

modern, and very many of the greatest virtuosi of the day, were for the first time introduced to English amateurs. Mr. Ella, it may be incidentally mentioned, also invented the analytical programmes which have ever since played so important a part in concert rooms. The Musical Union ceased to exist in 1858-59, when the Monday Popular Concerts were started on the basis of good music at cheap prices. The first performance took place in February, 1859, being devoted exclusively to the works of Mendelssohn. In 1865 the Saturday Afternoon Concerts were added to those given on Monday evening. Like a mighty tree the Monday Popular Concerts have thrown out shoots more or less vigorous, which in the form of annual concerts and series of concerts come round every season. The educational impetus given to music in England was largely due to the late Mr. John Hullah, who, in his private and later on in his official capacity as Government Inspector of Schools, did excellent service in diffusing elementary knowledge among all classes. In 1841 he started at Exeter Hall classes for the instruction of schoolmasters, and from that modest beginning the vast development of musical training in elementary English schools has taken place. Among the great music schools of England only the Royal Academy existed prior to the accession of Her Majesty, having been founded in 1823. As far as outward prosperity and the number of its pupils are concerned, the Academy has never been in better condition than at present. It cannot, however, be said to be conducted exactly in accordance with the spirit of the age. That spirit on the other hand is in two different ways represented by two younger institutions, the Royal College of Music, over which Sir George Grove presides, and the Guildhall School of Music, ably directed by Mr. Weist Hill.

It is curious to observe the comparatively inferior position which the tendency of dramatic music, properly so called, occupies at all these schools, and the small number of vocalists at all equal to Mr. Sims Reeves, Madame Patey, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Santley, which in consequence they have supplied to the stage.

The place of the deceased Sacred Harmonic Society has been taken by numerous choral bodies, amongst which the excellent choir conducted by Mr. Barnby must be mentioned. On the other hand, the largest city in the world is able to support an English opera only during one month, or at most six weeks, of the year. For the last decade or more the cause of English opera has rested entirely upon the shoulders of Mr. Carl Rosa, a veritable Atlas, who has borne the heavy burden to the satisfaction of innumerable audiences in London and the provinces. Mr. Rosa at the beginning had not only to get his singers where he could find them in America and England, but he had also to create a repertoire for them. That repertoire is of course not limited to works of English growth, but it includes a considerable portion of them, Mr. Cowen's "Pauline," Mr. Goring Thomas's "Esmeralda" and "Nadeshda," Mr. C. V. Stanford's "The Canterbury Pilgrims," Mr. Mackenzie's "Colombe" and "The Troubadour," and quite recently Mr. Cordor's "Nordesa." The veteran composers, Mr. John Burnet, Mr. Charles Salamar and Sir George Macfarren are still alive; Mr. Henry Leslie, Mr. Barnby and Mr. Cusins are well reputed both as composers and conductors. Among the younger men, Mr. John Francis Burnet, Mr. Wingham, Mr. Stanford, Mr. Hubert Perry, Mr. G. H. Lloyd, Mr. Cowen, more successful as a writer of symphonies than as a dramatic composer, Mr. Goring Thomas, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Cordor and Sir Arthur Sullivan, so far as outward success is concerned, may be referred to as by a long way the first of English composers.

### HAS IRELAND A GRIEVANCE?

A GREAT number of persons in the United States of America have been expressing opinions on the Home Rule Question in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. These opinions have been in favour of Home Rule, very often with vehement censure of those who oppose it. I will say nothing as to the propriety of this, nor of the decency of governing bodies in the States joining in it. All I will say is, that it would be as well for them to know the truth of what they are talking about. That they may have an opportunity of doing so, I write this paper. And as I am going to state matters of fact it is right I should say who I, the witness, am. I am an Englishman, *pur sang*, if there is such a being. I have no land in Ireland, nor interest in it or against it, save as I have in relation to Yorkshire, or any other part of the United Kingdom, its prosperity concerning me as much as that of Kent. I have been a lawyer and judge, with, I believe, a fair character, and am now retired.

So much for the witness, now for his facts. Ireland is part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The other part is Great Britain. There are some small islands, and there are the Colonies and India. The legislative bodies are the Queen, the House of Peers, and the House of Commons. The House of Commons is elected by voters in Great Britain and in Ireland. The population of Ireland is between one-sixth and one-seventh of the population of Great Britain and Ireland. The qualification of the voters is the same in all parts of the United Kingdom. The number of members returned by Ireland is somewhat larger than it would be if in proportion to its population. It is much larger than in proportion to its wealth. It is very much larger than in proportion to its taxation—its contribution to the fund of the United Kingdom of which it is part. Of course, the representatives of other parts of the Kingdom being over five times the number from Ireland, if they take one view and the Irish another the Irish are outvoted. So are the members for Yorkshire or Scotland, if they take one view and the other members another. So, I suppose, New York or Massachusetts might be outvoted if all the other States differed from either of them, but no one talks of tyranny

because such a thing may happen. It might happen that Ireland should be unanimous and outvoted. It is possible, as a matter of fact, but it never has happened and never will. England and Scotland have no interests opposed to those of Ireland. Their interest is in Ireland's prosperity as much as in that of any other part of the United Kingdom. To justify separation on the ground of a possible minority being obliged to give way to the majority would make the existence of a state impossible. Every county would be justified in seceding from the others; every parish in the county from every other; and, for aught I can see, every house from its neighbour. This is not a mere general argument; it is actually and practically true of Great Britain and Ireland. No one, not Mr. Gladstone, or Mr. Parnell, or any American dynamiter, says that England and Scotland have anything to gain by the misgovernment of Ireland, or wish anything but its prosperity. Except, then, as the whole of a state governs every part of it, England does not govern Ireland save as Ireland governs England, i.e., as part of the United Kingdom. Irish members have turned the scale. Their junction with the Liberals turned the last Conservative Ministry before the present out of office.

That Ireland is in no sense oppressed by the rest of the United Kingdom is beyond doubt. As I have said, it has a slight excess of representatives. Its taxation is less per head of its population than that of any other part of the kingdom. Some taxes levied on the other parts it is entirely free from. In a speech delivered at Aberdeen in 1871, Mr. Gladstone said:

"What are the inequalities of England and Ireland? I declare that I know none, except that there are certain taxes still remaining which are levied over Englishmen and Scotchmen which are not levied over Irishmen; and likewise that there are certain purposes for which money is freely and largely given in Ireland, and for which it is not given in England or Scotland."\*

Positively strange as it may seem, the Home Rulers make no complaint except as to the land, and of that I shall have something to say presently. When Mr. Gladstone brought forward his unhappy scheme he could not say there was any wrong to be redressed. All he could and did say was, that legislation did not come to Ireland "in an Irish garb." It seems incredible, but it is true. We hear a vapouring talk about Ireland as a nation, and a parliament on College Green, and Ireland for the Irish, but when they had got it they do not say what they would do with it; what wrong they would redress; what bad law they would get rid of; what good law they would make. Nor is the equality of British and Irish limited to legislative power. The Irish, in proportion to their numbers, hold as high offices in the state, army, navy, and church, as Englishmen.

Now as to the land. As to that, it is very certain what would be done by an Irish Parliament. The present owners of land would be deprived of their property, which would be given to the present occupiers. Observe, it would not be an adoption of Mr. George's scheme. The land would not be nationalised. Rent would not be received for the benefit of the community or state. The present tenants would remain in possession rent free. The owners would be plundered of their property. The man who had invested his money in buying a bit of land would be made a beggar. Do the Americans approve of this? Do they think it right? Do they think nothing can be stolen except what the thief can walk away with? This will probably be denied, and it will be said that the Irish only wish to get rid of excessive rents, and that if fair they are willing to pay them. They may, indeed, pretend to think so now, but the result would be as I have stated. Mr. Davitt, one of the Home Rule leaders, said that the landlords should have no rent except on the prairie value of the land. And so strongly did Mr. Gladstone feel this, that when he brought in his Home Rule bills he proposed that Parliament should find, at first, £150,000,000 to buy out the landlords. But it may be said that the landlords do exact excessive rents. I deny it, not on my own knowledge, but on the authority of Mr. Gladstone himself. He has stated that as a body they had behaved well, though there might be exceptions. But further, laws, exceptional laws, have been passed to prevent the possibility of injustice. The tenant cannot be disturbed in his holding if he pays his rent. The rent is fixed at a fair rate by a tribunal appointed on purpose. Owing to the fall in the price of farm produce distress has fallen on some farmers, and Parliament is now engaged in devising measures for their relief. It has been said, and is the truth, that nowhere in the world are the land laws so favourable to the occupier as in Ireland. An Englishman said he dare not explain the Irish law to a meeting of farmers in England for fear they should demand the same law for themselves.

It may be asked, Why, if this is so, is there that distress which undoubtedly exists in parts of Ireland? The cause is, that there is no industry in Ireland save the cultivation of the land, and the land will not support those who cultivate it. The north-east and east parts of Ireland can live, and live fairly well; but the miserable holdings of an acre or two in the west and south-west will not support their occupiers if given to them rent free. Let me put it to the good sense of my readers. Here are five men cultivating two acres each. One of them could cultivate the whole ten, but now each man works one-fifth of his time and wastes the rest. Is it possible that there should not be distress? In one of the last returns there was a statement of a man paying a rent of twenty-two shillings for his holding. Ten shillings and sixpence were taken off. What does this come to? A little over a farthing a day! Has rent anything to do with this man's case? He is relieved of one farthing, and still liable for the other. Some years ago the case was different. These men, these farmers, went, in harvest-time, to England and earned wages which enabled them to live for the rest of the year in a sort of idleness in Ireland. But owing

\* London Times, September 27, 1871.