

managers are urging on Liberal members the necessity of supporting a bill of which, as every one knows, many of these members do not approve. Men who always opposed home rule, and have recently denounced the Conservative alliance with Mr. Parnell, are being informed, with more or less plainness, that if Mr. Gladstone has become a Home-Ruler, followers of Mr. Gladstone must remember that a follower should follow; that it is for the Premier to find a policy, and for his supporters to find votes. Rumors are current that, to use the not very decent cant imputed to a leading politician, more than one member has "found salvation" by sudden conversion (under pressure) to the home-rule creed. Here, again, we see that the lesson is being taught to public men which, once learnt, will never be forgotten. Whatever be the end of the contest over home rule, it is certain that its incidents will lower the character of English statesmanship.

(5.) The home-rule policy, even if it be, as its advocates maintain, the wisest mode of dealing with Ireland, involves one admitted evil of which the magnitude may be exaggerated, but of which it is hard to deny the reality. It is a policy which must trouble instead of easing the national conscience. It involves at the outset the condonation, and indeed the reward, of lawlessness and injustice. It involves the desertion of men who, whatever their faults, have trusted to the protection of the English Parliament, and have been ill treated simply because they have respected the law and have attempted to exercise their legal rights. It involves in the future the surrender of all serious attempts to prevent the infliction of gross injustice on large bodies of men who are still citizens of the United Kingdom, and in any case will remain British subjects. This is and ought to be a most serious matter. A policy which may logically lead to the employment of British troops to enforce on Ulster obedience to a Parliament in Dublin, in cases where, in the opinion of Englishmen, the Irish Parliament is violating the rules of equity, may turn out wise and right; but it is a policy which rightly enough excites alarm, and disquiets the souls of men who think that the maintenance of justice between man and man is the main object for which the state exists.

I have purposely abstained from dwelling on what may be called the general arguments against the Home-Rule Bill. My aim has been rather to call attention to certain aspects of the present movement which may easily escape the notice of American observers, and which in my judgment render large bodies of Englishmen hostile to Mr. Gladstone's proposals, and, by stirring up such hostility, weaken the movement in favor of home rule. Let it, however, be carefully noted that I do not hazard any prophecy as to the relative power of the forces which favor, and of the forces which oppose, the success of Mr. Gladstone's attempt to place the relations between England and Ireland on an entirely new basis. We are in the midst of a revolution; it were the rashest and vainest of all things to endeavor to foretell what course that revolution may take. A great writer who remembered the first French revolution, has said somewhere that the worst of a revolutionary movement is that you begin it in company with all the honest men, and come out of it in company with all the knaves. This dictum is one of those sayings which impress on prudent men a possibly excessive dread of movements resting directly or indirectly on the encouragement of popular violence and the overthrow of law.

A. V. DICEY.

THE OPPOSITION IN IRELAND TO HOME RULE.

DUBLIN, May 18, 1886.

I HAVE frequently drawn attention to the intensity of the opposition in Ireland to any plan of home rule, mainly among Protestants and the cultured classes. It is idle to ridicule or under-rate the extent of this feeling: There it is, and it must be dealt with and allowed for. While 85 out of our 103 members are Nationalists; while the minority of 18 is confined to Ulster constituencies, except representatives elected by the close borough of Dublin University; while even Ulster has returned a majority on the National side, the opposition is nevertheless powerful and steady. If only as material for history, the intensity and persistency of this opposition are worth recording. On its reasonableness or unreasonableness the future alone can conclusively decide. The great meeting of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, held at the Rotunda a few days ago, affords a good opportunity of estimating its strength. A careful perusal of the speeches at those meetings must make any Irish Protestant Nationalist feel what a responsibility he assumes in differing from such an earnest, sincere, and cultivated body of men, with whose views on other questions he so much more nearly coincides than with those of his Nationalist friends.

The Rotunda is the largest room in Dublin; it was thronged, and an overflow meeting occupied a large concert hall upon the same premises. Admission was by ticket. The attendance was eminently upper-class and "respectable"—very different in its appearance and bearing from that presented by an average assembly at Nationalist meetings. The *Freeman's Journal* remarked that the working-class element was scarcely represented—that the meeting consisted mainly of "dudes." The *Conservative Express* was on the whole more correct: "Peers of the realm, merchants, professional men, clerks, laboring men—all differences of rank disappearing for the nonce—here came together to pronounce the opinion of vast numbers of the Irish people." There was a larger sprinkling of Catholics than, since the inception of the Land League movement, there occurs of Protestants at Nationalist meetings. The chair was taken by the Provost of Trinity College, Mr. Jellett, a man of the highest character, who has been ready to show his sympathy with great moral reforms. Many of the speakers were merchants of high standing, entirely above the suspicion of narrow motives—men to whom the community would first turn for leadership or advice in any matter connected with trade or commerce. Prof. Dowden was there—the Shakespearian critic, the Shelleyist. It may be remarked that whereas the opposition of most speakers was based on distrust of their fellow-countrymen and dread of a general upturning and commercial depression likely to ensue from Irish legislation, the opposition of Prof. Dowden arose rather from his belief that the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament would be derogatory to Ireland and lowering to the character of its people. He termed the bill one "for the disruption of the Liberal party, the disfranchisement of Ireland, and the dismemberment of the empire." Under the proposed change, "the wealth of England would be no longer at our back." "The only reason that could be conceived for honest Englishmen supporting the bill was that it got rid of Ireland, and left England free to work her will on the world." Resolutions were enthusiastically passed condemning Mr. Gladstone's bill, and calling upon "our fellow-subjects to maintain, by every legitimate means in their power, the unity of these kingdoms, and we tender our best thanks to our many friends at home

and abroad who came forward to assist us in maintaining the integrity of the empire."

This meeting only expressed the vehement convictions of a section of Irish society even more strongly declared in private than in public—except that in private the opposition to home rule is more admittedly based upon a dread of Catholicism *per se* than it is considered polite or expedient to confess in public. A thoughtful bank manager said to me, as Mr. Gladstone's exposition of his bill was coming in by telegraph, "You have now every step of the French Revolution unfolding before you: you now see the two orders debating together; the work will be crowned by the guillotine taking the place of King William in College Green." One of the first stock-brokers in Dublin declared: "If this bill becomes law, economic disasters will ensue, and before many years are over you will see men falling dead of starvation in the streets of Dublin." The librarian of a public library remarked: "You will yet see an auto-da-fé in Dublin, and you [Protestants who side with the Nationalists] will be the first victims!" "Every respectable person will leave the country" is the mildest prediction of most such individuals. Now that Gladstone and Spencer have spoken, it is certainly not utterly disreputable to be a Nationalist, as it used to be, but the lines are perhaps more sharply drawn; the battle is more closely knit than ever before. Men who could discuss the question together six months ago, now find it best to avoid the subject, if they desire to conserve their friendship for more settled times. We hear much of armed preparation in the north to oppose the measure if it pass, and to resist the authority of a Dublin Parliament. The mouth-piece of this party, William Johnston "of Ballykilbeg," is a man of sterling character. He figures on temperance, women's suffrage, and other social-reform platforms—a man of small means, whose family have to make their way in the world, and who lately relinquished a Government situation of £700 a year rather than stifle the public expression of his convictions. The yearly meeting of the Society of Friends in Ireland is just over. Several of the northern Friends present said they would refuse to pay taxes if the measure passed. It is true that a motion to include condemnation of home rule in the Epistle to the London yearly meeting was defeated, on account of the strong protest of a few Friends; but were matters decided, as in other assemblies, by vote, it would have been carried by an overwhelming majority.

The opposition shown to home rule is by many said to be no greater than that exhibited on previous occasions by the same classes in Ireland to Catholic Emancipation and Church Disestablishment. This is scarcely correct. Those measures were dreaded by certain classes almost as much as is the present; but upon the whole the opposition was not so determined and clearly defined. Many Protestants advocated Emancipation; fewer, Church Disestablishment; though there are more Protestants sympathizing with home rule than show in public or on platforms, their number is certainly small. Fiery passages regarding Disestablishment, such as the following by the Hon. David Plunket, now M. P. for Dublin University, are quoted on Nationalist platforms as showing that the present talk is all bunkum: At a meeting in 1869, Plunket

"appealed to our brother Protestants in England, Scotland, and Wales to stand by us in this last awful hour of our fortunes. We call upon them not to drive us again to that old kind of material, physical resistance which accompanied the first protesting of our forefathers three centuries ago; which accompanied the second protest in this kingdom by our forefathers two hundred years ago; which accompanied the glorious struggle for liberty

and Protestantism of our predecessors, and was a protest in act and word which they were willing to seal with their blood in martyrdom and battle, if need be, to protest against the oppression and the slavery of a system which they could not, and should not, and which their descendants never will submit to."

I might quote many similar passages, such as the famous declaration (cheered) of a reverend gentleman at a meeting about the same time as above, that if the Irish Church were disestablished, "Irish Protestants would kick the Queen's crown into the Boyne"; but I am bound to say that, in looking over the records of such past agitations, I cannot perceive as high a level of strong protest as we have at present. Separation is declared to be preferable to the proposed arrangement, because "under separation our hands would not be tied by England, and we should be fully able to reconquer the island from the Catholics."

It is remarkable that some, once apparently on the side of Irish self-government, now that the dream is likely to become reality, have joined the opposition. Among these are Goldwin Smith, William H. Lecky, whose 'Leaders of Public Opinion' drew many Protestants into the National ranks; Prof. Dowden, who was supposed by many to be National; also the author of "Who fears to speak of '98?" who was on the platform of the Rotunda; and, perhaps the most striking case, Boyd Kinnear, a Scotch advocate, the author of several papers on the National side, and who declared shortly before the murder of the Secretaries that, "if Scotland were governed as is Ireland, the life of no English official would be safe outside the radius of a policeman's baton."

The ascendancy or coercion party are certainly standing to their guns. There is no seeking to make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness. They mean to show fight to the last. They appear entirely unable to recognize what in some form or other is inevitable. They profess themselves prepared for a continuance of the history of the past eighty-three years, with its sixty or seventy coercion acts. They must see some way of working in Parliament against eighty-five Irish members banded together like one man. If continued agitation be, as it is, so destructive of the best interests of the country, have they any better remedy to suggest than Mr. Gladstone's scheme? They seem blind to its checks and safeguards; also to the fact that it is frankly accepted by the Irish party—even by such "extremists" as John Dillon and William O'Brien—men who, whatever may have been their action in the past, are above all suspicion by those who really know them, men of transparent honor and honesty. Nothing could be stronger than the declaration of both these gentlemen, who, with Mr. Parnell, hold in their hands the feelings of the Irish people to a degree almost unprecedented in the past. The attitude of the Opposition as expressed in the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union can arise only from complete ignorance of the real character and intentions of such men—of the real effect of concession upon them.

"What has happened in the case of Earl Spencer?" said Mr. O'Brien. "One touch of kindness in one speech at Newcastle has effaced and obliterated years of bitter memories from the hearts of Irishmen [Irish cheers], and the speeches of the Prime Minister in this house and the kindly English feeling shown in this house, and, I am glad to say, out of it, sir—these things have done more than fifty coercion acts could do—have done more to bring about a union, a real union, a union of sympathy and of generosity and respect between the two countries. Well, sir, I ask you, is that a people so hopeless to conciliate?"

The action and speech of men under antagonism and coercion are no measure of their action and speech under trust and responsibility. If the bit-

ter feeling of opponents is best ascertained in private intercourse, so in private intercourse is that of the leading Nationalists most correctly gauged. And they show themselves to be steady and altered men, impressed by a sense of the responsibilities likely to devolve upon them, and without the suspicion of a desire to act otherwise than fairly by their fellow-countrymen. A member of the party lately said, in private conversation, that he did not desire the modification of any one of the checks and safeguards in Mr. Gladstone's bill, believing all would be necessary, and would rather assist those who sought to pacify the country and to govern wisely and well.

These are the great difficulties before us: (1) The disappointments inevitable among the mass of the people at the results of home rule. The definite and absurd anticipations put forward by Nationalists to spur on the people to contend for autonomy, impossible as they will be of realization, will cause the greatest difficulty to be encountered in working home rule. This has been long acknowledged. "I know well what will ensue," remarked one of the leading Irish Nationalists some years ago: "the first home-rule Ministry will be assassinated." (2) The second great difficulty will arise from the present attitude and action of the upper classes. Those who at first will be best fitted to lead in thought, in economics, in manufactures, in the practical affairs of life, are those who have most resisted reform and the aspirations and desires of the mass of the Irish people. And it will be some time before the people learn to confide in that class as regards those matters in which, for the steady progress of the country, it ought to lead.

Seeing that the apprehensions of disaster from home rule are as great as they undoubtedly are at present, it is remarkable that Irish investments and property have not fallen even lower than they have fallen in value. Bank of Ireland stock is much depressed, but that is due less to the political outlook than to the realization, consequent on the failure of the Munster Bank, that for years it stood at an abnormal figure. The stocks of the three other principal banks, the Royal, the Provincial, and the National, have fallen within the year from 28 to 22, 29 to 20, 24 to 19; part of this decrease may be attributed to the failure of the Munster Bank, part to the state of the country. The stocks of the three principal railways, the Great Southern, Midland, and Northern, have in the same period fallen from 112 to 92, 71 to 62, 113 to 95. In the same period the stocks of some of the principal English lines, the North-Western, the North-Eastern, and the Great Western, have fallen from 162 to 152, 153 to 143, 135 to 127. The value of land as an agricultural investment has depreciated here as much as in England. Land let to tenants is, of course, here almost unsalable. The better class of mansion houses near Dublin have very much decreased in value; this has arisen from many other causes than those connected with politics. The residences of the better class trading and the rank and file of the professional classes, say those at about £100 a year in ordinary localities, have depreciated little, if at all. I was to-day speaking with a representative of one of our largest wholesale houses, that has connections all over the country. He is a cool observer, and insists that the commercial depression over Ireland is very much exaggerated, and that in any case it is little, if at all, due to the agitation. Be this as it may, the indefinite postponement of radical reform in the direction of self-government is not likely to benefit Ireland. Probably before very long many will declare publicly, what they now privately acknowledge, that anything would be better than a continuance of the present unsettlement.

D. B.

THE DUC DE BROGLIE'S RECOLLECTIONS.—II.

PARIS, May 17, 1886.

As soon as Mme. de Staël heard the news of the arrival of Napoleon at Cannes, she saw at once the consequences—the army in revolt, the country resigned to a new change, the King obliged to return into exile, and the Emperor at the Tuileries. She left Paris, the Duc de Broglie remained. The country offered a miserable spectacle. Treason was everywhere; the same people who had made great royalist demonstrations, prepared themselves for the new order of things. Benjamin Constant wrote a flaming article against the usurper, and the ink was not yet dry when he repented having written it. Louis XVIII. went to the Chambers, and announced solemnly that he had resolved to die on the throne, and to defend his people. The Duc de Broglie compares this scene to that of a play: "The curtain once fallen, the old King rolled away in his chair, and it was all over." When the fatal moment arrived, the Duc de Broglie did not feel for the persons any great regret. He did not go to the Tuileries; he knew that he was considered by the Legitimists there a secret enemy. He saw everything from the outside, as a mere witness. "It was easy," says he, "to see through the windows the movements, the precipitation, the trouble of people who feared to hear, from moment to moment, the quick step of the imperial grenadiers. In seeing this little man, exalted by a hundred victories, with a handful of old soldiers throw down with a movement of his hand this castle of cards, I remembered involuntarily the scene in the novel of Cervantes where the hero of La Mancha enters a puppet theatre, and, seeing a princess chained to a pasteboard giant, draws his great sword and cuts in two the prison and the prisoners."

The day after the departure of Louis XVIII. Paris was lugubrious. All the cafés were shut, the passers-by avoided each other. Nobody was in the streets but a few drunken soldiers, singing the "Marseillaise." Towards night "the master arrived. He came like a thief, to use the Scriptural expression. He went up the great staircase of the Tuileries, in the arms of his generals, of his former ministers, of all the past and present servitors of his fortunes, who bore as much anxiety as joy on their faces." The order of the day was a Constitution: the Empire proclaimed itself this time liberal and constitutional. The Duc de Broglie did not believe much in all these demonstrations; he recalls an ironical saying of the times: "How could I fail to be a Liberal? I served in the Mamelukes." We come here upon a curious incident. At a reunion of journalists of some eminence, the Duc de Broglie said openly that he did not for his part believe in this new constitutionalism; "that all hope of dressing the Emperor Napoleon in the garb of a constitutional king was folly; that the expectation of hindering him from attempting new adventures, and from bringing the Allies back a second time to Paris, was another folly. There was but one thing to do, which was to take advantage of this constitutional *coup de vent*, in order to organize a government to disembarass France of the Emperor, and to prevent a second invasion. The oldest branch of the house of Bourbon had fallen, and not without reason, into great contempt. I pointed to the cadet branch as the only hope of good people and of men of good sense. I was not, however, initiated in any plot; I was not even in intimate relations with the Duc d'Orléans. I had been presented to him, he had received me affably, but I saw him rarely. His position marked him naturally in the circumstances in which we were."

It is singular to see the Duc de Broglie anti-