

1416

# LIES AND REPLIES:

AN

EXPOSURE OF SOME OF THE COMMONER  
GLADSTONIAN FALLACIES,

BEING A

REPRINT OF FORTY LETTERS

FROM THE

RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.,  
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND,

AND FROM HIS SECRETARY,

GEORGE WYNDHAM, Esq., M.P.

IN REPLY TO VARIOUS FALSE CHARGES MADE BY MEMBERS  
OF THE GLADSTONIAN-PARNELLITE PARTY.

---

*WITH ANNOTATIONS AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.*

---

PRINTED FOR AND PUBLISHED BY

THE LIBERAL UNIONIST ASSOCIATION.

31, GREAT GEORGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

Houses of the Oireachtas

# LIES AND REPLIES:

AN

EXPOSURE OF SOME OF THE COMMONER  
GLADSTONIAN FALLACIES,

BEING A

REPRINT OF FORTY LETTERS

FROM THE

RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.,  
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND,

AND FROM HIS SECRETARY,

GEORGE WYNDHAM, Esq., M.P.

IN REPLY TO VARIOUS FALSE CHARGES MADE BY MEMBERS  
OF THE GLADSTONIAN-PARNELLITE PARTY.

---

*WITH ANNOTATIONS AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.*

---

PRINTED FOR AND PUBLISHED BY

THE LIBERAL UNIONIST ASSOCIATION,  
31, GREAT GEORGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

LIES AND REPLIES:

EXPOSURE OF SOME OF THE COMMONER  
CLASSTONIAN FALLACIES.

REPORT OF FORTY LETTERS

RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.,  
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY McCORQUODALE & Co. LIMITED, "THE ARMOURY,"  
SOUTHWARK, S.E.

GEORGE WYNNE, Esq., M.P.

IN ANSWER TO FORTY LETTERS CHARGES MADE BY  
MR. BALFOUR, CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND,

WITH A PREFACE BY

THE LIBERAL UNIONIST ASSOCIATION.

25, GREAT GEORGE STREET, LONDON, W.

## PREFACE.

THE forty letters which are contained in this volume appeared in the public press at various dates during the last three years. They did much good at the time of their first publication ; but their work is by no means done, and it would be a misfortune if they were to be forgotten.

Mr. Balfour has done admirable service to his country in many ways, in the face of most virulent opposition from the Gladstonians. He has upheld the law, protected the weak, punished the guilty, and restored peace to Ireland. But, as the correspondence here collected will show, he has put the country under a still further obligation to him. With perfect good humour, with admirable accuracy, and a remorseless logic, he has hunted down and exposed the lies by which his opponents sought, and still seek, to make the performance of his duties impossible. In this good work he has been splendidly seconded by his Secretary, Mr. George Wyndham, Member for Dover. This gentleman, as will be seen in the following pages, has contributed in behalf of his Chief, a series of letters, which are in many cases models of accurate, concise and unanswerable replies.

It is not pretended that the letters here selected cover the whole ground of Gladstonian false witness ; the public are already familiar with many lies, which are not referred to in the present correspondence ; and, moreover, every one of the selected lies has become the parent of an endless brood of kindred and derived falsehoods, which have multiplied as rapidly as the germs of disease in the congenial medium of a

putrid pond, and which, in many cases, have become so widely differentiated from their originals as to be rarely recognised as of the same variety. At the same time it will be found that the examples selected, if not exhaustive, are, at any rate, typical, and every reader may learn enough from a perusal of these pages to enable him to assign its proper value to any Gladstonian statement on any subject.

In order not to offend the most delicate susceptibilities, the various statements put forward by Gladstonian speakers and writers, which are set out in this book, have been styled "allegations," which undoubtedly they are, although many, if not all of them, might with equal accuracy be described by a shorter word. While, however, this friendly concession is made to the feelings of very sensitive persons, the true lesson of the correspondence now published must not be lost sight of or obscured by any ambiguity.

Ever since the Gladstonians threw in their lot with the Parnellites, and thus became the open allies of men who are the open enemies of this country, the convicted perpetrators and abettors of shameful crimes, and the avowed advocates of dishonest dealing, they have had a very hard case indeed. "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear," and you cannot build an honest British policy upon the principles of the Plan of Campaign and the practice of the Moonlighter.

The Gladstonians, with all their ability, have found the task too difficult for them, and in consequence they have given it up. They dare not defend their own allies; they dare not tell the Electors of Great Britain how far they propose to trust their allies; they dare not even ask their allies what they will take for their services. Hence it is that they are compelled to base their whole policy upon the alleged acts of wickedness which they allege are committed by the Unionist Party.

The following letters will show the character of the charges which the Gladstonians have learnt to make, and the sort of evidence upon which they are based.

It is probably fair to divide those members of the Gladstonian Party who devote themselves to deceiving the Electors into three classes. In the first place there are those who know nothing, and never try to learn anything, about the facts on which they base their charge; but who honestly believe that what they say is true.

In the second place, there are those who neither know nor care whether the charge be true, but who regard any statement as acceptable which is calculated to injure their opponents, and to interfere with the administration of the law in Ireland.

And, lastly, there are those who knowingly and wilfully make charges which they know to be false, with the deliberate object of misleading the intelligence, and inflaming the passions of those to whom they appeal. It would be invidious to attempt to classify according to the above schedule the persons whose statements are met and refuted by Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham. The intelligent reader will probably be able without difficulty to perform this task.

At the same time, it is well to speak plainly, and to point out that many of the allegations here quoted were not only false, but false to the knowledge of those who made them. There can be no doubt about this, for it is remarkable that a statement of the truth is invariably sufficient to close the mouth of the original slanderer. Over and over again, it is true, the original lie is reproduced in some other place, and on some other occasion, and in many cases by those who must be familiar with the contradiction; but it is never pretended that the contradiction is not true, or that the original allegation is not false. Perhaps the most degrading feature in the whole business is the fact that many of the

allegations are in themselves monstrous absurdities, which could only obtain credence among the most ignorant and ill-informed, and which any decently educated person must perceive to be as false as they are ridiculous. And yet it is this species of allegation which is repeated over and over again by educated Gladstonians on obscure platforms. Some day by chance the light reaches it, and the whole myth is blasted into fragments by six lines of truth. The Gladstonian too often neither apologises nor withdraws; he simply "lies low," and invents or picks up another tale of the same kind.

It is most important therefore that every Unionist should be prompt to watch and to expose every lie as it springs into life. Vigilance is required, but vigilance will be amply repaid.

The Gladstonian attack is largely based upon "Lies;" it is the duty of every Unionist to see that to every lie shall be fitted at once its appropriate "Reply." How effectively this can be done the following pages will show.

# CONTENTS.

NO.	PAGE
1. Captain Plunkett's Telegram ... ..	9
2. Cheering Mr. Gladstone ... ..	10
3. Confiscation of Improvements ... ..	11
4. Resident Magistrates ... ..	12
5. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Morley ... ..	18
6. Mr. Leveson-Gower distinguishes himself ... ..	22
7. A "Romance" by the Rev. J. Ellis ... ..	27
8. Mr. Balfour on Irish "Patriots" and "Martyrs" ... ..	29
9. The Myth of the Infant Prisoner ... ..	32
10. Mr. Gladstone's Method of Attack... ..	33
11. The Plan of Campaign... ..	35
12. Mr. Hibbert's Mistake ... ..	37
13. Mr. Bryce's Facts... ..	39
14. <i>Re</i> Patrick Murray (late), R.I.C. ... ..	42
15. Facts and Fallacies about Evictions ... ..	43
16. Little Minnie Griffin ... ..	47
17. The Hasty Baronet and the Salutory Correction ... ..	48
18. Mr. Philip Stanhope—as usual ... ..	51
19. Mr. Balfour and Sir Walter Foster... ..	58
20. The Legends of Samuel Danks Waddy examined ... ..	60
21. How Mr. Marjoribanks was hoaxed ... ..	64
22. The Legend of Mr. Harrington's Bible ... ..	66
23. Mr. Austin, M.P., and his Eight Little Errors ... ..	67
24. Guilty or Not Guilty? ... ..	71
25. Mr. Balfour and the Royal Irish Constabulary... ..	73
26. Only Mr. Herbert ... ..	74
27. <i>Re</i> Mr. Harrington's Food and Clothing... ..	76
28. An Ordinary Parnellite Lie exposed ... ..	77
29. That Infant Prisoner again! ... ..	79
30. The Sad Tale of Mr. Carew... ..	80
31. A Lie that is Half a Truth ... ..	82
32. Truth—Mr. Labouchere's Version ... ..	84
33. A Handy Guide to Parnellite Methods ... ..	85
34. "Bloody Balfour :—" a Tale for Children, by Miss Helen Taylor... ..	88
35. The True Story of Widow M'Ginley ... ..	90
36. A Typical Gladstonian ... ..	92
37. Sir Charles Russell's Unlucky Blunder ... ..	93
38. Mr. Redmond's Facts ... ..	96
39. The Art of Lying by the Suppression of Truth ... ..	98
40. M'Ginley's Pig ... ..	99



# LIES AND REPLIES.

## No. 1.

### CAPTAIN PLUNKETT'S TELEGRAM.

*July 25<sup>th</sup>, 1887.*

This letter requires little comment or explanation. It, however, furnishes a good instance of the effective manner in which Mr. Balfour has at all times stood by his subordinates when they were attacked by the Gladstonians for doing their duty.

With regard to the contents of the telegram referred to, one point is interesting. As in every other case since the commencement of the Parnellite agitation, fear for their skins overmastered every other consideration in the minds of the Parnellite persecutors. They were quite willing to inflict suffering and cause bloodshed, but the moment they had reason to fear that the bloodshed would not be all on one side they collapsed.

*"Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., has addressed the following letter to a correspondent who wrote to him asking for information on the subject of Captain Plunkett's telegram of the 7<sup>th</sup> of March to the police under his command":—*

(1a.)

*"Irish Office, Great Queen-street, S.W., July 25<sup>th</sup>.*

*"Sir,—You inform me that a telegram of Captain Plunkett's of the 9<sup>th</sup> of March, ordering the police in case of emergency to use vigorous measures for repelling any attack, is being extensively circulated, and that an attempt is being made to use it for electioneering purposes. The circumstances which produced, and, in my opinion, amply justified Captain Plunkett's action are as follows:—*

*"A savage attack had been made upon the police in the execution of their duty, in which many of them had been badly hurt. The Government had reason to know that a further organized attack was in contemplation. Had this attack taken place it would certainly have led to the infliction of further injuries and almost certainly to loss of life."*

*"The only means by which these consequences could be averted was to let it be clearly understood that such an attack would be resisted by the police in the most effective and vigorous manner possible. This method proved effectual, and the result of the telegram was to stop the intended assault and all the train of evils by which it would inevitably*

have been followed. If, therefore, Captain Plunkett's telegram could be justified on no other grounds, it can be amply justified on grounds of humanity.'

"Occurrences like this are further symptoms of that social disorganization under which brutal outrages are committed on defenceless men and women for no other reason than that they have pursued their lawful avocations in their own way; and under which such a state of terrorism has been established that in many cases the nearest relatives of the deceased dare not give evidence against the murderers.'

"I remain, yours obediently,

"ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

"T. L. Irwin, Esq."

## No. 2.

### CHEERING MR. GLADSTONE.

*November 23rd, 1887.*

(I.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Men are being sent to prison in Ireland (November, 1887) for cheering Mr. Gladstone.*

(I.) THE FACT.—Men are not being sent to prison in Ireland for cheering Mr. Gladstone. The statement that they have been so sent is a "foolish story," and is absolutely untrue.

This particular misstatement is one of a considerable class intended to discredit the administration of the Law in Ireland.

It was circulated in this case by Captain BRAND, a Parnellite candidate, at a public meeting at Eastbourne.

"The attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland having been called to a statement made by Captain Brand at a recent Home Rule meeting at Eastbourne, that men were being sent to prison in Ireland "for cheering Mr. Gladstone," Mr. Balfour has made the following reply":—

#### (2a.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle, Nov. 23rd, 1887.

"Dear Sir,—I duly received your letter in which you drew my attention to a statement which was being circulated in Sussex to the effect that certain prisoners were committed to Galway Gaol for having cheered for Mr. Gladstone. I can hardly suppose that any sensible person could really believe such a foolish story, but having made full inquiry, I am enabled to assure you that it is untrue.

"I intend to refer to the subject more fully on another occasion.

"Believe me, yours faithfully,

"ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

"Mr. H. C. Richards."

## No. 3.

## CONFISCATION OF IMPROVEMENTS.

*December 8th, 1887.*

This letter is inserted to show the value of a constant and careful criticism of all allegations, both of fact and law, made by the Parnellites. The article to which Mr. Balfour alludes appeared in a journal which professes to instruct public opinion, and it is probably facts of the nature supplied in the article that form the only information possessed by the ordinary Gladstonian.

It will be seen that the writer of the article referred to was wrong in his law, wrong in his facts, and wrong in his conclusions.

## “MR. BALFOUR AND EVICTED TENANTS’ CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION.

*“Mr. Balfour, Chief Secretary for Ireland, has sent the following reply to a correspondent who wrote to him with regard to statements recently published in the PALL MALL GAZETTE on the subject of the right of evicted tenants in Ireland to claim compensation for their improvements”:*—

(3a.)

“Irish Office, S.W., 8th December, 1887.

“Sir,—I have to thank you for your letter, in which you draw my attention to an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 24th of November, denying the accuracy of a statement recently made by the Prime Minister as to the right of an evicted tenant in Ireland to claim compensation for his improvements. The author of the article is under a complete delusion as to the nature of the law. This is the more curious as he had before him Lord Salisbury’s perfectly accurate statement, by which, if his indignation had given him time for reflection, he might safely have guided himself. The law as to compensation for improvements is contained in the fourth section of the Land Act of 1870. Under that section a tenant on quitting his holding, whether in consequence of an ejectment or for non-payment of rent, or by his own voluntary surrender, or for any other cause whatever, is entitled to full compensation for improvements, and the Court, in making its award, is governed solely by the value of the improvements. If the ejectment has been for non-payment of rent the landlord is of course entitled to set off the rent in arrear, so far as it goes, against the sums awarded for compensation. So many scores of cases have been decided in every county in Ireland in this sense that there is probably not a farmer in the country who is ignorant of the law. Of the particular instance (that of Patrick Conroy) cited by the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* as an

illustration of a law that has no existence, I can have no special knowledge. I have, however, learned the following particulars from the agent of the estate :—Conroy's rent was £24. Griffith's valuation was £27 5s.; there is, therefore, the strongest *primâ facie* evidence that the rent was an extremely moderate one. It is not true that Conroy had spent £200 on his house. He had spent nothing on the house, and its valuation was only £2. The only money spent on the farm was a sum of £50. This was spent on drainage. It was not expended by the tenant out of his own resources, but borrowed from the Board of Works, and the annual instalment required by the Board in payment of the debt is of course now paid by the landlord instead of by the tenant. On the 1st May, 1886, Conroy owed two years' rent. In the following June the agent offered to accept one year's rent in full satisfaction of all claims. Conroy thereupon paid £12 as an instalment, and promised to pay the remaining £12 in July. He did not keep his word. The £12 was restored to him, and he was evicted in the following August owing two years' rent, leaving behind him a house upon which he had spent nothing, and a debt for drainage to be paid by his landlord. According to this report of the facts of the case, given upon the authority of the agent of the property, the statement of the *Pall Mall Gazette* that the tenant had put up buildings to the value of £200 would seem to be unfounded; and in any case, even if this had been the fact, the allegation that the law entitled the landlord to confiscate improvements in the manner described by the journal is quite erroneous.

"Believe me, yours faithfully,

"ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR."

#### No. 4.

#### RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.

*February 27th, 1888.*

(I.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Resident Magistrates in Ireland receive their orders every day from Dublin Castle.*

(I.) THE FACT.—The statement that Resident Magistrates in Ireland receive their orders every day from Dublin Castle is a scandalous libel.

In addition to its utter and patent absurdity, this story is remarkable as being put into circulation by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., formerly Chief Secretary for Ireland.

In a correspondence which followed the two letters printed below, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman endeavoured to clear himself of the charge brought against him by Mr. Wilson Noble, alleging that Mr. Balfour's reply was based, not upon his

(Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's) own words, "*but upon a gloss of Mr. Balfour's manufacturing.*" As Mr. Campbell-Bannerman is of opinion that the mere recital of his actual words disposes of the charge against him, it will be sufficient to quote the said words as given by Mr. Bannerman.

"The Government strain and distort the law in order to secure the conviction of their political opponents. Dealing with those delicate questions, which, if they are not wholly political, are on the wavy confines between political offences and criminal offences, they send them to be settled, not by skilled lawyers of the highest standing in the Courts of the realm, but by Resident Magistrates, who may be excellent and capable men, but whose misfortune for this purpose is that they are not only appointed and removable by the Executive Authority, *but that they receive orders, and are accustomed to receive orders every day of their lives, from Dublin Castle.*"

As it would be absolutely impossible to imagine a more complete and absolute confirmation of the accuracy of the charge brought by Mr. Noble than that furnished by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman himself, there is no need to give the remainder of this correspondence, in which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman seeks to show that he really meant something quite different from what he said.

The portion of the speech quoted above, however, requires further notice, inasmuch as it leads us on by an easy process to the consideration of the next statement, which is as follows:—

THE ALLEGATION.—*The Government puts its political opponents upon trial in Ireland for political offences.*

THE FACT.—The Government does *not* put its political opponents upon trial in Ireland for political offences.

The offences punishable under the Crimes Act are strictly defined by law, and no political offence and no act which is not already an offence under the law is punishable under the Crimes Act.

NOTE.—A charge of the same nature as that brought by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman against Mr. Balfour was frequently brought against Sir George Trevelyan and Lord Spencer by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's present allies.

Thus—"Proofs of the most appalling crimes against the present Irish Administration are accumulating in such masses that nothing short of the impeachment of Lord Spencer—not even his prompt retirement—can now satisfy the public mind. The last English ruler of Ireland who was impeached, and whose head was cut off (Strafford) was guilty of very much more venial offences. Intimidating juries into false verdicts was one of his peccadilloes. Is it a worse crime to intimidate uncomplaisant juries than never to allow them to be juries at

“all, but to put murderers-made-easy from the Orange and Freemason’s Lodges in their place? . . . Strafford was not accused of *killing innocent men*; of *letting known murderers go unharmed*; of *instigating foul criminals to assail his political opponents*, and then screening them behind the Viceregal Ægis when they got the worst of it; of maintaining out of secret funds a detective department, which was simply a *devilish factory of crime and outrage*, a cave into which *unsuspecting youth was seduced*, to emerge on the gallows, or in a convict cell for life. **These are the charges for which public opinion has in vain striven, in the Press and Parliament, to bring Earl Spencer to account.**

“We do not expect that his allies in the English Parliament (Mr. Gladstone and Sir W. Harcourt) will hand Earl Spencer over to the public executioner; but we will very cheerfully force (?) the verdict of history, when the Irish indictment is unfolded, as to what would be his fate if he had perpetrated on English freemen the *slaughters, crimes, and perfidies* which will be monuments of his rule in Ireland.”—*United Ireland*, Sept. 13, 1884.

Again—“The whole country, with a moderately-minded Archbishop at its head, is importuning his administration for an enquiry into unanswered charges of *judicial murder, and condonation of murder and bestiality*.”—*United Ireland*, Sept. 13, 1884.

Of Sir George Trevelyan it is sufficient to say that as long as he tried to do his duty “Pinch-of-Hunger George” was, in Mr. O’Brien’s opinion, the most “sneaking Scotchman that ever crossed the Channel,” that “in wriggling he and the eel beat creation,” and that after having made himself principal or accessory to the commission of various base felonies, he finally “fled from the Castle in the miserable *sauve qui peut* which followed the Cornwall verdict.”

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman’s present charge is entitled to precisely the same amount of weight as those of Mr. O’Brien just referred to.

THE NEXT ALLEGATION is as follows:—*The Government sends persons charged under the Crimes Act to be tried, not by skilled lawyers, but by Resident Magistrates who are appointed and removable by the Executive Authority.*

THE FACT.—In all cases under the Crimes Act where the sentence exceeds one month there is an appeal from the decision of the Resident Magistrate.

In all cases there is an appeal on questions of law.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman’s sneer at the Irish Resident Magistrates, whom he insinuates are either dishonest or incompetent, is particularly unfortunate, when it is remembered—

- I. That the majority of them were appointed by the Government of which Mr. Bannerman was a member.

2. That the authority given to the same Magistrates under Mr. Gladstone's Crimes Act was much greater than that conferred under the Act which Mr. Bannerman attacks.

The following is the correspondence referred to :—

"MR. BALFOUR AND MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN."

(4a.)

"House of Commons, *Feb. 27th*, 1888.

"Dear Mr. Balfour,—Mr. Campbell-Bannerman recently said at Hastings that the Irish resident magistrates, besides being appointed by and removable by the Executive Government, received their orders every day from Dublin Castle. As he was speaking with the authority of an ex-Irish Secretary, he was no doubt relating what took place under his own administration. I should therefore be obliged if you would kindly inform me whether the same practice prevails under yours.

"Yours truly, WILSON NOBLE.

"The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P."

(4b.)

"House of Commons, *Feb. 27th*.

"Dear Mr. Wilson Noble,—If Mr. Bannerman means (as he appears to mean) that the Executive Government communicate with resident magistrates in respect of cases tried before them, it is a scandalous libel. No such communication has ever been made, directly or indirectly, by the present Government, and if Mr. Campbell-Bannerman acted differently when working a Coercion Act he deserves impeachment.

"Yours truly, A. J. BALFOUR.

"Wilson Noble, Esq., M.P."

(4c.)

"MR. BALFOUR AND MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN."

"(TO THE EDITOR OF 'THE TIMES.')

"SIR,—The pointed reference which you make in a leading article of to-day to letters which have been published as having passed between Mr. Arthur Balfour and Mr. Noble, M.P. for Hastings, regarding a recent speech of mine, makes it necessary for me to reply to Mr. Balfour's charge against me. I should not otherwise have thought it worth while to notice that charge, because the letters themselves, though evidently pre-arranged between the writers—they are both dated, with engaging simplicity, from the House of Commons, on the same day—are so inartistically framed as to show that it is not upon my words, but upon a gloss of his own manufacturing, that Mr. Balfour founds his accusation.

"The words I used at Hastings, as reported in the *Hastings and St. Leonard's Times*, are these :—

" 'They (*i.e.*, the Government) begin by obtaining power from a subservient Parliament to suspend what we believe to be some of the most ordinary guarantees of civil liberty. They strain and distort the law in order to secure the conviction of their political opponents. Dealing with those delicate questions, which, if they are not wholly political, are on the wavy confines between political offences and criminal offences, they send them to be settled, not by skilled lawyers of the highest standing in the Courts of the realm, but by resident magistrates, who may be excellent and capable men, but whose misfortune for this purpose it is that they are not only appointed and removable by the Executive authority, but that they receive orders and are accustomed to receive orders every day of their lives, from Dublin Castle.'

"The mere recital of these words disposes of the charge against me. Mr. Balfour himself will not dispute the accuracy, in point of fact, of the last sentence, which contains the statement now in question; and every intelligent Member of Parliament, who had his eyes and ears open during the debates of last year, knows that one of our strongest objections to the Coercion Act was that, under it, offences of a political, or at least semi-political kind, involving points of great nicety, were sent to be tried, without a jury, by men whose appointment involves executive as well as judicial functions, and who are not wholly judges, but servants of the Executive.

"Mr. Balfour, without a shadow of foundation, endeavours to fasten upon my words the meaning that 'the Executive Government communicate with resident magistrates in respect of cases tried before them.' That allegation has, I believe, been made; but never by me. I am glad to find myself in entire agreement with the Chief Secretary, who says that such a proceeding would be 'scandalous,' and would 'deserve impeachment.'

"I confess that I am not surprised at the gratuitous misrepresentation of my words thus published by Mr. Balfour. Entirely opposed as I am to his whole policy in Ireland, and to the legislation by which he has enforced it, I am disposed to condemn even more strongly the carelessness, caprice, and rashness of which there is evidence in his administration of it. I said the other night in the House that it was the business of the Irish Executive above all things to avoid, in the exercise of their exceptional powers, the very appearance of unfairness or vindictiveness. But what sort of fairness can we expect in his dealings with Irish Nationalists in Ireland, when we find him ready, in so small a matter as this, to jump at the chance of

damaging his political opponents by concocting—in conspiracy with one of his own supporters—this transparent misrepresentation of my words?

“I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

“H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

“6, Grosvenor-place, S.W., *March 1st.*”

(4d.)

“MR. BALFOUR AND MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.”

(TO THE EDITOR OF “THE TIMES.”)

“SIR,—In a letter addressed to you in your issue of to-day, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman asserts that “Mr. Balfour, without a shadow of foundation, endeavours to fasten upon my words the meaning that ‘the Executive Government communicate with resident magistrates in respect of cases tried before them.’”

“Mr. Bannerman, however (as anyone may see who refers to my letter), is mistaken in supposing that I tried to ‘fasten’ this, or any other meaning on his utterances. I am quite aware of the danger attending any attempt to turn into precise English the violent but ill-defined accusations which form the staple of Separatist speeches on Irish affairs. I merely advanced, with all humility, a hypothetical interpretation of his words which I supposed might agree with the meaning put upon them by ninety-nine hundredths of his audience. After a careful reconsideration of the text I am still of opinion that, though I appear to have failed, I succeeded as well as the inherent difficulties of the task admitted; and perhaps Mr. Bannerman will allow me, while apologizing for my error, to express the great pleasure with which I learn from him that he is not to be confounded with those of his party who (as he frankly admits) have made the accusation against the resident magistrates which he categorically repudiates.

“What exactly is his complaint against the resident magistrates, if it be not that which I attribute to him, I know not. But any one who alleges that these gentlemen are directly or indirectly influenced in their judicial decisions by their estimate of the wishes of the Executive Government utters a scandalous libel upon a body of men who, under rare difficulties, and subject to the most unscrupulous attacks, are vindicating with courage and impartiality the cause of law and justice in Ireland. The same men performed the same duty in the same manner when Mr. Bannerman was Chief Secretary, the sole difference being that they were then assailed only by the Irish advocates of disorder.

"With regard to the other accusations of Mr. Bannerman I need say nothing. The 'conspiracy with one of my own supporters' of which he speaks never existed outside his own imagination, and the desire to 'damage him' which he attributes to me has never crossed my mind. On the contrary, I can assure him that every motive, public and private, by which I am influenced, makes me desire to see him rise high in the counsels of his party.

"I remain, yours faithfully,

"ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

"4, Carlton-gardens, *March 2nd.*"

### No. 5.

#### MR. BALFOUR AND MR. MORLEY.

The following allegations form an interesting group; they are all taken from a speech made by Mr. John Morley, M.P., in March, 1888, in which he purports to describe the incidents accompanying and following the trial of Mr. Wilfrid Blunt at Galway, in January of the same year.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Eleven persons, two of them Town Commissioners, having been tried on a charge of rioting and obstructing the police, were wrongly convicted. They were charged with stone-throwing in which they took no part. No attempt was made to connect them with anything worse than shouting and cheering.*

*There was stone-throwing, but it was outside the station, and no attempt was made to connect the accused with anything that took place outside the station or with anything worse than shouting or cheering.*

(1.) THE FACT.—The two Town Commissioners were fully identified as the ringleaders in the riot. They were committed on the clearest evidence.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*On one of the convicted persons calling out in Court that he would do the same thing, the magistrate, with contemptible vindictiveness, gave him another week.*

[*"One of them (the prisoners) calling out that he would do the same again, the magistrate, with what I must call a very contemptible vindictiveness, said, 'You shall have another week's imprisonment for saying that.'"*]

(2.) THE FACT.—This base and untrue charge against a public officer endeavouring to do his duty under circumstances of great difficulty is not worth a reply.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Two Town Commissioners were punished for waving their hats and caps in honour of Mr. Blunt.*

[“Two of them, mind you, Town Commissioners, respected, elected men in the confidence of their fellow-citizens, were punished, not for concerting a riotous meeting, not for throwing stones, not for attacking the police, not for doing anything to alarm reasonable and courageous persons, but simply for waving their hats and caps in honour of Mr. Blunt.”—*Mr. Morley.*]

(3.) THE FACT.—The persons referred to *were* punished for riot, throwing stones, and attacking the police, and alarming reasonable and courageous persons. (b) They *were not* punished for waving their hats and caps in honour of Mr. Blunt. (c) “Whether the rioting was confined to the outside of the station may be judged from the following incidents, all of which occurred before the station was cleared”:—(1) The people broke forcibly through the police drawn up to protect Mr. Blunt’s escort; (2) They alarmed the driver of the carriage engaged to convey Mr. Blunt to such an extent that he drove off; (3) They attempted to throw over the Embankment the hotel omnibus; (4) They threw stones, striking, among others, the station-master; (5) The county inspector appealed in vain to a catholic clergyman to restrain the mob.

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Sheehy, M.P., having been tried and committed for an offence under the Crimes Act; the Government reporter who gave evidence at the trial failed to give satisfactory evidence as to the accuracy of his report.* [“It was vitally important to know what were the words spoken for which he (Mr. Sheehy) was about to have inflicted upon him a very severe punishment.”]

(4.) THE FACT.—It was not of the slightest importance, inasmuch as the use of the words in the sense alleged by the Crown was never denied by the accused.

(5.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Patrick Corcoran, a mechanic, was unjustly sent to gaol for printing a passage in a newspaper for which he neither was nor could be responsible.*

[“On the hearing of the first summons, the joint editor and manager (of the *Cork Daily Herald*) said he alone was responsible for everything that appeared in the paper . . . Corcoran—this mechanic, this foreman printer—was sent to prison for a month.”—*Mr. Morley*.]

(5.) THE FACT.—(1) Corcoran was the registered printer and publisher of the *Cork Examiner*; (2) Corcoran was the only person who could legally be made responsible.

[NOTE.—This Mr. Corcoran, speaking as the President of the Cork Young Ireland Society, assured Mr. Lane (a member of the Imperial Parliament) that he was ready to commit any statutable offence (*i.e.*, to break any law made by Parliament) that might be deemed advisable in the interest of the Nationalist Party in Cork].

“Mr. F. H. Balfour, of Oxford, has received the following reply to a communication drawing his attention to certain charges made against the administration of the Crimes Act by Mr. Morley, in his recent speech to the Union Society:—

(5a.)

“Irish Office, 10th March, 1888.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 1st inst., in which you enclose a report of a portion of Mr. Morley’s speech, delivered at ‘The Union,’ containing three ‘actual illustrations’ of the working of the Crimes Act in Ireland.

“The gravamen of Mr. Morley’s first charge appears to be as follows, viz.:—That the accused were inside the station; that such rioting as did take place occurred outside the station; that no attempt was made to connect them with the rioting outside, or with anything worse than cheering.

“As a matter of fact, the two Town Commissioners, men, by the way, of no position or standing in Galway, were fully identified as the ringleaders in the riot which took place. The witnesses at the prosecution proved this conclusively, and no serious attempt was made to dispute their evidence. The person who cried out that he would ‘Do the same again’ was one of these ‘respectable’ Town Commissioners.

“Whether the rioting was confined to the outside of the station may be judged from the following incidents, all of which occurred before the station was cleared:—(1) The people broke forcibly through the police drawn up to protect Mr. Blunt’s escort; (2) They alarmed the driver of the carriage engaged to convey Mr. Blunt to such an extent that he drove off. (3) They attempted to throw over the embankment the hotel omnibus requisitioned to replace the former vehicle. (4) They threw stones, striking, amongst others, the station-master. (5) The County Inspector appealed in vain to a Catholic clergyman to restrain

the mob. It was then, and not till then, that he ordered the police to clear the platform.

“Whether such proceedings are calculated ‘to alarm reasonable and courageous persons’ depends upon the standard of courage and sense to which an appeal is made; and this, of course, is a matter of opinion. But to describe those who take a leading part in them as ‘simply waving their hats and caps in honour of Mr. Blunt’ is to incur the danger of conveying a wrong impression of the facts.

“It is to be noted that Mr. Morley quotes from an authority whom he does not name. In the case of Mr. Sheehy it was, as Mr. Morley says, ‘vitally important to know what were the words spoken.’ It is, therefore, a matter for congratulation that the evidence given of these words was never questioned for the defence. At the trial, no evidence whatever was offered to show that Mr. Sheehy did not use the words imputed to him; nor was there any attempt made to deny that he used them in the sense attributed to them by the Crown.

“With reference to the conviction of Patrick Corcoran, the statement that he was a mere mechanic is misleading. He was the registered printer and publisher of the *Cork Examiner*, and, as such, the only person who could legally be made responsible for the persistent and defiant breaches of the law committed by that paper. Whether ‘this mechanic, this foreman printer,’ concurred in the nature of the matter published may be judged from his utterances on other occasions. According to a report published in the *Cork Daily Herald*, Mr. Corcoran, speaking as the President of the Cork Young Ireland Society, assured Mr. Lane, M.P., that he was ready to commit any ‘statutable offence’ that might be deemed advisable in the interest of the Nationalist Party in Cork.

“The Justices exercised their undoubted discretion in gauging the amount of punishment which the offence demanded. It is clear that if appeals were granted in every case, the Courts of Quarter Sessions would be completely swamped, and the business of ordinary suitors utterly paralysed.

“But Corcoran’s case is no new thing; all the facts of it have been fully explained more than once in the House of Commons. It is easy, as Lord Hartington pointed out at Ipswich, for practised advocates to complain of the incompetence of Resident Magistrates, and of impediments thrown in the way of obtaining the right to appeal (appeals not made on the merits of the question, but to obtain opportunities of repeating the same offence); easy for them to palliate the nature of the crime, and to exaggerate the severity of the sentence. But, in Lord Hartington’s words, ‘Even they . . . have not attempted to prove . . . that any person has been unjustly convicted of the offence with which he was charged . . . or that any sentence of punishment has been inflicted which was not within the competence of the lawful authority which inflicted it.’

“I am, yours faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

No. 6.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER DISTINGUISHES HIMSELF.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Men have been put in prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour.*

(1.) THE FACT.—Men have not been put into prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Cheering Mr. Gladstone's name is a serious offence, entailing imprisonment.*

(2.) THE FACT.—Cheering Mr. Gladstone's name is not a serious offence, and has on no occasion entailed imprisonment.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Aged women and children have been sent to prison, their offence being the intimidation of strong men, or of "booing" at unknown persons in the streets.*

(3.) THE FACT.—Aged women have not been imprisoned for intimidating strong men, nor young children for booing at unknown persons.

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Goschen and Lord Hartington being together on their arrival in Dublin, certain persons were arrested for hooting them.*

(4.) THE FACT.—Mr. Goschen and Lord Hartington were not together on the occasion of certain arrests referred to. The persons arrested were not arrested for hooting at Mr. Goschen and Lord Hartington, but were arrested for mobbing Mr. Goschen's carriage at 5.30 a.m. on a dark morning.

[Note it should be remembered that two officials have already been murdered in Dublin, and that frequent and violent threats have been directed against British officials individually and as a class. Ever since the commencement of the Parnellite movement, officials whose duties brought them into special contact with Ireland have required special protection from murderers].

(5.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour having denied, and seven inhabitants of Ballinasloe, not to speak of the station-master, having affirmed that certain prisoners were sentenced for cheering Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Leveson-Gower is of opinion that the testimony of the seven men of Ballinasloe is true, and that of Mr. Balfour untrue.*

(5.) THE FACT.—Although Mr. Leveson-Gower and the station-master of Ballinasloe unite in disbelieving Mr. Balfour, it is noticeable that not only did the magistrate before whom the prisoners referred to in No. 5 were brought take Mr. Balfour's

view, but the prisoners having in every case appealed, the Court on appeal sustained the view of the magistrate.

(6.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Ellen Tighe, aged 75, was sent to prison for leading a riot.*

(6.) THE FACT.—*Ellen Tighe, aged 75, was not sent to prison for leading a riot, nor was she sent to prison at all.*

(7.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Biddy Hunt, aged 12, was sent to prison for being on her father's land at the time of an eviction.*

(7.) THE FACT.—*Biddy Hunt was not sent to prison for being on her father's land at the time of an eviction, but she was sent to prison under the ordinary law, for one week, for refusing to enter into her own recognisances to be of good behaviour.*

(8.) THE ALLEGATION.—*During the fortnight ending February 8th, 1888, eleven women and girls were prosecuted under the Crimes Act.*

(8.) THE FACT.—*Eleven women and girls were not prosecuted under the Crimes Act during the fortnight ending February 8th, 1888. During that period the number of women and girls summoned was two only, in neither case was a sentence imposed.*

(9.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Ellen Tighe, above-mentioned as being sent to prison at the age of 75, was also sentenced on November 19th, 1887, being at that time aged 60.*

(9.) THE FACT.—*Ellen Tighe was not aged both 75 and 60 years, but she was mentioned twice over under such varying descriptions by Mr. Leveson-Gower, in his blundering attempts to damage Mr. Balfour.*

(10.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A crowd having assembled to meet Mr. Blunt, at Galway, on January 9th, 1888, were charged by the police with swords and batons.*

(10.) THE FACT.—*The police did not charge the crowd assembled to meet Mr. Blunt on the 9th January, Mr. Blunt being at that time in gaol.*

MR. BALFOUR AND MR. LEVESON-GOWER.

"SIR,—Will you kindly give publicity to the enclosed copy of Mr. Balfour's reply to a communication I made to him in reference to Mr. Gower's letter which appeared in your issue a few days ago.

I remain, dear sir, yours truly,

EDWARD J. GREEN.

Wolstanton, Stoke-on-Trent,

*March 26th.*"

6a.

"Irish Office, 24th March, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your communication of the 22nd inst., in which you enclose a letter of Mr. G. Leveson-Gower to the 'Editor of the *Staffordshire Sentinel*.'

"In that letter he takes exception to the contradiction which Mr. Balfour has given to certain statements made by him in a speech delivered at Kidsgrove, and gives some particular cases in additional confirmation of the statements impugned.

"Mr. Leveson-Gower's original propositions set forth in condemnation of the administration of the Crimes Act in Ireland were as follows:—(1) That men were put in prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour; (2) That cheering Mr. Gladstone's name was a serious crime, entailing imprisonment; (3) That aged women and children were in prison, some of the former for intimidating strong men, some of the latter for 'booing' at persons, possibly unknown to them, in the streets.

"It appears more than questionable whether the examples now published tend to support these three propositions.

"No case of imprisonment for groaning at Mr. Balfour's name is put forward at all. But we are told that such a report is not unnatural, because a policeman, under cross-examination, has given it *as his opinion* that it is unlawful to shout 'Down with Balfour.'

"Possibly it is not unnatural that such a report should on such flimsy evidence find a place in a National newspaper; but this is hardly a sufficient reason for affirming its truth to an English audience.

"We are now told that 'the fact remains that people have been arrested or imprisoned for groaning at his (Mr. Balfour's) political allies.' No case of imprisonment is given, and that of arrest is *not given accurately*.

"Lord Hartington was *not* in the company of Mr. Goschen when some persons were arrested, not for hooting him, 'but for pressing around his carriage at 5.30 a.m. on a dark morning, to the very natural and proper alarm of the police responsible for the safety of his person."

"Mr. Leveson-Gower states that he is aware that Mr. Balfour has denied that some young Irishmen were sent to prison for cheering Mr. Gladstone's name at Ballinasloe, yet he gives no further *instance of imprisonment* for such a cause, and thus apparently abandons the second proposition disputed.

"It is only fair to say that he accepts Mr. Balfour's denial in a somewhat *grudging* spirit, attaching a greater importance to the evidence given for the defence than seems warrantable, if it be considered that all the persons *appealed*, and that the decision of the magistrates was upheld, and the full sentence retained in *every case* at the Quarter Sessions.

"In support of the third allegation we are told, without a reference, that eleven women and girls were prosecuted under the Crimes Act in the fortnight ending February 8th. Turning to the weekly record published in the *Freeman's Journal* I find, in the leading Nationalist newspaper in Ireland, that during that period only two women were summoned, and that *in neither case was any sentence imposed*.

"The next story of Ellen Tighe, aged seventy-five, has been contradicted so often, notably in the *Times*, that I fear it will not be news to anyone to say that Ellen Tighe was never sent to prison at all, having been discharged before her trial commenced, when her age became known.

"Biddy Hunt, under the ordinary law, was imprisoned for one week for *refusing* to enter into her own recognizances to be of good behaviour.

"These two women, with another, Annie Conboy, and a man, by name Patrick Conboy, were summoned for being in a riot at a sheriff's sale.

"Will it be believed that Mr. Leveson-Gower's next case of the 'batch of prisoners' sentenced on November 19th is the same story over again. The old woman of sixty is the eternal 'Ellen Tighe,' described in more general terms, and fifteen years younger for the nonce.

"Mr. Leveson-Gower, seemingly, hopes to acquire a more intimate acquaintance with Ireland, from English and Irish newspapers, than any to which the Chief Secretary can lay claim.

"He would do well to reflect that it is physically impossible to contradict every mis-statement, and that some contradictions which have, indeed, been made, have apparently escaped his observation.

"Yours faithfully,  
(Signed) "GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## 6b.

## MR. BALFOUR AND MR. LEVESON-GOWER.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."

"SIR,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to a letter, signed by Mr. G. Leveson-Gower, which appears in your issue of to-day.

"Mr. Balfour's 'general denial' contradicts all the statements in the extract from Mr. Leveson-Gower's speech submitted to him and all the statements in his letter to the *Staffordshire Sentinel* which can be quoted as supporting the original allegations. We are now told of a police charge, made 'with swords and batons,' upon the crowd waiting to receive Mr. Blunt at Galway on January 9. It is sufficient to say that since Mr. Blunt was lodged in prison on the 7th there could have been no crowd to meet him on the 9th. Mr. Leveson-Gower tells us that he depends upon newspapers for his information, and relies upon their statements unless he happens upon a contradiction. In this case he clings so closely to his journalistic authority as to take the date of its issue for the date of the affair which it professes to describe. But even this description, as reproduced with a correct date by Mr. Morley, has been contradicted in a letter which appeared in the *Standard* of the 16th instant.

"Mr. Balfour is also invited to deny a new version of the Ballinasloe episode. Perhaps I can best deal with this invitation by quoting from Mr. Leveson-Gower's own letter to the *Sentinel*—'I am aware that Mr. Balfour denied at Manchester that some young Irishmen were sent to prison for cheering for Mr. Gladstone at Ballinasloe Railway Station'—and referring him back to that denial.

"Any person who will consider Mr. Balfour's remarks at Stalybridge, and the various utterances of Mr. Leveson-Gower, will see that uncontradicted statements afford a somewhat precarious basis for the building up of political opinions. For if every Irish anecdote is to be multiplied by changing the sex and age of its hero and shifting the date of its occurrence, it is evident that of each at least  $365 \times 4$  versions will need contradiction.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"Irish Office, *March 28th.*"

No. 7.

A "ROMANCE" BY THE REV. J. ELLIS.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour stated that in the autumn of 1887, a mob had broken the windows in Limerick and had been quelled by the police. The statement was FALSE, and Mr. Balfour knew it. According to THREE CREDIBLE WITNESSES the windows were broken by the officer in charge of the police, who threw stones at them.*

(1.) THE FACT.—Although Mr. Ellis apparently believes the "three credible witnesses" of Limerick, he forgets to state that the Judge refused to believe them on oath when they gave evidence on a claim for malicious injury.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour, in attempting to show that co. Mayo was in a lawless condition, entirely injured the testimonies of the judges in general, and of Judge Lawson in particular, to the contrary effect.*

(2.) THE FACT.—As a matter of fact, Mr. Balfour referred to and quoted in support of his view, not only the words of Judge Lawson himself, but also the charges of Mr. Justice Murphy, Mr. Justice O'Brien, and Mr. Justice Johnson.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour's account of the occurrences at Mitchelstown is NOTORIOUSLY FALSE, having been supplied by persons who were afterwards convicted of wilful murder by a jury of their countrymen.*

(3.) THE FACT.—When stating that the witnesses on whose testimony Mr. Balfour in part relied in forming his judgment on the occurrences at Mitchelstown, were convicted of wilful murder by a jury of their countrymen, Mr. Ellis forgets to add that the verdict (that of the coroner's jury) was promptly quashed by the High Court of Justice.

THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour is "an unblushing liar." He "deliberately misleads the public." He makes statements that are "notoriously false." He is "guilty of falsehood." He "hearkens to lies," and "all his servants are wicked."*—This requires no comment.

THE ALLEGATION.—Mr. J. Ellis of Wilsden Vicarage "abhors all falsehood."—This requires no comment.

NOTE.—It is sad to think that the writer of the very silly allegation quoted above is apparently a clergyman of some kind. It gives an idea of the kind of mischief which may be done by uninformed persons, and is a fine example of the sort of food upon which local Gladstonians are nourished.

The following reply has been sent to a correspondent in answer to a communication bringing to Mr. Balfour's notice a letter published in the *Bradford Observer*, in which his veracity upon three specified occasions was distinctly impugned:—

(7a.)

“Irish Office, *April 30th*, 1888.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 24th inst. and of the letter addressed to the Editor of the *Bradford Observer* by the Rev. J. Ellis, which you enclose. His remarks afford an interesting illustration of the curious judgments which may be formed upon current events in Ireland by any one who resolutely refuses to accept the plain teaching of facts. It is open to doubt whether the investigation of Irish affairs can be profitably approached under these conditions, even by a private individual. However that may be, the reverend gentleman is surely over sanguine in expecting a responsible Minister to adopt his practice in these matters. Yet this is just what he invites Mr. Balfour to do. He tells us that ‘three credible witnesses . . . swore that they saw the officer in charge of the police pick up stones and throw them at the windows.’ But, blindly obedient to his theory, he omitted to mention that these ‘credible’ witnesses were not as a matter of fact believed by the Judge before whom a claim for malicious injury by the police was made and disallowed. Again, we are reminded that a coroner’s jury returned a verdict of murder against the police for the deaths which occurred at Mitchelstown, but curiously enough, in forming an opinion on the matter, we are apparently to forget that this verdict had been quashed by the High Court of Justice. Incomplete as the accounts of these two cases undoubtedly are, they are not so strangely misleading as the concise *précis* given by Mr. Ellis of the debate on the introduction of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. In it he informs us that Mr. Balfour described county Mayo as in a state differing little, if at all, from that of civil war, and that Mr. Dillon in reply gave ‘the report’ (whatever that may be) of Judge Lawson to show that in Mayo but few agrarian outrages had been committed. He then complains that, ‘notwithstanding . . . the testimony of Judges, . . . Mr. Balfour retracted nothing.’ Will it be believed that in so describing county Mayo Mr. Balfour was quoting from the charge delivered in county Mayo by this very Judge Lawson? Could any reader of Mr. Ellis’s letter infer that, so far from neglecting the testimony of Judges, Mr. Balfour, in addition to quoting from the charge already referred to, quoted also from those delivered in Galway by Mr. Justice Murphy, in Clare by Mr. Justice O’Brien, in Limerick by Mr. Justice Johnson, in Kerry by Mr. Justice O’Brien, and in county Cork by Mr. Justice Johnson. Could he by any possibility suppose that Mr. Balfour spoke as follows in this

very debate? 'I stated before, and I state again, that we do not rest our case upon statistics of agrarian crime in Ireland. We take the view now that was taken by the right hon. gentleman the member for Mid-Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone)—that you must not only consider the amount of crime, but you must take that amount into consideration with its source, with its character, and with what it indicates and what it means.' These facts supply a sufficient comment on the substance of the rev. gentleman's letter. No comment is required on its style and taste.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"G. A. Mitchell, Esq."

## No. 8.

### MR. BALFOUR ON IRISH "PATRIOTS" AND "MARTYRS."

The following are the relevant passages in the *North British Daily Mail* referred to in the following letter. The article purports to give a statement of the law as administered in Ireland:—

"People who assemble to welcome a politician on his arrival at a railway station are punished with a month's hard labour."

"If a Member of Parliament addresses a public meeting he gets three months' imprisonment."

"A member who goes to a meeting of his own constituents, even though he may not speak, is sent to prison for a month."

"A newspaper proprietor or editor, who publishes a report of a meeting opposed to the Government, must suffer two months' imprisonment."

"A foreman printer, who obeys the instructions of his employer, by supervising the printing of such a report, also gets two months' imprisonment. Three months' imprisonment is given to the news vendor who sells the paper."

"If a Member of Parliament advises tenants to make a united request for reduction of rent, the penalty is four months' imprisonment. A clergyman is sure of three months for the same offence."

"Persons who refuse to buy from a Tory grocer cannot expect less than three weeks."

"A fortnight is awarded to young men who take part in a football match, when a policeman happens to be a spectator."

"Persons who call a man an informer get a fortnight's hard labour.;"

"You get a month if you laugh at a policeman."

"A man who picks up a bullet in the street gets three months."

"These are incontestable facts, for these punishments have been actually inflicted for these crimes under Mr. Balfour's Scotch Law."

It would be tedious and undeniable to summarize No. 8 and the reply which follows it. The allegations are so numerous and so concisely put, and the replies are so short and at the same time so sufficient, that a summary of either document would be well-nigh as long as the original.

The article in the *North British Daily Mail* may be profitably treated in two ways. In the first place, the insertion of a negative before every allegation will give in most cases a correct statement of fact.

Thus, for "a fortnight is awarded to young men who take part in a football match, &c.," read "a fortnight is *not* awarded."

For "to march in procession carrying food to destitute families means two months," read "*does not mean two months,*" &c., &c.

8a may be profitably studied by all readers of the *North British Daily Mail*.

"The following reply has been sent, by Mr. Balfour's direction, to a correspondent who drew his attention to an article purporting to 'state cases which have actually been tried, and punishments which have actually been inflicted,' under the Irish Crimes Act:—

(8a.)

"Irish Office, May 4th, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter, dated April 30th, in which you enclose a cutting from the *North British Daily Mail*. You ask whether any foundation exists for the instances cited in this leader. With a view to answering your inquiry, I have subjected to the closest scrutiny each of the thirty-three curious statements therein set forth. I must, however, confess that my labours have been, for the most part, in vain. I have, indeed, in some three or four cases succeeded in penetrating the disguise, but the allusions contained in the vast majority of these anecdotes, which are illustrated by neither names, dates, nor places, still remain obscure to the most patient research.

“‘People,’ we are told, ‘who assemble to welcome a politician on his arrival at a railway station are punished with a month’s hard labour.’ I am not sure, but I think I can here detect yet another version of the Galway incident. If I am right in my surmise, the politician on this occasion, January 7th, happened to be a prisoner in custody, and the welcome of his admirers took the form of a vigorous riot. The story of this welcome is an old favourite. It has been contradicted nearly as often as it has been told in the past, with various particulars, and even with different dates. Divested of such paraphernalia it now reappears, naked and unashamed, with all the extension and certainty of a general proposition. Under these circumstances it is, perhaps, needless to contradict it again.

“‘The foreman printer who obeys the instructions of his employer,’ &c., and ‘gets two months,’ is of course Patrick Corcoran, the president of the Cork Young Ireland Society, who, according to the *Cork Daily Herald*, a Nationalist newspaper, assured Mr. Lane, M.P., that he was ready to commit any ‘statutable offence’ that might be deemed advisable in the interest of the Nationalist party in Cork. I mention this because, though not new, it may still retain a little interest. No one would, I presume, dare to say so much of the fact that Corcoran was the registered printer and publisher, and the only person who could be legally prosecuted for the breaches of the law committed by the *Cork Examiner*. That essential element in the case has been insisted upon even to weariness.

“I venture upon my next guess with greater diffidence. But taking the words ‘clergyman’ and ‘three months’ together, I shall not, perhaps, be too rash in supposing that Father McFadden is intended. Be this as it may, neither he nor any other priest has been convicted for ‘advising tenants to make a united request for a reduction.’ He is, however, now in prison for preaching the ‘Plan of Campaign,’ a conspiracy declared to be illegal by the highest courts of law, and condemned in the interests of morality by the head of the Church to which he belongs.

“In the man who gets three months for picking up a bullet I touch firmer ground again. The case is identified easily. ‘Timothy Sullivan’ without a doubt is the victim we are to pity. He was tried, but not under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, for having ammunition in his possession. For his defence, which the writer of the article apparently believes, evidence was given that he had never seen a bullet in his life, and picked up this small object supposing it to be a marble. The fact that Sullivan pleaded guilty at the Summer Assizes of 1887 to being one of a party of twenty-two men charged with firing at the police is one of the difficulties in the way of accepting this statement.

“It is harder to find a clue to the rest of these strange legends. The people who cheer to their cost a member of Parliament, and the little girls who suffer for obstructing the police, may possibly be fresh

incarnations of the friends of Paddy Barrett and of the eternal 'Biddy Hunt.' For these mysterious persons, and the 'old woman of 80,' whom for once in a way we are happily spared, have undergone in the course of the last year more transformations than the characters of a fairy tale.

"Further than this I cannot advance in the task of penetrating the mystery that enshrouds these shadowy beings—of the unfortunate football players and the hapless wights who will not buy from Tory grocers I can offer no explanation. I cannot even classify them. They constitute a completely new contingent to the patriots and martyrs of Irish mythology,—Yours, faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

---

## No. 9.

### THE MYTH OF THE INFANT PRISONER.

This letter is interesting, inasmuch as it gives a guide to the proper understanding of a whole class of lies, which have done duty over and over again in Gladstonian speeches and writings. They may be described as variations of the "Innocent Infant Lie," and are much used in public meetings.

The following point is specially noticeable; that a common Parnellite method of resisting the police is to put the women in front, and for the men to throw stones over their heads.

Mr. Balfour has directed the following reply to be sent to a correspondent:—

(9a.)

"Irish Office, May 9th, 1888.

(9a.) "Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 2nd inst., in which you enclose a cutting from the *Lancashire Evening Post*. The statement contained in it—viz., that 'a little girl of 14 was sent to gaol for a fortnight for saying "boo" to an emergency man' is, of course, absurd.

"After exhaustive inquiries I am convinced that the origin of the innumerable tales with infant heroines condemned to prison for exhibiting a childish aversion to policemen and to bailiffs, must be found in one single occurrence. The circumstances of this case have already been fully explained more than once, both on the platform and in the

Press. But I infer from the paragraph you are good enough to furnish that they still command the attention of, at any rate, one section of the public. To enable these somewhat negligent observers to arrive at a just conclusion it is apparently necessary to restate the particulars once again. Near Ballyhaunis, county Mayo, on October 18, 1887, a bailiff, accompanied by a force of police, made a seizure of sheep for rent due to a landlord. A riot ensued. The women, according to tactics not unfrequently adopted, were placed in front, while the men threw stones at the police over their heads from behind. A number of these rioters were identified and prosecuted. Among others, two girls, Honoria Drudy, who gave the age of 20, and Bridget Hunt, who gave the age of 13. It is interesting to note that the weight of the latter, 8st. 2lb., exceeded by 2lb. that of her companion of 20. No punishment at all was inflicted upon either of these girls under the Crimes Act. When, however, they refused to find sureties for their good behaviour they were committed to prison under the ordinary law for one week, without hard labour. I may add that an old woman named Ellen Tighe was inadvertently summoned at the same time. Upon her age being discovered proceedings against her were dropped, and she was at no time under arrest.

"From this single incident have sprung all the tales told of tender children who intimidate the police, and all the stories of little girls who only say 'boo' to a bailiff. It will be seen from the above that we are also indebted to this historic occasion for the equally popular 'old woman of 80.' Had no sheep been seized at Ballyhaunis in last October it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that one-half of the recent speeches and articles of the Irish party would have been lost to posterity.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

---

### No. 10.

#### MR. GLADSTONE'S METHOD OF ATTACK.

These two letters (10a & 10b) are useful in two ways. In the first place, they call attention to the extraordinary levity with which Mr. Gladstone gives his approval to any sort of attack which is calculated to injure his political opponents. In the second place, they help to remind us of the fact, which every Gladstonian knows, but invariably ignores, viz., that the Irish Prison Rules form part of the Statute Law, and are neither framed nor carried out by the Chief Secretary.

## "MR. BALFOUR'S FACTS."

(10a.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

"SIR,—Your issue of to-day contains a letter from a correspondent imputing falsehood to Mr. Balfour in having denied the accuracy of Mr. Gladstone's statement to the Nonconformist ministers with regard to prosecutions for the sale of newspapers containing illegal matter. To this letter Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply. Will you then, permit me to point out in your columns that what Mr. Gladstone alleged, and what Mr. Balfour denied, was that 'Lads and poor men selling copies of newspapers in the streets are made responsible and put in prison because they contained reports of branches of the National League' . . . being left 'to ascertain for themselves whether in the particular places the League had been declared illegal by the Lord-Lieutenant.' None of the cases mentioned by your correspondent fulfilled either of these conditions. The persons proceeded against were not 'lads and poor men selling copies in the street,' nor were they prosecuted without having been previously fully warned as to the illegality of their acts.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"Irish Office, Great Queen-street, *May* 18."

## "MR. BALFOUR AND IRISH PRISON TREATMENT."

"The following answer has been sent by Mr. Balfour's direction to a correspondent:—

(10b.)

"*June* 28th, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 23rd inst., in which you are good enough to enclose a cutting from the *Star* newspaper. You ask whether the account there given of the prison treatment to which nine members of Parliament have been subjected is a true one or not.

"In so far as its sensational terms impute unnecessary violence or cruelty to the governors and warders of Irish prisons, it is absolutely untrue. The force used to any one of those convicted prisoners was in each case the minimum required to secure obedience to the prison regulations. The heading again, 'Balfourian Barbarities,' is also calculated to convey a wrong impression, viz., that the Chief Secretary is responsible for the rules in force. These rules, as a matter of fact,

have been laid down by Parliament, and form a part of the law of the United Kingdom. No deviation has been made from them in any particular in any case adduced by the *Star*. When, therefore, Mr. Gladstone compliments the editor on performing 'an important public service,' he desires his readers, doubtless, to understand that he considers the rules unsatisfactory, and wishes to see them, from which they take effect, either amended or repealed. We can hardly suppose that he desires the Irish Executive to tamper with the law as it stands.

"It is now more than thirty years since Mr. Gladstone described the unchallenged finality of the law in the following eloquent terms:— 'The principle of our constitution is that the law is above everyone. It is above the Sovereign, it is above the House of Lords, and it is above the House of Commons. The law is the only absolute supremacy acknowledged in this country.' The quotation is old, I admit, but the principle enforced is one not likely to suffer with the lapse of time.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## No. 11.

### THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.

No. 11 is a reply to a lengthy communication, signed J. Corben, appearing in the *Hampshire Independent*, and dated June 26th, 1888. Among other matters Mr. Corben refers to a correspondence with the Rev. R. Hughes, in which he challenges that gentleman "to produce a single case where the Plan of Campaign had been used against a good landlord."

The reply gives the answer to this challenge.—It is worth remarking that Mr. Corben appears to believe that civilization could continue in a country in which a man had only to declare his neighbour "bad" to be entitled to steal his property and threaten his life, not only with impunity, but with credit.

"MR. BALFOUR'S SECRETARY AND THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN."

London, Tuesday.

"Mr. George Wyndham, private secretary to Mr. Balfour, has sent the following letter to a correspondent:—

(11a.)

"Irish Office, July 17th, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—I am obliged to you for bringing to my notice a letter published in a Hampshire newspaper, and signed by Mr. J. Corben,

who passed some criticism upon my answer to your original communication. The accuracy of the facts with which I then supplied you has also been impugned by Mr. William O'Brien, who, again in the *Freeman's Journal* of Monday attacks the reply I made to him in that paper's issue of the 14th instant, and is further reinforced by a letter contributed from the prison at Derry by Father M'Fadden. If you care to read these letters and the leading article upon the same subject, you will see how very far this controversy has strayed from the original point at issue, viz., the morality of the Plan of Campaign. I enclose my answer to Mr. O'Brien's violent attack, and am convinced that any impartial reader will allow that the interpretation placed by me upon Mr. Kilbride's words is not only a natural one, but the only one they can be made to bear. To return to the original question. You asked for a judgment upon the morality of the 'Plan of Campaign,' and in particular for a contradiction of Mr. Corben's assertion that it had never been used against a good landlord. In answer to your appeal, I submitted that this title could hardly be withheld from Mr. Ponsonby, The O'Grady, or Lord Lansdowne. I might have added the name of Mr. Brooke. Mr. O'Brien, except with a curious want of success in the case of Lord Lansdowne, makes no attempt to prove that these gentlemen are bad landlords. Mr. Corben does. He objects in the first place to the *Times* being cited as an authority on facts which illustrate the past management of these estates. Waiving the question as to the propriety of publishing confidential reports upon the private affairs of Irish landlords, a course which Mr. Corben appears to expect, I fail altogether to perceive that he has disposed of the detailed and comprehensive statement in the *Times* of December 27th, 1887, whose authority he disputes, by adducing the cases of five tenant farmers, for which he gives no authority at all. I see that he admits the Plan of Campaign to be illegal, and he is wise. 'It is not,' in the words of Baron Dowse, 'proclaimed to be legal by anybody except amateur politicians.' But this illegal Plan of Campaign depends for its efficiency upon the threat or enforcement of boycotting against all who are loth to break the law by entering its ranks. If it depends upon boycotting, the claims of the one and the other to be considered moral must stand or fall together. Now many definitions have been given to boycotting. Mr. Gladstone's of the 24th May, 1882, is perhaps the best, but I prefer to quote again from the same learned judge, for whose opinions so many Separatist politicians have recently expressed the greatest respect. In addressing the grand jury of the county Down at the last Spring Assizes, Baron Dowse said—

'He was told there was no boycotting in the county. He was really glad to know it, for he did not know a worse offence against the laws of God and man, and it was a cowardly offence to boot, which might be an attraction in the eyes of some people.'

"Yours faithfully,  
 "(Signed) GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## No. 12.

## MR. HIBBERT'S MISTAKE.

In No. 12 it will be seen that Mr. J. T. Hibbert, having endeavoured to damage Mr. Balfour by a statement that the latter treated "political prisoners" with special harshness, by which Mr. Hibbert means prisoners convicted under the Crimes Act, supports his allegation by a reference to the treatment of prisoners arrested as suspects under the Peace Preservation Act.

In the following letter Mr. Balfour exposes the dishonesty of this comparison, and shows that, whereas prisoners under the Peace Preservation Act, not having been convicted by a Court, were treated as untried prisoners, persons undergoing sentence under Protection of Person and Property Act received the same treatment under Lord Spencer as consists under the Crimes Act received under Mr. Balfour. The treatment in both cases being regulated by Statute.

---

"MR. BALFOUR AND CRIMES ACT PRISONERS."

"The Chief Secretary for Ireland, having been furnished with a report of Mr. J. T. Hibbert's recent speech at Hollins, has written the following letter :—"

(12a.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle,  
"13th August, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—I am sorry that a gentleman of Mr. Hibbert's position should have condescended to use arguments like those contained in the speech which you send me. He quotes a speech I recently made, in which I stated that those whom he is pleased to designate as 'political prisoners' were treated now in precisely the same manner as they were treated by Mr. Gladstone's Government; and he thinks fit, in answer to this, to state that Mr. Forster treated the prisoners under the Peace Preservation Act in a different manner. Mr. Hibbert ought to be aware, if he is not, that Mr. Forster imprisoned people without trial; and very properly, therefore, did not treat them as condemned prisoners. But Lord Spencer never (so far as I know) under any circumstances drew a distinction between 'political' and other prisoners, and this distinction was expressly repudiated by Mr. Hibbert's colleagues—Sir William Harcourt and Sir George Trevelyan. With

regard to the statement that Mr. Hibbert appears to have made—that Mr. Mandeville was treated with especial harshness—I have only to observe that he was treated in accordance with prison rules, which are alike both in England and in Ireland, except that in Ireland the diet given to prisoners is of a somewhat more generous character.

“I remain, yours faithfully,

“ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

“T. Stott, Esq.”

---

“MR. BALFOUR AND POLITICAL PRISONERS.”

“The following letter has been addressed to a correspondent by the direction of Mr. Balfour:—”

(12b.)

“Irish Office, *August 30th.*

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has directed me to thank you for bringing to his notice a letter addressed by Mr. Hibbert to the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*. To one point in that letter he desires me to reply. The writer of it, in common with many others, has asserted that ‘political’ prisoners are subjected to a different and a harsher discipline under Mr. Balfour’s administration than formerly under that of Lord Spencer. But I gather from another paragraph in his letter that ‘political’ prisoners cannot properly be said to have existed when the latter held the office of Lord-Lieutenant, for he, according to Mr. Hibbert, ‘having drawn a clear line between politics and crime, punished with firmness the real criminal and left the political offender alone.’ It will be seen from this that Mr. Hibbert wisely abandons the ordinary contention of those who agree with him in this matter—namely, that punishments inflicted under Lord Spencer, though consisting of identical terms of imprisonment, varied in their severity according to the social position of the convict or the nature of his crime. We are, then, to understand that the distinction between politicians and law-breakers, for the neglect of which Mr. Balfour is so severely censured, was, as a matter of fact, observed by Lord Spencer, not in the persons of prisoners after conviction, but of offenders before they were prosecuted. If this was his practice, and I believe it was, Mr. Hibbert’s case breaks down completely, for the prisoners convicted under Lord Spencer, and subjected in 1882 and 1883 to a prison treatment which continues unchanged, can easily be shown to have belonged to the same ranks in life; to have been, indeed, in some cases the same persons who are now prosecuted for precisely similar offences, before Courts similarly constituted, under Mr. Balfour.

“The following out of the many examples which can be adduced are sufficient to prove this point. Mr. John Callaran, editor and proprietor of the *Western News*, was, on the 1st of December, 1883, sentenced to

14 days' imprisonment for publishing in his paper an article intended to intimidate a herd on an evicted farm. Mr. Edward Walsh, proprietor of the *New Ross Standard*, was on the 29th of December, 1882, sentenced to 14 day's imprisonment for publishing the proceedings of a branch of the Ladies' Land League. (The occasional identity of the persons proceeded against under the contrasted administrations is proved by this case, for Mr. Walsh was again arrested only last Saturday). Mr. John M'Philpin, proprietor of the *Tuam News*, was, on the 1st of January, 1883, convicted in the same Court of three distinct charges arising out of articles published in his journal. Mr. M'Philpin was sentenced to one month on the first charge, to 14 days on the second, and 14 days on the third. The sentences did not run concurrently; he was, therefore, imprisoned for two months in all, without the privilege of appealing. (This case is interesting in connexion with the recent outcry against cumulative sentences). On the 9th of July, 1883, Mr. E. Harrington, now M.P. for a division of Kerry, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment on a charge of having taken part in 'an unlawful association.' On this occasion the entire plant, machinery, type, &c., of Mr. Harrington's paper, the *Kerry Sentinel*, was seized by the police. This extreme proceeding affords an example of violent interference with the Press, for which no parallel can be found under the present *regime*. Mr. T. Harrington was, in 1883, sentenced to six months' imprisonment for a speech delivered in the town of Mullingar. These cases, far from being isolated exceptions, are typical of the Act of 1882, and can easily be multiplied.

"It may be urged that they are of slight assistance in the hard task of defining the 'political prisoner' of the present day. This is true. They can do little to elucidate that obscure character. What they can do is to prove that all who admire Lord Spencer's discrimination in this difficult matter cannot logically condemn Mr. Balfour's.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

### No. 13.

#### MR. BRYCE'S FACTS.

In August, 1888, Mr. Bryce, M.P., in the course of a speech endorsed the allegations set out below. Letter No. 13 enables us, as usual, to add the facts.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A man was sentenced to three months' hard labour for selling copies of a newspaper which contained reports of a meeting of the League.*

(1.) THE FACT.—A man *was* sentenced for selling a newspaper containing a report of a League meeting, and the paper was illegally sold in a prescribed district. The person convicted wilfully defied the law. He had been frequently convicted of assaults on the police, and other offences, and had openly declared his intention to defy the law.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—A poor man, with a large family, was sentenced to two months' hard labour for refusing to sell a box of matches to an emergency man.

(2.) THE FACT.—No man, rich or poor, was sentenced to two months' hard labour for refusing to sell a box of matches to an emergency man.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—A boy was sent to prison for a week because he lighted a bonfire to celebrate the coming out of prison of a Nationalist member.

(3.) THE FACT.—No boy was sent to prison for a week, or at all, for lighting a bonfire.

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—A man got a month's imprisonment for laughing at the police.

(4.) THE FACT.—No man ever got a month's imprisonment, or any other term, for laughing at the police.

(5.) THE ALLEGATION.—A man got a fortnight's imprisonment for cheering Mr. Gladstone.

(5.) THE FACT.—No man got a fortnight's imprisonment for cheering Mr. Gladstone.

Whether Mr. Bryce himself believed a single word of all these cock-and-bull stories does not appear. It is worth remarking that he does not even pretend to have the slightest personal knowledge about any of them, but quotes them from a publication called *The Coercion Record*.

“MR. BALFOUR AND COERCION.”

“The following answer to a correspondent has been sent by Mr. Balfour's direction :—”

(13a.)

“Irish Office, August 27th.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter, in which you were good enough to enclose a cutting from a newspaper

report of a speech delivered by Mr. Bryce, M.P. You are quite justified in doubting the accuracy of the information there furnished, in spite, as you say, of the weight which you, as a constituent, would naturally attach to the public representations of your member. But you will, no doubt, have observed that Mr. Bryce was not speaking of his own knowledge, but merely repeated some statements culled—on account, I imagine, of their startling character—from the pages of a pamphlet called ‘The Coercion Record.’ Mr. Bryce has been singularly unfortunate in his choice of an authority. Of the six cases which he quotes, the first can certainly be identified, but owing to the complete suppression of all the accompanying circumstances is, as he gives it, only calculated to mislead public opinion. The second and third cases are possibly ludicrous misrepresentations of facts which have occurred, while the remaining three are absolutely devoid of any foundation whatever. (1) A man, Ferriter, of Dingle, county Kerry, has been, as a matter of fact, sentenced to three months’ imprisonment for selling copies of a newspaper which contained reports of a meeting of the League. He was a man of bad character, who had been repeatedly convicted for assaults on the police and other offences. In this instance he defiantly persisted in selling copies of illegal newspapers in a district in which the National League was suppressed, and steadily refused to conform to the law, which prohibits their sale under these circumstances. The magistrates, in passing a heavy sentence upon him, were influenced by his previous conduct and expressed determination to defy the law. (2) No such case has ever occurred as the infliction of ‘two months’ hard labour for refusing to sell a box of matches to an emergency man.’ We have here, in all probability, a travesty of some incident in the persecution of ‘Mitchell’ of Drangan, county Tipperary, a tenant of an evicted farm, who has been rigidly boycotted and refused the necessities of life. Some of the leading members of the conspiracy against him have been punished for their cruel conduct, and matches, I have no doubt, were included among the many necessities of which it was their object to deprive the unfortunate ‘Mitchell.’ (3) No boy has been convicted for lighting a bonfire. Serious riots, it is true, occurred on more than one occasion during demonstrations made in certain places to celebrate the release of Mr. W. O’Brien, M.P., and several men have been convicted for assaults on the police and breaches of the peace, originating in some instances at bonfires.

“The idle tales of imprisonment for ‘laughing at the police, groaning at Mr. Balfour, and cheering Mr. Gladstone’ have been contradicted *ad nauseam*, and every attempt to adduce a single instance in support of charges so absurd has been refuted times out of number. The last of the three has ever been for the most part abandoned in recent controversy. May we not hope, since this is so, that these fables may at length be allowed to rest undisturbed amid their congenial sur-

roundings in the 'Coercion Record' ? a work which, unless Mr. Bryce believes it, can only, as a mine of romance, be compared to the 'Arabian Nights.'

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

---

**No. 14.**

*Re* PATRICK MURRAY, LATE R.I.C.

The Gladstonians having hired a man to go round the country in what was known as the Home Rule Van, sought to give weight to the statements made by this person, by alleging that he was an ex-constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary, who had resigned his post rather than take part in an eviction.

From the following letter it appears that the Gladstonian allegations in respect of the man referred to were false : that he had not resigned his post in the R.I.C. on account of his reluctance to take part in an eviction, or at all.

That, as a matter of fact, having a disease of the brain, he was discharged from the force, and was immediately enlisted as a Gladstonian lecturer.

"THE HOME RULE UNION VAN."

"The following letter has been addressed to a correspondent by the direction of Mr. Balfour :—"

(14a.)

"Irish Office, *September 3.*

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour's attention has been drawn to a letter originally addressed by the Rev. W. O. Neill, P.P., to the secretary of the Home Rule Union, and afterwards published in the Press. Father Neill, it appears, was at one time the parish priest of 'Patrick Murray,' the driver of the 'Home Rule Union Van' in West Cambridgeshire, an ex-constable who professes to have resigned his post in the Royal Irish Constabulary rather than take part in an eviction. It will be remembered that the Chief Secretary when asked in the House of Commons if he had any knowledge of such an occurrence, replied that no man of that name had resigned in recent years, and further, could do no more than to refer his questioner to the desertion and imprisonment of one man in 1885, the dismissal from the force for drunkenness of a second in 1886, and the discharge on the ground of ill health of a third

in 1887, who all three bore the name of 'Patrick Murray.' This answer, unavoidably vague though it was, still clearly showed that the Patrick Murray in question had not accurately described the causes which led to his severance from the service. Yet this answer and the obvious deduction from it form what Father Neill is pleased to call 'Mr. Balfour's dastardly imputation upon Murray's character.' But now, thanks to the information fortunately furnished by Father Neill, even this vagueness can be dispelled, and it is possible completely to identify the distributor of leaflets for the Home Rule Union with one out of the three ex-constables. The circumstances of his discharge thus rendered accessible are in no way consistent with the story which he apparently imposed upon his priest. And since this discrepancy is worthy of note in connexion with his present employment as an itinerant purveyor of Parnellite pamphlets, Mr. Balfour has desired me to state the facts for publication. Briefly, they are as follows:—On June 20, 1887, this Patrick Murray was returned by the medical attendant to the constabulary at Athboy, county Meath, as unfit for further service in the force, on the ground that he was suffering from a disease of the brain, the result of a severe brain fever. Murray had at that time been upon sick leave for over three months. Dr. Gordon, surgeon to the force, subsequently examined him, and certified his unfitness. He was accordingly discharged on August 2, 1887, receiving a gratuity of £39 17s. 4d. It is absurd to speak of his resignation, for he left the service, not at his own request, but by order of the doctor, who declared that he would never again be fit for the performance of his duties. After his discharge Murray applied for a pension on the plea that he had incurred this fever while on duty, and because he would have to look to 'an adverse public for employment.' No pension could, under the rules of the service, be granted to him. Patrick Murray has succeeded in obtaining employment from an adverse public, but only under false pretences. This might easily have been inferred from Mr. Balfour's former answer. However that may be, now, at any rate, that the facts which prove it have been plainly stated, his patrons can no longer be excused for shutting their eyes to them, and for presuming to censure any who will not imitate their example of wilful blindness.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## No. 15.

### FACTS AND FALLACIES ABOUT EVICTIONS.

The following letter is one of general interest as giving an accurate account of the way in which matters of fact are, owing

to ignorance or through malice, represented by Gladstonian partisans; and throws a useful light upon the state of affairs in Woodford in the autumn of 1888.

“MR. BALFOUR ON IRISH EVICTIONS.”

“The following reply has been sent to a correspondent by Mr. Balfour’s direction:—

(15a.)

“Irish Office, *September 27.*

“Dear Sir,—In a letter dated September 22, and addressed to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, you question the accuracy of an account furnished by an ‘English Eye-witness’ of an Irish eviction. In acknowledging your communication, Mr. Balfour has directed me to meet your inquiries by a short comment on the testimony of Mr. Trow, whose experiences on the Clanricarde estate are set forth in the newspaper cutting which you are good enough to enclose. I have carefully read Mr. Trow’s description of two evictions in the neighbourhood of Woodford. It appears to be given in good faith, and whenever it deals with facts actually witnessed, it is, allowing for political bias, a fairly accurate statement. In this it compares favourably with the large majority of similar documents, but in spite of those merits its value is wholly vitiated owing to the common error into which the writer has fallen of founding his view of the social state of Ireland on the observations of one day spent in entire ignorance of all the events which have previously taken place on the spot selected for investigation.

“I will first deal with an incident which, had the version of it given been correct and full, could alone be said to argue a want of feeling on the part of the authorities. In speaking of the removal from a hut of a young man ‘dying of consumption,’ Mr. Trow has evidently been misinformed. John Fahy, to whom he alludes, was not, so far as I can ascertain, consumptive, but a confirmed epileptic. The sheriff had no other course open to him but to allow Fahy to be removed from the premises, viewing the fact that the dispensary doctor, who had for years been attending him for epilepsy, refused positively to certify that his life would be exposed to any risk by that operation. This man, further, was only obliged to spend one hour and a half outside his door on a fine evening, and was then permitted to re-enter the house. The eviction, in fact, appears to have been conducted in the very ‘spirit of human and Christian forbearance,’ which Mr. Trow is unable to discover in the administration of the law.

“The account of these two evictions is a long one, but, if stripped of mere expressions of opinions, the above incident is the only one really requiring explanation, for all the rest resolves itself into two sets of facts—(1) the poverty of buildings and land in the neighbourhood;

and (2) the large force of police and soldiers employed, both of which, even as referred to by Mr. Trow, are only likely to mislead those who have an equally limited acquaintance with the circumstances of the evictions he witnessed, and with the recent history of the locality in which they occurred.

"1. It is unnecessary to examine the accuracy of the opinion here expressed on the value of some of the land and the poor circumstances of its occupiers. I may venture, however, to say that the man who represented his wages and those of his fellows to be but a shilling a day was apparently, and this is not unknown in Ireland, imposing upon the first Englishman he found only too ready to believe such a tale. The labourer's wage ranges at present from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. a day all over the country. But it is not easy to see the connexion between this opinion, whatever its value, and the evictions in question. They are admitted to be legal; whether they are harsh—*i.e.*, carried out for non-payment of excessive rents which the tenant is willing but unable to pay—can only be decided by the knowledge of affairs at Woodford, which Mr. Trow apparently lacks. The chief of the tenants, for instance, evicted on this and the following days, was a Mr. Tulley, the notorious 'Doctor' Tulley, so named for his advice to dose the police with 'leaden pills' (bullets). He had announced his intention to resist eviction by force, and, as a matter of fact, did so resist until overpowered by numbers.

"Now, what were the circumstances which led to his eviction? He held an excellent farm at a very low rent, but had paid none at all for three years. His rent was  $37\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. under the valuation of the land alone. He was offered, in common with the other tenants, a reduction upon this of 20 per cent., and yet he absolutely refused to pay a penny. That is, he refused to pay a sum which, on his arrears of three years, would have been  $57\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. less than the Poor Law valuation of his land. Again, one of the very tenants whom Mr. Trow saw evicted owed only £27 10s. The agent of the estate, Mr. Tener, at the eviction offered him £300 for the stock on his land and the balance to his credit in his bank book, but the offer was declined, and the man evicted for the sum of £27 10s.

"Facts such as these prove beyond the possibility of cavil that eviction in these cases is the result not of the poverty of the tenants, but of the intrigues of agitators, who intimidate their victims in order to provide scenes for amateur politicians from England.

"2. Agitation and the lawlessness it engenders alone necessitates the forces of police and soldiers to whose presence Mr. Trow takes exception. He has overlooked the fact that the district around Woodford, in which these evictions took place, is the very worst in all Ireland. There have been more murders, attempted murders, mutilation of cattle, burning of property, and other serious agrarian outrages within a limited area around Woodford during the last eight years than in any other area at all comparable in size in any other part

of the three kingdoms. Here, too, occurred the first serious riots of late years at evictions. In the autumn of 1886 bridges were broken down, roads torn up, telegraph wires were cut, and the evictions had to be carried out by an army of police and military advancing as if through an enemy's country. In consequence of these riots 35 persons were convicted by a jury for assaults and obstructions to the officers of the law. Chief Baron Palles, in sentencing these men to various terms of imprisonment, varying from 12 to 18 months, laid down in the most emphatic terms the imperative duty of the Executive on such occasions to enforce the law and protect its officers. I am aware that Separatist apologists have not refrained in some cases from aspersing the integrity of the Judges of the land, but, so far as I know, they have never accused the impartiality of Chief Baron Palles. Such a pronouncement justifies the presence of a large force; their conduct may be justified from the very description under discussion. Mr. Trow only mentions the hustling of two or three men and the cuffing of another, who had deliberately passed through the cordon, within which their presence was forbidden.

"The police of Woodford are boycotted and illtreated in every conceivable way under the direction of men like 'Dr.' Tulley. At evictions, filth, offensive matter, and sometimes lime are thrown in their faces. Mr. Trow mentions, without comment, that 'the lads poured hot water on them,' and yet is indignant because they obeyed their orders in clearing the space within the cordon. This they appear to have done with no greater violence than is exerted on a racecourse or parade ground at a review in this country. Mr. Trow would not, I imagine, object to regulations put in force by the police for the convenience of the public in England; it is only in Ireland, where they are necessary to prevent the shedding of blood, that they appear to him tyrannical and inhuman.

"The writer of this account finally concludes that 'Home Rule' is the only cure for an agrarian agitation, and this fulfils the expectation of those by whom it is organized. Without following him on this ground, I may remark that the scenes which he witnessed are contrived at the expense of the tenant alone, and that every Englishman who makes public his readiness to argue from such narrow and artificial premises to a conclusion involving the welfare of the Empire holds out to the Separatists in Ireland a direct incentive to continue their work of destroying with bribes the honesty of the greedy, and by intimidation the liberty of the weak.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## No. 16.

## LITTLE MINNIE GRIFFIN.

The following letter refers to the case of Minnie Griffin, aged 19 (falsely alleged by the Gladstonian press to be 14), who was tried, committed, and sent to prison by the magistrates for having, under father's instructions, broken and defied the law.

"CONVICTION OF MINNIE GRIFFIN."

"ECHO" AND "GLOBE," *November 13th, 1888.*

"Mr. Balfour has caused the following letter to be written and addressed to Mr. George Ratcliffe:—"

(16a.)

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour desires me to reply to your letter, in which you enclose a cutting from the *Leeds Evening Express*, of October 29th. The writer of that paragraph apparently attributes the imprisonment of Minnie Griffin to a new departure in the policy of the Government, constituting an outrage for which we must go to Bulgaria for a parallel (while still, I presume, under Turkish rule). We are, therefore, to believe that such a sentence would not have been passed in England. The facts are these: The prosecution was instituted by a private individual, and not by the police. Minnie Griffin's age is 19, not 14. The landlord, who prosecuted, offered to withdraw the prosecution against her and her brother if they would consent to give up the premises of which they had taken forcible possession, that is, restore to him his property, which they illegally held. They refused, saying that their father had ordered them to do so. Under the circumstances the magistrates had no alternative but to commit Minnie Griffin to prison, nor could they have acted otherwise in England. When in prison she was at first exercised in the common jail, and this, again, must have happened in England under similar circumstances. In her case, however, the regulation was relaxed by the Irish Prisons Board on the recommendation of the Visiting Justices, and she was, after a few days, allowed to exercise alone. I may add that even under the first arrangement there was no real association, as prisoners are compelled to walk five paces apart, and are not allowed to converse.

"The above facts show the absurdity of connecting this case in any way with the Government, and prove that it might equally have happened in England, provided, of course, any English father could have been found so callous as to subject his daughter to imprisonment by ordering her to defy the law.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## No. 17.

THE HASTY BARONET AND THE SALUTARY  
CORRECTION.

This letter is useful in showing us what a ridiculous figure a good man can cut when he is fighting in a bad cause. It also serves as a warning against believing any statement relating to facts or figures made by a Gladstonian. On the occasion referred to Sir Joseph Pease was probably ill-informed and careless, and nothing more. But, at the same time, had not Mr. Balfour's attention been called to his absurd inaccuracies, his charges would have remained uncontradicted, and would have been quoted again as the unimpeachable evidence of so worthy a gentleman as Sir Joseph.

Here are the allegations and the facts put shortly :—

- (1.) *"I (Sir Joseph Pease) took out the other day the figures of agrarian crime for the three quarters before coercion became law and after."*
- (1.) **He (Sir Joseph Pease) did nothing of the kind, but muddled up the two periods without regard to facts or dates.**
- (2.) *"So (from the evidence of the figures quoted) coercion has done no good."*
- (2.) **The facts are as wrong as the figures ; if Sir Joseph had been accurate with regard to the former he would have seen that he was totally wrong in his opinion about the latter. The Crimes Act *did* enormously diminish crime.**
- (3.) *9,035 writs of eviction were served during a given period.*
- (3.) **The statement is true.**
- (4.) *As a result of these notices 45,000 persons were driven out of their homes.*
- (4.) **As a result of these notices not *one* seventeenth part of the number alleged by Sir Joseph Pease were evicted.**
- (5.) *Ejectment notices make eviction easy.*
- (5.) **As a matter of fact, eviction notices have exactly the opposite effect.**

"SIR JOSEPH PEASE."

"WITH REGARD TO COERCION."

(17a.)

"It is said to have a wonderful effect in Ireland. I don't wish to trouble you with statistics, but I took out the other day the figures for the three quarters before coercion became law, and after. I took out, too, the number of threatening letters, but I lay them aside. I daresay you, sir, have received a good many—(laughter)—and we all know that they have no meaning. (Cheers.) The cases during the three months before coercion became law, numbered 329—or 109 as an average for every quarter—and during the three months after coercion became law the number was 383—or a quarterly average of 127. So coercion has done no good.

EVICTON.

"I turn to this new Act of the other day, and I see that during the last three quarters of the year—in March, June and September quarters of this very year of our Lord—9,035 of those notices for eviction-made-easy were served—which means on an average five persons, or 45,000 persons driven out of the homes which, in almost every case, they have erected, and from the improvements which the work of their hands has effected. ("Shame!") Then, in addition, there were 4,000 people probably driven out by the old process; and if you take that and multiply the three quarters and bring the three quarters into the probable results of this year, 1888, you have upwards of 60,000 people turned out of their homes and habitations—"shame!"—for arrears of rent which some of us have done our best to get equalised and put out of the way.

"SIR J. PEASE AND MR. BALFOUR."

"NORTHERN ECHO."

"Mr. Balfour has sent the following letter to Mr. L. H. Hayter, Conservative Agent of Barnard Castle Division:—

(17b.)

"Irish Office, *December 5th*, 1888.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 1st inst., in which you question the accuracy of two statements made by Sir J. Pease, at Darlington.

"(1.) With regard to coercion, it is said to have a wonderful effect in Ireland; but I took out the other day the figures (of agrarian outrages) for the three quarters before coercion became law, and after. I

took out, too, the number of threatening letters. The cases during the three quarters before coercion numbered 329, or 109 as an average for every quarter. During the three quarters after coercion became law the number was 383, or a quarterly average of 127; so coercion has done no good.'

"(1.) The Crimes Act was not passed at the end of one quarter and the beginning of another, but at the end of the month of July. Yet Sir J. Pease includes this month, during which crime was exceptionally high, in the first quarter after the Act. Apart from this error, serious as it is in a comparison of this kind, it should be borne in mind that the provisions of the Act came gradually into force (one section, indeed, not being applied until this year), and that a gradual effect was therefore to be expected. By adding the returns of three quarters together, and taking an average, this gradual effect is deliberately disguised. That it exists appears plainly enough if we resolve Sir J. Pease's total of 383 into its constituent elements, viz., agrarian outrages, exclusive of threatening letters, for the quarter ending September 30th, 1887 (during only a part of which the Act was in force), 165; for the quarter ending December 31st, 1887, 120; and for the quarter ending March 31st, 1888, 98. Sir J. Pease's reasons for adopting this cumbrous and misleading method are not far to seek. By it he contrives to spread the low figures for the December quarter of 1886 and the high figures for the September quarter of 1887, respectively, over each of the two periods selected for comparison. Having been at such pains, it is curious that he should have given the grossly inaccurate total of 329 for the former period. The correct total is 387. So that even the absurd method of comparison adopted, if carefully carried out, would have saved the speaker from the error into which he has fallen. Should he, however, at any time wish to reconsider his verdict that 'coercion has done no good,' I would suggest to him the substitution of a comparison between the three first quarters of the present year, during which the Act has been in operation, and a similar period of last year. He will then find that there has been a decrease in agrarian crime, exclusive of threatening letters, of 34 per cent., and a decrease in the more serious forms of this crime, *i.e.*, in offences against the person, of 43 per cent.

"(2.) I turn to this new Act (Land Act), and see that during the last three quarters of this year 9,035 of those notices for eviction-made-easy were served, which means on an average five persons, or 45,000 persons driven out of their homes. Then, in addition, there were 4,000 people probably driven out by the old process; and if you take that and bring the three quarters into the probable results of this year, you have upwards of 60,000 persons turned out of their homes.'

"(2.) In the above statement one fact is correctly given; 9,035 rejected notices have been served up to the 30th September. The manner in which other facts have been treated may be judged from the following considerations. So far from the services of these notices having led to the expulsion of 45,000 persons, only 277 tenants and

sub-tenants in all have been evicted under that process during the last three quarters. The number of persons evicted under other processes is given in the same return from which Sir J. Pease correctly took the number of ejectment notices. He seems, however, to have wearied of further research, being content to assess it at 'probably 4,000.' The total number of tenants and sub-tenants so evicted during the same period is 245. If, then, we make an estimate for the whole year, allowing five persons to the family, we shall get for the total number of persons 'driven from their homes' 3,480, or one-seventeenth of the preposterous exaggeration for which Sir J. Pease has made himself responsible. It may be objected that eviction will eventually follow the 9,035 notices. But this is by no means the case, as the shortest consideration of the proportion which actual evictions bear to notices will show, the reason being that the large majority of those who receive notices come to terms with their landlords. So far from making eviction 'easy,' ejectment notices delay and check eviction. That the action of the Land Act of 1887 has fulfilled the expectation of the Government in this direction may be proved by comparing the 522 evictions already alluded to with the 1,498 carried out during the corresponding period of last year, before the passing of the Act.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"L. H. Hayter, Esq., Barnard Castle."

---

## No. 18.

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE—AS USUAL.

The allegations and replies contained in the following series of letters are so concisely set out that it is not necessary to summarize them further.

But the letters themselves are useful and important, as showing the utter recklessness of the Parnellites.

Again, it is impossible not to note the value of prompt and categorical contradiction as soon as a Parnellite misrepresentation is put in circulation.

The nature of the charges originally made by Mr. Stanhope may be judged from the references to them in Letter 18a. The utter collapse of every one of these charges the moment the touchstone of Truth is applied to them is made apparent in Letter 18b.

The letter itself is a good instance of the Parnellite method. Mr. Stanhope being utterly unable to support his original

charges, neither withdraws them, apologizes for them, nor attempts to prove them. He simply retires under a cloud of insinuations, vague accusations and bad language. Letter 18c. is scarcely necessary in this series, but it should be read as an example of how complete and crushing a rejoinder can be made by merely comparing a Gladstonian utterance with the truth.

“MR. PHILIP STANHOPE'S SPEECH AT TORQUAY.”

“REPLY BY MR. BALFOUR.”

“The honorary secretary of the Torquay Liberal Unionist Association, Mr. Maconachie, has received the following letter from Mr. Balfour's private secretary.

(18a.)

“Irish Office, *December 12th*, 1888.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has directed me to reply to your letter, in which you submit for comment various statements made by the Hon. P. Stanhope at Torquay,

“(1) ‘He went to a meeting in company with Mr. John Dillon, Mr. William O'Brien, and Mr. T. D. Sullivan. The sole resolution to be proposed was one declaring the confidence of the Irish people in Mr. Gladstone. And, nevertheless, that meeting was proclaimed.’

“The meeting appeared to the Government to be an unlawful assembly, held in order to promote the interests of an illegal association and to further the objects of a criminal conspiracy. Such a meeting would be illegal in any part of the United Kingdom, and was, in fact, proclaimed not under the Crimes Act, but under the ordinary law common to England and Ireland. According to Mr. Stanhope, on the other hand, it was held merely to afford the people ‘an opportunity of expressing their views upon Constitutional questions.’ Such a meeting, if correctly described, would, I need hardly say, be perfectly lawful in Ireland as in England. Now, if the law officers were in error and Mr. Stanhope is in the right, the action of the Executive was plainly illegal. It is then, at the least, curious that neither he, nor Mr. Dillon, nor Mr. O'Brien, nor Mr. Sullivan took any steps to have that action reviewed before the supreme courts of law, a course which they and everyone present were fully competent to take. That Mr. Stanhope forewent the brilliant triumph in the law courts, which, if only his account be correct, must surely have fallen to his lot, may encourage us to prefer even to his opinion, that given by the responsible legal advisers of the Crown.

“(2) ‘He came now to another branch of the question—the Press prosecutions. They were told by Mr. Balfour that there was no such things as Press prosecutions.’

A pure invention. Mr. Balfour has never denied that prosecutions have been instituted against newspapers under the Crimes Act. These prosecutions, about twelve in number, have been governed by one rule, viz. :—Those papers have alone been proceeded against which persist in recording illegal resolutions passed by branches of the League which have been suppressed for practising boycotting and intimidation, and this only in the districts where the sale of such newspapers constitutes a menace to the safety of individuals.

“(3) ‘Thomas O’Rorke was prosecuted, and his offence was that he sold a copy of the *Cork Herald* which contained an article making indirect reference to a Land League meeting in a proclaimed district.’

“Thomas O’Rorke was prosecuted not because he sold ‘a copy’ of a paper, but because he persisted, in the face of *repeated* warnings, to distribute in county Kerry grossly illegal documents calculated, owing to the disturbed state of that county, to lead to a breach of the peace. The Court, further, offered to inflict no penalty upon him if he would undertake to refrain for the future from breaking the law in this respect. In consequence of his defiant refusal to accept so lenient a decision the Court had no alternative but to commit him to prison.

“(4) ‘He could give them many instances of poor boys who had been thrown into prison because they sold the newspapers.’

“I shall be very much surprised if Mr. Stanhope can give one. To the best of my belief no such case has occurred.

“(5) ‘Timothy Sullivan was sent to prison for three months with hard labour. The accused was arrested for drunkenness, and on being searched by the police a bullet was found in one of his pockets, and for this, and this only, he was sent to prison.’

“The magistrates believed that this bullet was intended for the commission of one of those murderous outrages at that time too unhappily frequent in county Kerry. Could Sullivan, although a notoriously bad character, have shewn that the bullet was intended for any proper purpose, he would not, of course, have been punished. He preferred, however, to plead that he did not know what the bullet was, and picked it up supposing it to be a marble. One of the difficulties in the way of accepting this defence—a difficulty already pointed out in a letter published in the Press—is the fact that he had pleaded guilty only a year before to forming one of a gang of ruffians who fired at the police.

“Yours faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

“THE HON. P. STANHOPE AND MR. BALFOUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “WESTERN DAILY MERCURY.”

(18b.)

SIR,—I have no desire to specially remark upon the flippant tone of the comments contained in the letter which appears in your columns of

the 17th inst., signed by Mr. G. Wyndham, the young gentleman whom Mr. Balfour has chosen to be his private secretary, but I must ask you to be good enough to allow me to reassert and to amplify the statements made in my speech at Torquay, which Mr. Balfour endeavours to controvert.

1. Mr. Balfour points out that the meeting at Ennis, at which Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. T. D. Sullivan and I were present, was proclaimed "under the ordinary law as an unlawful assembly," and he asks why we did not take the course of reviewing the legality of the act of the Executive before the supreme courts of law. The answer is a very simple one. The suppression of the Ennis meeting as an "unlawful assembly" was, in the opinion of authorities far more weighty and competent than the legal hacks of Dublin Castle, absolutely illegal, and as wholly unjustifiable as would have been the suppression of the Liberal gathering at Torquay at which my statements were made. Unfortunately, however, the only way of testing the legality of the action of the Executive was by an action for assault against the police or military, and, inasmuch, as happily no one was actually assaulted, any such action was clearly impossible. Mr. Balfour therefore indulges in a sneer at our successful endeavours to avoid a collision between the military forces and the crowd. He apparently regrets that the meeting at which more than twenty thousand people were assembled for a constitutional purpose should at our persuasion have dispersed with such admirable order and regularity, and it would seem evident that the Minister who was so tickled with the "comedy" of Mr. John Mandeville's untimely death was disappointed of an anticipated opportunity of showing at Ennis those remarkable administrative abilities in connection with the suppression of the right of free speech which a few days later was conspicuously exhibited in the carnage of Mitchelstown.

2. Mr. Balfour's Press prosecutions have undoubtedly now ceased in consequence of the denunciations levelled against them, but in the early stages of his erratic crusade against the Press, which he wishes now to forget and desires to explain, was governed by certain fantastic rules which have long since lapsed, his action was deliciously simple in its violence and impropriety. Stripped of the disguise of the lofty phraseology in which in his letter he seeks to envelop it, his policy was one of the wholesale, though indirect, suppression of the Nationalist Press of the West of Ireland. Its object was to exterminate papers like *United Ireland*, the *Cork Herald*, the *Kerry Sentinel*, and many others; in fact, the entire Press representation of the vast majority of the people of these districts, and he would have indubitably persisted in his intentions had he not been summarily checked by an explosion of popular indignation in England. His course, however, was not the bold one of attacking the offending newspapers themselves, but by constant and vexatious prosecutions of newsvendors, and even of the unfortunate compositors employed in the manual operations of printing, to indirectly

strike at the property and circulation of newspapers whose proprietors he was not venturesome enough to directly assail.

3. The statement of Mr. Balfour on the subject of the prosecution of Thomas O'Rorke is absolutely incorrect, I was present in court during the whole course of the trial, and I prefer the evidence of my own ears to the strange versions of Mr. Balfour's model magistrate, Mr. Cecil Roche.

The only evidence produced against O'Rorke was that of policemen who had been instructed to purchase copies of the *Cork Herald* in O'Rorke's shop. Undoubtedly O'Rorke refused "to undertake to refrain in future" for exposing for sale what Mr. Balfour is pleased to call those "grossly illegal documents," the *Cork Herald* and *United Ireland*, but I venture to believe that every fair-minded lover of liberty would rather approve of O'Rorke's refusal to relinquish a right of which no law, unless such a term can be applied to Mr. Roche's extraordinary interpretation of the provisions of the Coercion Act, could possibly deprive him. His sentence of one month's imprisonment with hard labour admitted of no appeal, and when it is remembered that this iniquitous decision was pronounced by a gentleman whose qualifications to administer the Coercion Act in Ireland were principally supported by his long career as a stump orator of the Loyal and Patriotic Union, employed in violently denouncing the Irish people from English platforms, I think that no more startling illustration of the way in which "law and order" are at present maintained in Ireland could probably be produced.

4. I gave instances in my speech of poor boys who had been thrown into prison because they either sold or refused to sell newspapers to the police. I will give them again for the instruction and advantage of the secretary of the Torquay Liberal Unionist Association. I will confine myself to the city of Cork, in which the following youths, Denis Desmond, Denis McCarthy, John Radley, Cornelius Coakley, Patrick Bradley, and Patrick Carleton, for refusing to sell to various officers of police *United Ireland* or the *Cork Examiner*, under the very natural apprehension of possible consequences, were on different occasions arrested by Sergeants Kennedy and Power and lodged in Bridewell.

5. Mr. Balfour declares that Timothy Sullivan was sent to prison for three months, on a bullet having been found in his pocket, because he was a "bad character." I fear that in Mr. Balfour's eyes every Nationalist is "a bad character," but I would observe that the question of character only comes under review in ordinary courts of justice when some offence has been shown to have been committed. If Timothy Sullivan had been charged with having taken part, or conspired to take part, in any crime or outrage it would have been proper that his suggested bad character should have been considered in deciding upon his guilt and punishment; but I confess that I am at a loss to understand what specific offence is committed by carrying a bullet in one's pocket,

without the presence of arms, and with an entire absence of proof of felonious intent, and it must have taxed even the vivid imagination and the peculiar legal qualifications of Mr. Balfour's resident magistrates to arrive at their astounding and discreditable conclusion in the case of Timothy Sullivan.

Yours faithfully,  
PHILIP STANHOPE.

London, Dec. 18th, 1888.

“MR. BALFOUR AND THE HON. P. STANHOPE, M.P.”

Sir,—I take this somewhat unusual course of asking you to publish a reply to a letter addressed to the editor of another journal. On the 17th December there appeared in the *Western Morning News*, and also in the *Western Daily Mercury*, a reply by Mr. Balfour to allegations made shortly before at Torquay by the Hon. P. Stanhope, M.P., who rejoined in the *Mercury* on the 20th. I have now received the enclosed letter in reply. It quotes Mr. Stanhope's letter sufficiently, I think, to make the case intelligible to your readers. The points discussed are important, and that of the imprisonment of boys for “refusing to sell” newspapers is especially instructive.

Yours truly,  
A. MACONACHIE.

Hon. Sec., Torquay Division, Liberal Unionist Association.

(18c.)

“Dublin Castle, *January 5th*, 1889.

“Dear Sir,—I regret that owing to a mischance your letter of December 21st has only to-day been placed in my hands. Mr. Stanhope's reply has, I dare say, by now been forgotten. I will, however, since you wish it, indicate a few of the points upon which he is undoubtedly in error.

“1. In support of the view held by the Government that the meeting attended by Mr. Stanhope was, in fact, an ‘unlawful assembly’ at common law, I pointed out that neither he nor his friends took any steps to review the action of the executive in suppressing it. To my contention Mr. Stanhope can offer a ‘very simple’ answer. He asserts that ‘the only way of testing the legality of the action of the executive was by an action for assault against the police or military, and inasmuch as, happily, no one was actually assaulted, any such action was clearly impossible.’ His answer may be ‘very simple,’ it is certainly

incorrect. For a number of prosecutions were instituted against those who took part in the meeting, upon every one of which the legality of the suppression might have been tested by a case stated to the Supreme Courts.

"2. In dealing with Press prosecutions, Mr. Stanhope is peculiarly unfortunate. In his speech, by an unlucky slip, he attributed to Mr. Balfour a denial that any such prosecutions existed. So absurd a charge I was obliged to describe as 'a pure invention.' Undeterred by former ill-success, he is, with strange inconsistency, prepared to explain Mr. Balfour's entire policy in the matter, and to point out the very reasons that induced him to abandon those sinister intentions which he now only 'wishes to explain and desires to forget.' His policy, I read, was 'the wholesale suppression of the Nationalist Press in the West of Ireland.' Against this account of it I am content to set forth, for the second time, the fact that but a dozen prosecutions in all were undertaken; and against the statement that 'Press prosecutions have undoubtedly now ceased in consequence of the denunciations levelled against them,' the fact of Mr. Harrington's recent committal for such an offence.

"3. Mr. Stanhope describes my version of the prosecution of Thomas O'Rorke as 'absolutely incorrect.' Having passed this sweeping condemnation, he proceeds, oddly enough, to accept the most important part of it, viz., that O'Rorke would not have been committed had he not refused to give a promise to refrain from breaking the law. I must, therefore, suppose that he wishes to contradict my account of the one other material point in the case, viz., that O'Rorke had before his arrest been repeatedly warned that his conduct was illegal. I can assure him that in this I am also strictly accurate, and challenge him to prove the contrary.

"4. Mr. Stanhope, in his speech, assured his audience that 'he could give them many instances of boys who had been thrown into prison because they sold the newspapers.' I begged him to give one. Confining himself to the city of Cork, he produces the names of six boys, and alleges that they were arrested and imprisoned for refusing to sell newspapers to the police. Waiving the fact that this is no answer to my challenge (for I am well aware that no answer can be made to it), I take Mr. Stanhope on his own ground. But here, again, someone has been imposing upon him. No boys have been imprisoned for refusing to sell newspapers; the names he gives belong, with one exception, to youths committed or fined under the following circumstances:—Denis Desmond, committed for failing to pay a fine inflicted in the Cork Police Court for drunkenness. John Radley, Denis McCarthy, and Patrick Bradley, fined at the same Court for obstructing the thoroughfare in Cork city. Cornelius Coakley, committed for forming one of a disorderly crowd and throwing stones at the police. No such person as Patrick Carleton can be discovered to have been arrested in Cork.

"(5) If 'Timothy Sullivan' had lived in any other country, or even in any other part of Ireland, Mr. Stanhope's strictures might not be so wholly out of place. As he did, however, live in Kerry, where murderous outrages were frequent, and as he had already been convicted of taking part in one, the magistrates were bound to punish him for breaking the law, and Mr. Stanhope's observations on their conduct appear to be somewhat wide of the mark.

"It is well worthy of note that Mr. Stanhope, after mature consideration, is obliged to rest his reckless charges against the Government upon (1) a meeting at which no one was assaulted and the legality of which no one was found to defend. (2) A preposterous account of the few prosecutions instituted in connection with papers publishing boycotting notices. (3) The committal of a man repeatedly warned that his acts were illegal, and who declined to avail himself of the clemency of the court. (4) The apocryphal imprisonment of boys for selling, or refusing to sell, newspapers, and (5) the imprisonment of a notorious offender.

"Yours truly,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

(No. 19.)

MR. BALFOUR AND SIR WALTER FOSTER.

Sir Walter Balthazar Foster, M.P., as is well known, is one of the organizers and teachers of the English Parnellites. The following correspondence gives us a fine example of Sir Walter's qualifications as an accurate and instructive teacher.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*There was a boy and his name was Burke.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**There was a person named Burke, but the said Burke was not a boy.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Burke was sent to prison.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**Burke was *not* sent to prison.**

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Burke was sent to prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour's name.*

(3.) THE FACT.—**As Burke was not sent to prison, it is untrue that the charge on which he was sent there was "groaning at Mr. Balfour's name." A tramp named Burke was charged with being drunk and disorderly.**

(19a.)

"TIMES," *January 15th*, 1889.

We are requested to publish the following correspondence:—

"12, Hereford-square, South Kensington, *January 9th*, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—In a Nottingham newspaper of yesterday it is reported that Sir B. W. Foster, M.P. for the Ilkeston Division of Derbyshire, when speaking at Draycott, in that division, the previous night, made a statement to the effect that 'a boy named Burke was sent to prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour's name.'

"Having been the Unionist candidate for the division at the two last elections, I venture to trouble you with an inquiry whether or not Sir B. W. Foster's statement is correct.

"If not correct I shall be glad to know what foundation there is for the statement, as I should like the electors to know the exact truth.

"Apologizing for troubling you,

"I am, &c.,

"S. LEEKE.

"The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P."

(19b.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle, *January 10th*, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of yesterday, in which you bring under his notice a statement made by Sir B. W. Foster, M.P., on the 7th of this month, at Draycott. He is reported to have said that 'a boy named Burke was sent to prison for groaning at Mr. Balfour's name,' and, unless mis-reported, is in error upon every point, excepting only the name of the person arrested. The facts are these: An affray between some soldiers of the Berkshire and Leinster Regiments occurred in Templemore upon Christmas Day. Several arrests having been made, a large crowd followed the prisoners, who were being conducted to the military barracks for identification by those who claimed to have suffered injury at their hands. Thomas Burke, a tramp shoemaker, was arrested in the crowd, and charged before a magistrate with being drunk and disorderly. He was ordered to appear and answer to this charge at the ordinary petty sessions held on January 2nd, but failed to do so. A warrant for his apprehension has accordingly been issued. You will observe that Burke was not a boy, that his offence was not 'groaning at Mr. Balfour's name,' a crime unknown to the law, and that at present he has not been imprisoned. The only foundation for Sir B. W. Foster's story must be sought for in the evidence given before the magistrate. It was then incidentally stated that the prisoner, whose fate he bewails, had shouted, 'To hell with Balfour.'

"Even those ardent politicians to whom such an expression may commend itself can hardly, I imagine, consider it so meritorious as to indemnify its author against the penalties for being found drunk in the street.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"S. Leeke, Esq."

---

No. 20.

THE LEGENDS OF SAMUEL DANKS WADDY, Q.C.,  
EXAMINED.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The cases during the three quarters before the Crimes Act became law numbered 329, or 109 as an average for each quarter; and during the three quarters after the Crimes Act became law the number was 383, or an average of 127 per quarter; therefore the Crimes Act has done no good.*

(1.) THE FACT.—The average of agrarian crimes per quarter in 1888, after the passing of the Crimes Act, was not 127.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*During the last three quarters of the year 1888, 9,035 notices of eviction were served in Ireland.*

(2.) THE FACT.—It is a fact that 9,035 notices of eviction were served in the first three quarters of 1888.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*This means upwards of 60,000 persons have been turned out of their homes and habitations within the year 1888.*

(3.) THE FACT.—It is not a fact that in virtue of these notices upwards of 60,000 persons were driven out of their homes during the year. It might possibly be correct to say that one-seventeenth of this number were actually evicted in the whole of Ireland during the period named.

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The Land Act of 1887 is correctly described as an Act for evictions-made-easy.*

(4.) THE FACT.—The Land Act of 1887 is not correctly described as an Act for evictions-made-easy. It was passed with the object of making evictions less frequent, and it has attained this object, having in a single year reduced by nearly two-thirds—from 1,498 to 522.

(5.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Waddy has seen people's houses pulled down over their heads, he has seen them turned out of houses built with their own money, and on land which they reclaimed by their own exertions, for which they paid exorbitant rents.*

(5.) THE FACT.—*Mr. Waddy has not seen people's houses pulled down over their heads. When an eviction takes place the house is the property of the creditor, not of the debtor. No persons can be evicted in Ireland since the Act of 1881 for non-payment of an exorbitant rack-rent. Rents are fixed, not by the landlord, but by the Land Court. Any persons evicted for non-payment of a judicial rent may (1) sell his interest in the holding to the highest bidder, (2) obtain full compensation for all his improvements, including the house, if he has built it.*

(6.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Waddy has been to a place where a public meeting was held, where no disturbance was caused, where an old man, a boy, and a man, were shot down like dogs.*

(6.) THE FACT.—*The meeting alluded to is not correctly described as one at which no disturbance was caused; on the contrary, according to the Parnellite papers, the police were driven in disorder into their barracks by the mob. The police fired in self-defence, and the officer who ordered one of the shots to be fired was acquitted by the very jury to which Mr. Waddy refers.*

(7.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A coroner's jury very properly found a verdict of wilful murder against the persons who shot down these peaceable individuals like dogs.*

(7.) THE FACT.—*The verdict of the jury was instantly quashed by a higher court.*

(8.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The Government, to the shame and dishonour of England, kept these persons in their employment.*

(8.) THE FACT.—*The Government has, in accordance with the honourable traditions of the British public service, retained in their employment officers who, under circumstances of great difficulty and danger, did their duty.*

(9.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The Government kept the murderers under their beneficent wings.*

(9.) THE FACT.—*This is only Mr. Waddy's way of talking, nothing more.*

"MR. WADDY."

"SOUTH LONDON PRESS."

(20a.)

Mr. S. Waddy, Q.C., M.P., seconded the motion, and dilated at some length on the Irish question. He had seen in Ireland, he said, people's houses pulled down over their heads; he had seen people turned out of houses built with their own money, and on land which they reclaimed by their own exertions, for which they had paid exorbitant rack-rents for years, until they could stand it no longer, and so broke down; he had seen the constabulary and soldiers take places under circumstances which would almost draw blood from a stone; he had seen 200 of the Irish constabulary armed with rifles and bayonets to carry out the law and order that was required for that purpose; he had seen houses broken to pieces by the battering ram; he had seen the constabulary not only make a hole in dwellings sufficient to gain admittance, but, out of pure savagery, and in order to destroy the tenant's property, with the sole purpose of ruining them, shift the ram further and further on, doing their terrible work at each place until they had levelled the whole wall in order that the roof might fall in, and all that after the tenants had been evicted. He had been to a place where a public meeting was held, where no disturbance was caused, where there was no confusion and no crime, where an old man who was a pensioner of the Government, a boy of sixteen, and a man standing 100 yards away, were shot down like dogs in broad daylight; and he had seen the broken fanlight through which some young women, who had done nothing but run away, had been shot at by the police from the opposite house, and that out of pure savagery and malignity. Although the coroner's jury very properly found a verdict of wilful murder, yet to this day, to the shame and dishonour of England, the present Government kept the men who had done these things in their employment—had spread for them the shield of its protection, protected them from being tried, as they ought to have been fairly tried, by a jury of their own countrymen. And at the same time that the Government did that with an unsparing hand and with a ruthless tyranny, it imprisoned the poor people for defending their homes, in which they had been bred and born, and kept the murderers unharmed under their beneficent wings. (Cheers.)

"MR. BALFOUR."

("TIMES," *December 27th*, 1888.)

"Mr. R. J. H. Eccles (having called the attention of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to a speech recently delivered by Mr. S.

Waddy, M.P., at the opening of a Radical club) has received the following:—

(20b.)

“Irish Office, *December 23rd.*

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has directed me to reply to your letter of the 18th inst., in which you enclosed a report of a speech delivered by Mr. S. Waddy, Q.C., and asking for some comment upon his account of recent Irish evictions and of the riot at Mitchelstown.

“1. ‘He had seen people turned out of houses they had built with their own money, and on land which they reclaimed by their own exertions, for which they paid exorbitant rack-rents for years until they could stand it no longer, and so broke down.’

“1. Since 1881 these tenants have had it in their power to get a judicial or fair rent fixed. If they did not apply to the Land Commission for such a rent, they were apparently satisfied with their existing circumstances. If they did apply, since the new rent obtains from the gale day next after the date of application, they have evidently not been paying ‘exorbitant rack-rents for years.’ In securing a ‘a fair rent’ they acquired also ‘fixity of tenure’ and ‘free sale.’ That is to say, they could only be evicted for failing to pay the fair rent, and whether evicted or not, they could at any time sell their interest in the holding to the highest bidder. In the event of their not selling the interest, they were entitled to compensation for all improvements, including, of course, ‘the houses built with their own money.’ Under these circumstances an Irish landlord might fairly consider himself entitled to the payment of judicial rents in full. Full and certain payment, was, indeed, guaranteed to him by Mr. Gladstone in passing the Act. That justice, however, has been tempered with mercy is proved by the terms offered to the tenants on the Vandeleur estate. The yearly rental of the 24 tenants evicted on that property during this year, and to whom Mr. Waddy’s remarks may possibly refer, was £626. They owed in March last £2,406. Their landlord offered to accept in full discharge of that sum £917, and, to stay eviction, if they would consent to pay £458, or £168 less than one year’s rent. The refusal of such an offer can only be attributed to the intimidation which still unhappily exists in Ireland.

“2. ‘He had been to a place where a public meeting was held, where no disturbance was caused. . . . where an old man, a boy, and a man standing 100 yards away, were shot down like dogs,’ &c. ‘Although the coroner’s jury very properly found a verdict of wilful murder, the present Government kept the men who had done these things in their employment.’

“2. It is perhaps sufficient to point out that Mr. Waddy refers to the Mitchelstown riot, and is reproducing fictions already frequently

disproved. You will doubtless recollect that the only question to be considered in this matter is whether the police were or were not justified in firing. There are four reasons for holding that they were. (1) Their rules laid down that it is their duty to defend their barracks ; (2) the Nationalist papers gave glowing accounts of the defeat of the police by the mob, and exalted in the fact that they were driven into their barracks in disorder ; (3) the first shot saved the life of Sergeant Leahy, who received permanent injuries on that occasion ; (4) the last two shots, obviously the least defensible of all the shots, were fired by order of a police officer named Irwin, who was acquitted even by the coroner's jury. Such being the facts of the case, it is no matter for surprise that the inconsistent and scandalous verdict of the jury, described albeit by Mr. Waddy as 'very properly found,' was quashed by a higher Court.

"Mr. Waddy was undoubtedly well advised in not naming the scene of the action depicted by him with so much fire and imagination. Had the word 'Mitchelstown' escaped his lips it is barely conceivable that his audience would have given a patient hearing to such a travesty of the truth.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"R. J. H. Eccles, Esq."

---

## No. 21.

### HOW MR. MARJORIBANKS WAS HOAXED.

The only points noticeable here are that the charges are even more absurd and baseless than usual ; and that they are made by a man who might be reasonably expected to know better.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour was primarily a Home Ruler.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**An absurd untruth.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Fifteen young men were committed and fined for merely lighting a bonfire in honour of Mr. O'Brien's release.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**Fifteen young men were not fined as alleged, but one young man was fined for lighting a bonfire in the road and causing an obstruction.**

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A man was sent to gaol for singing a ballad about Mr. O'Brien.*

(3.) THE FACT.—**A pure invention.**

"MR. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., AND MR. MARJORIBANKS, M.P."

("SCOTSMAN," *January 14th*, 1889.)

(21a.)

12, Marchmont Road, Edinburgh,

*January 12th*, 1889.

SIR,—A little more than a fortnight ago, Mr. Marjoribanks, addressing a meeting of his constituents at Gordon, near Greenlaw, made a furious and rather ill-natured attack on Mr. Balfour, the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He charged him with being in his early days a Home Ruler. He condemned in strong terms his administration of the Crimes Act, and he asserted that fifteen young men had been convicted and fined for merely lighting a bonfire on the occasion of the release of Mr. O'Brien. He also said that a man had been arrested for singing a ballad about Mr. O'Brien's imprisonment in Tullamore Jail. Believing that Mr. Marjoribanks had been cruelly hoaxed by a clumsy imitation of Professor Stuart, M.P., or by some of his Irish political companions, and moreover, knowing that many of the Gladstonians are wonderfully credulous, it occurred to me that it might be well to call Mr. Balfour's attention to the silly and ridiculous stories of Mr. Marjoribanks. I have to-day received a reply from Mr. Balfour's secretary, which I enclose; and I should feel obliged if you will give it a place in Monday's *Scotsman*.

I am, &c.,

JOHN GIBSON.

P.S.—For report of meeting referred to, see *Scotsman* of December 27th.

(21b.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle,

*January 10th*, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—I regret that I have not sooner been able to reply to your letter, addressed to Mr. Balfour. Of the three statements made by the Honble. E. Marjoribanks, and submitted by you for criticism, the first is most absurd. It is incredible that Mr. Marjoribanks can here have been correctly reported. His words as they stand—viz., that in the 'Irish Secretary they had one who in his early days had been returned as a Home Rule member'—are destitute, not only of truth, but of plausibility.

"The second statement—that 'fifteen young men had been fined for lighting a bonfire on the occasion of the release of Mr. O'Brien'—is incorrect and misleading. On a former occasion I examined this

charge and was unable to discover any foundation for it. I then confined my research to cases tried under the Crimes Act since the story was brought forward as a proof of coercion. I now find that sixteen youths were prosecuted, not under the Crimes Act, but before an ordinary Court of Petty Sessions, for causing a dangerous obstruction in the public square of the town of Mountmelleck, on January 30th, 1888. Of these one man only was fined 10s., and the case against the others dismissed. The occasion of the bonfire was not considered by the magistrates in arriving at their decision. It appeared to them intolerable that under any circumstances the entire traffic in the main street of a town should be stopped by the erection of a huge fire on the roadway. Had a more suitable site been selected by Mr. O'Brien's admirers they would have been secure against any interference on the part of the authorities.

"The third statement—that 'a man had been arrested for singing a ballad relating to Mr. O'Brien's imprisonment'—is of a like nature. I am unable to discover any case in which a ballad-singer has figured, and doubt if any such exists. If, however, a ballad-singer has been arrested, I can confidently assert that it was not for the subject of his song, but probably because he caused an obstruction, and refused to move on at the request of the police. Under similar circumstances he would have been arrested in England.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"Mr. John Gibson."

## No. 22.

### THE LEGEND OF MR. HARRINGTON'S "BIBLE."

This letter is noticeable because it refers to a kind of invention, much used by the Gladstonians, and which is evidently manufactured expressly for the English market.

It is probable that this fiction about Mr. Harrington and his Bible has done duty on scores of Gladstonian platforms, and indeed is very likely alive still.

"MR. BALFOUR AND MR. HARRINGTON'S BIBLE."

("MANCHESTER COURIER," *February 18th, 1889.*)

"A few days ago Mr. R. Mercer, a working man, of Great Harwood, Lancashire, wrote to Mr. Balfour respecting a statement made at the Radical meeting held in the town by Mr. Pearce

Mahoney, M.P. for North Meath, to the effect that on the last occasion Mr. Harrington was imprisoned he visited him at the end of three weeks, when Mr. Harrington told him that after he had been in prison two or three days he asked for a Bible, and was informed by the authorities that they had not one. He made the same request several times afterwards, and was told that one had been sent for, but that it had not arrived. The following reply has been received from the Irish Office:—

(22a.)

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and to inform you that he has caused the fullest investigation to be made into the charge preferred by Mr. Mahoney, M.P., namely, that Mr. Harrington complained to him of not being provided with a Bible on the last occasion of his imprisonment. As a result, I am able to inform you (1) that Mr. Mahoney, M.P., visited Mr. Harrington in prison on December 26th, 1887, and made the following entry in the visiting book:—‘Visited Mr. Harrington, M.P., Mr. Murphy, and Mr. O’Rourke. They had no complaints to make.’ This statement appears to be at variance with the one to which you refer in your letter. I may add that there is no record at Tralee Prison of Mr. Harrington’s application for a Bible. All Roman Catholics are supplied with a Prayer-book, and, subject to their chaplain’s approval, with a Bible. All Protestants are supplied with a Bible and Prayer-book.

“Yours faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

### No. 23.

#### MR. AUSTIN, M.P., AND HIS EIGHT LITTLE ERRORS.

It is not without reason that the *Yorkshire Post* speaks of the following letter as “crushing.”

Mr. J. Austin is evidently a typical Gladstonian, and the statements which he endeavoured to palm off as facts are worthy of his party.

“MR. J. AUSTIN’S FALSE STATEMENTS EXPOSED.”

(“YORKSHIRE POST,” *March 12th*, 1889.)

“Mr. J. H. Hellewell (the secretary of the Castleford Conservative Club) having sent to the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P.

(Chief Secretary for Ireland), the published report of Mr. J. Austin's speech at Pontefract, has received from Mr. Balfour, through his secretary (Mr. G. Wyndham), the following crushing reply :--

(23a.)

"Irish Office, Great Queen Street, London, S.W.,

"7th March, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—If the *Castleford and Pontefract Express* has correctly reported the speech delivered by Mr. Austin, M.P., to which you draw my attention, the Unionist party in your Division have certainly reason to be grateful to him for affording them an excellent example of the sort of statements on Irish affairs which are palmed off on English audiences by Gladstonite orators. Most of the cases to which Mr. Austin refers as illustrations of what he is pleased to call the "undignified and barbarous" treatment of Irish Crimes Act prisoners have been frequently exploded before now. This speech contains, however, such a marvellous collection of misstatements that I have thought it worth while to tabulate some of them as under. You will observe that I give in one column Mr. Austin's statements as to the cases he mentions, and opposite to each I give the actual facts. I shall make no further comment, but will permit you to form your own judgment on this, the latest sample of an attack upon the Irish Government :—

MR. AUSTIN'S STATEMENTS.

1. "Fourteen men were sent to prison for one month for cheering for Mr. Gladstone."

riotous attack on a party of policemen. It was proved in the evidence that some of these men did cheer for Mr. Gladstone, but this incident had nothing to do with the very serious offence of which they were convicted. (This case happened in the autumn of 1887, and yet it is the only basis for all the charges subsequently made of imprisonment for cheering).

2. "Quoting from the charge of Judge O'Brien at Ennis Summer Assizes in 1887, Mr. Austin makes him say : 'There is an absence of open and serious crime.'

ACTUAL FACTS.

1. "No man in Ireland has ever been sent to prison for cheering for Mr. Gladstone. Fourteen men were sent to prison in the town of Ballinasloe, County Galway, for a

2. "Mr. Austin does not continue the quotation. If he did, he would find that the Judge attributed the absence of open crime to the existence of a terrible system of intimidation which renders such crime unnecessary. How the

Crimes Act has dealt with this intimidation in this County of Clare will best be judged from the fact that on the 30th June, 1887 (just before the passing of the Act), there were in Clare no less than 470 persons boycotted. On the 31st December, 1888, as the result of one

year-and-a-half's administration of the Crimes Act, this number had been reduced to eight only, agrarian crime in the same period being reduced by some 30 per cent.

3. " 'On the 18th October, Michael Devereux and John Kelly, two schoolboys, were sent to prison for 14 days. Mary Ann Lawlor, a girl in her 14th year, was sent for 14 days.'

3. "This case occurred on the 14th October, 1887, in the County of Waterford, Michael Devereux, the so-called 'schoolboy,' was a man of 40 years of age; John Kelly, a strapping youth of over 16. Mary Ann Lawlor was a stout girl of 21.

4. " 'These school-children looked at these men as they passed, and the result was that they were taken before two magistrates, and a girl and two boys were committed to 14 days' imprisonment.'

4. "This refers to the above persons, who were certainly *not* school-children. They were not charged with looking at passing persons, but they were convicted of having been the ringleaders of a mob which went to a field in which two inoffensive farmers (not Emergency

men, as Mr. Austin asserts), were working, and there and then attempted to drive them away by blowing horns, shouting out abusive epithets, and using threatening gesture and language. Mary Ann Lawlor was called on to give bail for her good behaviour; she defiantly refused to do so, and it was only then that she was sent to prison.

5. " 'Then there was a blacksmith, Martin Maloney, sent to prison for one month for refusing to shoe a horse in Galloway County.'

5. "It is significant of the little trouble taken by speakers of Mr. Austin's type to work themselves up in the simplest matters that there is no such county in Ireland as Galloway. If the speaker re-

ferred to Galway, which is probable, I can identify no such case as that he quotes; it is, however, absolutely certain that no blacksmith in Ireland has at any time been sent to prison for merely refusing to shoe a horse. Blacksmiths, in common with other tradesmen, have in a very few instances been imprisoned when they combined together to refuse the necessities of life to a boycotted person.

6. " 'They have sent such men as the late Lord Mayor of Dublin, Mr. Sullivan, for simply publishing reports in his newspaper, and the same with Mr. E. Harrington, M.P., Alderman Hooper, and Mr. Ed. Walsh.'

6. "Messrs. Sullivan, Harrington, and Hooper were imprisoned for deliberately publishing illegal notices in districts in which such notices were calculated to lead to crime and outrage. Mr. Walsh was imprisoned for publishing a grossly intimidatory article of such a character which in Ireland

has frequently led to the murder of the person pointed at.

7. "I have a further case of a little girl, Bridget Hunt, who was sentenced to one week's imprisonment with an old woman, 70 years of age, named Ann Conley, who was committed for three weeks.

bailiffs. Anne Conboy, whose case was a bad one, was sentenced to three weeks' imprisonment. Bridget Hunt was required to find bail to be of good behaviour, but, following the instructions issued by the Nationalist leaders, she refused to enter into recognizances, and was sent to prison for seven days. Mr. Austin has been ridiculously misled as to the ages of these persons. Bridget Hunt gave her own age at the prison as 13; she, however, looked more like 20, and on being weighed she scaled 8st. 2lb., a fair woman's weight. Anne Conboy gave her own age as 35; she weighed but 8st., or 2lb. less than the 'little girl' Bridget Hunt.

8. "Under this iniquitous law no less than 841 persons within a year and a half have been imprisoned."

which he refers would if no Crimes Act ever existed have been dealt with by the ordinary law. This is evident from the fact that under the administration of the Crimes Act the total number of prisoners in Irish prisons has been less than before it was passed.

"There are many other inaccuracies and misconceptions in this speech of Mr. Austin's which I think it unnecessary to detail. These instances will suffice to give you a fair idea of their nature.

"Your obedient servant,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

"THE IRISH CHIEF SECRETARY AND THE MEMBER FOR OSGOLDCROSS."

"The following letter from the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P. (Irish Secretary), has been received by a Pontefract correspondent, who sent a copy of Mr. Austin's rejoinder to Mr. Balfour. It will be remembered that Mr. J. Austin, M.P., in a speech delivered at Pontefract, made certain statements which were contradicted by Mr. Balfour:—

(23b.)

"Irish Office, *March 16th*, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter enclosing Mr. Austin's rejoinder to the correction of some among the

many errors into which he fell during his speech delivered at Pontefract. You ask for a further reply on the ground that his misstatements are 'likely to do the Conservative cause much harm.' I cannot believe it. His defence is far more damaging to the accuracy of his speech than the criticism of it upon which I ventured. In his speech he asserts that 14 men were sent to prison for cheering Mr. Gladstone. In his defence he admits that they were charged with 'riot and unlawful assembly.' That is to say, he proves that his original statement was inaccurate and misleading. With the view of adding, if possible, to the bewildering inconsistency of his various utterances he appends to the refutation of it, supplied by himself, the words 'my statement correct.' It is difficult to treat such an apology with becoming seriousness. I will, however, take one other case; the two will enable everybody to form a just estimate of the value of Mr. Austin's testimony. He asserts that 'Bridget Hunt was sentenced to one week's imprisonment with an old woman of 70 years of age named Anne Conboy.' The facts here misrepresented occurred like those of the first case in the year 1887, and just as the former afford the ground plan of all the stories dealing with imprisonment for cheering Mr. Gladstone, so the latter supply the sole pretext for all the tales of imprisonment inflicted upon old women. In dealing with Mr. Austin's account of this case I pointed out that Bridget Hunt was not committed under the Crimes Act, but under the ordinary law, and that Anne Conboy was but 35 years of age. What I neglected to point out was that Mr. Austin had made a mistake in the accepted Separatist version of the incident. The old woman was not 'Anne Conboy,' but 'Ellen Tighe.' I have so often corrected misstatements about 'the old woman of 70,' who, as a matter of fact, was not sent to prison (proceedings against her being dropped on account of her age), that I began to weary of the task. And now an additional burden is imposed. It is time to protest when a Home Ruler blunders about the characters in a work of fiction composed by his own colleagues.

"Yours, faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

---

(No. 24.)

GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY?

This letter gives another example of Gladstonian methods of controversy. According to the Gladstonian speaker; the offence for which Mr. Finucane, M.P., was imprisoned was that of "*listening to a violent speech delivered by another man.*"

What the offence really was, and what were the real grounds upon which Mr. Finucane was sent to gaol, will be found in the following letter.

“MR. BALFOUR AND MR. FINUCANE’S SENTENCE.”

(“GLOBE,” *May 3rd*, 1889.)

“Mr. S. Woollam, hon. secretary of the South-West Manchester Conservative Association, recently forwarded a letter to Mr. Balfour drawing attention to a letter by a leading Gladstonite and published by a local contemporary, stating that Mr. Finucane, M.P., was sentenced to four months’ imprisonment for listening to a violent speech delivered by Mr. Moran, an Irish solicitor, at Castleconnell. Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Balfour’s secretary, has sent the following reply:—

(24a.)

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to acknowledge the receipt of the communication of the 16th inst., in which you enclose a copy of a letter dealing with the imprisonment of Mr. Finucane, M.P. The account there given of the charge preferred against him is most misleading. It is a favourite device of Gladstonite Liberals to give an insufficient and inaccurate account of the offence with which an Irish prisoner is charged, and then to dilate upon the magnitude of the punishment inflicted. It is quite true that Mr. Finucane listened without protest to the words used by Mr. Moran—words which the Judge who decided the appeal declared sufficient to sustain an indictment for inciting to assassination—but this action, however culpable, by no means constituted the whole, or even an essential part of his crime. The charge for which Mr. Finucane, M.P., and Mr. M’Querney were prosecuted was that they conspired with others to induce John Quilty not to occupy a farm. The charge arose out of speeches delivered at meetings held at Castleconnell, on the 28th October, and at Ballyneety, on the 4th November, 1888. Both these meetings were publicly called with the view to intimidate certain individuals. The speeches were directed at the persons named in each case, and no doubt was left as to their meaning and intention. At the Castleconnell meeting the person attacked was John Quilty, and this man was so alarmed that he did give up his farm. You are not to suppose that Mr. Finucane confined himself to listening; on the contrary, he spoke on the first occasion as follows:—‘In the whole Eastern Division there are only two god-forsaken land-grabbers. I am sorry to say that one of them is in your midst, but I believe ye won’t have him long,’ &c. And in the second to

this effect :—‘I hope this meeting will be as successful in its result as was the meeting in Castleconnell last Sunday. Unfortunately there is a little case of land-grabbing in this neighbourhood,’ &c. You will easily see from the above that Mr. Finucane was punished for taking an active part in a cruel conspiracy to persecute an inoffensive and law-abiding man, and this in a country where such conspiracies are known to have led in the past to loss of property, and occasionally to loss of life on the part of the victim denounced. In England such a state of affairs does not happily exist; it is, therefore, difficult to convince Gladstonite Liberals that the law is the same in both countries. But even in England such action as that taken by Mr. Finucane would undoubtedly be punished. If the writer of the letter you were good enough to forward doubts this, let him prevail upon some English Member of Parliament to call a meeting upon a Sunday with a view to inciting his audience to persecute one of their neighbours.

“Yours faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

### No. 25.

#### MR. BALFOUR AND THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

It was worth while remembering this letter, and it is well worth while remembering that ever since Mr. Gladstone's surrender to Mr. Parnell the Gladstonian party has had to do honour to its new allies, by reserving all its admiration, all its sympathy, and all its encouragement for plan-of-campaigners, rioters, boycotters, and other law-breakers, while for honest and law-abiding men and women, for faithful servants of the crown, for the oppressed, for the suffering, they have had nothing but bitter words, scorn, and condemnation.

(“DAILY EXPRESS,” and “MANCHESTER GUARDIAN,” *May 8th*, 1889.)

Replying to a correspondent who wrote on the subject of the murder of the late Inspector Martin and on other matters connected with the Royal Irish Constabulary, Mr. Balfour's private secretary writes as follows :—

(25a.)

“Irish Office, *May 7th*.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour desires me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and to inform you that so far as he is aware no Separatist

speaker, Mr. Morley perhaps excepted, has expressed any deep regret for the injuries from time to time inflicted upon Irish policemen engaged in doing their duty. It is certain that nothing in the nature of an agitation on behalf of the men wounded under these circumstances has ever been set on foot by an advocate of Home Rule.

“Yours, faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

---

No. 26.

ONLY MR. HERBERT.

It would be a mistake to take Mr. Herbert Gladstone too seriously, but inasmuch as there is probably no member of his party who, to judge from the evidence available, is more habitually and more completely uninformed with respect to the facts about which he speaks, it is as well to give one sample from the collection furnished by the member for Leeds.

It is not easy to decide whether inaccuracy or silliness is the most remarkable characteristic of the hon. gentleman's allegations.

“THE BATTERING RAM AND PETROLEUM AT EVICTIONS.”

(“WESTERN DAILY MERCURY,” *May 13th.*)

“The following correspondence has taken place between Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. J. P. Rogers :—

(26a.)

“4, Portland Villas, Plymouth, *May 6th*, 1889.

“Sir,—You stated at Tavistock that Mr. Balfour had patented his battering ram for use at evictions, and also that a stock of petroleum was kept on hand at convenient centres for burning down peasants' cottages.

“Will you kindly favour me with your authority for these two statements, and oblige?

“Yours faithfully,

“J. P. ROGERS.

“H. Gladstone, Esq., M.P.”

(26b.)

"House of Commons, *May 9th*, 1889.

"Sir,—The existence and use of Mr. Balfour's 'defensive' battering rams are not denied. Paraffin or petroleum has been used by the emergency men and police on occasions when they destroyed the tenants' cottages by fire after evictions. This is so notorious a fact that to look up dates would be lost labour.

"Your obedient servant,

"HERBERT GLADSTONE.

"J. P. Rogers, Esq."

(26c.)

"Irish Office, Queen-street, S.W., *May 8th*, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 7th instant in which you question the accuracy of three statements made by Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., in a speech delivered at Tavistock. I quote from the *verbatim* report of the *Western Daily Mercury*, a copy of which you are good enough to enclose.

"1. 'Mr. Seagrave, too, has been appointed by Mr. Balfour to a similar post. But we have compelled Mr. Balfour to dismiss his friend.'

"1. We have here a truly remarkable specimen of concise inaccuracy. Mr. Seagrave is not personally known to Mr. Balfour. He has not been dismissed, for his resignation has been accepted, nor did Mr. Balfour make him a resident magistrate. He received that appointment from Sir M. Hicks-Beach, in fulfilment of a promise made to him by Lord Aberdeen, Viceroy of Ireland, during Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule administration. We may well question the zeal for the purity of the public service which prompts partisans to hound down to ruin a man for whose selection one of their own colleagues was largely responsible.

"2. 'Mr. Balfour has patented his battering ram.'

"2. The meaning of this announcement is somewhat obscure. Mr. Balfour has no interest pecuniary or otherwise in the rams occasionally used at evictions upon houses, fortified and garrisoned against the execution of legal decrees. He, however, fully approves of their employment under such circumstances, out of consideration for the lives, both of the bailiffs, whose duty it is to attack, and of the misguided men who defend buildings, frequently belonging to others, at the bidding of political agitators. For the use of the ram affords the only possible protection to the former from savage assaults, and in its absence the prolonged and violent resistance of the latter cannot fail ultimately to force the officer in command to give his troops the order to fire.

"3. 'There is a stock of petroleum in hand in different centres for burning down peasants' cottages.'

"3. This charge is absolutely untrue. It is founded, at least in one instance, upon the discovery by an Irish M.P. of a tub of liquid matter in one of the houses at Clongorey from which the occupiers had been evicted. But this vessel, so far from holding petroleum for use by the police upon the property of peasants, contained, as a matter of fact, a noxious compound, forming a part of the derelict ammunition laid in by the defenders for use upon the heads of the officers of the law.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"J. P. Rogers, Esq."

---

No. 27.

*Re* MR. HARRINGTON'S FOOD AND CLOTHING.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Harrington was brought to London in his prison clothes.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**Mr. Harrington did come to London in his prison clothes.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*This indignity was inflicted upon Mr. Harrington by the express order of Mr. Balfour.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**Mr. Harrington came thus attired of his own choice, and not by Mr. Balfour's order.**

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour promised that Mr. Harrington should have a special indulgence in the way of feeding.*

(3.) THE FACT.—**Mr. Balfour made no such promise.**

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour having given this promise, not only broke his word, but put Mr. Harrington on a short allowance.*

(4.) THE FACT.—**Mr. Balfour did not break his promise, nor did he inflict any hardship on Mr. Harrington as alleged.**

"MR. BALFOUR AND HIS DETRACTORS."

("GLOBE," May 27th, 1889.)

"A correspondent resident in Kentish Town, having written to Mr. Balfour with reference to certain statements made at

a recent meeting in St. Pancras, has received the following reply:—

(27a.)

“ Irish Office, Great Queen Street, S.W., *May 25th.*

“ Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 18th instant, in which you direct his attention to two statements made by Mr. Danaughton at a meeting at St. Pancras. These statements are (1), “that Mr. E. Harrington was brought to London in his prison clothes by the express order of Mr. Balfour.” This statement is in direct contradiction to the well-known facts of the case. Mr. Harrington appeared in prison dress of his own free will, having obtained permission under the new rules to wear his own clothes some weeks before his journey to London. It is difficult to explain Mr. Danaughton’s ignorance of so notorious a matter, for Mr. Harrington’s intention was announced in many newspapers of both parties, and was also commented on in the House of Commons. (2), ‘Mr. Balfour, after promising from his place in the House of Commons that Mr. Harrington should have an improved and more liberal diet, actually reduced the amount of food allowed him.’ The facts are these. Mr. Harrington was originally sentenced to six months, with hard labour. It was decided that three months of the hard labour out of the six should be remitted. The immediate effect of the decision was somewhat to reduce the quantity of food allowed Mr. Harrington without, for a time, giving him any countervailing advantage. For he had already been allowed to forego the hard labour during the preparation of his defence before the Commission. This relief was, of course, merely temporary, and would shortly have come to an end; whereas, the formal remission, of which Mr. Danaughton apparently complains, is permanent, and will benefit Mr. Harrington during all the remainder of his sentence. Mr. Danaughton has here twisted a favour conferred into a hardship inflicted upon the gentleman of whose affairs he is so strangely ignorant.

“ Yours faithfully,

“ GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

## No. 28.

### AN ORDINARY PARNELLITE LIE EXPOSED.

(I.) THE ALLEGATION.—*That a certain type-setter on the staff of the “CORK HERALD” was arrested merely for following his trade.*

(I.) THE FACT.—The allegation is a pure falsehood.

“FACT VERSUS FICTION: ANOTHER LIE NAILED DOWN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “MANCHESTER COURIER.”

“Sir,—The following correspondence will speak for itself. May I ask for the favour of its insertion in your columns?”

Yours, &c.,

THOMAS ALDRED.

37, Queen-street, Clayton-le-Moors, *June 1st*, 1889.

(28a.)

“37, Queen Street, Clayton-le-Moors, *April 27th*.

“Sir,—As a Conservative working man I beg leave to be excused for trespassing upon your valuable time by asking the following question.—Has any person on the staff of the *Cork Herald* been arrested under the Crimes Act now in operation in Ireland; if so, what was the charge laid against him? My reason for asking this question is as follows:—On Thursday evening last I attended the Unionist meeting at Accrington to hear Mr. Hermon Hodge meet the charges the local Gladstonians had laid against him, and at the close I got mixed up with some of these Gladstonians. The subject very soon turned on the way the law was being administered in Ireland, when one of these men made a statement that a type-setter on the staff of the *Cork Herald* had been arrested for no other crime than that of following his work as a type-setter.—Apologising for the liberty I have taken,

“I remain, sir, yours faithfully,

“THOMAS ALDRED.

“The Right Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P.”

(28b.)

“37, Great Queen Street, S.W., *May 28th*, 1889.

“Sir,—Mr. Balfour desires me to say that he is sorry your letter has accidentally remained unanswered until now. You mention that it has been stated to you by a Radical opponent that a type-setter on the staff of *Cork Herald* had been arrested for no other crime than that of following his work as a type-setter, and you ask if this is true. It is not true, nor has any case occurred even remotely resembling such an incident. It is quite possible that the speaker had heard and intended to repeat to you a very distorted version of one or other of the following cases:—

“1. A reporter on the staff of the *Cork Herald* was recently arrested at Killarney for obstructing the police in the discharge of their duties.

“2. About a year-and-a-half ago the registered printer and publisher of the *Cork Examiner* was sentenced to two months' imprisonment

for publishing illegal notices. The circumstances of this case have frequently been explained in public.

"The person responsible for the management of the *Cork Examiner* persistently broke the law, and the reason why the publisher was prosecuted was that his name appeared in the Newspaper Registry Office. Having signed the legal register there, which the statute makes evidence in all criminal proceedings, he was primarily liable for any illegal publications in the paper.

"You will see that neither of these cases affords any justification for the allegation that a type-setter has been arrested for following his work as a type-setter.

"Yours, &c.,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"Mr. THOMAS ALDRED."

## No. 29.

### THAT INFANT PRISONER AGAIN!

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A child of 12 years was sent to prison.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**A child of 12 years was not sent to prison.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The said child was sent to prison under the Crimes Act.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**A boy of 15 was sent to prison, but not under the Crimes Act.**

("TIMES," June 21st, 1889.)

"Mr. George Wyndham writes to a Newcastle-on-Tyne correspondent:—

(29a.)

"House of Commons, June 19th.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th inst. enclosing a newspaper extract. The account there given of the prosecution of Thomas Clancy, under the heading 'A child sent to Prison,' contains two misstatements of fact, and omits one important factor in the case, the neglect of which precludes the formation of a just opinion upon it. The writer alleges (1) that Clancy was but 12 years old; he was 15; and (2) that he was

sent to prison under the 'Coercion Act,' whereas he was, as a matter of fact, required to give securities for his good behaviour under the ordinary law, and only committed to prison on refusing to comply with the lenient decision of the Court. The writer omits to state that the place (Miltownmalbay) at which this case occurred has been notorious for the existence of boycotting conspiracies, and that Mrs. Moroney, the owner of the cattle, who has there been boycotted now for some years, can only be protected against her persecutors by the strict enforcement of the law. The boy, quite old enough to be aware that he was breaking the law, was no doubt used as an instrument by persons too cowardly to act openly themselves, who probably thought that political capital could be made out of his imprisonment, which, it should be recollected, would not have taken place had he been permitted by his advisers to give the bail readily offered on his behalf."

### No. 30.

#### THE SAD TALE OF MR. CAREW.

This letter gives an excellent example of the real as opposed to the sham reasons for which the law has been put in force against certain promoters of the Parnellite agitation.

"MR. BALFOUR AND MR. CAREW."

("GLOBE," Oct. 31st, 1889.)

"The following letter has been received by Mr. Maconochie, hon. secretary of the Torquay Division, Liberal Unionist Association:—

(30a.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of the 15th inst., in which you enclose a report of a speech delivered at Torquay by Mr. J. L. Carew, M.P. (1) Giving particulars of his arrest and imprisonment, and (2) defending the action for which he was prosecuted under the Crimes Act. (1) Mr. Carew was subjected to arrest because he deliberately ignored a summons served upon him. In like manner whatever inconvenience he might have suffered in prison he incurred of his own accord. I understand, indeed, that he made no charge against the prison officials. He is even reported in the *Star* of May 23 to have said, 'No, I do not blame them. I suppose they merely did their duty.' (2) Turning now to Mr. Carew's defence of his action, he apparently alleges that he was justified in inciting

his hearers to enter a conspiracy to boycott any person who took the vacant farm from which T. O'Brien had been evicted, because O'Brien's rent had many years ago been increased. Mr. Carew, it should be noted, did not confine himself to advising his audience to refrain from making any offer for the farm; he urged them, further, to prevent other persons from performing this perfectly legal action, by employing 'the weapon of boycotting,' a weapon which, he went on to declare, involved no 'shedding of blood.' Even were he correct in this comfortable assertion, the mere fact that a victim is to be spared the last penalties of death and mutilation, will not assuredly absolve his persecutors from the crime of compassing his ruin. But he is not correct. The records of agrarian crime afford irrefragable proof that a boycotted man is left a defenceless prey to the criminals who are to be found in all societies; and that, as a consequence, he is deprived not only of the means of earning his livelihood, but too often of life itself. Actions and words leading to such deplorable results are illegal in every civilised community. In Ireland they are exceptionally without excuse. For in that country—and so far as I know in that country alone—all tenants of the class to which O'Brien evidently belonged have since the year 1881 enjoyed the privilege of either insuring themselves against any increase of rent, or in cases where their rent had already been raised, of submitting it to the revisal of an impartial tribunal, simply by making an application to have a fair rent fixed. If this tenant had a grievance a legal method of redress lay ready to his hand. Why, then, may we ask, do Mr. Carew and his colleagues prefer the cumbrous and illegal expedient of paralysing the industry of a whole countryside? The answer can, I think, be found in two other passages uttered by a colleague of Mr. Carew on the same occasion: 'If you want to govern yourselves in Ireland you must endeavour to wrest the soil of Ireland out of the hands of the Cromwellian settlers.' And again: 'You will have to make the government of this country perfectly impossible for Balfour and Salisbury.' By the light of such exhortations we may at last understand the conduct of those who promote boycotting and the Plan of Campaign. For their action, not only illegal but senseless, were it indeed undertaken to benefit the tenants of Ireland, becomes, at any rate, intelligible when known for an effort to carry out a revolution at their expense.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"October 26th, 1889."

---

## No 31.

## A LIE THAT IS HALF A TRUTH.

This letter furnishes a useful exposure of a favourite Parnellite method, which consists in giving a false reason for an undoubted fact. It will be seen that Mr. Cecil Roche and Colonel Turner (Resident Magistrates) did, in fact, refuse to subscribe to some races in Kerry. The Parnellites represented this action as an open and unprovoked act of aggression.

It will be seen from the extracts given above that the two gentlemen referred to acted as any two honourable and self-respecting men would have acted, and ought to have acted in their place.

"MR. BALFOUR AND MR. E. HARRINGTON."

("TIMES," *August 10th*, 1889.)

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'TIMES.'"

"Sir,—In the speech delivered by the Chief Secretary for Ireland upon the resident magistrates' vote yesterday evening the following observations occurred:—

## 31a.

"It appeared that Mr. Roche and Colonel Turner were asked to subscribe to some races in Kerry. They declined to do so, and the reason given was that the hon. member for West Kerry was on the committee and had used, and was in the habit of using, in his newspaper, language against them and the police, which made it impossible for them to take an active part in supporting any institution with which the hon. member was connected. That was not a subject on which I think it my duty to pronounce any opinion (cheers and laughter), because it is not an official matter; but to say that we are not to give a vote for resident magistrates in Ireland because Mr. Cecil Roche and Colonel Turner objected to subscribe to some races which were managed by a gentleman who, in their opinion, was in the habit, through his newspaper, of describing them and the police as cowards and uniformed bloodhounds, is really rather absurd."

On the scene which followed it is not necessary to comment, but in justification of the magistrates whose conduct was in question perhaps you will afford me the opportunity of giving some appropriate quotations from the *Kerry Sentinel*, the journal of which the member for West Kerry is editor. These quotations, which might be readily multiplied, are of two kinds. Some are drawn from the resolutions purporting to have been passed by National League branches, to which every publicity is given in the *Kerry Sentinel*, and on the language of which its editor, so far as I know, has never made any hostile criticism. Others are drawn from leading articles in that journal, for the language of which the editor is even more directly responsible. As specimens of the first I may mention the following:—

*Kerry Sentinel*, Feb. 21, 1888.

“Tralee Branch, Irish National League.

“Largely-attended meetings have been held every week under the very noses of the police, and will be held in the same way in future in spite of every effort of Balfour’s bloodhounds and ‘Cecil the briefless’ to prevent them.”

*Kerry Sentinel*, Feb. 14, 1888.

“Tralee Branch, Irish National League.

“Resolution—That we express our utmost indignation, and view with supreme disregard and contempt the flagrant and unblushing outrage in the name of law perpetrated on our two respected fellow-members, Messrs. Maurice Moynihan and Thomas Quinlan—by bloody Balfour’s wretched hireling, Cecil Roche, R.M., on the prepared evidence of enraged and baffled policemen.”

*Kerry Sentinel*, September 8, 1888.

“Asdee Branch, Irish National League.

The police are thus designated:—“Cowardly, black-coated renegades, whom Balfour has bribed and paid, and also well-schooled, to bludgeon and butcher the Irish people.”

It will perhaps be said that the editor of the *Kerry Sentinel* cannot be blamed for language which is not his own, but is put forward as that of secretaries of National League branches. It may be at once admitted that there is a difference between writing and publishing, between manufacturing goods and distributing them, though how far that difference supplies an adequate defence in this case is a matter of opinion. I proceed, however, to give specimen extracts from leading articles, for the writing and publication of which the editor, and the editor alone, must be held responsible.

*Kerry Sentinel*, April 25, 1888.

Leading Article.

"And Cecil Roche need not plume himself on being the most brazen liar of the removable lot. Colonel Turner can give him points. Balfour himself, starting from scratch, can beat his whole crew."

*Kerry Sentinel*, June 19, 1889.

Leading Article.

"That the baton charge in question was a ruffianly outrage goes without saying; unoffending women and children were ruthlessly belaboured by uniformed hellhounds who delighted in their savage work."

I do not think that any words of mine are required to give emphasis to the commentary which these extracts supply on the episode of Thursday night's debate.

I remain, yours faithfully,

GEORGE WYNDHAM.

House of Commons, S.W., August 9th.

---

(No. 32.)

TRUTH (MR. LABOUCHERE'S VERSION).

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A Meeting held at Lismore resembled in character an ordinary Scotch Political Meeting.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**The Meeting at Lismore in no way resembled an ordinary Scotch Political Meeting.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour ordered such Meeting to be broken up by the Police, and it was broken up.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**Mr. Balfour gave no orders to break up such Meeting, and the Meeting was not, in fact, broken up.**

"MR. GLADSTONE, MR. LABOUCHERE, AND PUBLIC MEETINGS  
IN IRELAND."

("GLASGOW HERALD," November 4th, 1889.)

8, Bloom Park Road, Fulham,

London, S.W.,

November 1st, 1889.

(32a.)

Sir,—I beg to enclose you a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. George Wyndham, M.P., Mr. Balfour's secretary, in reply to one of mine drawing Mr. Balfour's attention to a statement made by Mr. Labouchere on the occasion of his addressing

a meeting at Govanhill, near Glasgow, in October last. The statement was in reference to the right of holding public meetings in Ireland and their suppression by the police, and Mr. Labouchere instanced a case of a meeting being called together for the purpose of congratulating the electors of Elgin, and of the police attending with the intention to suppress same. I wrote therefore to Mr. Balfour drawing his attention to this statement, and he has authorised this reply to be sent. Will you kindly, therefore, insert it in your paper at your earliest convenience, and oblige.

Yours, &c.,

FROWD PHELPS.

(32b.)

“ Chief Secretary’s Office, Dublin Castle,

“ *October 28th, 1889.*

“ Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter in which you enclose an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Labouchere, M.P., at Govanhill. Mr. Labouchere, if correctly reported, was entirely inaccurate in stating that the police insisted that a meeting held to congratulate the electors of Elgin should be broken up. The meeting to which he refers, held at Lismore on the 9th October, was called together by the leading members of the local branch of the National League, a branch which has recently been suppressed in consequence of the prevalence of boycotting within the sphere of its influence. The police attended to ascertain whether the meeting was indeed called together for its ostensible object or to carry on the business of the branch under a specious pretext. There is absolutely no foundation for saying that they broke up the meeting, which, on the contrary, was peacefully conducted to its close in their presence.

“ It does not lie with those who habitually declare that the League flourishes in spite of its suppression to censure the police for taking evidence of the real character of this meeting. For those who now blame their attendance would, in their absence, have been the first to proclaim that they had been successfully outwitted by the League.

“ Yours faithfully,

“ GEORGE WYNDHAM.

“ Frowd Phelps, Esq.”

---

(No. 33.)

### A HANDY GUIDE TO PARNELLITE METHODS.

This letter should be read carefully, for it furnishes some admirable examples of the methods of Mr. Gladstone’s Irish colleagues.

It shows how a Parnellite Member can misrepresent.—How a Parnellite Priest can persecute.—How Irish Magistrates are attacked for doing their duty.—How the Parnellites endeavour to represent British Trades Unionists as being cruel, lawless, and unjust as themselves; and, finally, it shows how, by a slight application of the touchstone of truth these Parnellite lies can be exposed by any man who has patience enough to learn the facts, and courage enough to speak plainly.

“LETTER FROM MR. BALFOUR.”

(“MORNING ADVERTISER,”) *November, 6th, 1889.*

“A Galashiels gentleman recently called Mr. Balfour’s attention to the speech delivered at a Gladstonian meeting at Galashiels by Mr. John O’Connor, M.P. Mr. Balfour, through his secretary, replied as follows:”—

(33a.)

“Chief Secretary’s Office, Dublin Castle,

*November 4th, 1889.*

“Dear Sir,—At Mr. Balfour’s request I will endeavour to supply the comment you ask for, upon a speech recently delivered by Mr. O’Connor, M.P. So many passages in this speech are open to adverse criticism, yet have not arrested your attention, that I cannot do more than touch lightly upon such as you have been good enough to mark. Mr. O’Connor complains that he was prosecuted for making a speech to his constituents. This is true in so far as the speech in question formed an important part of the evidence for the charge preferred against him of taking part in a conspiracy to boycott persons who had rented vacant farms in the neighbourhood. The admitted object of these conspiracies to coerce law-abiding men from following a lawful occupation by branding them as social outlaws, and reducing them to financial ruin. Even if this were all they would be entitled to the protection of the State. Unfortunately other and more cruel penalties than those openly set forth, and, I will even add, those contemplated by the organiser of boycotting conspiracies, too often follow as a result from their illegal action. The unhappy tenant-farmers whom they denounce, held up to execration, and at the same time deprived of all protection from public sympathy, are exposed without a defence to the criminal passions of lawless men. These, therefore, and not the landlords, and the agents, swell the roll of victims in the melancholy records of agrarian crime. Whether Mr. O’Connor’s speech could or could not be construed as an incitement to boycotting can readily be determined from one passage, ‘The word used to be in the past,

agitate! agitate! agitate! The word to-day is boycott! boycott! boycott!' No comparison can be maintained between the strike in the London dockyards and the alleged conspiracies existing in certain districts of Ireland. The lawful objects of the farmers were compassed by lawful means. The dockers entered into a perfectly legal agreement to refuse a part of their own property, namely, their labour. The illegal object of the latter is to retain a part of another's property, namely, his rent and his land. This, again, is compassed by the illegal methods of boycotting and intimidation applied to all who would not join in breaking the law. Secondly, in order to discredit the magistrates before whom they were tried, Mr. O'Connor declares that fifteen of his constituents were charged in the conspiracy, adjudged not guilty, and yet required to give bail. These men were, as a matter of fact, charged, not with conspiracy, but with riot. The magistrate, taking a lenient view of the case, considered the evidence insufficient to sanction the charge, although, in their opinion, it proved that the delinquents had taken part in the disturbances which led to their arrest. They accordingly bound them over to be of good behaviour in pursuance of the ordinary practice usually adopted under similar circumstances in all parts of the United Kingdom. Third, we are told that the evidence against Father O'Dwyer amounted to this—that he and his parishioners were 'nodding' at a fair. Father O'Dwyer was convicted of a gross attempt to boycott a Scotch gentleman, Mr. Brown, for the faithful discharge of his duty as factor to his landlord. Mr. O'Connor's summary of the evidence against the rev. gentleman is chiefly remarkable for its significant omissions. I will supply one. It was sworn at Father O'Dwyer's trial that in a speech to his parishioners he used the following words: 'Now let it be your resolution here to-day that Brown and none of his men will be allowed to work on this farm. There is a law, a rotten law, but are we to abide by the law? Do not go into prison for six months now. The thought has struck me as very likely that at Brown's place there will be a burning or something like that, but I promise you that no woman or child will put a hand to it.' Comment is unnecessary. Fourth, I have dealt with the case of John Fitzgibbon at some length in a letter to another correspondent. His offence was in no way connected with the Clanricarde estate. On the occasion to which Mr. O'Connor refers he refused to serve Mrs. Winn with any article, and pushed her out of his shop. This act, it should be noted, was not an isolated occurrence, but a normal incident in the persecution to which both Winn and his wife were continually subjected owing to the local branch of the National League of which John Fitzgibbon was a leading member. It is sufficient to remark that Fitzgibbon appealed from the decision of the resident magistrates, that the appeal was heard, and that the conviction was upheld by County Court Judge O'Connor Morris—one described by Mr. Shaw Lefevre as one of the fairest on the bench. Mr. O'Connor's speech is a good example of the use to which the advocates of Home Rule turn the

prosecution of Irish M.P.'s and others, by boldly substituting an imaginary charge for the real offence which brought them within the reach of the law. From the criticism, though brief, and, I fear, defective, upon which I have ventured, it will, I hope, be seen that the true origin of those prosecutions must be sought not in any inequality of the laws governing England and Ireland, but in the callous disregard of individual liberty displayed by those illegal associations which exist alone in the latter.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"To Mr. Wm. Lockhart"

### No. 34.

"BLOODY BALFOUR;" A TALE FOR CHILDREN, BY MISS  
HELEN TAYLOR.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Two women were killed by the Police.*

(1.) THE FACT.—**Two women did die of wounds inflicted by the Police.**

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The killing of these women was shameful and cruel.*

(2.) THE FACT.—**The women were wounded by the Police acting in defence of their lives.**

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Their death must be attributed to Mr. Balfour.*

(3.) THE FACT.—**The death of these women cannot be attributed to Mr. Balfour, as he was not in office till five years after the event.**

(4.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The Police who killed the women were armed with a specially designed bayonet.*

(4.) THE FACT.—**The Police were armed with the ordinary Regulation Bayonet.**

(5.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The Police stabbed one woman in a hut.*

(5.) THE FACT.—**The women were not stabbed, but shot.**

NOTE.—The whole set of charges, in their utterly slap-dash carelessness, is thoroughly characteristic of the lady who made them, and of the numerous other lady tourists who are perpetually demonstrating how completely they can avoid learning anything during a three weeks' run in Ireland.

(“TIMES,” *November 27th*, 1889.)

“Mr. George Wyndham, private secretary to Mr. A. J. Balfour, writing to a gentleman at Ramsbottom, says:—”

(34a.)

“Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter in which you enclose a report furnished by a local paper of a lecture delivered by Miss Helen Taylor. You urge that the statements of the lecturer cannot fail, if uncontradicted, to prejudice the Unionist cause by casting reflections upon the administration of the law under Mr. Balfour’s *regime*. I anticipate no such result, for I find, on studying the passage you have marked, that the events there related at length are not to be referred to recent times. The error into which you, and doubtless the rest of her audience, have fallen is, I admit, a very natural one, since Miss Taylor omitted altogether to mention the fact that the two women whose death she deplores met their fate at Belmullet on the 21st of October, 1881. No women have died of wounds inflicted by the police since the present Government came into office. It is, therefore, from a party point of view, wholly unnecessary for me to defend the action of the police on this occasion, since Mr. Gladstone, and those who held office under him, are, in so far as any Government is responsible for the action of its subordinates in this respect, alone concerned. Having, however, a reliable account of the facts before me, I am constrained by common charity to declare that Miss Taylor’s version of the matter is altogether inaccurate. The police were not armed with a new bayonet, ‘sharpened on both sides and at the point.’ They were provided, as might have been expected, with the ordinary regulation weapon. No policeman entered a hut and then stabbed a woman. Both these unfortunate women, as a matter of fact, succumbed to the fire of the police—a serious step, but only, I should add, adopted by the latter as a last resource in order to defend their lives against the repeated assaults of a crowd numbering about 500 persons, armed in part with stones and in part with reaping hooks. The authentic account of this almost-forgotten incident, which I am fortunately able to offer you, will strike most people as the more reasonable, charitable, and probable of the two. It will even, I am disposed to hope, be accepted by some of the advocates of Home Rule—not, I need hardly point out to any one acquainted with their canons of belief, because of its inherent probability, but because its acceptance is necessary in order to exculpate the Government of Mr. Gladstone, and its rejection of no avail to discredit that of Lord Salisbury.”

---

No. 35.

THE TRUE STORY OF WIDOW M'GINLEY.

(1.) THE ALLEGATION.—*The homes of certain tenants were burnt down.*

(1.) THE FACT.—No homes were burnt down on the occasions referred to, and the homes alleged to have been burnt down were not the property of the tenants as stated.

(2.) THE ALLEGATION.—*Mr. Balfour was responsible for the burning.*

(2.) THE FACT.—Mr. Balfour neither was nor could have been responsible for any action such as that alleged even if it had been taken (which it was not) inasmuch as Mr. Balfour was not in office at the time.

(3.) THE ALLEGATION.—*A certain landlord wished to rob the widow M'Ginley of her property and did rob her.*

(3.) THE FACT.—The landlord did not wish to rob Mrs. M'Ginley of her property, nor did he rob her. The widow M'Ginley did however fail to give to the landlord a considerable sum which undoubtedly *did* belong to him.

“MR. BALFOUR AND IRELAND.”

(“STANDARD,” November 28th, 1889.)

“Mr. J. H. Fawcett, Hon Sec. of the Cockermouth Division Liberal Union Association, has received the following letter in reply to a communication :—”

(35a.)

“Irish Office, November 23rd, 1889.

“Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your communication, in which you enclose a letter addressed by Mr. Willmott to the Editor of the *West Cumberland Times*. The writer endeavours to discount the effect evidently produced by a convincing speech of Mr. T. W. Russell, delivered at Maryport, by parading again some of the most time-worn specimens of Home Rule fiction. Let us see what they are worth. I read (1), ‘We do not deny that Mr. Gladstone passed coercive measures; but did he, like Mr. Balfour, apply the torch at Glenbeigh, or paraffin oil, as in Donegal?’ I will not pause

to comment on the bold figure of speech, from which I gather that its author holds the Chief Secretary, for the time being, directly responsible for the action of landlords over whom he has no control; though it is evident enough that no Government can prevent a man from destroying his own property if he chooses to do so. As showing the careless inaccuracy which invariably characterises the framing of such charges, it will be more instructive to point out that in January, 1887, the date of the Glenbeigh evictions, Mr. Balfour did not even hold the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland. In referring to Donegal, Mr. Willmott fares but little better. For, though it is quite true that on the 26th and 27th October the landlord unroofed two houses, and burned a portion of the thatch, to prevent the former tenants, evicted five or six months previously, from retaking possession of property to which they were no longer entitled, the police on the spot had no knowledge of these proceedings. I am not now concerned to defend, or even to discuss, the action of a private individual, who apparently adopted the one remedy left him by the Plan of Campaign. All blame for the destruction of these houses rests, it would seem, upon the authors of that illegal conspiracy, and upon their shoulders alone. What I do wish to emphasise is the degree of contempt displayed by Mr. Willmott for the intelligence of his readers, in asking them to believe that the Government of the day is personally responsible for acts which, whether just or unjust, were not even within the cognisance of its local officers and servants.

“(2) We are told that ‘a poor widow,’ M’Ginley, offered to pay her rent, and that her offer was refused, because her landlord wished to rob her of her own property. Even this account of the matter, imperfect and misleading as it is, implies, and correctly, that Mrs. M’Ginley had lost all title to the holding, which, in the eye of the law, now reverted to the landlord, and belonged to him exclusively and alone. Does Mr. Willmott, then, wish the Government to deprive the landlord of his property, and to defeat the provisions of the laws they hold office to administer without respect of persons? Unless he desires this, his remarks are altogether irrelevant. Assuming that he does wish to see this, and that a Government could be found mad enough to decide whether the legal rights of landlord and tenant should be enforced or not, according to their private estimate of the moral qualities of the two parties, what leads him to select the case of Mrs. M’Ginley as typical of those in which a just Government should be generous at other people’s expense? Mrs. M’Ginley held a good farm of forty-seven acres, for which she paid a rent of £3 2s. On the other hand, she received a rent of £15 a year for a house on her farm let as a police barracks. Yet, in spite of this comfortable balance in her favour, she deliberately refused to pay any rent for three years, and forced her landlord, in self-defence, to take proceedings against her. The assertion that the landlord was prompted by a desire to possess himself of her improvements is, I believe, a baseless calumny, refuted, if by

nothing else, by the fact that negotiations are still pending which may end in the long-suffering owner allowing his refractory tenant yet another chance.

"With the justification of the landlord, however, we have nothing to do, for it is the Government whom Mr. Willmott, oddly enough, chooses to arraign. They, and not the landlord, stand upon their trial. The issue, since this is so, cannot, I think, be doubted, for the suggestion that the Government of the country should interfere in a case of this kind to deprive a landlord of his property need only be stated to be rejected by all reasonable men.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM."

### No. 36.

#### A TYPICAL GLADSTONIAN.

This letter furnishes a good example of the kind of fraud which it has been the work of the Parnellites to promote and reward during the past ten years.

"AN IRISH TENANT."

("TIMES," *December 6th*, 1889.)

"Writing on behalf of Mr. Balfour to Mr. W. E. Bannister, of Hyde, Cheshire, Mr. George Wyndham, M.P., recounts a somewhat remarkable circumstance in connection with the position and circumstances of a tenant on Lord Kenmare's estate, who declined to pay his rent on the plea of poverty:—

(36a.)

"Irish Office, *November 28th*, 1889.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 22nd inst., I beg to inform you that I have made careful enquiries into the case of Mahony, a tenant on Lord Kenmare's estate. I find that, so far from exaggerating the scope of this incident, you somewhat understate the case. The full particulars were as follows:—The estate bailiffs visited the house of Mahony, a tenant who owed £30 rent and arrears. They seized his cows, and then called at his home to ask him if he would redeem

them by paying the debt. Mahony stated that he was willing to pay, but that he had only £7 altogether. He handed seven notes to the bailiff, who found that one of them was a £5 note, so that the amount was £11 instead of £7. On being pressed to pay the balance he admitted that he had a small deposit of £20 in the bank, and produced a document which he said was the deposit receipt for this sum. On the bailiff examining this receipt he found it was for £100, and not for £20. On being informed of his mistake, Mahony took back the £100 receipt and produced another, which turned out to be for £40. A further search on his part led to the production of the receipt for £20, with which and £10 in notes he paid the rent. You will observe that this tenant, refusing to pay £30, and obliging his landlord to take steps against him, possessed at the time £171, besides having stock on his land.

“Yours faithfully,

“GEORGE WYNDHAM.”

---

### No. 37.

#### SIR CHARLES RUSSELL'S UNLUCKY BLUNDER.

This letter is interesting as showing the way in which Parnellite speakers endeavour to support their case by sheer downright misrepresentation of their opponents. They calculate that they will not be found out and exposed once in a hundred times, and that on the ninety-nine occasions in which they escape detection and exposure they will have succeeded in producing the impression they desired.

In this case it will be seen that Mr. Balfour made a speech in which he especially directed attention to the false statements so often made by the Gladstonians, to the effect that the Crimes Act interfered with combinations in Ireland, which the law could not touch in England. He went so far as to speak of the statement as a “shameful accusation.”

And yet it is this very speech which Sir Charles Russell picks out as furnishing a proof that, in Mr. Balfour's opinion, there was one law on the subject in England and another in Ireland. The process by which a clever and clear-headed man like Sir Charles Russell so confused his mind as to directly misrepresent the plain words of a political opponent may be studied in the letter.

"MR. BALFOUR AND SIR CHARLES RUSSELL."

("MORNING ADVERTISER" AND "MANCHESTER COURIER,"  
*December, 12th, 1889.*)

"An Ipswich correspondent has received the following letter from Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P.:—

(37a.)

"Irish Office, *December 3rd, 1889.*

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter of November 19th, inviting his attention to a speech made by Sir Charles Russell at Ipswich on the 10th, in which he challenges more than one of the contentions put forward by the Chief Secretary in an address previously delivered in the same hall.

"(1.) Sir Charles Russell refers to Mr. Balfour's 'extraordinary admission' that the rights of Englishmen to deal with whom they please are not the rights of Irishmen, and asks 'what becomes in the face of it of the statement, that there is no exceptional law in relation to Ireland.' He proceeds then to assert that 'this admission cuts the ground from under' the Liberal Unionists, because they see in their policy 'the application of equal laws between the two countries.' In this passage, upon which no two interpretations can be placed, Sir Charles Russell gives his audience clearly to understand that Mr. Balfour's admission referred to the enforcement of the law against criminal conspiracies. He leads them to believe that the Chief Secretary endorses the view sedulously propagated by Mr. Gladstone and his lieutenants that the Crimes Act interferes in Ireland with combinations which in England are allowed to exist unmolested. And this he does although in the very speech against which his criticism is directed Mr. Balfour branded this charge as a 'shameful accusation.' Nor is this all. For assuming that Sir Charles Russell bestowed so little attention on the arguments he undertook to refute, as to miss altogether their general drift, the astonishing fact remains that he overlooked the immediate context of 'the admission' on which he laid such especial emphasis. Mr. Balfour's words, as reported in the *Times* of November 13th, are as follows:—

"'There are the rights of Englishmen in respect of exclusive dealing; they are not the rights of Irishmen. I grant it. Who prevents their being the rights of Irishmen except the very men who in his speech Mr. Gladstone told you were doing more than anyone else to put down crime in Ireland? Who prevents it but the Nationalist members of Parliament, and those whom they represent?'

"The carelessness imported by Sir Charles Russell into his review of Mr. Balfour's contention concerns chiefly himself and the audience whose time he wasted in expatiating on an expression of opinion to which the latter never gave utterance. The point worthy of our notice

is, that excepting this astonishing attempt to bring the Chief Secretary over to his side, he relied, to prove the alleged inequality in the laws governing Ireland and England, mainly upon general assertion that combinations are punished in the one which in the other are tolerated by the law. Since many of the highest legal authorities have pronounced an opposite opinion, and Sir Charles Russell adduces no facts to shake our confidence in their judgments, we may, I think, await the further development of this argument with equanimity; gratified, no doubt, and encouraged by the thought that the weakness of his case drives him to seek support and confirmation even in the public speeches of the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

"In the next passage to which you refer, Sir Charles Russell has oddly enough again missed Mr. Balfour's meaning. I read, 'that reference to Kerry is a very unhappy one for Mr. Balfour . . . though he was dilating upon this (the suppression of serious crime) in connection with his attack upon the Land League. Anyone who knows anything about Ireland knows that in Kerry the Land League was less powerful than in any part of Ireland.' Mr. Balfour did not dwell on the suppression of serious crime in Kerry in this connexion. In this passage of his speech neither the Land League nor even the National League were so much as mentioned. He undertook to disprove Mr. Gladstone's assertion that the Crimes Act had been directed against combination, and had left other species of crime untouched, and he did disprove it by pointing out that 'since the Crimes Act was passed in the county Kerry alone there have been brought to justice by its means the criminals in the cases of four separate murders and six separate murderous attacks.' Had Mr. Balfour attributed these crimes to the influence of the Land League, Sir Charles Russell's argument would, whatever its worth, have been relevant; as it is, it does not even meet Mr. Balfour's conclusive proof that the Act had been efficient in procuring the punishment of serious crime. It is difficult to understand how Mr. Balfour's critic came to confuse so simple an issue. For after dealing with the detection of crime by means of the Crimes Act, and before entering on his justification of prosecutions directed against suppressed branches of the league, Mr. Balfour said in so many words that he 'did not propose further at that moment to dwell upon' the one, but would 'pass' to consideration of the other.

"Here, because the supposed weakness of the League in Kerry, and consequent prevalence of crime, is a part of the regular stock-in-trade of Irish controversy, we actually find an eminent speaker stepping by force of habit into an old track, albeit it leads him away from the issue he had set himself to meet. It is a really amusing illustration of the effects produced in able politicians by the sad task their Irish colleagues impose; of repeating again and yet again the stale arguments and exploded fictions that have done service now for three years.

"Yours faithfully,

(Signed) "GEORGE WYNDHAM."

## MR. REDMOND'S FACTS.

This letter is interesting and important as dealing with one of the commonest and most baseless of the Parnellite myths—that which relates to Press prosecutions.

It will be seen that Mr. Redmond, M.P., departing from the ordinary Gladstonian practice, not only makes a statement, but endeavours to prove it. The statement which he makes is that a number of "Newspaper Editors in Ireland have been sent to prison as common criminals for inserting matters of simple news in their journals, and that not one of these gentlemen committed the slightest crime." The subjoined letter will show the value of Mr. Redmond's assertions. Once more it must be remembered that the charge which is here made and refuted is part of the regular stock-in-trade of Gladstonian accusations. In no case does it rest upon a stronger basis of truth than that supplied by Mr. Redmond; it could not rest upon a weaker.

"MR. BALFOUR AND IRISH PRESS PROSECUTIONS."

("THE TIMES," *January 30th*, 1890.)

"The *Preston Herald* to-day publishes the following letter which Mr. Balfour has caused to be addressed to Mr. T. C. Smith, F.R. Hist. S., Longridge, near Preston:—

(38a.)

"Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle, Jan. 24.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your communication of the 18th inst., in which you enclose a letter by Mr. William Redmond, M.P., published in the *Daily News* of the 17th.

"Mr. Redmond deals with 'Irish Press Prosecutions,' and certainly the subject is one of great interest. In his letter he gives a comprehensive list of newspaper editors 'sent to prison,' so he tells us, 'as common criminals for inserting matters of simple news in their journals.' Elsewhere he alleges that 'not one of these gentlemen committed the slightest crime.'

"In order to test Mr. Redmond's assertion I will take but one of his cases and confine myself to its examination. In this way only can I hope to probe within the limits of a letter the mass of misrepresenta-

tion piled around this subject by the opponents of the Government. Nor will anything be lost by restricting the scope of my comment. For the detailed examination of a single case will not only disprove Mr. Redmond's sweeping assertion, but will also illustrate the action of the Government in every prosecution of the kind, since in instituting all these proceedings they have been guided by a single principle. No person connected with the Press has, during the present administration, been proceeded against, even though they may have broken the law, unless by their illegal conduct they interfered with the civil rights of persons entitled to protection by the law.

"The case I select is that of Mr. M'Inery, editor of the *Limerick Leader*. He was prosecuted for publishing in his paper two articles, in the first of which, under the heading 'On the Pillory,' the following passage occurs!—

"'There is only one man in the country who openly defies the people's organization. This Bombastes Furioso is Mr. Michael Ryan. It is a shame to admit, but it is nevertheless true, that this individual has been able to trade with impunity in the county and city of Limerick.'

"In the second article, under the heading 'The Trial of the Grabber,' I read:—'A word as regards the future is now all that is required. It is stated the people in Ryan's district are not so active as they ought to be. If this be so, we hope the same story will not obtain in a week's time.'

"In the first paragraph a law-abiding man is held up by name to execration. In the second his neighbours are incited to persecute him. From both it plainly appears that in the absence of such incitation his neighbours are ready to let him live in peace. Can it be pretended that the editor merely 'inserted matters of simple news,' or that the Government had any course open to them other than to prosecute him for 'unlawful intimidation?' Why should one man guilty of intimidation escape the punishment of his crime because he chooses to commit it through the medium of the Press, whilst another, guilty of libel, rather aggravates than condones his offence by publishing his libel in a newspaper?

"I have designedly selected this case because it makes it perfectly plain that intimidation through the Press is upon all fours with intimidation exercised in other ways—that it exists for the same objects and inflicts the same wrongs. The persecution of this man Ryan dates from 1886, when he took a farm from which another man had been evicted. But it has not been continuous. On the contrary, it has shown a constant tendency to flag except when promoted from outside. In 1888 Mr. David Sheehy, M.P., Mr. Finucane, M.P., and Mr. Moran addressed a meeting at Ballyneety, convened for the sole object of lashing Ryan's apathetic neighbours into a sufficiently hostile attitude towards him. For this charitable office the three speakers were convicted and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. They appealed, and the convictions were upheld in every case by an irremovable Judge, who

laid down that to 'prevent persons from taking or occupying farms from which other persons had been evicted for non-payment of rent was an offence at common law ;' he also asserted that the speech delivered by Mr. Moran to effect this object was 'of a character that would sustain an indictment for incitement to assassination.' As a result of these convictions Ryan lived in peace until the *Limerick Leader* was started.

"In the face of these facts the public are invited by Mr. Redmond to judge and condemn the Government for prosecuting the editor of that journal. In forming their judgment they have only one question to decide, whether it is to be borne that any man should presume upon their affection for a free Press in order to commit with impunity a cruel offence against a fellow-citizen for which others have received condign punishment.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"T. C. Smith, Esq."

---

(No. 39.)

THE ART OF LYING BY THE SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH.

This letter furnishes a useful example of the Gladstonian practice of suppressing half the truth, and thereby conveying an impression which is totally false. The *allegation* is that for "booing" Mr. Balfour certain persons were sent to prison. The *fact* is that certain persons who were sent to prison for breaking the law, and on trial were found guilty of having done so, did also "boo" Mr. Balfour and cheer Mr. Parnell. The Gladstonians suppress the former fact and dwell on the latter, thereby creating an impression which is absolutely false.

"BOOING" AT MR. BALFOUR.

"Mr. George Wyndham, M.P., has directed the following letter to Mr. W. Pollitt, secretary of the Higher Ardwick Conservative Club :—

Irish Office, December 11, 1889.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Balfour has desired me to reply to your letter in which you ask whether, 'it is true that during the last two years no less than five persons have been put in the lock-up in Ireland for booing at the police, or groaning for Mr. Balfour.'

"The general assertion that persons have been imprisoned for conduct of this kind has frequently been made, and as frequently

contradicted. Whenever the names of the supposed sufferers have been given a detailed and particular refutation has invariably been supplied. Where, however, as in this instance, the names are withheld, it is impossible to do more than point out that 'booing Mr. Balfour,' or 'groaning the police,' are not indictable offences, and cannot, therefore, have constituted the crime for which any person has been imprisoned.

"Politicians who prefer this charge rely, apparently, upon the undoubted fact that persons engaged in breaking the law in Ireland are prone to cheer for the leaders of the Parnellite party, and to express their dislike for Mr. Balfour and the police. Under these circumstances they are, of course, punished for breaking the law, and not for giving vent to political sympathies and antipathies, the connection of which with law-breaking is, I understand, purely accidental.

"Even those who in England most heartily re-echo such expressions of approval and dissent must see that, in the interests of the community, rioters and disorderly persons have to be punished, whether they select one politician or another for public censure or praise. It is clear surely to all, that if offenders are to give a political complexion to their conduct merely by 'booing' or 'cheering,' every one with a voice possesses a sovereign palladium against the arm of the law.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"William Pollitt, Esq."

### (No. 40.)

#### M'GINLEY'S PIG.

The untruth which was exposed in this letter has for a long time been going the round of Gladstonian platforms, and is still, in all probability, current in many quarters. For it is the peculiarity of a lie of this kind that it dies hard. It is much the same class of story as Mr. Gladstone's well known tale of Mitchelstown.

(*"TIMES," March 15th, 1890.*)

"Mr. Balfour, through his secretary, Mr. G. Wyndham, has forwarded to Mr. Stewart, of Bollington, Cheshire, the following reply to a communication inquiring into the truth of an assertion that a man named M'Ginley had been sent to gaol for winking at a pig:—

(40a.)

"House of Commons, March 11, 1890.

"My dear Sir,—I am obliged to you for the opportunity afforded by your letter of commenting on one at any rate of the absurd versions of the case of Edward M'Ginley, so many of which, some in verse and

some in prose, are now going the round of Separatist journals. It is stated that M'Ginley was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, and sometimes even that he is now suffering that penalty, for having exercised intimidation towards pig-buyers, the sole evidence adduced in support of the charge being that he winked at a pig.

"The facts are as follows :—M'Ginley was prosecuted at the instance of one Charles Gallagher, who, as a result of the defendant's action, was unable to find any purchaser for his pig. This witness swore that, having paid his rent on the Olphert estate in January, he had in consequence been boycotted, and that at a certain fair he saw M'Ginley talking to buyers, to such effect that no offer was made to him in the course of the day. Neal Gallagher, a son of the last witness, swore that he heard M'Ginley tell five separate buyers not to buy his father's pig, and that he saw him accost every buyer in the fair. Upon cross-examination, conducted by the solicitor for the defence, witness stated that M'Ginley pointed out the pig to one of the buyers by winking and nodding his head towards it. The Court held that the evidence of intimidation was insufficient, and dismissed the charge. As the defendant had undoubtedly interfered with the sale of Gallagher's pig, they required him to give bail to be of good behaviour. This he did at once, and left the Court.

"The case is well worthy of note, for it is typical of the kind of misrepresentation to which resort is made by those who desire to keep up this organised intimidation of unfortunate Irish farmers and cattle dealers, without outraging too far the public opinion of this country. Here one statement made upon cross-examination is selected and put forward as the sole evidence of the charge against the accused. The whole of the examination-in-chief is suppressed; no reference is made to the somewhat important fact that the accused was acquitted, it being even sometimes asserted that he was condemned. The public are not told that the evidence was tendered not by the police, but by the injured party, and they are deliberately led to believe that such proceedings are confined to Ireland, although two men, Fitzgerald and Bellew, were tried and convicted before a Liverpool jury for a similar offence only a few weeks ago. Those who read the simple recital of this case may wonder why they are invited by speakers and journalists to be vastly amused at Gallagher's failure to sell his pig, a failure which, after all, meant ruin to him. The explanation is not far to seek. By the suppression of truth, the suggestion of falsehood, and actual misstatement of fact, those apostles of intimidation seek in England to give a harmless and, if possible, a ludicrous complexion to the cruel tyranny of their disciples, in the hope that the empty laughter they excite may drown the suffering cries of their victims in Ireland.

"Yours faithfully,

"GEO. WYNDHAM."

# INDEX.



	PAGE
Austin, M.P., Mr., his Eight Little Errors ... ..	67
Balfour, Mr., and Mr. Morley ... ..	18
,, Groanings at ... ..	22
,, on Irish "Patriots" and "Martyrs" ... ..	29
,, a Home Ruler ... ..	65
,, and the Irish Constabulary ... ..	73
,, Booming for ... ..	98
Balfourian Barbarities ... ..	34
Ballyhaunis, Riot at ... ..	33
Ballinasloe, Evidence of Inhabitants ... ..	22
Ballad, Imprisonment for Singing ... ..	66
Barrett, Paddy ... ..	32
Bible, Harrington's ... ..	66
Blacksmith, Imprisonment of ... ..	69
Bloody Balfour, A Tale for Children, by Miss Helen Taylor ... ..	88
Blunt, Wilfrid, Riot on Arrival at Galway ... ..	18
Bonfire, Imprisonment for Lighting ... ..	40
Boycotting, Baron Dowse's Opinion ... ..	36
Brand, Captain, Speech of ... ..	10
Bryce, M.P., Mr., Speech of ... ..	39
Burke, Thos., Imprisonment of ... ..	59
Callagher, Charles, Boycotting of ... ..	99
Callaran, John, Imprisonment of ... ..	39
Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., Mr., Statement of ... ..	13
,, ,, ,, Letter of ... ..	15
Carew, M.P., Mr., Sad Tale of ... ..	80
,, ,, Imprisonment of ... ..	80
Charges against Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan ... ..	13
Cheering Mr. Gladstone ... ..	10, 22, 24, 40
Children, Imprisonment of ... ..	22, 25, 32
Conboy, Anne, Imprisonment of ... ..	70
Conboy, Patrick, Charge against ... ..	25
Conroy, Patrick, Case of ... ..	12
Constable, Resignation of ... ..	42
Constabulary, Irish, Mr. Balfour and ... ..	73
Confiscation of Improvements ... ..	11
Corben, J., Letter of ... ..	35
Corcoran, Imprisonment of ... ..	19, 31
Crimes Act Prisoners ... ..	37
Crimes Act, Working of, in Kerry ... ..	95

	PAGE
Devereux, Michael, Imprisonment of ... ..	69
Dowse, Baron, on Boycotting ... ..	36
Draycott, Speech of Sir Walter Foster, at ... ..	58
Drudy, Honoria, Prosecution of ... ..	33
Dublin Castle and Resident Magistrates ... ..	12
Ellis, Revd. J., Romance by ... ..	27
Ennis Meeting, Proclamation of ... ..	52, 54, 56
Evicted Tenants' Claim for Compensation ... ..	11
Evictions, Facts and Fallacies about ... ..	43
"    Woodford ... ..	43
"    Statistics of Reply to Sir J. Pease ... ..	48
Exceptional Law in Ireland ... ..	94
Fahy, John, Eviction of ... ..	44
Ferriter, — Imprisonment of ... ..	41
Finucane, M.P., Imprisonment of ... ..	71
Foster, M.P., Sir Walter, Speech at Draycott ... ..	58
Gladstone, Mr., Cheering ... ..	10, 22
"    Method of Attack ... ..	33
"    Imprisonment for Cheering ... ..	68
"    Mr. Herbert ... ..	74
Galway, Wilfrid Blunt Riot ... ..	18, 21, 29
Girls, Imprisonment of ... ..	23
Goschen, Mr., Mobbing of Carriage ... ..	22
Green, E. J., Letter of ... ..	24
Griffin, Little Minnie ... ..	47
Groaning at Mr. Balfour ... ..	22
"    "    "    Imprisonment for ... ..	59
Hartington, Lord, Speech at Ipswich ... ..	21
Harrington, E., Imprisonment of ... ..	39
Harrington's Bible ... ..	66
Harrington's Food and Clothing ... ..	76
Hastings, Speech of Mr. Campbell-Bannerman at ... ..	16
Hebberts, J. T., M.P., Mistake ... ..	37
Home Rule Union Van, Lecture of ... ..	42
Hunt, Bridget, Case of ... ..	23, 32
"    "    Imprisonment of ... ..	70
Infant Prisoner ... ..	32, 79
Judges, Testimony of, respecting Co. Mayo ... ..	27
Kelly, John, Imprisonment of ... ..	69
Kerry, Working of the Crimes Act in ... ..	95
Kidsgrove, Speech of Mr. Leveson-Gower at ... ..	24
Legends of Mr. Waddy examined ... ..	60
Leveson-Gower, Mr., distinguishes himself ... ..	22
Limerick, Riot at ... ..	27
Limerick Leader, Prosecution of Editor of ... ..	97
Lismore, Truth about Meeting at ... ..	84

	PAGE
Mahoney—Tenant of Lord Kenmare—True Story of ...	92
Maloney, Martin, Imprisonment of ...	69
Mandeville, Mr., Prison Treatment of ...	38
Marjoribanks, M.P., Mr., hoaxed ...	64
Matches, Prosecution for refusing to sell ...	40
Mayo, condition of ...	27, 28
McFadden, Father, Imprisonment of ...	31
McGinley's Pig ...	99
McGinley, True Story of Widow ...	90
McInery, Editor of Limerick Leader, Prosecution of ...	97
McPhilpin, John, Imprisonment of ...	39
Meeting at Ennis, Proclamation of ...	52, 54, 56
M.P.'s, Prison Treatment of ...	34
Misrepresentation by a Parnellite M.P. ...	86
Morley, Mr., Allegations of ...	18
Murray, Patrick, R.I.C. ...	42
Myth of the Infant Prisoner ...	32
Newsboys, Imprisonment of ...	53, 55, 58
Newspapers, Prosecution for Sale of ...	34, 39, 53, 54, 56
Noble, Mr. Wilson, Letter of ...	15
North British "Daily Mail," Article in ...	29
O'Brien, Judge, Charge of, at Ennis ...	68
O'Dwyer, Speech of Father ...	87
O'Rourke, Thomas, Imprisonment of ...	53, 55
Oxford, Speech of Mr. Morley at ...	18
"Pall Mall Gazette," Statement in ...	11
Parnellite Lie Exposed ...	77
Parnellite Methods, Handy Guide to ...	85
Patriots and Martyrs ...	29
Pease, M.P., Sir Joseph ...	48
Persecution by Parnellite Priest ...	86
Petroleum, Use of, at Evictions ...	75
Plan of Campaign, never used against good Landlords ...	35
"    "    Morality of ...	35
Plunkett, Captain, Telegram from ...	9
Political Prisoners, Treatment of ...	37
Press Prosecutions ...	52, 54, 56, 96
Prison Rules, Irish ...	33, 35
Prison Treatment of M.P.'s ...	35
Redmond, M.P., Facts of ...	96
Resident Magistrates and Dublin Castle ...	12
Riots, Ballyhaunis ...	18
"    Galway ...	
"    Limerick ...	46
"    Woodford ...	
Roche, Mr. C., Epithets applied to in "Kerry Sentinel" ...	83, 84
"    Refusal to Subscribe to Kerry Races ...	82
Romance by Revd. J. Ellis ...	27
Russell, Sir C., Unlucky Blunder of... ..	93
Ryan, Mr. Michael ...	97

	PAGE
Schoolboys, Imprisonment of ... ..	69
Sheehy, Mr., Evidence against ... ..	19
Speeches referred to—	
Captain Brand ... ..	10
Father O'Dwyer ... ..	87
Lord Hartington ... ..	21
Mr. Campbell-Bannerman ... ..	13, 18
Mr. Leveson-Gower ... ..	24
Mr. Morley ... ..	18, 21
Sir Walter Foster ... ..	58
Spencer, Lord, Charges against ... ..	13
" Sentences under Administration of ... ..	38
Stanhope, M.P., Mr. Philip ... ..	51
Strike in London Dockyards and Boycotting ... ..	87
Sullivan, Timothy, Imprisonment of ... ..	31, 53
Taylor, Miss Helen, Misrepresentations by ... ..	88
Telegram, Captain Plunkett's ... ..	9
Tighe, Ellen, Case of ... ..	23
Tighe, Ellen, Imprisonment of ... ..	71
Town Commissioners, Charge against ... ..	18
Trevelyan, Sir George, Charges against ... ..	13
Trow, Mr., Description of Evictions ... ..	44
Tulley, "Dr.", Eviction of ... ..	45
Turner, Colonel, Epithets applied to in "Kerry Sentinel" ... ..	83, 84
" Refusal to Subscribe to Kerry Races ... ..	82
Type-setter, Imprisonment of ... ..	77
Waddy, Samuel Danks, Q.C., M.P., Legends of ... ..	60
Walsh, Edward, Imprisonment of ... ..	39
Women, Stabbing of by Police ... ..	88
" Prosecution of ... ..	22, 23, 25
Woodford Evictions ... ..	44
" Riots ... ..	46