Ireland being given Home Rule, he would cease his agitation, Sir Edward Carson declined to bind himself. On the contrary, he went on to say that neither one nor twenty Parliaments would have the right to force Ulster out of the Union. We think this admission fairly gives away the whole anti-Home Rule agitation. Ulster is not being driven out of the Union. Under local Home Rule she will be as much in the Union as she is to-day; in fact, more so, for the rest of Ulster and the other three provinces will then be upon their trial, and therefore on guard to see that no legitimate complaint of tampering with the Union shall stand. Nothing but the supremest bigotry and the most determined obduracy not to have Home Rule at any price can be urged in support of Sir E. Carson's accusation. Under the Home Rule Bill of the Asquith Government the supreme power and authority of the Imperial Parliament remain unaffected. Such public services as Land Purchase, Insurance, Old Age Pensions, Con-stabulary, Post and Telegraph, Post Office Savings Bank, and the collection of taxes other than Duties and Excise, are expressly reserved for and by the Imperial Parliament. Nor can the local Palriament repeal the Act that calls it into being; neither can it affect nor whittle away the right of appeal to the Privy Council, while, in addition, there are special provisions for the absolute preservation of religious equality, to say nothing about the Veto of the Lord Lieutenant and the representation of Ireland at Westminster by 42 members. "Forced out of the Union!" cries Sir Edward Carson; "no, we will obey no mandate from any Parliament." Surely there never has been a more humiliating appeal on behalf of religious intolerance than that which Sir Edward is now making to the Empire at large.'

To the like effect, and with equal emphasis, writes the Auckland Star of July 22. Its leaderette on the subject is somewhat lengthy, but so much to the point that we ask our readers' indulgence to reproduce it in Writing under the caption 'Ulster's 'Rights' and dealing with this same utterance of Sir Edward Carson, the Auckland paper says: 'Any possible doubt as to the true character of the Unionist agitation against Home Rule will surely be dispelled by Sir Edward Carson's latest pronouncement on the question. According to Ulster's enthusiastic champion, the anti-Nationalist party now entirely denies the right of Parliament or the people to decide this question of self-government for Ireland. This must be rather disconcerting for Lord Lansdowne and the Unionist party in the Upper House, who have just formally based their rejection of the Home Rule Bill on the plea that it has not been submitted to the people, and have challenged the Liberals to ask the nation for its verdict, and abide by its decision. But, happily, it is not our business to reconcile such curious inconsistencies, and we are chiefly concerned just now with the truly monstrous character of the doctrine that Sir Edward Carson is promulgating. It is surely a new constitutional principle, that any given fraction of the United Kingdom may, whenever it pleases, repudiate the authority of Parliament and Crown, and decide for itself how it is to be governed. Is the West Riding of Yorkshire or the Isle of Wight, or the Lake district constitutionally competent in Sir Edward Carson's opinion to settle such matters for itself? And if not, why should three counties out of the whole of Ulster be permitted to dictate to the rest of the Irish nation and to England what policy is best adapted to the needs of Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the Empire?'

'Merely to assert such a proposition is to reduce any political controversy to a farce. But Sir Edward Carson goes further than this. He maintains that neither Parliament nor Government, even after twenty elections, could deprive Ulster of its alleged "rights." For a distinguished lawyer this is surely the most extraordinary interpretation of "rights" ever put into words. Juristically and constitutionally speaking, rights are defined by laws, and laws emanate from the Parliament and the Crown. What right has Ulster or any other part of the United Kingdom to any privilege

except what is conferred on it by law? As to natural rights, so far as Ulster is concerned, the less said about them the better. For the Protestants of Ulster are aliens in race and religion from the great majority of the inhabitants of Ireland; they were planted there by conquest, their supremacy while it lasted was established and maintained by force. The temporary predominance of Ulster involved the absolute sacrifice of the national racial and hereditary rights of the main body of the Irish people, and Sir Edward Carson would do well to keep clear of historical reminiscences altogether.'

But quite apart from the ridiculous character of these pretensions, it is simply outrageous that the anti-Nationalists should call upon England, in the name of justice, to listen to Ulster alone, and turn a deaf ear to the rest of the Irish nation. On what ground, moral, equitable, or legal, should the protests of a small fraction of the Irish people outweigh the united demand of the rest of the Irish nation pleading for the right to manage their own affairs? And the unanimity of the rest of Ireland, as Mr. Dillon aptly reminds us, has been secured not by intimidation and sedition and the threat of war, but by a spontaneous outburst of patriotic and national feeling. Surely whatever argument can be urged on behalf of Ulster's right to control her own destinies, applies with tenfold force to the Irish nation, of which the Ulster Protestants form but a relatively small part. However, it is a good sign for the Nationalists that their enemies are now hopelessly at variance, and that Sir Edward Carson, not content with flatly repudiating the one standard of appeal which the Unionists have agreed to accept, is now propounding doctrines that imply the rejection not only of all the claims of patriotism and loyalty, but of the fundamental principles of constitutional government and political liberty, based upon Parliamentary Government.

Our recent visitors from the Irish Party will doubtless remember well their great meetings and enthusiastic reception in Auckland and Dunedin; and they at least, amongst our Home readers, will be interested to note the accuracy with which the 'Ulster' business is 'sized up,' and the vigor with which it is reprobated, in the self-governing dominions beyond the seas.

## Notes

## The Grey By-Election

Several correspondents have sent us communications descriptive of 'the battle for Grey,' telling us with some detail how the fight was fought and won. We thank our correspondents for their communications, which will be carefully pigeon-holed for use if occasion should call for it; but we have said elsewhere in this issue all that we think, for the present, needs to be said on the subject. It is a bad thing to start sectarian bigotry; it is an almost equally bad thing to perpetuate it. The lesson of the election is perfectly obvious; and we may fairly conclude that it has been driven home when we find an influential daily, which supported the Reform candidate, lamenting the tactics employed as 'suicidal and deplorable.' If such tactics are again employed, they will be once again just as strenuously resented; and that is the one fact now which needs to be impressed and remembered. It is clear that feeling over the recent contest had been wrought to a painfully high pitch, and we can quite understand the very natural desire of the participants to 'fight the battle over again'; but we think they may well rest content with the substantial and triumphant success with which they have attained their end.

## Wanted, A Job

The men—numbering, according to Mr. Foster Fraser, some 35,000 who have been making the Panama Canal will soon be wanting a job. Here is their appli-

S. F. ABURN

PAINTER, PAPERHANGER, GLAZIER, Etc., 245 Princes St., Dunedin. Importer of Paints, Oils, Colors, Varnishes, Brushware, Paperhangings, Picture and Room Mouldings, Sheat and Colored Glass, Etc. Taleprone 1329,