory in the Division lobby.

It is however notable that the activities of both parties revived again in the critical year of 1910, their figures rising from 22.72% to 42.32% in the case of the Nationalists, and from 33.90% to 42.89% in the case of the Unionists. The equality in numbers of the two English parties made every division a doubtful quantity with the result that Irish attendances were greatly increased.¹

¹ For a fuller consideration of the question of Parliamentary attendance, see Appendix lil.

CONCLUSION

We have now in turn considered in some detail the electioneering methods of the Irish parties, their personnel, and their activities in Parliament. We turn from these detailed studies to attempt an appraisal of Irish representation as a whole. The first, and most obvious, feature of this representation is the contrast it affords between the Nationalist and the Unionist members. The second, and scarcely less important feature, is the evidence of continual stress and strain within each of these two major parties. Both of these features require some further comment.

The analysis of the different General Elections between 1892 and 1910 which we made at the beginning of this work revealed at the outset the sharp territorial diversions between Nationalists and Unionists. We saw that the Unionists drew almost their whole representative strength from Ulster, or rather, from the north-east corner of Ulster. In the constituencies of Antrim, Armagh, Down and Londonderry, the Unionists were, with a few exceptions, supreme. Most of the seats in this area were usually uncontested, or, if they were contested, it was by Liberals or Independent Unionists.¹ Elsewhere the Unionists had always to struggle hard for seats, always excepting Dublin University where circumstances were different. In Fermanagh and Tyrone they met with varying success and these two counties may truly be said to have acted as buffers between the Nationalist and Unionist spheres of influence.

1. Londonderry City, West Belfast, S. Armagh, and S. Down were the only exceptions to this rule.

The remainder of Ireland may fairly be said to have been completely dominated by the Nationalists. It is true that in Dublin, and particularly in S. Dublin, the Unionists were capable of winning seats, but by the end of the period the Nationalist grip upon the city itself had been tightened and thorough organisation had succeeded in ousting the Unionist member even from S. Dublin.

The compactness of the Unionist bloc and the extent of Nationalist influence were alike brought out time after time by the similarity of successive election results. Throughout the period, there was no violent oscillation of electoral fortunes, such as took place in England in 1906. Indeed, so well marked were the lines of cleavage between Unionists and Nationalists that, after 1892, the great majority of seats went uncontested, or were contested only by factions within the respective parties.

The geographical location of the two parties to some extent influenced the manner in which they approached the problem of selecting candidates on the eve of each of the General Elections. The Unionists, being mainly grouped in a small area, had little need of elaborately organised County Conventions, whereas the Nationalists, whose influence extended far over the countryside, were obliged to develop a method of keeping in touch with the opinion of the remoter constituencies. ² Of course, as we saw,

1. Apart from Dublin, only one Unionist held a seat in southern Ireland during the whole period. This was the Hon. Martin Morris who occupied the Galway City seat from 1900 to 1901. Significantly enough, he was a Roman Catholic and the member of a prominent local family.

2. It is noteworthy that the United Irish League, which so radically altered the situation after 1900, began its work in Mayo and had developed considerably before it attracted the attention of the Party leaders who, between 1895 and 1900, seemed to have lost touch with local opinion.

Geographical considerations were not the only factor which governed the methods used by the respective parties in the selection of candidates. The Unionists, it will be remembered, left the constituencies considerable freedom in all but a few specific instances. This was dictated partly by the fact that in most constituencies a Unionist was either certain to win or certain to lose, and no action by the central authorities would be likely to affect the issue; when, however the issue was uncertain, such action was taken without scruple. But the freedom of the constituencies was also influenced by the quality of the electors. In the south, where they were almost always in a permanent minority, these electors usually consisted of members of the landowning class and their dependents. The machinery of convention would have been both ludicrous and unnecessary under these conditions. In the north, where the Unionists were dependent upon the votes of the labourers of town and country, a somewhat different situation prevailed, and the meetings of the local Unionist Associations assumed greater importance. Yet the influence of the landlords and the large employers of labour remained paramount during this period as may be seen by the manner in which the two challengers of "Orange democracy" and T. W. Russell's agrarian movement were met and overcome between 1906 and 1910. So long as this influence was supreme there could be no grouping of the electorate along lines similar to those pursued for many years past by the Nationalists.

The main framework of the Nationalist electoral machinery was as we have seen, taken over from the days of Parnell. The Nationalist movement, if it was to be a dynamic movement, must on no account allow its progress to be impeded by inertia in the constituencies. It must organise local opinion in such a fashion that the demand for change must never slacken. This need was met by

the system of Conventions whose working we have described in detail above. When the system was working efficiently it performed two valuable services. On the one hand it gave the constituencies a considerable voice, often the deciding voice, in the selection of their representatives. Secondly, it enabled the Party, through the members who attended the Conventions, to keep the constituencies informed of the progress of events and to stimulate enthusiasm by relating local efforts to the Nationalist movement as a whole.

For its efficient working, however, the Convention system required a unified directing power at the head of affairs. Parnell had supplied such a power, and the ill effect of its removal was apparent in 1892, and blatantly obvious in 1895. The substitution of some body able to exert an influence similar to that of Parnell became the most urgent need of the Irish Parliamentary Party. This need was met in 1900 by the United Irish League which had been founded, as we saw earlier, in 1898 by William O'Brien, in order to ventilate the grievances of the peasants of the West of Ireland. The two Conventions of June and December 1900 were of crucial importance in the history of the Irish Parliamentary Party, for they linked it once more to a popular movement, not decayed by jealousy and faction, but in the first flush of energy and enthusiasm. The system of Conventions was retained, but was thoroughly reorganised and purged. The result was the attainment of an efficient electoral machine which was as democratic as any such machine could ever hope to be. The alliance between the United Irish League and the Party did not indeed dissolve all differences since the founder of the League soon found himself opposed to both organisations, but at least it restored the prestige of the Party and established a procedure for the selection of candidates which was used with success in 1900, 1906, and

January 1910.

Not the least important of the services rendered by the United Irish League was the fact that the pronouncements of its National Conventions did much to clarify public opinion on the issues confronting the country at the various General Elections. In 1892, indeed, there could be no mistake about the issue involved. The imminence of Home Rule overshadowed all other questions, though even in 1892 numerous resolutions passed at County Conventions recommended that, in the event of Home Rule failing to be realised, the Irish Party should seek to obtain redress on the Land Question and on the question of the Evicted Tenants. In 1895, on the other hand, no such definite issues were laid before the country and the electoral campaign degenerated into squalid bickering between the supporters of John Dillon and the followers of T. M. Healy. In 1900, however, the National Convention promulgated an impressive list of issues which were held to be at stake. The principal places were of course occupied by the demand for Home Rule and for a settlement of the Land Question, but following these came a series of demands ranging from the encouragement of Irish manufactures to the granting of a University which could be attended by Roman Catholics. In 1906, the Liberal triumph had brought Home Rule once more within a measurable distance, and this was in reality the primary issue of the Election, although demands for the amendment of the Land Act of 1903 and for a Roman Catholic University, were closely associated with it. In 1910, again, the issue was once more clear. Attempts were made, indeed, to divert attention to the Budget which was in so many respects unfavourable to Ireland, but the United Irish League secured for Redmond and his Party the loyalty of the great mass of the electors.

Naturally, the issues at the different General Elections, presented themselves to the Unionists in a very

different light. For them the issue was, in a broad sense, the maintenance of the status quo. Yet circumstances did not allow them to play a merely reactionary role during the whole period. In 1892, of course, the issue was as simple for them as for the Nationalists. Where the latter demanded the repeal, the former urged the maintenance, of the Union. Yet there existed among Irish Unionists many who felt the harsh, unbending regime of coercion to be inadequate, or even impossible. The representatives of this viewpoint did not form a coherent group, nor did they plan concerted action, but collectively they succeeded in diminishing the Unionist resistance to a series of beneficial measures passed by Unionist governments between 1895 and 1906. One representative of this viewpoint was Sir Horace Plunkett who, at the 1895 Election and afterwards, supported the general principle of beneficial social legislation for Ireland. His advocacy of such views cost him his seat in 1900, but in that campaign another Unionist, T. W. Russell energetically championed the cause of Land Reform, even going so far as to advocate compulsory sale. Such an extreme idea was far from appealing to his colleagues but the election speeches of many Irish Unionists showed that they had become largely reconciled to the prospect of some further diminution in the powers and privileges of landlordism. In 1906 the issue once more became clear and just as the Liberal victory in England had stimulated hopes of Home Rule among the Nationalists, so it stiffened the attitude of Irish Unionists who mostly declared themselves hostile to any further concessions - economic or political - to the Nationalists. In 1910 the issue was even more clearly defined, and although the Unionist Press gave prominence to the question of the Budget, this was more a device to weaken the country's confidence in the Nationalists, than an indication that the Unionists

actually believed the Budget to be a more immediate danger than Home Rule; indeed the election addresses of Unionist members gave plenty of evidence to the contrary.

The divergence between Unionists and Nationalists which we have so far noted at every point, becomes more clearly marked than ever when we turn to a consideration of the personnel of the two parties. When examining this aspect of Irish parliamentary representation we found that the Unionist members were almost all drawn from a narrowly defined class. In education, in social background, in occupation, they represented one particular facet of Irish society. They were almost all highly educated (the great majority of them had been to universities) and we found that they could be classified according to occupations in only three main categories - lawyers, landowners and industrialists. Inevitably a party confined to so small a section of society th ~~o~~ felt itself, and was regarded as, aloof from the common run of Irish politicians. The Nationalist Party could not have offered a greater contrast to the Unionists. Where the latter were compact and homogeneous, the Nationalists represented every variety of class in Ireland. Landowners, barristers, solicitors, business men, farmers, labourers, doctors, journalists and country merchants - all were included. With this variety of class and occupation went a variety of education also. While we saw that a considerable number of Nationalist members were University graduates, there was also a section (perhaps too large a section) whose education had been cut short at a National School. There was one other contrast also to be noted, Where the Unionists were almost without exception Protestant, the Nationalist Party always had an average of 8 or 10 Protestants among its members. On every score, therefore, the Nationalists could claim to be more widely representative than the Unionists. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the Nationalists

had many more seats, and a wider area, at their disposal and that the continued success of the Unionists in north-east Ulster seemed to indicate that their constituents desired no change from the type of representative to which they had been accustomed.

Turning now to the third aspect of Irish Parliamentary Representation which has been treated in this thesis, that of the activity of the Irish parties in Parliament, we find that this activity developed along clearly marked lines. The central problem which confronted the Nationalist leaders was the extent to which they could trust themselves to an alliance with the Liberal party. In 1892 the prestige of Gladstone was such that the Anti-Parnellite majority relied upon his promises to introduce a satisfactory Home Rule Bill. The Parnellites, on the other hand, adhered strictly to the doctrine of their dead leader and went to Westminster determined to carry out a policy of "independent opposition". While the Unionist ministries were in power between 1895 and 1906 it was possible for all Nationalists to adopt this policy, and it became the working principle of the reunited Party in 1900. With the advent of the Liberals to power in 1906 the question arose once more and it became more than ever urgent when it was seen that the reforming zeal of the Liberals was carrying them into direct conflict with the House of Lords. It must be admitted that the Irish Party utilised this situation in a highly successful manner. Between 1906 and 1909 they gained a series of valuable measures for Ireland - among them a new Land Act and an Act establishing the new University - but they did so without sacrificing their independence. Irish Nationalist support was given to the Liberals not in the hope of Home Rule but on the condition of Home Rule. The position was made even more difficult by the introduction in 1909 of Lloyd-George's celebrated Budget, a Budget

which was extremely unpopular in Ireland. Redmond's decision to support the Liberals in spite of the Budget brought about the ironic situation in which William O'Brien reproached him for servility to the Liberals, the precise sin for which he himself had reproached O'Brien and others nearly twenty years earlier. However, Redmond's policy was seen to be justified when the fortunes of the Election campaigns of 1910 gave him the control of the balance of power in the House of Commons. By the end of 1910, which is the end of our period, his understanding with the Liberal Party seemed to have been strengthened without involving any diminution of his independence.

So much for the general policy of the Nationalist Party. When carried into practice it expressed itself in a series of debates in each session of each Parliament when the Government in power - whether Liberal or, Unionist - was vigorously attacked on a wide front.¹ We saw that the Irish Nationalists time after time raised the same subjects in debate. The Land Question, the Evicted Tenants, the University Question, Financial Relations, Education, Local Government - these were the themes constantly reiterated either in amendments to the Address or in special Resolutions, or in debates on the Estimates. In this way the Nationalists expressed their independence. It did not matter how many concessions were made, the demand for further change never slackened. It may be conceded that this system obtained results. The following are some of the principal measures gained for Ireland during this period by Nationalist action in Parliament: Three Land Acts, an Evicted Tenants Act, a Local Government

1. These attacks were mainly of an orderly and peaceable character. It is a feature of this period that the Irish Nationalists practically abandoned the technique of obstruction. We have only been able to find one serious case of mass obstruction (see Part III, Section 3); there were other individual exploits but they were unimportant.

act, a Town Tenants Act, a Housing of the Working Classes Act, an Act setting up the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and an Act establishing the new University in Ireland; the list might be considerably extended but it is sufficiently representative to show how many-sided was the activity of the Irish Parliamentary Party.

It is, however, true that the burden of debate upon these subjects fell upon comparatively few shoulders. Before 1900 the Anti-Parnellites could number only about 10 or 12 debaters of the first rank, and the Parnellites about half that number. The situation improved somewhat after 1900 but even then only about 20 members - or one quarter of the strength of the Party - could be considered as outstanding in debate. The other members served two useful purposes. First, their votes were essential, and second, they maintained a steady stream of Parliamentary Questions dealing with every conceivable aspect of Irish administration, but particularly with the progress of land settlement and the re-instatement of the Evicted Tenants.

The record of the Party was much less imposing in British and Foreign Affairs than in Irish business. There were a few members - seldom more than 6 or 8 - who could rank as experts¹ on specific aspects of Foreign Affairs but only one member - John Dillon - showed a comprehensive grasp of the business of an Imperial as opposed to a purely local Parliament. It is not too much to say that the great majority of Irish members did in fact regard Parliament in this purely local aspect; for them it was an enforced substitute for a Parliament in Dublin and they used it solely for the discussion of Irish affairs.

The action of the Irish Unionists in Parliament naturally differed considerably from that of the

1. ³ S. F. Hogan on Australia and Edward Blake on Canada are examples.

Nationalists. The Unionists initiated far fewer debates because it was to their interest in most instances that the status quo. should be maintained. When they did take the initiative it was usually to protest either against Government ~~i~~nnovations or against the agrarian outrages which remained one of the most difficult problems of Irish administration at this period, and which many Unionist members believed to be instigated by the Nationalists. Moreover, the Parliamentary action of the Irish Unionists was in some degree hampered by their connection with English conservatism. We have seen that the Nationalists were able to express their independent spirit by frequent sorties against the Government, even if it happened to be a Government favourable to their claims. The Irish Unionists did not enjoy so large a measure of independence, or at least did not exercise it while Unionist Governments were in power. There was, however, one very significant exception to this rule, the part played by Irish Unionists in securing the downfall of George Wyndham in 1905 when he was Chief Secretary in a Unionist Government. This incident showed that the loyalty of Irish Unionists was not inexhaustible, and it foreshadowed to a remarkable extent the recalcitrant spirit exhibited by this Party when the Third Home Rule Bill was being debated.

This connection with a great English Party had its advantages as well as its demerits. It allowed Irish Unionists to play a part out of proportion to their numbers in the general business of the House. There were always a few members who made little or no contribution to debate but, on average, about three-quarters of the strength of the Party consisted of able debaters. Among Irish members Sir Edward Carson (as he was for most of the period), Col. E. J. Saunderson, William Johnston, William Moore and later the two Craig brothers, were the most prominent in debate, while the presence of ^{H.} O. Arnold-Forster

(J. Belfast 1892-1906) and Walter Long (J. Dublin 1906 - 10) linked the Party very closely to the leading ^{circles} ~~circles~~ of English Conservatism.

In general, it may be said that both Irish Parties made considerable contributions, in their respective ways, to the debates in Parliament between 1891 and 1910. The years after 1914 witnessed a tendency to discredit the action of the Irish members in Parliament. Such a condemnation cannot be unreservedly accepted, for it does not accord with all the facts which we have cited here. The final failure of the Nationalists to secure Home Rule for all of Ireland should not be allowed to obscure the fact that their energy and perseverance secured for Ireland numerous valuable and important measures of social improvement. Nor should the work of the Irish Unionists be misjudged. They must often have appeared obstinate, bigoted, obscurantist. In fact they were performing their duties to their constituents in the best way they could. They were charged with the defence of the Union. They believed that the chief menace of Home Rule came from clerical control of political life. Holding this belief, they were entitled to press their own viewpoint with all the urgency they could command. Neither Party ultimately secured the whole of its demands and both have been much criticised; there exists wide scope for criticism no doubt, but the energy and sincerity of both parties cannot with accuracy be impugned.

In conclusion we must add that, although the divergence between Nationalists and Unionists was the fundamental factor in Irish politics in this period, to assume that this was the only factor would be a gross over-simplification of the situation. Each party had its own internal troubles which seriously affected its activity. The Unionists, it is true, suffered comparatively little in this respect. Between 1900

and 1906 it had seemed as though the more progressive wing of the Party might split the forces of Irish Unionism in two. But the reforming Unionists never succeeded in gaining control of the Parliamentary Party. The most enlightened of them, Sir Horace Plunkett, was - as we have seen - driven from S. Dublin in 1900. Of the other reformers, T. W. Russell changed his allegiance from about 1904 and T. H. Sloan's supporters were all defeated in 1906; he himself retained his seat until 1910 but his influence had declined, and by the end of the period the orthodoxy of the Irish Unionist members had been re-established.

Much more serious were the divisions which from time to time racked the Nationalist Party. Some of these divisions were no doubt due to personal jealousies but the two most serious breaches in the unity of the Party were inspired by deeper causes. The Parnellite minority of 1891 - 1900 and the Independent Nationalist minority of 1909 and 1910 both had one thing in common. They feared that the majority was jeopardising its independence by too close alliance with an English party. This fear probably weighed more with the Parnellites than with William O'Brien and his followers, but it was present in both groups. The frequent repetition of the cry of "independent opposition" is symptomatic of an underlying uneasiness on the whole subject of relations with English parties which persisted throughout the period.

This uneasiness was not confined to the Nationalist members. It spread steadily among various sections of Irish opinion and it is significant that one of the earliest aims of the Sinn Fein movement was to put into effect the "Hungarian policy" of abstention from Parliament.¹ None

1. R. M. Henry, The Evolution of Sinn Fein, pp 65-6.

of the Irish members of either majority or minority group held quite such extreme views in 1910.¹ Both Redmond and O'Brien had complete faith in the efficacy of Parliamentary action, though they differed as to what that action should be. But the principle of "independent opposition" was capable of an extra-Parliamentary interpretation and there was growing up a generation to which this latter course seemed far more promising than the "constitutionalism" of the older leaders. As is now known, the newer movement triumphed and the Irish Parliamentary Party was annihilated by forces whose inspiration owed not a little to that very idea of "independent opposition" so often voiced by Irish members, but now put to a use of which they had never dreamed.

1. The only member to do so, C. J. Dolan, resigned his seat in N. Leitrim and contested it again as a Sinn Fein candidate (1908). He was defeated by a large majority (1,946) but even so his poll (1,157 votes) was larger than had been expected. One other member, Sir T. Esmonde, also resigned at this time but he later rejoined the Party.

APPENDIX 1

The following pages contain lists of all the members returned to Parliament for Irish constituencies during the period 1892-1910. Biographical details - so far as such are available - are given to supplement the Tables in Part 11. This Appendix and the Tables are both based upon the same sources.¹ The information here given relates to the date of birth, Parliamentary experience, education and occupation of members.

All parties are included in this survey.

Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites are not placed in separate sections but the former may be distinguished thus (P).

Where details of education, occupation etc., are lacking, a blank space has been left.

1. See the sources listed at the beginning of Part 11.

1 NATIONALISTS.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
1) W. Abraham " (b.1840)	M. Limerick, N - E. Cork Dublin Harbour	1885 - 92 1893 - Jan. 1910 Dec. 1910 - 14.	National Schools			Nurse & later manager London Insurance Doctor.
2) D. Ambrose (b.1843)	S. Louth.	1892 - 95 1895 - 96	--	St. Munchen's Limerick	Catholic Univ. Queen's " (M.D) L.R.C.S.	Surgeon.
3) R. Ambrose (b.1855)	W. Mayo	1893 - Jan. 1910	--	Weir's School, Limerick.	Queen's College Cork.	Composite, Later Sec. Irish Labor Democratic Federation
4) M. Austin, (b.1855)	M. Limerick	1892 - 1900		Christian Bros. Schools, Cork.	--	Farmer
5) E. Barry (b.1852)	S. Cork.	1892 - Dec. 1910	--	Castleknock & Dr. Knight's, Cork	--	Manufac- turer
6) J. Barry (b.1845)	Wexford S. Wexford	1880 - 5 1886 - 93				Qualified Teacher later journalist.
7) D. Boyle (b.1859)	M. Mayo	Jan. 1910 - 1914	National School Fermanagh	--	--	

1 NATIONALISTS (contd.)

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
8) E. Blake (b. 1833)	S. Longford.	1892 - 1907	--	Upper Canada, College.	Toronto	Barrister.
9) J. P. Boland (b. 1870)	S. Kerry	1900 - 1914	--	Oratory School, Edgbaston.	London & Oxford & Bonn.	Barrister
10) J. Boyle (b. 1853)	W. Donegal.	1900 - 1902	--	Blackrock College	--	Solicitor.
11) P. J. Brady (b. 1868)	Dublin - St. Stephen's Gn.	Jan. 1910 - 1914	--	Castleknock	Catholic Univ.	Solicitor.
12) J. B. Burke- Roche (b. 1852)	E. Kerry	1896 - 1900	--		Cambridge	Landowner.
13) J. Campbell (b. about 1871)	S. Armagh.	1900 - 1906	--	St. Patrick's Armagh Blackrock College	London (LLB)	Barrister

1890 - 1905
 1875 - 1892
 1893 - 1900
 1897 - 1900
 1890 - 1905
 1875 - 1892
 1893 - 1900
 1897 - 1900
 1890 - 1905
 1875 - 1892
 1893 - 1900
 1897 - 1900

NAMES	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
14) ^{S.} L. Carew (b.1853)	N. Kildare College Green (P) S. Meath.	1885 - 92 1896 - 1900 1900 - 1903	--	Clongowes.	T.C.D.	Barrister.
15) P.G.H. Garvill (1839)	Newry.	1892 - 1906	--	Armagh.	London	Barrister.
16) P. A. Chance (b.1857)	S. Kilkenny.	1885 - 1894	--	C.U.S. Dublin.	Catholic Univ.	Solicitor.
17) ^{S. J.} M. T. Clancy (b.1847)	N. Dublin. " (P)	1885 - 1914 (1892 - 1900)	--	Summer Hill, Athlone.	Queen's College Galway.	Barrister & on editorial staff of "The Nation" 1870 - 85.
18) D. J. Cogan (b.1859)	E. Wicklow	1900 - 1907	--	Private		Provision Merchant.
19) B. Collery (b.1838)	N. Sligo	1891 - 1900	--			Wholesale wine mercha
20) A. Commins (b.1832)	Roscommon B. Roscommon S. E. Cork	1880 - 1885 1885 - 1892 1893 - 1900	--	St. Patrick's Carlow	Queen's Coll. Cork, Queen's Univ. London (I.L.D.)	Barrister.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
21) T. J. Condon (b.1850)	S. Tipperary	1885 - 1914				Butcher and cattle dealer
22) W. J. Corbet (b.1824)	S. Wicklow " (P)	1886 - 92 1895 - 1900		Broadwood, Lence.	--	Journalist
23) H. F. Cotton (b.1841)	S. Dublin	Dec. 1910 - 14		Old Polytechnic Institute	Oxford	Director of D.U.T.C. Alliance Gases Findlater & etc.
24) E. Crean (b.1856)	Ossory-Queen's Co S.E. Cork	1892 - 1900 1900 - 1914		Galigan Normal School Leno.		Carpenter and Sec. of an Irish Labour Organisation.
25) D. Crilly (b.1859)	N. Mayo	1885 - 1900		Catholic Institute Liverpool and Sedgely Park, Coll. Steffe.	--	Journalist (formerly on staff of "The Nation".
26) P. Crumley (B. circa 1860)	S. Fermanagh	Dec. 1910-14				Cattle merchant

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
27) J. Cullinan (b. 1858)	S. Tipperary	1900 - 1914	---	Thurles	---	Journalist.
28) T. Curran (b. 1840)	S. Sligo.	1892 - 1900	Carrick-on-Shannon.	---	---	Hotel business in Australia.
29) T. B. Curran (b. 1870)	Kilkenny City W. Donegal	1892 - 1895 1895 - 1900	---	Jesuit School Sydney: Clongowes	Oxford	Barrister.
30) J. Dely (b. 1852)	S. Monaghan.	1895 - 1902	---	---	---	Local Merchant
31) M. Devitt (b. 1846)	W. Meath W. E. Cork S. Mayo.	1892 1893 1895 - 1900	---	Wesleyan Normal School, Lincs.	---	Journalist et.
32) J. Deasy (b. 1856)	Cork City W. Mayo.	1884 - 5. 1885 - 13	---	---	---	Civil Engineer.
33) W. Deleny (b. ?)	Queen's Co-Ossory	1900 - 14.	---	Private	---	Farmer
34) C. R. Devlin (b. 1858)	Galway City.	1903 - 06	---	Montreal College	Quebec Univ.	Journalist.
35) J. Devlin (b. 1872)	W. Kilkenny W. Belfast.	1902 - 06 1906 - 14.	---	Christian Bros. Schools, Belfast	---	Staff official United Irish League

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
36) C. Diamond (b.1858)	W. Monaghan	1892 - 95	National school	& Privately	--	Journalist
37) S. Dillon (b.1851)	Tipperary E. Mayo	1880 - 83 1885 - 1914	--	C. U. S.	Catholic Univ. I.R.C.S.I.	Doctor (not practising)
38) C. J. Dolan (b.1881)	N. Leitrim	1906 - 8	--	St. Patrick's Coll. Cavan	Maynooth and Queen's Coll. London	School Teacher
39) Capt A. Donelan (b.1846)	E. Cork E. Wicklow	1892 - 1911 1911 - 14	--	Private	Sandhurst.	Soldier (retd.)
40) P. C. Doogan (b.1841)	E. Tyrone	1895-July 1906	--	Private	--	Farmer
41) W. Doris (b.1860)	W. Mayo.	Jan. 1910-1914	--	Christian Bros. School, Westport	--	Journalist.
42) F. Driscoll (b.1858)	S. Monaghan	1892 - 95	--	chiefly in Australia	--	Civil Engineer
43) W. Duffy (b.1865)	S. Galway	1900 - 14	--	St. Brendan's Coll. Loughrea	--	Local Merchant
44) C. Engledew (b.1860)	N. Kildare	1895 - 1900	--	--	Cambridge	Landowner.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
45) J. Esmonde (b.1862)	N. Tipperary	Dec. 1910 - 14		Oscott College	--	Surgeon
46) Sir T. Esmonde (b.1862)	S. Dublin W. Kerry N. Wexford	1886 - 92 1892 - 1900 1900 - 14		Oscott College	--	Landowner
47) J.P. Ferrell (b.1865)	W. Caven N. Longford	1895 - 1900 1900 - 14		St. Mel's Coll. Longford	--	Journalist and proprietor
48) T.J. Ferrell (b.1847)	S. Kerry	1895 - 1900		St. John's Coll. Waterford.	--	Merchant
49) P. French (b.1844)	S. Wexford	1893 - 1914		Private	--	Farmer
50) W. Field (b.1848)	Dublin - St. Patrick's (P)	1892 - 1914 1892 - 1900		St. Laurence O'Toole Sch. Dublin.	Catholic Univ.	Victualler
51) J. Finucane (b.1842)	E. Limerick	1885 - 1900		Thurles Coll.	Maynooth.	Farmer.
52) J. Fitzgibbon (b.1849)	S. Mayo.	Dec. 1910-14		St. Kyran's Kilkenny	--	Local Dreper
53) M.J. Flavin (b.1866)	N. Kerry	1896 - 1914	Tralee	St. Michael's Coll. Tralee	--	Local Merchant

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
54) J. C. Flynn (b. 1855)	M. Cork	1892 - 1910	--	Christian Bros. Cork	--	Merchant
55) P. J. Foley (b. 1836)	Galway-Connemara	1885 - 95	--	Catholic Schools Prescot & Leeds	--	Managing Director Pease Assurance Co.
56) S. F. Fox (b. 1853)	King's Co. Tullamore	1885 - 1900	--	St. Colmen's Coll. Fermoy	Queen's Coll. Cork, St. Francis Xavier's Coll. N. York.	Surgeon.
57) M. Frewen (b. 1853)	M. E. Cork	Jan. 1910 - 11	--		Cambridge.	Economist
58) J. Gibney (b. 1847)	M. Meath	1893 - 1900	Beltraena	--	--	Farmer
59) J. Gilhooly (b. 1847)	W. Cork.	1885 - 1914	Bantry.	--	--	Local merchant
60) L. Ginnell (b. 1854)	M. Westmeath	1906 - 14.		Self-Educated		Barrister and Author.
61) S. L. Guyard (b. 1864)	Galway City	1906 - 14.		St. Columba's	Oxford	Author.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL SECONDARY SCHOOL		UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
62) J. Guiney (b.1869)	N. Cork	1913 - 14	--	Castleknock	--	Solicitor, and
63) P. Guiney (b.1867)	N. Cork	Jan. 1910 - 13	Kanturk	St. Patrick's Mountrath	--	Farmer
64) J. Hackett (b.1865)	Mid Tipperary	Jan. 1910 - 14	--	Patrician Bros. School Queen's Co.	--	Farmer
65) J. Halpin (b.1843)	W. Clare	1906 - 10.	--	Springfield Coll. Ennis	--	Farmer
66) J. Hammond (b.1842)	Carlow	1891 - 1907	--	Carlow College	--	Local Merchant
67) T. Harrington (b.1851)	Westmeath Dublin Harbour " (P)	1883 - 85 1885 - Dec 1914 1892 - 1900	--		Catholic Univ. and T.C.D.	Barrister and Newspaper Proprietor.
68) E. Haviland Burke (b.1864)	King's Co. Tullamore.	1900 - 14.	--	Private - on the Continent		Journalist
69) J.P. Hayden (b.1863)	S. Roscommon	1897 - 1914	--	St. Coman's Roscommon.	--	Journalist and Proprietor.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
70) L.P. Hayden (b.1850)	S. Leitrim S. Roscommon (P)	1885-92 1892 - 97	--	St. Coman's Roscommon	--	Journalist and Proprietor.
71) R. Hazleton (b.1880)	N. Galway	1906 - 14	--	Blackrock College	--	Private Means (Priv. Sec. to #11 Field)
72) M. Healy (b.1859)	Cork City " " Cork City	1885 - 1900 1909 - 1910 Dec. 1910 - 14	--	Christian Bros. Schools, Lismore	--	Solicitor.
73) T.J. Healy (b.1854)	N. Wexford	1892 - 1900	--	Christian Bros. Schools, Lismore	--	Solicitor.
74) T.M. Healy (b.1855)	N. Longford H. Louth N.B. Cork	1887 - 92 1892 - 1910 1911 - 1914	--	Christian Bros. Schools, Lismore	--	Barrister.
75) J.F. Hogan (b.1855)	Mid Tipperary	1893 - 1900	--	St. Patrick's Melbourne	--	Journalist
76) M.H. Hogan (b.1853)	N. Tipperary	1906-Dec. 1910	--			Tenant Farmer

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
77) J. Jordan (b.1830)	1. Clare 2. Meath 3. Fermanagh	1885 - 92 1893 - 95 1895 - Dec 1910	Fermanagh	Royal School Bniskillen	--	Local Merchant (and Tenant farmer)
78) M. Joyce (b.1854)	Limerick City	1900 - 14	--	Christian Bros. Schools, Limerick	--	River Pilot
79) A. McM. Kavansagh (b.1856)	Carlow	1908 - 10	--	Eton.	Oxford	Soldier (retd.) Landowner.
80) M. Keating (b.1869)	3. Kilkenny	Jan. 1910 - 14	--	Duffyn School S. Sales	--	Commercial agent.
81) B.J. Kelly (b.1883)	3. Donegal	Jan. 1910 - 14	--	Castleknock	M.A. Royal Univ.	Solicitor.
82) P.J. Kennedy (b.1864)	N. Kildere N. Westmeath	1892 - 95 1900 - 06	--	Castleknock	--	Landowner
83) V. Kennedy (b.1876)	W. Caven	1904 - 14	--	Clongowes	--	Solicitor
84) M.J. Kenny (b.1861)	Bnnis Mid Tyrone	1882 - 85 1885 - 95	--	Bnnis	Queen's Univ.	Barrister

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
85) J. B. Kenny (b. 1845)	S. Cork Dublin, College Green (P)	1885 - 92 1892 - 96	--	Milltown School	Catholic Univ.	Doctor
86) T. M. Kettle (b. 1880)	E. Tyrone	1906 - 10 Jan. Dec. 1910	--	Milltown School	T.C.D.	Barrister and Professor of Economics
87) D. Kilbride (b. 1848)	S. Kerry N. Galway S. Kildare	1887 - 95 1895 - 1900 1906 - 14	--	Clongowes	--	Tenant-Farmer
88) B. V. Knox (b. 1865)	W. Cavan I. Derry City	1890 - 95 1895 - 99	--	St. Columba's	Oxford	Barrister
89) S. C. Lardner (b. 1879)	N. Monaghan	1907 - 14	--	Clongowes	--	Barrister
90) H. Law (b. 1872)	W. Donegal	1902 - 14	--	Rugby	Oxford	Landowner
91) E. Jeary (b. 1848)	Waterford City N.E. Cork S. Sligo N. Kildare	1880 1885 - 6 1889 - 1892 1900 - 5.	--	Univ. High School Waterford	--	Barrister and Journalist

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
92) T. Lundo (b.1885)	B. Limerick	Dec. 1910 - 1914		Kilteely Classical School	--	?
93) A. Lundo (b.1839)	B. Limerick	1900 - Dec 1910	--	Kilteely Classical School	--	Teacher of Languages
94) A. Lynch (b.?)	Galway City W. Clare	1901 1910 - 14	--		Melbourne, Berlin, Paris St. Mary's Hospital London	Civil Engineer Letter Designer and Author
95) D. Macalcese (b.1840)	N. Monaghan	1895 - Dec 1900	Self	Educated	--	Journalist and Proprietor
96) M.A. MacDonnell (b.1854)	Queen's Co. Leix	1892 - 1905		Jesuit College	Queen's Univ and Richmond Hospital	Surgeon.
97) F.H. ^{S.G.S.} MacNeill (b.1849)	b. Donegal	1887 - 1914	--		T.C.D. and Oxford	Barrister, Lecturer & Author.
98) J. MacVeagh (b.1870)	b. Down	1902 - 14	--	St. Malachy's Belfast.	--	Journalist

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
99) ^{S.} P. McCann (b.1840)	Dublin-Stephen's Green.	1900 - 04				Stock broker and Company Director
100) M. McCarten (b.1851)	S. Down	1886 - 1902	--	St. Malachy's Belfast, and Blackrock College	--	Solicitor.
101) John McCarthy (b.1862)	Mid Tipperary	1892 - 3	National School	--	--	Local provision a merchant.
102) Justin McCarthy (b.1830)	Longford L'Derry City N. Longford	1874 - 1885 1886 - 1892 1892 - 1900		Private	--	Journalist and author.
103) P. McDermott (b.1860)	N. Kilkenny	1891 - 1902	National School	--	--	Tenant Farmer
104) E. McFadden (b.1862)	E. Donegal	1900 - 06		St. Eunan's Letterkenny	Catholic Univ.	Solicitor.
105) R. McGhee (b.1851)	S. Louth Mid Tyrone	1896 - 1900 Dec. 1910 - 14	--	St. Peter's Lurgan	--	Commission Agent and Labour leader
106) P. McGilligan (b.1847)	S. Fermanagh	1892 - 5.	National School	Coleraine A.I.	--	Local Draper

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
107) T. McGovern (b.1851)	J. Caven.	1900 - 4	---	Private	---	Farmer and Auctioneer.
108) B. McHugh (b.1846)	S. Armagh.	1892 - 1900	---	St. Joseph's Coll. Clondalkin.	---	Linen Manufacturer.
109) P.A. McLugh (b.1858)	N. Leitrim W. Sligo	1892 - 1905 1906 - 10	---	St. Patrick's Coll. Caven.	---	Journalist and Proprietor.
110) J. McKeen (b.1876)	S. Monaghan	1902 - 14	---	St. Martin's Monaghan.	---	Barrister
111) W. McKillys (b.1860)	N. Sligo. S. Armagh	1900 - 05 1906 - 10	National Schools	---	---	Wine Merchant.
112) C. McVeigh (b.1849)	E. Donegal	1906 - 10	---	St. Blain's Coll. Donegal.	---	Gold Miner in Australia (retd.)
113) J.R. Maguire (b.1856) (P)	N. Donegal W. Clare	1890 - 2 1892 - 5	---	Cheltenham.	Oxford.	Barrister.
114) J. Mains (b.1851)	N. Donegal	1892 - 5.	---	Coleraine A.I.	---	Menure Manufacturer and Contractor.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATES	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
115) F. Mandeville (b.1852)	S. Tipperary	1892 - 1900	--	Lay College Carlow and in France	--	Landowner.
116) M. Meagher (b.1846)	M. Kilkenny	1906 - 14	--	Mountrath Coll. Queen's Co.	--	Farmer
117) F.E. Meehan (b.1870)	M. Leitrim	1908 - 14	--	Manerhamilton Intermediste School	--	Farmer
118) P.A. Meehan (b.1852)	Queen's Co. Leix	1906 - 13	--	Christison Bros. Schools.	--	Farmer
119) P.J. Meehan (b.1877)	Queen's Co. Leix	1913 - 14	--	Castleknock	--	Solicitor.
120) M.J. Minch (b.1857)	S. Kildare	1892 - 1906	--	Blackrock College	--	Local Merchant
121) B.C. Molloy (b.1842)	King's Co. King's Co. Birr	1880 - 85 1885 - 1900	--	St. Edmund's Coll. Herts.	Germany and France	Barrister i abo former officer in French army
122) M. Molloy (b.1850)	Carlow.	Jan.1910 - 14	--	Grange, Carlow.	--	Local merchant.
123) J.J. Mooney (b.1874)	S. Dublin. Newry.	1900 - 6. 1906 - 14	--	^U Ashaw Coll., Dunham.	T.C.D.	Barrister.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
124) A. J. Moore (b. 1849)	Clonmel - L. Derry City	1874 - 85 1899 - 1900				Lendowner.
125) S. Morris (b. 1846)	S. Kilkenny	1894 - 1900		Grammar School Carrick-on-Suir		Timber Merchant and Shipowner
126) J. Morragh (b. 1849)	S. B. Cork	1889 - 93		Christien Bros, Cork		Diamond merchant Director de Beers etc.
127) J. Muldoon (b. 1865)	N. Donegal E. Wicklow E. Cork.	1905 1907 - 11 1911 - 14		Local School in Tyrone.	Queen's Coll. Galway	Barrister.
128) G. Murnaghan (b. 1847)	Mid Tyrone	1895 - 1910		Royal School <i>Armagh, Armagh.</i>		Lendowner and Dairy Farmer.
129) J. Murphy (b. 1876)	E. Kerry	1900 - 10		Presentation Sch. Killarney.		Sawyer.
130) M. J. Murphy (b. 1860)	E. Waterford	1913 - 14.				Hotel Proprietor.
131) M. J. Murphy (b. ?)	S. Kilkenny	1907 - 10		St. Kieran's Coll. Kilkenny		Local Merchant

NAMES	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
132) J.P. Monnetti (b.1851)	Dublin-College Green.	1900 - 14	--	Christian Bros. Schools, Dublin.	--	Printer and Labour leader
133) Col. J.P. Molan (b.1838)	Galway. N. Galway (P) " "	1874 - 80 1885 - 95 1900 - 0.	--	Stoneyhurst.	T.C.D. and Staff College	Soldier (Retd.)
134) Jos. Molan (b.?)	N. Louth S. Louth	1835 - 92 1900 - 14	--	Downside.	Oxford	Landowner and Railway Co. Director.
135) Sir W. Nugent (b.1865)	S. Westmeath	1907 - 14	--			Party Treasurer
136) J.F.X. O'Brien (b.1828)	S. Mayo, Cork City	1885 - 95 1895 - 1905	--	St. John's Coll. Waterford	Queen's Coll. Galway (no degree)	Farmer and Labour Leader
137) K.D. O'Brien (b.1849)	Mid Tipperary	1900 - 10	--	St. Joseph's Clondalkin.	--	Civil Engineer
138) P. O'Brien (b.1853) (P)	N. Monaghan Kilkenny City	1886 - 92 1895 - 1914	--	--	--	Hotel Proprietor.
139) P.J. O'Brien (b.1835)	N. Tipperary	1885 - 1906	Mensagh	--	--	

137) J.P. Monnetti (b.1851) 1900 - 14 National School Christian Bros. Schools, Dublin. 1900 - 14

138) P. O'Brien (b.1853) (P) 1886 - 92 1895 - 1914 N. Monaghan Kilkenny City

139) P.J. O'Brien (b.1835) 1885 - 1906 N. Tipperary

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
140) W. O'Brien (b.1852)	H.B. Cork, Cork City "	1887 - 92 1892 - 95. 1900 - 14.	--	Cloyne Diocesan College	Queen's Coll. Cork	Journalist and Author.
141) A. O'Connor (b.1844)	Queen's Co. E. Donegal	1880 - 85 1885 - 1900	--	^U Rehaw Coll. Durham.	--	Barrister.
142) J. O'Connor (b.1836)	W. Wicklow	1892-Dec.1910	National School	--	--	Journalist.
143) John O'Connor (b.1850)	S. Tipperary N. Kildare	1885 - 92 1905 - 14		Christian Bros. Schools, Cork and privately.	--	Barrister.
144) P. O'Doherty (b.1871)	N. Donegal	1906 - 14	--	St. Columb's L'Derry.	--	Solicitor.
145) W. O'Doherty (b.1868)	N. Donegal	1900 - 05.	--	St. Columb's L'Derry	--	Solicitor.
146) J. O'Donnell (b.1870)	S. Mayo.	1900 - 10 Jan. Dec. 1910	National School	--	--	Journalist and Proprietor.
147) T. O'Donnell (b.1872)	W. Kerry	1900 - 14	National School	Marlborough St. Training College	M.A. Royal University	Barrister and Chairman Tralee and Dingle Railway

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
148) J. O'Dowd (b.1856)	S. Sligo	1900 - 14	National School	--	--	Farmer and Local Merchant
149) P. O'Hare (b.1849)	N. Monaghan	1906 - 7.				In business in Scotland
150) F.A. O'Keefe (b.1856)	Limerick City	1888 - 1900	--	Clongowes	T.C.D.	Solicitor
151) C. O'Kelly (b.1873)	N. Mayo.	1900 - 10.	"Locally and at Dublin"			Landowner
152) E.P. O'Kelly (b.1846)	E. Wicklow W. Wicklow	1895 Dec.1910 - 14	--	Carlow College	--	Local Merchant.
153) J.J. O'Kelly (b.1845)	Roscommon N. Roscommon "	1880 - 85 1885 - 92 1895 - 1914	--		T.C.D. and The Sorbonne	Formerly officer in the French army. Journalist
154) W. O'Malley (b.1857)	Galway-Connemara	1895 - 1914		St. Mary's Coll. London.	--	Journalist
155) J. O'Mara (b.1873)	S. Kilkenny	1900 - 7.	--	Clongowes	B.A. Royal Univ.	Wholesale provision importer and exporter

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
156) C. O'Neill (b.1844)	S. Armagh	Jan. 1910 - 14	--		Glasgow	Doctor.
157) P. O'Shaughnessy (b.1872)	M. Limerick	1900- 14.	--	Blackrock College	--	Local Merchant.
158) B. O'Sullivan (b.1879)	E. Kerry	Jan. Dec. 1910		Killarney		Farmer.
159) T. O'Sullivan (b.1879)	E. Kerry	Dec. 1910 - 14	--	St. Brendan's Killarney.	--	Merchant.
160) J. H. Parnell (b.1843)	S. Meath (P)	1895 - 1900	--			Landowner
161) E. Phillips (b.1840)	S. Longford	1907 - 14	--	Clondalkin.	Queen's Coll. Galway.	Farmer.
162) J. Pinkerton (b.1845)	Galway City	1886 - 1900	--	Private School	--	Tenant Farmer.
163) P. J. Power (b.1850)	E. Waterford	1885 - 1913	--	Stoneyhurst	--	Landowner
164) M. Reddy (b.?)	King's Co. Birr.	1900 - 14.				Farmer.

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	DATE	NATIONAL SCHOOL	SECONDARY SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY	OCCUPATION
165) J. B. Redmond (b. 1856) (P)	M. Wexford Waterford City	1885 - 91 1892 - 1914	--	Clongowes	T.C.D.	Barrister and Landowner.
166) W. A. Redmond (b. 1886)	E. Tyrone	Dec. 1910 - 14	--	Clongowes	U.C.D.	Barrister
167) M. H. K. Redmond (b. 1861) (P)	M. Wexford M. Fermagh	1883 - 85 1885 - 92	--	Clongowes	T.C.D.	Barrister.
168) W. J. Reynolds (b. 1856)	E. Tyrone.	1885 - 95	--	Royal School Dungannon	--	Solicitor, Journalist and Publisher
177) J. D. Shannon (b.)	E. Kerry	1885-95				Hotel Proprietor
176) D. Shreeve (b. 1844)	S. Galway S. West	1885-1900 1903, 14		Irish College, Paris		Party Organizer
177) W. L. Smyth (b. 1872)	S. Leitrim	1906-14	National Schools	St. Mel's, Lough		Local Auctioneer & Insurance

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
169) A. Roche (b. 1848)	Cork City N. Louth	1905-Dec. 1910 1911-14		Privately	-	Wine-merchant
170) A. Roche (b. 1848)	E. Galway	1890-1914				Tenant-Farmer & Miller
171) T. Scanlon (b. 1874)	N. Sligo	Jan. 1910- 14		Summerhill Coll.	St. Andrews	Barrister
172) T. Sexton (b. 1848)	Sligo S. Sligo W. Belfast N. Kerry	1880-85 1885-86 1886-92 1892-96		Christian Bros. Waterford		Journalist Former Chairman Freeman's Journal
173) J. J. Sheehan (b. 1866)	W. Waterford	1895-1914		Rockwell College	Catholic Univ.	Solicitor
174) D. D. Sheehan (b. 1874)	Mid. Cork	1901-14	Cork and	Privately	-	Journalist and Barrister
175) J. D. Sheehan (b. 1848)	E. Kerry	1885-95				Hotel Proprietor
176) D. Sheehy (b. 1844)	S. Galway S. Meath	1885-1900 1903.14		Irish College, Paris		Party Official
177) T. F. Smyth (b. 1875)	S. Leitrim	1906-14	National Schools	St. Mel's, Longford	-	Local auctioneer & Insurance Agent

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
178) D. Sullivan (b. 1838)	S. Westmeath	1885-1907	Bantry	-	-	Manager publishing Dept. of The Nation
179) D. Sullivan (b. 1827)	Westmeath Dublin-College Green W. Donegal	1880-85 1885-92 1892-1900	Bantry	-	-	Journalist and Proprietor
180) J. Sweetman (b. 1844)	E. Wicklow	1892-95	-	Downside	-	Shareholder in Newspapers.
181) C. K. D. Tanner (b. 1849)	Mid. Cork	1885-1901	-	Winchester	Queen's Col. Cork, Berlin & Leipzig.	Doctor
182) E. C. Thompson (b. 1851)	N. Monaghan	1900-06	-	Royal School, Raphoe	T. C. D.	Doctor
183) J. Tuibe (b. 1849)	N. Westmeath	1885-1900	-	St. Mary's Mullingar	-	Watchmaker
184) J. Tully (b. 1859)	S. Leitrim	1892-1906	-	Summerhill Coll. Athlone	-	Journalist and Proprietor
185) L. A. Waldron (b. 1858)	Dublin Stephen's Green	1904-10	-	Belvedere Oratory School Birmingham	-	Stockbroker Chairman Grand Canal Co.
186) J. Walsh (b. 1855)	S. Cork	Dec. 1910- 14	-	-	-	Manufacturer

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
187) A. Webb (b. 1834)	W. Waterford	1890-95		Privately	-	Master Printer and Author
188) P. White (b. 1860)	N. Meath	1900-14				Farmer
189) S. Young (b. 1822)	E. Cavan	1892-1914	-	Old Presbyterian Coll., Belfast	-	Whisky Distiller & Chairman of Bakery Company.
190) M. Bodkin (b.)	N. Roscommon	1892-5	-	Tullamore	Catholic Univ.	Barrister
191) Maj. J. Jameson (b. 1852)	W. Clare	1895-1906	-	Wimbledon	Sandhurst	Soldier (Retd.) & Whisky distiller.

II Unionists and Liberal Unionists.

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
1) E.M. Archdale (b.1853)	N. Fermanagh	1898-1903	-	"For the Royal Navy"		Navy (Retd.) Landowner
2) H.O. Arnold Forster (L.U.) (b.1852)	W. Belfast	1892-1906	-	Rugby	Oxford	Barrister & Author
3) J. Atkinson (b.1842)	N. London- derry	1895-1906	-	R.B.A.I.	Queen's Univ.	Barrister
4) H.T. Barrie (b.1860)	N. London- derry	1906-14				Large-scale grain merchant.
5) D.P. Barton (b.1853)	Mid. Armagh	1891-1900	-	Harrow	Oxford	Barrister
6) J. Blakiston- Houston (b.1829)	N. Down	1898-1900				Landowner
7) G.F. Brunskill (b.1866)	Mid. Tyrone	Jan-Dec. 1910	-	Christ's Hospital	T. C. D.	Barrister & Director Dublin Steam Packet Co.
8) J.H.M. Bell (b.1851)	Dublin - Stephen's Green, Dublin Univ.	1898-1900 1903-14	-	Stacpoole's School Kingsdown	T. C. D.	Barrister

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
9) E. Carson (b.1854)	Dublin Univ.	1892-1914	-	Private School	T. C. D.	Barrister
10) J. Chambers (b.1863)	S. Belfast	Jan. 1910- 14	-	R. B. A. I.	Queen's Univ.	Barrister
11) G. H. Clark (L. U.) (b.1861)	N. Belfast	1907-10	-	Merchiston Castle Edinburgh	-	Shipbuilder (Firm of Work- man & Clerk)
12) C. C. Connor (b.1842)	N. Antrim	1892-5	-	R. B. A. I.	Queen's Univ.	Merchant & Manufacturer
13) B. Cooper (b.1884)	S. Dublin	Jan-Dec. 1910	-	Eton	Woolwich	Soldier (& Landowner)
14) T. L. Corbett (b.1854)	N. Down	1900- Dec. 1910	-	Private	£	Business
15) C. C. Craig	S. Antrim	1903-14	-	Clifton	-	Soldier (Retd.) (Landowner)

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
16) J. Craig (b.1871)	S. Down	1906-14	-	Salisbury Academy	-	Soldier (Retd.) & Landowner
17) R.M. Dane (1852 b.)	N. Fermanagh	1892-98	Knock National School	Portora	T. C. D.	Barrister
18) Sir D. Dixon (b.1844)	N. Belfast	1905-7	-	R. B. A. I.	-	Shipowner & Timber Merchant
19) G. Fetherstonhaugh (b. 1859)	N. Fermanagh	1906-14	-	Charl Grammar School	T. C. D.	Barrister
20) J. Gordon (b.1849)	S. Londonderry	1900-14	-	R. B. A. I.	Queen's Coll. Galway	Barrister
21) Lord F. Hamilton (b.1856)	N. Tyrone	1892-5	-	Harrow	-	Diplomat and Landowner
22) Marquis of Hamilton (b.1869)	Londonderry City	1900-13	-	Eton	-	Soldier (Retd.) Landowner

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
23) Sir. E. Harland (b.1831)	N. Belfast	1889-96	-	Edinburgh Academy	-	Shipbuilder
24) Sir J. Haslett (b.1832)	N. Belfast	1885 1896-1905	Knock National School	R. B. A. I.	-	Chemist
25) Lord A. Hill (b.1846)	Down " Down "	1880-5 1885-1898 1907-8	-			Soldier (Retd.) Landowner
26) Capt. A. Hill (b.1873)	M. Down	1898-1905	-	"For the Army"	-	Soldier
27) A. L. Horner (b.1862)	S. Tyrone	1910-14	-	Foyle College	Queen's Univ.	Barrister
28) M. Johnston (b.1829)	Belfast S. Belfast	1868-78 1885-1902	e		T. C. D.	Barrister and Author.

Maritime Club
Maritime & Marine

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
29) W. Kenny (L.U.) (b.1846)	Dublin - Stephen's Gn.	1892-8	-	Privately	T. C. D.	Barrister
30) P. Kerr-Smiley (b.1879)	N. Antrim	Jan. 1910- 14	-	Eton	Cambridge	Soldier (Retd.) Chairman "Northern Whig" newspaper
31) Sir. T. Lea (L.U.) (B.1841)	Donegal S. London- derry	1876 & 1880- 5 1886-1900	-	Private	-	Landowner
32) W. H. Lecky (L.U.) (b.1838)	Dublin Univ.	1895-1903	-	Cheltenham	T. C. D.	Historian
33) H. Liddell (L.U.) (b.1866)	W. Down	1905-7				Linen Manufacturer
34) W. H. Long (b.1854)	S. Dublin	1906-10	-	Harrow	Oxford	Landowner
35) Sir J. Lonsdale (b.1851)	Mid. Armagh	1900-14				Manchester Corn Merchant & Banker

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
36) W. Macartney (b. 1852)	S. Antrim	1885-1903	-	Eton	Oxford	Barrister
37) Capt. J. M. Calmont (b. 1847)	E. Antrim	1885-1913	-	Eton	+	Soldier (Retd.) Landowner.
38) Maj-Gen. M. Calmont (b. 1845)	N. Antrim	1895-99	-	Eton	-	Soldier and Landowner
39) Maj. R. M. Calmont (b. 1881)	E. Antrim	1913-14	-	Eton	-	Soldier and Landowner
40) W. J. McCaw (b.)	W. Down	1908-14	-	Private	-	Business in India & Far East.
41) R. McMordie (b. 1849)	E. Belfast	Dec. 1910-14	-	R. B. A. I.	Queen's Univ.	Solicitor
42) E. Mitchell (L.U.) (b. 1859)	N. Fermanagh	1903-6	-	Privately	-	Landowner and Stockbreeder

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
43) W. Mitchell-Thompson, (b.1877)	N. Down	Dec. 1910-14	-	Manchester	Oxford	Advocate of the Scottish Bar and in business in W. Indies.
44) J. Moore (b.1864)	N. Antrim N. Armagh	1899-1906 1907-14	-	Marlborough	T. C. D.	Barrister
45) Hon. M. Morris (b.1867)	Galway City	1900-14	-		T. C. D.	Barrister and Landowner.
46) Hon. H. L. Mulholland (b.1854)	N. Londonderry	1885-95	-	Eton	Woolwich & Oxford	Soldier (Retd.) & Landowner.
47) Hon. A. E. B. O'Neill (b.1876)	Mid. Antrim	Jan. 1910-14	-	Eton	-	Soldier and Landowner
48) Hon. R. T. O'Neill (b.1845)	Mid. Antrim	1885-1910	-	Harrow	Oxford	Soldier (Retd.) & Landowner
49) Hon. D. R. Plunkett (b.1838)	Dublin University	1870-95	-		T. C. D.	Barrister
50) Hon. Horace Plunkett (b.1854)	S. Dublin	1892-1900	-	Eton	Oxford	Landowner

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
51) J. A. Rentoul (b.1854)	E. Down	1890-1902	-	Cookstown Academy	Queen's Coll. Galway. Queen's Univ. Berlin & Brussels.	Barrister
52) J. Ross (b.1853)	Londonderry City	1892-95	-	Foyle	T. C. D.	Barrister
53) T. W. Russell (L. U.) (b.1841)	S. Tyrone N. Tyrone	1886 Jan. 1910	-	Madras Academy Fife	-	Landowner
54) Col. E. J. Saunderson (b.1837)	Cavan N. Armagh	1865-74 1885-1907	-	For the Army	-	Soldier (Retd.) Landowner.
55) T. Sloan (b.)	S. Belfast	1902-10	-			Business in Belfast.
56) R. Thompson (b.1838)	N. Belfast	Jan. 1910- 14	-	Wellington Academy, Belfast.	-	Director of firm of Linen Manufacturers.
57) Col. T. Waring (b.1828)	N. Down.	1885-98	-	Privately	T. C. D.	Barrister and Soldier.
58) G. W. Wolff. (b.1834)	E. Belfast	1892-1910	-	Hanburg and Liverpool	-	Shipbuilder
59) J. Wood. (L.U.) (b.1865)	E. Down	1902-6	-	Privately	-	Solicitor

LIBERALS AND INDEPENDENT UNIONISTS

Name	Constituency	Date	National School	Secondary School	University	Occupation
1) R. Barry (Lib) (b. 1866)	N. Tyrone	1907- 11	-	Cork	B.A. Royal Univ.	Barrister
2) W. H. Dodd (Lib.) (b. 1844)	N. Tyrone	1906- 7	-	R. B. A. I.	Queen's Univ.	Barrister
3) R. G. Glendinning (Ind. Unionist) (b. 1844)	N. Antrim	1906- 10		Private		Linen Manufacturer
4) C. H. Hemphill (Lib.) (b. 1825)	N. Tyrone	1895- 1906		Dr. Wall's School, Dublin.	T. C. D.	Barrister
5) D. C. Hogg (Lib.) (b. 1840)	Londonderry City	1913- 14				Shirt-making firm.

APPENDIX II

This Appendix consists of a list of all the Irish constituencies - 103 in number - arranged alphabetically. Opposite each constituency is the name of the Party holding the seat after each of the General Elections between 1892 and 1910. The figures in brackets after the names of Parties indicate the majorities gained by those Parties in the given seats. Where there is no figure, the seat was uncontested.

Constituency	1907	1901	1896
1) Wick	Unionist (2529)	Unionist	Unionist (79)
2) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (7)
3) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (2)
4) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
5) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (577)
6) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (1137)
7) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
8) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
9) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
10) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
11) Wick	Unionist (879)	Unionist	Unionist (896)
12) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (587)
13) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
14) Wick	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist

APPENDIX II

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
1) N. Antrim	Unionist (2639)	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (788)	Unionist (384)	Unionist (583)
2) Mid. Antrim	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (790)	Unionist	Unionist
3) E. Antrim	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (929)	Unionist (2351)	Unionist	Unionist
4) S. Antrim	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (593)	Unionist	Unionist (2970)	Unionist
5) N. Armagh	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (1111)	Unionist (3795)	Unionist	Unionist
6) Mid. Armagh	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
7) S. Armagh	Anti-Parnellite (1,197)	Anti-Parnellite (1,383)	Nationalist (385)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,887)
8) N. Belfast	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (2317)	Unionist (291)	Unionist (2324)	Unionist
9) E. Belfast	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
10) S. Belfast	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (816)	Unionist (2220)	Unionist (2,863)
11) W. Belfast	Unionist (839)	Unionist	Unionist	Nationalist (587)	Nationalist (587)	Nationalist (373)
12) Carlow	Anti-Parnellite (2,925)	Anti-Parnellite (3,206)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
13) W. Cavan	Anti-Parnellite (4,508)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist

Constituency	1895	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
14) E. Cavan	Anti-Parnellite (4,664)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
15) W. Clare	Parnellite (1,007)	Anti-Parnellite (403)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
16) E. Clare	Parnellite (446)	Parnellite (58)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
17) Cork City I	Anti-Parnellite (3087)	Anti-Parnellite (333)	Nationalist (3,577)	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (638)	Ind. Nationalist (538)
18) Cork City II	Anti-Parnellite (1,682)	Anti-Parnellite (203)	Nationalist (3,827)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (526)
19) N. Cork	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (1,090)	Ind. Nationalist
20) N. E. Cork	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (1,474)	Ind. Nationalist
21) Mid. Cork	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (825)	Ind. Nationalist (623)
22) S. Cork	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,339)

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
23) S. Cork	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (162)
24) W. Cork	Anti-Parnellite (2,826)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (773)	Ind. Nationalist (196)
25) S. E. Cork	Anti-Parnellite (3,418)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (798)	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (543)	Ind. Nationalist (536)
26) N. Donegal	Anti-Parnellite (2,711)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (949)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
27) E. Donegal	Anti-Parnellite (763)	Anti-Parnellite (662)	Nationalist (453)	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,213)	Nationalist
28) S. Donegal	Anti-Parnellite (571)	Anti-Parnellite (2,301)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
29) W. Donegal	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
30) N. Down	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (1263)	Unionist (1263)	Unionist	Unionist
31) W. Down	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
32) E. Down	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist (670)	Unionist (974)	Unionist (1,698)
33) S. Down	Anti-Parnellite (571)	Anti-Parnellite (673)	Nationalist	Nationalist (3,044)	Nationalist (635)	Nationalist (628)

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
34) Dublin - College Green	Parnellite (1,127)	Parnellite	Nationalist (294)	Nationalist	Nationalist (3,320)	Nationalist
35) Dublin Harbour	Parnellite (3,106)	Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist (2,750)	Nationalist	Nationalist (2,613)
36) Dublin - St. Patrick's	Parnellite (2,597)	Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
37) Dublin - Stephen's Green	Unionist (15)	Unionist (556)	Nationalist (556)	Nationalist (1,474)	Nationalist (662)	Nationalist (829)
38) Dublin Univ. <u>I</u>	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
39) Dublin Univ. <u>II</u>	Unionist (712)	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist	Unionist
40) N. Dublin	Parnellite (1,295)	Parnellite (2,240)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
41) S. Dublin	Unionist (2110)	Unionist (1939)	Nationalist (504)	Unionist (1343)	Unionist (66)	Nationalist (133)
42) N. Fermanagh	Unionist (317)	Unionist (376)	Unionist	Unionist (88)	Unionist (350)	Unionist (347)
43) S. Fermanagh	Anti- Parnellite (621)	Anti- Parnellite (696)	Nationalist (753)	Nationalist	Nationalist (595)	Nationalist

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
44) Galway City	Anti-Parnellite (51)	Anti-Parnellite (190)	Unionist (118)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (859)
45) N. Galway	Parnellite (389)	Anti-Parnellite (565)	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,321)	Nationalist	Nationalist
46) Galway - Connemara	Anti-Parnellite (2,039)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
47) E. Galway	Anti-Parnellite (3,482)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
48) S. Galway	Anti-Parnellite (1,212)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
49) N. Kerry	Anti-Parnellite (2,023)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,752)	Nationalist
50) W. Kerry	Anti-Parnellite (1,326)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (1,399)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
51) S. Kerry	Anti-Parnellite (1,871)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,944)

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
52) E. Kerry	Anti-Parnellite (2,347)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist (681)	Ind. Nationalist (489)	Nationalist (1,253)
53) N. Kildare	Anti-Parnellite (446)	Anti-Parnellite (232)	Nationalist (228)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
54) S. Kildare	Anti-Parnellite (1,767)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
55) Kilkenny City	Anti-Parnellite (140)	Parnellite (14)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
56) N. Kilkenny	Anti-Parnellite (2,584)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
57) S. Kilkenny	Anti-Parnellite (3,093)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,978)
58) King's Co. - Birr	Anti-Parnellite (2,659)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (1,451)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,499)
59) King's Co. - Tullamore	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
60) N. Leitrim	Anti-Parnellite (3,865)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (3,642)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
61) S. Leitrim	Anti-Parnellite (3,755)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
62) Limerick City	Anti-Parnellite (388)	Anti-Parnellite (87)	Nationalist (2,047)	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,164)	Nationalist (1,770)
63) W. Limerick	Anti-Parnellite (2,399)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,767)
64) E. Limerick	Anti-Parnellite (1,729)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (159)	Nationalist (2,934)
65) Londonderry City	Unionist (28)	Anti-Parnellite (40)	Unionist (42)	Unionist	Unionist (57)	Unionist (105)
66) N. Londonderry	Unionist (3,190)	Unionist (2,225)	Unionist	Unionist (2,107)	Unionist	Unionist (2,743)
67) S. Londonderry	Unionist (501)	Unionist (452)	Unionist	Unionist (71)	Unionist (307)	Unionist (333)
68) N. Longford	Anti-Parnellite (2,538)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
69) S. Longford	Anti-Parnellite (2,197)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
70) N. Louth	Anti-Parnellite (699)	Anti-Parnellite (861)	Nationalist (319)	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (99)	Nationalist (488)
71) S. Louth	Anti-Parnellite (1,325)	Anti-Parnellite (962)	Nationalist (308)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
72) N. Mayo	Anti-Parnellite (839)	Anti-Parnellite (721)	Nationalist (1,388)	Nationalist	Nationalist (40)	Nationalist
73) N. Mayo	Anti-Parnellite (2,847)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (2,849)
74) S. Mayo	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (441)	Nationalist
75) E. Mayo	Anti-Parnellite (2,364)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
76) N. Meath	Anti-Parnellite (133)	Anti-Parnellite (32)	Nationalist (137)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
77) S. Meath	Anti-Parnellite (83)	Parnellite (43)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
78) N. Monaghan	Anti-Parnellite (1,467)	Anti-Parnellite (1,283)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,472)	Nationalist (1,428)

Constituency	1892	1897	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	1910-1910
79) S. Monaghan	Anti-Parnellite (3,228)	Anti-Parnellite (2,870)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (708)	Ind. Nationalist
80) Newry	Anti-Parnellite (163)	Anti-Parnellite (359)	Nationalist	Nationalist (67)	Nationalist (537)	Nationalist
81) Queen's Co. Ossory	Anti-Parnellite (3,143)	Anti-Parnellite (2,356)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
82) Queen's Co. Leix.	Anti-Parnellite (2,748)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
83) N. Roscommon	Anti-Parnellite (52)	Parnellite (476)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
84) S. Roscommon	Parnellite (1,571)	Parnellite (954)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
85) N. Sligo	Anti-Parnellite (3,258)	Anti-Parnellite (2,043)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
86) S. Sligo	Anti-Parnellite (4,852)	Anti-Parnellite (2,835)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
87) N. Tipperary	Anti-Parnellite (3,602)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
88) Mid. Tipperary	Anti-Parnellite (2,347)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (1,729)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (524)
89) S. Tipperary	Anti-Parnellite (1,798)	Anti-Parnellite (501)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
90) E. Tipperary	Anti-Parnellite (1,107)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
91) N. Tyrone	Unionist (58)	Liberal (91)	Liberal (55)	Liberal (9)	Liberal (102)	Liberal (132)
92) S. Tyrone	Unionist (372)	Unionist (452)	Unionist (90)	Unionist (283)	Unionist (284)	Unionist (300)
93) Mid. Tyrone	Anti-Parnellite (969)	Anti-Parnellite (1,507)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Unionist (405)	Nationalist (723)
94) E. Tyrone	Anti-Parnellite (208)	Anti-Parnellite (152)	Nationalist (76)	Nationalist (31)	Nationalist (112)	Nationalist (140)
95) Waterford City	Parnellite (390)	Parnellite (501)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
96) W. Waterford	Anti-Parnellite	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (354)	Nationalist (1,675)

Constituency	1892	1895	1900	1906	Jan. 1910	Dec. 1910
97) E. Waterford	Anti-Parnellite (1,520)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
98) N. Westmeath	Anti-Parnellite (2,499)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist (348)	Nationalist	Ind. Nationalist (617)	Ind. Nationalist
99) S. Westmeath	Anti-Parnellite (1,477)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
100) N. Wexford	Anti-Parnellite (4,873)	Anti-Parnellite (3,903)	Nationalist (1,670)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist
101) S. Wexford	Anti-Parnellite (4,750)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (2,414)
102) E. Wicklow	Anti-Parnellite (238)	Parnellite (87)	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist (1,109)
103) W. Wicklow	Anti-Parnellite (1,798)	Anti-Parnellite	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist	Nationalist

APPENDIX 111

Comparative Table of General Election Results.

Parties	ENGLISH PARTIES				Jan. 1910	Dec 1910
	1892	1895	1900	1906		
Liberal	274	177	184	377	275	272
Labour	1	0	2	53	40	42
Liberal Unionist	40	65	63	19	--	--
Unionist	252	325	318	118	252	253
	IRISH PARTIES					
Nationalist ¹	71	71	82	83	71	76
Parnellite	9	11	--	--	--	--
Independent Nationalist	--	--	--	--	11	9
Liberal Unionist	6	6	5	6	--	--
Unionist	17	15	16	14	21	19

These figures are based upon the Election Results in the Annual Register for the relevant years and upon the figures given in R.C.K. Ensor's England, 1870-1914, pp.208, 221, 267, 386, 418, and 427.

1. "Nationalist" is used to distinguish the Anti-Parnellites from the Parnellites before 1900. From 1900 to 1910 it embraces all Nationalists. In 1910 it applies once more to the majority party.

APPENDIX IV

THE PARLIAMENTARY ATTENDANCE OF IRISH MEMBERS

At the end of each Section dealing with the activities of the Irish Members in the Parliaments between 1892 and 1910 we have appended a Note on the average attendance of these members at the various divisions during the different Parliaments. In this Appendix we bring together the figures used in these Sections in order to demonstrate the record of the Irish Parties in this matter over the period as a whole. The following Table reproduces the necessary figures.

Year	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904
Attendance	21.0	22.1	22.9	25.2	24.5	26.5	18.6	19.8	14.5	14.1	12.4	14.1
Percentage	62.7	7.5	19.4	13.6	15.7	12.5	21.5	7.5	-	-	-	-

	(a)	(b)	1893	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910
Parties																					
Nationalist ¹	81.8	49.1	52.8	45.2	25.2	24.5	20.3	18.6	19.8	64.5	36.1	18.4	44.1	55.5	51.7	30.3	27.8	22.7	42.3		
Parnellite	62.7	7.5	19.4	13.6	15.7	12.5	21.5	7.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unionist	64.0	24.7	30.9	64.2	34.5	44.5	45.4	38.3	40.3	49.4	34.5	38.0	47.9	47.1	36.9	35.1	36.0	33.9	42.9		

In the above Table the figure opposite each Party and under each date represents the average per cent attendance per member during that particular year. Thus in the Home Rule session of 1893 the average Anti-Parnellite Nationalist attended for 81.8% of the total divisions of that period. Similarly, in 1910, the average Unionist member attended on 42.9% of the possible occasions on which he might have voted.

1. Anti-Parnellite until 1900 (1893 (a) = Home Rule Session and 1893 (b) = Winter Session.

We have commented elsewhere on the high attendance in 1893, but that that was quite exceptional, the above Table shows very clearly. Indeed, the most striking general feature of these figures is the consistently low averages maintained by all parties. The Parnellites were, of course, exceptional in this matter, and the exceedingly low average which they registered between 1894 and 1899 must be attributable partly to the smallness of their numbers which made their vote on divisions of little importance on many occasions, and partly also to their declared policy of independent opposition which led them frequently to abstain from voting.

The next feature of these figures is the difference between Unionists and Nationalists. Although there was not much ultimate variation in the averages of the two parties yet the Unionists displayed on the whole a greater consistency. If they could not reach the occasionally very high averages of their rivals, yet they never sank to the lowest averages of the Nationalists. For example, only once (in the autumn session of 1893) did the Unionists fall below an average attendance of 25% of the whole. Yet the Nationalists dropped below this figure on six occasions - nor were all these occasions under Unionist Ministries.¹

It might be thought that the attendance of Irish members would be governed by the extent of the non-Irish majority in the House, and also to a certain extent by the

1. Five of them admittedly were, (1897 - 8 - 9, 1900 and 1903) but the last was in 1909 at the height of the Liberal Struggle against the House of Lords.

Ministry in power. There are not, however, many indications that this was actually so. The figures do not seem to reflect the political situation in the House of Commons at any given time.¹ Even in 1910, when the Nationalists held the balance of power, they only registered an average of 42.3%. It is, however, probable that the strength of English majorities did have a negative influence upon the attendance of Irish members. It was only between 1892 - 5 and in 1910 that the Irish vote was of real importance. During the 15 years which intervened both English parties - first the Conservatives and then the Liberals - had majorities which rendered them quite independent of minority groups. This fact would help to explain the relative indifference shown by the Irish parties - in terms of attendance in divisions - to whatever party was in power. It might normally be expected that where the Conservatives were in power, the Irish Unionists would be constant in their attendance, and that when a Liberal Government held office the Nationalists would lend it support. To a limited extent this was what happened; some of the highest Irish Unionist averages occur between 1896 and 1906, just as some of the highest Nationalist figures occur before and after that period. But the difference in the figures of the respective Irish parties from year to year is so very slender that it can scarcely be cited as evidence to prove that the presence in power of an English Government of a particular complexion automatically affected the attendance of Irish members. It is, indeed, far more probable that the size of the English majorities for the greater part of the period, allowed the Irish parties to plan their attendance not according to which Government was in power, but according to what measures that Government was bringing forward.

1. With the exception of those for the Home Rule session.

This is, in fact, probably the clue to Irish attendance at Westminster. This attendance was regulated by the importance of legislation and not by the political sympathy or antipathy which Irish parties might have towards the prevailing Government. We might qualify this still further and say that the attendance of Irish members was conditioned primarily by the Irish legislation which was before Parliament at any given date. We have given examples in the various Sections of Part III of Irish measures which attracted Irish votes either in support or in opposition. Here we need only add that the theory that Irish votes were cast mainly on Irish divisions and much less frequently on non-Irish divisions explains three facts. First, it explains the smallness of the Irish figures in crucial years. In 1903, for example, the year of Wyndham's Land Act, the Nationalist average was only 18.4% and in 1898, the year of the Local Government Act, it was only 20.3%. But we know that these were both measures in which the Irish members took the keenest possible interest, and it seems certain, therefore, that during these sessions, their attention was concentrated on these measures to the exclusion of most other business. The second fact explained by the theory is the smallness of the Irish average as a whole. This average, over the whole period, was, at a rough estimate $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total divisions at which Irish members could have been present. Since the great majority of divisions were on imperial and non-Irish affairs it follows that Irish attendances would appear infrequent in comparison with the total, whereas, seen from the Irish viewpoint, attendances at Irish measures of importance were consistently high.¹

1. As we saw when considering Irish measures in Sections I, II and III of Part III.

Finally, the low average of Irish attendance, implying a concentration on Irish divisions, corresponds to what we actually discovered to be the case when considering the Parliamentary debates. There we observed that the Irish members as a whole were silent when Imperial business was discussed, with only a few exceptions. Their interest, we saw, was centred largely upon Irish business; it was natural, therefore, that their attendance should be regulated likewise by the frequency of Irish divisions. This analysis of the figures for Parliamentary attendance - as revealed in the division lists - thus confirms our general theory of the aloofness of the Irish parties, and more particularly of the Nationalists. As their leaders so often asserted, they attended Parliament only for their own limited and clearly marked purposes.

1895, and particularly the Irish members, as here described above, led to the effect that the Party like others as well as the doctrine only developed gradually and slowly, leading to the passage of the Home Rule Bill in 1907. It is evident, that the doctrine of the Fledge was that it should be...

-
1. For the details of the Fledge see C. J. ...
 2. See Irish Review, July 1902.

APPENDIX V

Note on the discipline of the Irish Parliamentary Party.

The link binding the Irish Party tightly together in the time of Parnell had been the Party Pledge. The inescapable condition of a member's election was that he should have sworn "to sit, act, and vote with the Irish Parliamentary Party".¹ This link was broken at the General Election of 1892 when, as we have seen, the Nationalist Party was split into two sections, Anti-Parnellite and Parnellite. The epithet "pledge-breakers" was frequently used by the Anti-Parnellite Press² in its attacks upon the Parnellites. The discipline of the Anti-Parnellites continued to be governed by the Pledge even after 1892, though the hostility between Dillon and Healy robbed it of much of its virtue. The scenes at the General Election of 1895, and particularly the "Omagh scandal" (which we have described above) led to a new interpretation of the Pledge, to the effect that it should bind a member to conformity to the Party line outside as well as inside Parliament. This doctrine only developed gradually and we owe our knowledge of it to William O'Brien's description of the negotiations leading to the reunion of T. M. Healy and himself with the Party in 1907. He maintains, that Dillon's interpretation of the Pledge was that it "binds members unreservedly to

1. For the origin of the Pledge see C. Cruise O'Brien, The Machinery of the Irish Parliamentary Party, 1880 - 5, in Irish Historical Studies, March 1946.

2. See Freeman's Journal, July 1892.

the loyal support in or out of Parliament of any decision come to by a majority of the party".¹ O'Brien believed that Healy would refuse to accept this definition but he did so and rejoined the Party.² The Conventions of June and December 1900³ had reaffirmed the principle of the Pledge and it remained binding on all members of the Party during the rest of the period.

Turning now to the organisation of the Party in Parliament, we find certain variations from the practice established in the time of Parnell's supremacy. During that earlier period (December 1880) a Committee had been made up of:

- 1 Sessional Chairman.
- 1 Sessional vice-chairman.
- 2 honorary secretaries
- 2 whips.
- 1 treasurer
- 9 other members of committee.⁴

In 1893, i.e. after the first General Election held within our period, the Party met as usual at the beginning of the session and elected the following officers:

1. W. O'Brien, *An Olive Branch in Ireland*, p. 429.
2. When Healy and O'Brien left the Party again in 1909, Healy wrote to Redmond protesting that, since they had taken the Pledge, only the constituencies could expel them. See Healy, *Letters and Leaders* ii, pp. 492-4.
3. See above.
4. See Cruise O'Brien *op. cit.*

- 1 Chairman (Justin McCarthy)
- 3 treasurers.
- 2 secretaries.
- 4 whips.
- 8 members of committee. ¹

There was here a considerable divergence from the somewhat rudimentary organisation of December 1880. The office of vice-chairman was left vacant but the number of whips had been doubled and that of treasurers trebled. Moreover, the Committee members, although reduced from 9 to 8 comprised the very flower of the Party, as the following names show: Blake, Devitt, Dillon, Healy, William O'Brien, Arthur O'Connor, T. P. O'Connor and Sexton.

Indeed this body was rather too much a ministry of all the talents for it to work harmoniously and, as we saw when considering the Parliamentary activity of the Irish members in 1892 - 5, there was often considerable difference among them. When the retirement of the Chairman (Justin McCarthy) took place in 1896 the opportunity was taken to abolish the Committee altogether and the directorate of the Party then stood as follows:

- 1 chairman.
- 3 treasurers.
- 2 secretaries
- 4 whips.²

1. Freeman's Journal, 1 Feb. 1893.

2. Freeman's Journal, 19 Feb. 1896. Instead of the Committee Devitt proposed a meeting of the whole party to be held on the second Tuesday of each month "for general consultation" while the House was still sitting. This was carried by 33 votes to 13.

"With a view of utilising the full force of the Party in Parliamentary warfare we recommend that Sessional Standing Committees of the Party be appointed to deal with the following subjects viz:

1. Land and Evicted Tenants.
2. Congested Districts.
3. Labour.
4. Town Tenants.
5. Education.
6. Financial Relations.
7. Administration.
8. Local Government.
9. British Affairs.
10. Foreign Affairs.
11. Private Bill Legislation.

"That the members selected to serve on these Committees be chosen by the Chairman and Whips.

That each Committee be empowered to select its own Chairmen and Secretary and to name additional members to serve in reference to any particular subject." This scheme was actually carried through¹ and functioned in the Parliament of 1900 - 6. The number of members on each Committee varied, ranging from 8 on Colonial affairs to 26 on Irish administration. The average was about 12. Most members served on several Committees. The plan was not continued in subsequent Parliaments, perhaps because it demanded too much of members, and it remains as an interesting experiment, but little more than that.

In conclusion, then, we may say that the Irish Nationalists were free to intervene in debate provided they did so upon lines approved by the Party. At the same time we must add that this freedom remained to a great extent unused by the majority of members.

1. Freeman's Journal, 19 Feb. 1901.

LIST OF SOURCES

The most complete list of sources for this period is to be found in the Bibliography of Irish History 1870-1911, compiled by Mr. James Carty M.A. and published for the Department of Education by the Stationery Office, Dublin. The manuscript sources listed below are not, however contained in that Bibliography.

A. PRIMARY SOURCES.

1 Manuscripts and Correspondence.

1. The Collected Papers of J. F. X. O'Brien, a former treasurer of the Irish Parliamentary Party.

These may be grouped under the following heads:

- (i) Account-books and Ledgers, 1886 - 1896.
 - (ii) Two Letter-books for the period 1886 - 1905.
 - (iii) Notebooks containing the rough notes of the minutes of the Electoral Committee of the Irish Parliamentary Party in 1892, and the minutes of some meetings of the Committee of the Party in the period 1892 - 5.
 - (iv) Boxes of miscellaneous letters, also containing bank pass-books, and cheque counter-foils for some of the years between 1886 - 1905.
2. The Collected Papers of John Dillon, William O'Brien and T. M. Harrington. These have only recently been acquired and have not yet been made available.
3. Letters to the present writer from Mr. S. L. Gwynn and Mr. J. P. Hayden, both former members of the Party who supplied valuable information on points connected with the system of Conventions and with the Parliamentary discipline of the Party.

11 Newspapers and Periodicals.

The best general guide to the Press of this period is the Newspaper Press Directory and Advertisers' Guide, published annually in London from 1846 onwards. There were

frequent contributions by Irish members to the various periodicals of the time, but they were expressions of opinion and have no direct bearing upon the aspects of Irish Representation selected for treatment in this thesis. The same applies to the numerous pamphlets issued by both Unionists and Nationalists. Valuable as sources for studying opinion, they afford no reliable information as to the working of party systems.

Of the newspapers listed below, four require special mention. The Freeman's Journal is by far the most valuable source now available for studying the day to day working of the Nationalist Party. While the "split" endured, the Irish Daily Independent served the same purpose for the Parnellite party. Unionist activities were best reported in two other Dublin newspapers, the Irish Times and the Daily Express. To these four Dublin newspapers should perhaps be added two provincial organs, which wielded great influence, the Cork Examiner and the Belfast Newsletter.

The list is as follows:

Belfast Newsletter.

Cork Constitution.

Cork Examiner.

Daily Express.

Freeman's Journal.

Irish Catholic.

Irish People.

Irish Times.

Irish Independent.

National Press.

United Ireland.

Waterford Press.

To these should be added the Annual Register whose Parliamentary summaries are accurate and reasonably complete.

III Directories etc.

Alumni Dublinense, Burtchell and Sadleir, 1935.

F. Boase, Modern English Biography, 3 vols. Truro, 1892 - 1901

" " " " Supplement, 3 vols. Truro, 1908-21

Sir J.B. Burke, The Landed Gentry of Ireland, 10th ed. London,

Harrison, 1914.

Constitutional Year-book.

Dictionary of National Biography, Revised ed. London, 1909.

Dod, Parliamentary Companion.

Dublin University, Catalogue of Graduates (1595 - 1868)

" " " " " " (1869 - 1883)

Thom, Irish Directory.

Thom, Irish Who's Who (1923)

Vacher's Parliamentary Companion.

Who's Who, 1897 and after

Who Was who 1897 - 1916, London, Black, 1920.

Who Was Who 1916 - 1928, London, Black, 1929.

IV Memoirs and Speeches.

Balfour, A. J., Aspects of Home Rule, Routledge, 1912.

Beresford, Lord Charles, Memoirs, Methuen, 1914.

Birrell, A., Things Past Redress, London, Faber, 1937.

Blunt, W. S., My Diaries, London, 1932.

Bodkin, M. M. Recollections of an Irish Judge, London,

Hurst and Blackett, 1914.

Chamberlain, Joseph, Speeches, ed. C. W. Boyd, London,

Cassell, 1914.

Davitt, M. The Fall of Feudalism in Ireland, London and

New York, Harper, 1904.

Dunraven, Earl of, Past Times and Pastimes, London, Hodder

and Stoughton, 1922.

Hamilton, Lord George, Parliamentary Reminiscences, vol. 11

London, 1922.

Healy, T. M. Letters and Leaders of My Day, London,

Butterworth, 1928.

Long, J. H. Memories, London, Hutchinson, 1923.

- Lucy, Sir Henry, Diary of the Home Rule Parliament, Cassell,
1896.
- " " " Diary of the Unionist Parliament, 1895 - 1900,
Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1901.
- " " " Diary of the Balfourian Parliament, 1900 - 5,
London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.
- Lynch, Arthur, My Life Story, Long, 1924.
- McCarthy, Justin, The Story of an Irishman, London, Chatto
and Windus, 1904.
- MacNeill, J. G. S., What I have seen and heard, Arrowsmith,
1925.
- Morley, Lord John, Recollections, Macmillan, 1917.
- O'Brien, William, An Olive Branch in Ireland and its
failure, Macmillan, 1910.
- " " The Irish Revolution and how it came about,
Dublin, Maunsel and Roberts 1923.
- O'Connor, T. P., Memoirs of an Old Parliamentarian, Benn,
1929.
- " " Sketches in the House, London, Ward, Lock
and Bowden, 1895.
- O'Malley, William, Glancing Back, London, Wright and Brown,
1933.
- Oxford and Asquith, Earl of, Fifty Years of Parliament, Cassell,
1926.
- Redmond, J. E. Historical and Political Addresses, Dublin 1898.
- Ross, Sir John, The Years of My Pilgrimage, London, Arnold,
1924.
- Sheehan, D. D., Ireland Since Parnell, London, D. O'Connor,
1921.
- Sullivan, T. D., Recollections of Troubled Times, Dublin,
Sealy, Bryers and Walker, 1905.
- West, Sir A., Private Diaries, Murray 1922.

V Parliamentary Debates.

Hansard, Parliamentary Debates, 4th series, vols. 8 - 199.

--- -- -- 5th - vols. 1 - 20.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES.I General Histories.

Curtis, E., History of Ireland, London, Methuen, 1937.

Cosgrave, D., History of Ireland in the 19th Century, Dublin,
Duffy, 1906.

D'Alton, F. A., History of Ireland, vols. III and IV,
London, Aresham Publishing Co.

Emmett, T. A., Ireland under English Rule, New York and
London, Putnam's 1903.

Ensor, R. C. K., England, 1870 - 1914, Oxford, Clarendon Press,
1936.

Cretton, R. H., A Modern History of the English People, London
Grant Richards, 1913.

Hayden, M. and Moonen, G., Short History of the Irish People,
Dublin, Talbot Press, 1925.

Hull, E., History of Ireland, vol. II, London, Harrap, 1931.

Locker-Lampson, G., State of Ireland in the 19th century,
Constable, 1907.

Low, S., and Saunders, C., History of England, 1837 - 1901,
Longmans Green, 1907.

Marriott, Sir J. R., England 1885 - 1932, Methuen, 1934.

Morris, W. O'C., Ireland, 1798 - 1898, London, Innes, 1898.

O'Connor, Sir J., History of Ireland, 1798 - 1924, vol. II, Arnold
1925.

Paul, H. History of Modern England, vols. IV and V, Macmillan
1905.

II Special Subjects.

Barker, E., Ireland in the last fifty years, Oxford, Clarendon
Press, 1919.

Bergen, J. J., History of the Ancient Order of Hibernians,
Dublin 1910.

Clarkson, J. D., Labour and Nationalism in Ireland, New York.

Columbia University (1925), Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, vol. Cxx.

Eversley, Lord, Gladstone and Ireland, 1850 - 94, Methuen 1912.

Good, J. W., Irish Unionism, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1920.

Hammond, J. L., Gladstone and the Irish Nation, London, 1938.

Henry, R. M. The Evolution of Sinn Fein, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1920.

Hope, J. F. History of the 1900 - 6, Parliament, Blackwood, 1908.

MacDonagh, The Home Rule Movement, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1920.

Mansergh, N., Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution, London, 1940.

O'Donnell, F. H., History of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Longmans Green 1910.

Phillips, W. A., The Revolution in Ireland, Longmans Green, 1926.

Pomfret, J. E., The Struggle for the land in Ireland, Princeton, University Press, 1930.

Ulster Liberal Unionist Association, a sketch of its history, introduction by T. R. Fisher, Belfast, 1913.

111 Biographies.

Arnold-Forster, H. O., a memoir, by His Wife, London, 1910.

Auchmuty, J. J., Lecky, Dublin 1945.

Barton, D. P., T. M. Healy, Dublin, Talbot Press, 1933.

Black, C. E., Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, Hutchinson, 1903.

Cecil, Lady Gwendolen, Life of Lord Salisbury, vol. 1V, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1921-32.

Churchill, W. S., Life of Lord Randolph Churchill, Macmillan, 1906.

Crewe, Lord, Lord Roseberg, London, Murray 1931.

Dugdale, Blanche, A. J. Belfour, Hutchinson, 1936.

Finch, E., Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, London, Cape, 1938.

Fisher, H. A. L., Life of Viscount Bryce, Macmillan, 1927.

Fyfe, H., T. P. O'Connor, Allen and Unwin (1934)

Gardiner, A. G., Life of Sir William Harcourt, Constable, 1923.

Garvin, J. L., Life of Joseph Chamberlain, vols. 11 and 111,

Macmillan, 1932 - 4.

- 1 Gwynn, D., Life of John Redmond, London, Harrep, 1932.
- Holland, B., Life of the 8th Duke of Devonshire, London,
Longmans, 1911.
- MacDonagh, M., Life of William O'Brien, Benn. 1928.
- Mackail, J. W. and Nyndham, G., Life and Letters of
George Nyndham, Hutchinson, 1925.
- Maryoribanks, E., Life of Lord Carson, vol. 1 London, Gallanaz,
2
1932.
- Morley, John, Life of Gladstone, Macmillan, 1903.
- Newton, Lord, Lord Lansdowne, Macmillan, 1929.
- Petrie, Sir Charles, Walter Long and his Times, Hutchinson,
1936.
- Redmond-Howard, L. G., John Redmond, the man and the demand,
London, Hurst and Blackett, 1910.
- Spender, J. A. and Asquith, Cyril, Life of H. H. Asquith,
London 1932.
- Spender, J. O., Life of Campbell-Bannerman, Hodder and
Stoughton, 1923.

1. This has been classified as a secondary source but it has been used in the text virtually as a primary authority because it contains numerous and valuable extracts from the papers of John Redmond.

2. The second and third volumes of Carson's Life, by Ian Colvin, are concerned with the period 1910 onwards.

CRITICAL NOTES ON SOURCES

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Although there are valuable manuscript sources for this period, only a small proportion of them are available at present. These consist of the J. F. X. O'Brien Papers, detailed in the list above. They provide important evidence for the study of the finances of the Nationalist Party, but are less valuable in dealing with other, and more purely political, aspects. The papers of John Dillon, William O'Brien, and T. M. Harrington, would probably throw considerable light on the political events of the period, but they are not yet open to inspection.

Of the newspaper sources employed all that is necessary has already been said. Four principal organs have been of great value - the Freeman's Journal for the Nationalist majority, the Irish Daily Independent for the Parnellite minority and the Irish Times and Daily Express for the Unionists. Much of the information relating to the electioneering methods of the various parties has been obtained from these sources.

The various biographical dictionaries and directories which have been consulted are, to a certain extent, repetitive. The most useful are the Dictionary of National Biography, Dod's Parliamentary Companion, Thom's Irish Directory, and Who's Who. These sources have supplied most of the evidence for Part II - the personnel of the Irish parties. Since much of the information was supplied by members themselves it has been necessary to keep a constant check upon the evidence of these dictionaries and directories.

Of the numerous memoirs diaries etc., listed above, the majority are useful only for forming a background to the subject of Irish representation. This applies particularly to the memoirs of English statesmen, to such volumes for example, as Morley's Recollections, Walter Long's Memories and

Augustine Birrell's Things Past Redress. An exception might be made of the various Diaries of Sir Henry Lucy covering the Parliaments from 1892 to 1905. His books supply a considerable amount of evidence on the Parliamentary Record of Irish members of all parties. Among the Irish memoirs quoted only a few stand out. These are T. M. Healy's Letters and Leaders of My Day, William O'Brien's An Olive Branch in Ireland and his The Irish Revolution, T. P. O'Connor's Memoirs of an Old Parliamentarian and J. O'Malley's Glancing Back. To these might be added two more impersonal works which yet supply valuable first-hand evidence - Michael Davitt's Fall of Feudalism in Ireland, and D. D. Sheehan's Ireland Since Parnell. The last named work is the least valuable of all because its author was a keen partisan of William O'Brien and his book is closely modelled upon O'Brien's Olive Branch in Ireland. All these sources are of course biassed in one direction or another and have not been used as objective statements of the course of events. But they do reflect very accurately the opinion of different sections of Irish Nationalism¹ and the works of Healy and O'Brien, in particular, throw much light upon the various dissenting movements within the Nationalist Party as a whole. Our greatest loss for this period is any similar expression of views by John Dillon; until his papers are examined no complete study of the political controversies of the time is possible.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Most of the general histories of Ireland, or indeed of Great Britain, during this period, devote only a few pages to the affairs of the Irish parties between 1891 and 1910. The years between the death of Parnell and the advent of the

1. There are, unfortunately, virtually no similar sources for Irish Unionism.

Third Home Rule Bill seems to have been regarded more or less as a vacuum. Sir James O'Connor, in his History of Ireland, 1798-1924, does indeed allot several chapters to the period but the narrative is sketchy and somewhat distorted by the disgust of a moderate Nationalist at the rivalries within the Parliamentary movement. G. Locker-Lempson, writing in 1907 on The State of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century, has much of interest to say but his contribution virtually ceases with the defeat of Gladstone's Second Home Rule Bill. A much more recent work (published in 1936), R. C. K. Enzor's England 1870-1914 is by far the most valuable general appraisal of the importance of the Irish question in English politics, though naturally he does not enquire deeply into purely Irish affairs. But, these works apart, there is little of value on the period 1891-1910 in the general histories of Ireland now extant.

This want has latterly begun to be redressed by the appearance of a few specialised works on various aspects of the Irish question, though none has as yet appeared on the specific subject of Irish Parliamentary Representation. Of these, the most important for our purposes is J. L. Hammond's Gladstone and the Irish Nation, based on unpublished Gladstone papers and dealing thoroughly with the events leading up to the Second Home Rule Bill; the book was published in 1938. Other works of value for this period are Michael MacDonagh's, The Home Rule Movement, W. A. Phillips, The Revolution in Ireland and Nicholas Mansergh's Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution. All are useful as regards background though none are directly concerned with the particular problems treated in this thesis.

Turning finally to the biographies dealing with leading figures of the period, we find many works of importance. We need however only list a few of the principal ones because they are concerned primarily with English affairs and Irish parties are mentioned only in so far as they infringe upon English politics. Into this category fall

Winston Churchill's Life of Lord Randolph Churchill, Blanche Dugdale's Life of A. J. Balfour, A. G. Gardiner's Life of Sir William Harcourt, J. L. Gerwin's Life of Joseph Chamberlain, John Morley's Life of Gladstone, J. A. Spender and Cyril Asquith's Life of Asquith and J. A. Spender's Life of Campbell-Bannerman. All these biographies may be described as background material; their references to Irish parties are for the most part, incidental.

There only exists as yet one Irish biography of commensurate importance.¹ This is Dr. Dennis Gwynn's Life of John Redmond, based fully upon Redmond's papers. This is a valuable work and although it has been listed as a secondary source it has been used throughout this period in conjunction with primary sources because of its numerous quotations from Redmond's papers. Similar studies of other Irish leaders have yet to appear.

TOTAL WORDS = 110,000.

1. The first volume of the Life of Lord Carson (by E. Marjoribanks) takes the story up to 1910 but is primarily concerned with the legal rather than with the political career of Carson.

