A MILITANT AMONG THE MAGDALENS ?

Mary Ellen Murphy's Incarceration in High Park Convent During the 1913 Lockout

Peter Murray

This article was published in 1995 in Volume 20 of Saothar (Journal of the Irish Labour History Society). It reappears now on the centenary of the Lockout and in the year in which a Taoiseach has apologised unreservedly to women who spent time in Magdalen laundries.

Introduction

In September 1993 more than a hundred bodies buried within the grounds of the Convent of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge at High Park in Drumcondra were exhumed and, the remains having been cremated, moved to a plot within Glasnevin cemetery. The bodies were those of deceased inmates of the convent's former Magdalen asylum and their removal to another site was a consequence of the sale of a part of the convent's grounds to a housing developer. The episode led to public expressions of protest[i], attracted considerable media coverage[ii] and sparked off a wider controversy about what one commentator termed `the underground history that is still largely unacknowledged'[iii] of the archipelago of Magdalen asylums for `fallen women' operated by communities of nuns - and other religiously-inspired organisations - across Ireland from about the middle of the nineteenth century to sometime after the middle of the present one.

This upsurge of interest in the history of the Magdalen asylums coincided with the eightieth anniversary of the start of the 1913 Dublin lockout. An aspect of that protracted lockout which has hitherto gone undocumented is the manner in which High Park Convent and its Magdalen asylum were placed in the firing line of public controversy eight decades before their recent appearances there in the aftermath of a case of assault that took place close to one of the dispute's principal flash points, Jacob's biscuit factory. The background to and course of this 1913 controversy will now be described and discussed.

Locked Out of Jacob's

Faced with large-scale defiance of an instruction that all goods tendered - including those tendered by firms locking out Irish Transport and General Workers Union (ITGWU) members -

must be handled and of a regulation forbidding the wearing of union badges in the factory, Jacob's closed down completely on 1 September 1913.[iv] A fortnight later the factory was reopened with a gradual build-up of workforce numbers, first in the male areas and later in the female ones. On 11 October Jacob's issued an ultimatum to those who had not returned to work to do so by October 15 or be taken off the firm's books. Old workers who had returned to work were paid `loyalty money' increases in their wage rates from 14 October, the day on which the Dublin employers rejected the report of Sir George Askwith's inquiry as a basis for a general settlement of the conflict. Between 16 October and 3 November the factory advertised in the press every day for women workers.[v]

Locked Up in High Park

Against this background of exacerbated friction, physical clashes occurred in the vicinity of the factory between those working and those remaining out during early November which gave rise to a spate of assault or intimidation prosecutions and to custodial sentences for a number of those convicted. In one of these cases:

> A girl named Mary E. Murphy, who was on strike from Messrs Jacob's factory in Dublin, was charged with assaulting one of the girls employed by Messrs. Jacob by giving her a box on the face and calling her a "scab" on the morning of the 3rd [of November], and with acting in a similar manner in the afternoon of the same day when complainant was returning from dinner. Murphy was remanded for a week and was sent to High Park Reformatory, which is a place of detention under the Children Act, 1908. After the remand, she was convicted of assault and sentenced to one month in the same reformatory.[vi]

Already imprisoned in Mountjoy at the beginning of November 1913, and the focus of a Labour movement campaign to force the Liberal government to order his release, was James Larkin. This pressure bore fruit on Thursday, November 13, when Larkin was freed after serving less than three weeks of a seven month sentence. Speaking at a meeting in Beresford Place the following (Friday) evening, James Connolly, who had deputised for Larkin during his time in jail, announced that demonstrations due to be held at the weekend in Dublin and Manchester would go ahead, with their original purpose of demanding Larkin's release

replaced by that of demanding the release of all those who still remained in Mountjoy in connection with the lockout. He went on to highlight three individual cases. One was that of Frank Moss, who had gone on hunger strike and was being forcibly fed. Another was that of Molly Doyle `who had been a kitchen maid in Liberty Hall, and who, he said, had been sentenced to an extra month by a bilious old magistrate because she cheered for Larkin in the dock'. Then:

> Mr. Connolly went on to say that he had another thing to tell them, and if there was any shame left among the custodians of our public morality, the clergy, they would denounce it in every pulpit on Sunday. A young girl who had been sentenced in connection with the strike had been removed from Mountjoy to an institution at Drumcondra for fallen women.
> A Voice - Leave the clergy alone.
> It might be said, Mr. Connolly proceeded, that he was attacking the clergy. He was not attacking them. He was only pointing out to them their duty and he said this, if they not denounce this infamous and damnable outrage they would be whited sepulchres and hypocrites. The clergy, like everyone else when they neglected their duty, laid themselves open to public criticism.[vii]

On Monday, November 17, two Dublin morning newspapers, the *Irish Times* and the *Freeman's Journal*, contradicted Connolly's claim, stating that the girl was in the High Park Convent Reformatory and not in a Magdalen Institution. The *Irish Times* had been `asked by the Sisterhood in charge of the institution' to publish this information: the *Freeman's Journal* did not indicate how it came to be `in a position to state that the allegation in reference to a young girl is without the slightest foundation'.[viii]

On the same day a broadside aimed at Connolly appeared over the signature `A City Curate' in the stablemate of the *Freeman's Journal*, the *Evening Telegraph*. This began by depicting `Connolly of "Liberty Hall"' as a man with a pet topic - `he loves to have a rap at the clergy, and consequently he is always on the look-out for some pretence under which to introduce them into his irresponsible harangues to his poor dupes'. The facts of the matter were that the High Park nuns had under their charge both a juvenile Reformatory and a Magdalen Asylum and that `these two institutions are as widely separated and exclusive as the Mater Hospital and Mountjoy'. Intent on lessening the respect of the workers for their clergy, Connolly did not

care for truth that did not serve his purpose. The workers themselves `are sick of all this wild abuse' and a perception that `it is as well not to test too severely the Catholicity of the workers', reinforced by representations made by some workers to him on the issue, would, the author predicted, lead the freed Larkin to curb Connolly, `the arch-offender'.[ix]

Disappointment lay in store for `A City Curate', however. Embarking on a frenetic round of meetings in Britain, Larkin frequently referred to the plight of the Dublin workers left behind him in prison or, as in Mary Ellen Murphy's case, in another type of custody. Thus he was reported in *The Times* as telling an audience in London's Albert Hall:

> Let them not forget that there were over 300 men lying in gaol in Dublin, guilty of no illegal act, and over 57 mothers and daughters - girls of 16 up to women of 60 - lying there because they dared to say "Up Larkin" (cheers). Think of the statesmen that would send a pure clean-minded, clean-souled girl of 16 to spend a week's holiday with those who had forgotten their race, their sex and their soul. Think of a Christian Government (hisses) who had put her there that she might be soiled, and that in years to come people might say she had been in a home for fallen women - the Magdalene Asylum.[x]

Four Letters And A Statement

A short piece quoting Larkin to its Irish readers as having said on this occasion that `an innocent girl in Dublin has been sent to a home for fallen women because she said "Up Larkin"', and concluding with the comment that `it is a shocking thing that inoffensive nuns cannot escape the repetition of such lying attacks' was published in the *Evening Telegraph* on Thursday, 20 November.[xi] The set of headlines over this piece ran, in descending order: `Mr. Larkin and the Nuns. Mr. Connolly's Falsehood. Reproduced in London. After Being Authoritatively Denied'. Further denial of a most authoritative kind was shortly to follow. References to the Murphy case in Britain prompted the most senior civil servant in Ireland, the Dublin Castle Under Secretary Sir James Dougherty, to write a letter to *The Times* setting out an official version of the facts. This was published on Tuesday, November 25:

> In a speech delivered at Manchester by Mr. James Larkin it was stated that a young girl who had been brought before a magistrate in Dublin, charged with intimidation, was sent to a female penitentiary. That statement was contradicted in a portion of the Dublin press nearly a week ago, but it has been repeated and apparently gained some credence. I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to declare definitely and officially that the story is absolutely untrue. The girl referred to was committed by the magistrate to a reformatory school in accordance with the provisions of the Children's Act, Section 107, which authorises a magistrate to commit a juvenile offender to "custody in a place of detention under the Act". The school to which the girl was sent is the only "place of detention" for youthful Catholic offenders in Dublin or, indeed, in the province of Leinster. It happens that the religious community who have charge of the school to which the girl was committed have also under their management a female penitentiary, but the two institutions, which are in different buildings, are entirely separate, and the inmates never come in contact. In view of the very serious nature of the allegations which have been made, his Excellency will be greatly obliged if you will have the goodness to insert this letter.[xii]

That evening Connolly, speaking at a meeting in Beresford Place, returned to the subject of Mary Ellen Murphy's detention, showing no inclination to withdraw or apologise:

> About a week ago, speaking at that very place, he referred to a girl - a prisoner on remand - who had been sent to an institution in Drumcondra instead of to Mountjoy, and he had been denounced in the local press for what he had then said. He had since taken the trouble of inquiring into the matter, and he had satisfied himself that every word he had then said was true. He had found that in High Park, Drumcondra, there were two separate buildings inside one wall - one a reformatory for girls and the other an institution for fallen women. His statement had been denied on the ground that the girl was sent to a reformatory and not to a home for fallen women, but he could only describe that denial as a subtle dodge. When that girl was sent into that institution her character was foully besmirched and a damnable outrage committed.[xiii]

The next day the *Evening Telegraph* re-entered the fray with an article whose headlines ran, in descending order: `Lie That Was Nailed. Repeated by Mr. Connolly. The Myth About A Girl. Attack on the Priests'. This began by rehearsing the controversy's history - Connolly's allegation, the Freeman/Telegraph refutation of it, the Freeman/Telegraph version of what Larkin had said at the Albert Hall, Dougherty's letter - and quoting two further letters which restated the official line on the case - one from the Private Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant to an unnamed correspondent and the other from an official in the Chief Secretary's London Office to a London Unionist M.P., G.A. Touche. It then commented that:

> No withdrawal of the statement has ever been made. No apology has been offered to the priests or nuns who were so cruelly maligned. On the contrary, the libel is still doing duty on the syndicalist platforms of England.
> Nay! more, in face of the fact that this calumny affecting the priests and nuns has been repeatedly shown to be a gross and glaring lie, it was reiterated again last night by its originator, Mr. Connolly.[xiv]

The quotation from Connolly's November 25 speech given above followed, leading into the article's conclusion that `comment would spoil such a characteristic exhibition of the code of truth and morals that prevails in Liberty Hall'.

Larkin now emulated the Castle Under Secretary by addressing a letter to a London newspaper on the Murphy case. But while most of Dublin newspapers had reproduced Dougherty's letter to *The Times*, none of them reproduced Larkin's letter which was published in the *Daily Herald* on Thursday, November 27. Some quotes from the Larkin letter were, however, embedded in an *Evening Telegraph* article published on the same day which began its attack on Larkin's stance by referring to his `characteristic disregard for any feeling of fair play':

> "High Park Home" he [Larkin] states "appears in the Directory as a Magdalen institution, the car which takes the laundry to and from the institution has painted on both sides "High Park Magdalen Institution". There is only one entrance gate, so far as I know, to this home".
> On these premises he proceeds to ask how is one to remove the slur from the girl's name by suggesting that the inmates of the Magdalen institution are in two categories.
> As a matter of fact the inmates are not in two categories, but in two wholly distinct institutions. They are as different and distinct as separate buildings, separate grounds and separate staffs can make them. The situation and structural arrangements forbid not only any kind of inter-communication but provide against the inmates of the Reformatory School even seeing the inmates of the other institution, either at work or at recreation. The convent and chapel completely divide off the one from the other and where in one or two instances a window in the upper storeys of the Reformatory overlooks an angle of the Magdalen Asylum grounds there windows are glazed with ground glass.
> Even the poor subterfuge of a single entrance gate will not avail Mr. Larkin. It is conceived in misrepresentation. The Reformatory approach is from the Drumcondra road at the western end of the grounds, and that to the Magdalen Home is at the eastern side. At no point at any of the entrance avenues is any portion of the second entrance visible.

> It is interesting to note that the Reformatory School is the first certified institution of its kind in Ireland. It of course satisfies all the requirements the authorities demand with regard to these schools. Originally built for 100 children, the inmates at present number 36, and there are also a number of orphans whom the Sisters bring up and educate. One further point will do away with Mr. Larkin's assumed solicitude for Mary Murphy's welfare. Amongst the visitors to the schools are the little girl's parents and, at his most recent visit, the father expressed his thanks in the most touching terms to the Sisters for the care they are bestowing on his child.[xv]

Different versions of High Park's level of institutional segregation and of his own attitude towards his daughter's care there were, however, put forward in a statement made by the girl's father, Patrick Murphy, on November 28:

> I visited my daughter on Saturday November 22nd and found that the building in which she is confined is only separated from the Home for Fallen Women by the Chapel. My daughter also states that during the Retreat the inmates of both the establishments had to attend chapel at the same time, were in full view of each other and only a partition separated them. I am not satisfied that any daughter of mine should be brought into such company in any way. I did not thank the Sisters for anything except the common courtesy of showing me into the room. I would rather see my daughter in Siberia than in such a place.[xvi]

Speaking in Beresford Place that evening, Connolly referred to this statement when he announced that the programme for a demonstration to be held on Sunday November 30 `would include a march around the grounds at Drumcondra where the girl to whom he had alluded in previous speeches was detained':

> He [Connolly] had been criticised about what he said about that girl being in a home for fallen women but he had the signed statement of her father that it was only the chapel that separated the reformatory from the home. Even last week, when a Retreat was given there, the girls of the reformatory were in the same chapel with the fallen women and in view of them, a partition only dividing them. On Sunday when passing the grounds they would cheer the girl and let her see she was not forgotten by her friends, though the hell hounds of the capitalist system were trying to blacken her character.[xvii]

The Labour Demonstration of November 30

Copies of Patrick Murphy's statement were sent from Liberty Hall for publication. In the *Evening Telegraph* of Saturday, November 29, it appeared at the end of a report which began with the passage of Connolly's speech of the previous evening quoted above and continued

with a letter from Father Richard Fleming, C.C., which the newspaper stated it had received `in reference to Mr. Connolly's threat to mob the Reformatory'. The set of headlines to this composite report read, in descending order: `Mr. Connolly's Lie. His Latest Threat Against High Park Convent. Dublin Priest's Appeal'. Father Fleming's letter dealt first with the position of the High Park nuns. When there was a vacancy in their Reformatory, the nuns were obliged to admit any girl committed to it by the courts: `the nuns had no choice in the matter at all. Why then should their peaceful, prayerful life be disturbed by a mob?'. It then suggested that a young Dublin girl like Mary Ellen Murphy was less exposed to corrupting influence in the High Park chapel than by the everyday presence of fallen women on the city's streets:

> If that girl were free she could, alas, see in the streets every day and every night fallen women who are not repentant. In the convent chapel, and only then, she might, in spite of a partition, get a glimpse of those who like Mary Magdalen are bathing the feet of Our Lord with tears of love and of sorrow for past sins. Would that possible glimpse degrade or defile her?[xviii]

Father Fleming's letter concluded by trusting that `the men will have Catholic spirit enough not to carry out Mr. Connolly's arrangements'. These arrangements were not, in fact, to be carried out, although rank-and-file opposition to them does not appear to have contributed significantly to this outcome. The ITGWU programme of events on Sunday, November 30, began with a march from Liberty Hall to Croydon Park in Fairview where members of the newly-formed Citizen Army performed military drill. The High Park demonstration was to have followed the drilling but all of the next morning's Dublin newspaper accounts concurred in reporting that an attempt to march to Drumcondra was frustrated by police action:

> The processionists left the Croydon Park grounds at 3 o'clock and, when some hundred paces or so from the Park avenue, they made an attempt to enter Fairview Strand which leads in the direction of Drumcondra. A big force of fifty police, who had been waiting near by, lined up two deep across the thoroughfare and barred their progress. For a few moments those at the head of the procession commenced pressing forward; some sticks were raised and waved aloft, and there was considerable boohing and cheering. The police became busy adjusting their chin straps and dressing their ranks in close formation. A menacing situation was in the making, but the tension lasted only for a minute. Superintendent Quinn, with whom were Inspectors Willoughby, Gordon and Freeman, spoke to people in the front ranks and, without more trouble, they headed citywards by the North Strand road.

> Their route back to Beresford Place was chosen to lead by North Circular road past Mountjoy prison. The numbers in the extended line of the procession could not be less than six or seven thousand and accompanying the crowd were three bodies of D.M.P. and R.I.C. constables, numbering over two hundred in all. Opposite the prison a short halt was called and a spirited cheer was raised along the line of the processionists.[xix]

But in the version of events presented by Connolly, when he spoke in Beresford Place at the end of the march, the obstructive police deployment was merely incidental to the non-occurrence of a demonstration at High Park: `they had intended that day to pass by the institution and would have done so but for two reasons'.[xx] These reasons were stated to be, first, a letter published by Archbishop Walsh and, second, a letter from the Dublin Trades Council President, Thomas McPartlin. Archbishop Walsh's letter had appeared in the evening papers on Saturday, November 29. It dealt with the industrial deadlock, in relation to which it deplored `the avidity with which every extreme statement that comes from one side or the other is fastened upon, emphasised and at times set forth in the most sensational garb'. Why, the Archbishop asked, `should we not look out for those indications - and at both sides there are indications - that the course of events is gradually, though but slowly, shaping itself in the direction of peace'?[xxi] Thomas McPartlin's letter was not published in the press and does not appear to have survived. It may have conveyed the information that a Dublin deputation had been invited to meet British Labour party and trade union leaders in London on Tuesday, December 2, to discuss a new industrial settlement initiative.

In his speech in Beresford Place that Sunday afternoon Connolly moved back and forth between Mary Ellen Murphy's detention in High Park and the prospect of a general settlement. Developing a variation on the Archbishop's theme, he declared that `the continuance of the strike was due neither to William Martin Murphy nor to Jim Larkin but to the lying capitalist press of Dublin which had laid itself out to misrepresent facts':

> The *Evening Telegraph* had published a statement the previous evening which amounted to an announcement that the workers were going to High Park Asylum that day to mob it and to attack the nuns. (A Voice - That is a lie). Only it was a lie it would not have been published in that paper, but their intention was not to attack the nuns, for whose self-sacrificing work he had the greatest respect and admiration, no more than when they cheered the prisoners in Mountjoy were they attacking the warders of that institution (No, No). It was the system they were attacking. The girl Murphy was only fifteen years of age and when attending a retreat she was brought into full view of the fallen women in the chapel of the institution.[xxii]

At this point Connolly indicated in the manner quoted above that there had been a change of plan with regard to the holding of a demonstration at High Park. Referring to one of the stated reasons for the change, he said that the letter of the Archbishop `showed that he had at last got a proper insight into the situation... the newspapers and some people had been fastening on some statements with the object of putting the workers' position in a wrong light before the public'.[xxiii] Returning to the Murphy case, he then said:

> Her father had written a letter stating that his daughter had been brought into association with fallen women. It had been flung in his [Connolly's] teeth that in everything he said about that girl he had been uttering a slander. He did not make any statements about that girl's case without being perfectly satisfied of their truth and he was prepared to stand over every single thing that he said. Not only should the girl never have been sent to that penitentiary but she could never have been sent to Mountjoy (cheers).[xxiv]

But it was with the issue of ending the long industrial conflict that the final part of Connolly' speech dealt:

> They were not expecting the social revolution before Christmas nor did they intend to put Jim Larkin in the Viceregal Lodge before New Year's Day but they were now, as always, ready to accept any proposals to bring about a settlement (cheers).[xxv]

The upshot of the meeting in London on Tuesday, December 2, was the arrival in Dublin the next day of a six-strong British deputation seeking to arrange a conference between employers and workers' representatives. As attempts to arrange the conference, originally envisaged as beginning on Friday, December 5, dragged on into Saturday, Archbishop Walsh again wrote to the press deprecating `intermeddling of outsiders' and declaring that `the negotiations are in the hands of men as capable as they are earnest'.[xxvi] The conference finally

began in the Shelbourne Hotel at 6 p.m. on Saturday, December 6, only to founder in the early hours of Sunday morning on the gulf between the reinstatement formula the trade unions sought and that which the employers were prepared to concede.[xxvii]

Mary Ellen Murphy's Early Release

Did Mary Ellen Murphy suffer the fate of being `forgotten by her friends' in the midst of fresh developments on the industrial front which continued to unfold with the acrimonious Special Conference of the Trade Union Congress that debated the Dublin dispute in London on Tuesday, December 9? Judging by the actions of the authorities, it would seem not. On December 8 Catherine Morris, Superior, wrote from St. Joseph's Reformatory School to Sir John Ross, the Dublin Metropolitan Police Commissioner:

> In reference to the girl Mary E. Murphy whose commitment of one month's detention in High Park will expire on the morning on the 11th Dec. may I ask that you will be pleased to sanction her release on the 10th or if contrary to your wishes in the small hours of the morning of the 11th so as to avoid the demonstration which is reported will take place when she leaves this place. Apologising for this trouble and thanking you for your protection during this time.[xxviii]

This request was forwarded to the Chief Secretary's Office in Dublin Castle and the Chief Secretary's approval for the girl's release a day early was obtained from London by telegram. Mary Ellen Murphy `left our care this morning at 9.30', the Chief Secretary's Office was informed by Catherine Morris on December 10.[xxix] From the Chief Secretary's Office notification of the decision to bring forward the girl's release was sent to the Inspectors of Reformatories.[xxx] But no hint that external turbulence had impinged on High Park's enclosed world appears in the Chief Inspector's report for 1913 where the detailed report on the convent's reformatory school concludes by remarking that:

> This school continues to do good work and is a well-managed institution. The general tone and deportment of the children are also good. One of the Sisters teaches drill, and the exercises are carried out with smartness and precision. The installation of the electric light throughout the school has proved a great boon.[xxxi]

Discussion

The controversy surrounding Mary Ellen Murphy's detention in High Park has now been described. In the remainder of this article some of the broader issues of lockout history raised by the documentation of this controversy will be discussed. These issues are demonstrations of solidarity with and protest by the lockout prisoners; the variety of ways in which the Catholic Church became entangled in the conflict; partisanship in the press and the enforcement of bans on demonstrations in the vicinity of custodial institutions by the police.

Protest and the Prisons

During the month of November 1913 the industrial struggle continued to intensify with employer importation of blacklegs and trade unionist resort first to mass picketing and later to an attempt to close Dublin port `as tight as a drum'. Away from the industrial battlefront, historians' attention to this month has largely been captured by two developments: first, the formation of the Irish Citizen Army and of the Irish Volunteers and, second, the `Fiery Cross' campaign waged in Britain by James Larkin after his release from Mountjoy. Cast into obscurity has been the extent to which, against a background of settlement effort frustration[xxxii], the momentum of the campaign for Larkin's freedom afterwards carried over into a series of solidarity demonstrations with the lockout prisoner population.

November 30 was the third Sunday in succession on which Mountjoy had been the site of such a demonstration. On November 16, as noted above, a march and rally originally called to demand Larkin's release was turned into one demanding the release of all those who had been prosecuted in connection with the lockout featuring `the somewhat novel demonstration' whereby `the whole body of the processionists halted for a short interval and raised repeated and hearty cheering' opposite the prison in the North Circular road.[xxxiii] On November 23 there was a large trade union turnout for the Manchester Martyrs Commemoration whose route took it from the city centre to Glasnevin cemetery for a wreath-laying ceremony. Then:

> As the different contingents were returning from Glasnevin Cemetery, the Transport Workers Union band and members of that organisation made a demonstration outside Mountjoy Prison. The crowd boohed and cheered and called for the release of the prisoners imprisoned in consequence of recent disturbances. Having roared themselves hoarse the processionists continued their march and proceeded direct to Liberty Hall.[xxxiv]

Within the prison walls a small number of trade unionists - James Byrne[xxxv] and James Connolly[xxxvi] on remand, the convicted Frank Moss[xxxvii] - confronted the authorities with hunger strikes, emulating the militant women's suffrage activists who had, since 1912, been resorting to direct action protests against the franchise provisions of the third Home Rule Bill and laying claim to political prisoner rights when jailed.[xxxviii] The imprisoned trade unionists were not, however, a self-selected vanguard consciously using imprisonment for largely symbolic crimes against property as a means of furthering a very specific cause like the women's suffrage militants but a group thrown together in a more or less chaotic way by the rapid and volatile unfolding of a complex and large-scale confrontation of class forces. Most frequently jailed for assault on or intimidation of strikebreaking persons, the trade unionist prisoners did not, from the authorities' point of view, possess the unsettling exotic qualities of their women's suffrage counterparts who `were articulate, argumentative, wrote over their guardians' heads to their superiors and received prestigious visitors'.[xxxix] That leading Labour figures were better treated in prison than obscure members of the rank-and-file was generally known[xl] - proof to the hostile that an unscrupulous agitator/deluded dupe relationship underpinned Larkinism and proof to trade unionists of the authorities' cowardly viciousness.

In less disturbed times the prison system impinged on trade unions only when the jobs of members were perceived to be threatened by the competition of goods or services produced using inmate labour. The supply of convict-made brushes to government offices by the General Prisons Board, for example, aroused the strong opposition of the brushmakers' union.[xli] Relations between organised labour and the Magdalen asylums arose in the same circumstances. Involvement in the laundry trade was usual in the case of these `homes for fallen women'[xlii] and this placed them at odds with the Irish Women Workers Union when it built a membership base within the commercial laundry sector.[xliii] As one aspect of the

obsession with convent life displayed by Protestant zealots - within the mainstream of politics until around 1870 and on its fringes thereafter - working conditions within convent laundries were a matter of sectarian rather than trade union concern.[xliv]

Under challenge from politicised prisoners resorting to hunger strikes, the prison system in this period resisted the concession of recognition to a formally separate political prisoner status.[xlv] But the system did by this date embrace the principle that age was a proper basis for separate custodial arrangements. The Children Act of 1908, under whose terms Mary Ellen Murphy was sent to High Park, `was hailed by reformers as the most notable event in the history of penal legislation affecting youthful offenders. It provided that no child under 14 years would thenceforth be sent to prison under any circumstances and that prison terms could be meted out to convicted young persons (14 and under 16 years) only if they were unruly and depraved'.[xlvi] Magdalen asylums formed no part of the prison system[xlvii] but the presence of one in High Park cheek-by-jowl with a reformatory school did place young offenders in proximity to a group of disreputable adults - although by 1913 the two institutions had co-existed there for decades without previously provoking controversy.

Collisions with the Church

The operation of this convent reformatory school, with its designation as a place of detention under the Children Act when this legislation came into effect, provides a good example of the process by which `key areas of the social services became a joint venture between `voluntary' church effort and official funding and administration'[xlviii] in Ireland. Strained relations between the Labour movement and the state partner in this joint venture were likely to have repercussions on its relations with the church partner. By mid-November 1913 Larkin and Connolly were declaring that:

> The government has withdrawn from us all the rights guaranteed us by civil society. It has made outlaws of the working class of Dublin and as such we will wage war upon that government by withdrawing from society the aid of our labour, until our rights are restored, until the employers resume proper relations with our unions and until our brothers and sisters are at liberty. We propose to accept as ours the category in which the employers and their government have placed us. If we are treated as outlaws without civil rights, then we shall act as outlaws and refuse to accept any duties.[xlix]

Implicit in this declaration is an answer to Father Fleming's question as to why, since the High Park nuns were obliged to admit any girl committed by the courts if there was a vacancy in the reformatory school, their `peaceful, prayerful life' should `be disturbed by a mob'. From the sound of prisoner-focused protest they could expect no more exemption than could the Mountjoy warders. At an earlier stage in the conflict Labour leadership inattention to what the church authorities regarded as critically important Catholic duties with regard to children's education and religious observances had been evident in the scheme launched during October to send children of locked-out workers to the homes of sympathisers in England. The promoters of this scheme were soon forced to abandon it as, once its existence became known, movement of the children from the city was made physically impossible by the intervention of clerical and lay opponents on the quays and at railway stations.[l] It is ironical that, had trade unionists been permitted a comparable degree of latitude by the civil authorities in carrying out their picketing, the outcome of the overall dispute might have been quite different and Mary Ellen Murphy might have remained unacquainted with the High Park reformatory school.

Archbishop Walsh's strong condemnation of the `deportation' scheme had been an important element in mobilising the hostile reaction which forced its abandonment and, when discussed, his role in relation to the wider dispute has been presented in negative terms. The Archbishop, who had been seriously ill and had gone abroad to recuperate, was away from Dublin during August and September. On his return both he and the Church of Ireland Archbishop `refused to intervene when invited to do so in a resolution of Dublin Corporation' and, during October, `he had publicly owned that the employers had been to some extent justified in hesitating to enter into an agreement until they had obtained guarantees of good faith from the ITGWU,

which in the view of employers could only come after the removal of Larkin'.[li] Although he took no part in the Mary Ellen Murphy case controversy, its reconstruction has incidentally highlighted evidence supporting a revised, and more positive, appraisal of Archbishop Walsh's lockout role. By the end of November his influence had, as we have seen, been publicly thrown behind the proposition that the time for a settlement had ripened, prompting James Connolly to comment that `he had at last got a proper insight into the situation'.

The Role of the Press

The Mary Ellen Murphy case controversy was one in which a part of the Dublin press played the role of participant rather than that of reporter. This was especially true of the *Evening Telegraph* which, along with its morning stablemate, the *Freeman's Journal*, had initially been slow to clearly take sides on the lockout. After the `deportation' of the children affair and the interventions against Liberal candidates in British by-elections which formed part of the campaign to secure Larkin's release from jail, however, an editorial line manifestly hostile to the Labour side emerged. In relation to Mary Ellen Murphy's case this hostility spilled over into a remarkable display of undisguised partisanship in these papers' news columns. Ironically this partisanship was to prove counter-productive as it enabled Connolly to recover from being wrong-footed by his initial inaccurate allegation and to go onto the offensive as the completeness of High Park's institutional segregation arrangements and the views of the girl's father were shown to have been misrepresented by his press detractors.

The Mary Ellen Murphy story's treatment in the other nationalist Dublin daily paper, William Martin Murphy's *Irish Independent*, was hardly less slanted but it was considerably less extensive, mainly due to the fact that this paper's coverage of Labour activities was almost exclusively focused on the sayings and doings of Larkin who was in England during virtually the entire period of a controversy whose originator and chief protagonist on the Labour side was the Dublin-based Connolly. Curiously the Dublin weekly papers in which the Labour viewpoint was expressed or presented sympathetically - the *Irish Worker* and the *Irish Citizen* - made no mention of the Mary Ellen Murphy case. If it was a Labour *cause celebre*, its celebrity was fashioned by the movement's oral communication channels with the only recording in

print of the Labour perspective taking place in ideologically hostile papers.[lii]

Police Bans on Prison and Reformatory Demonstrations

The labour history literature contains only one reference to Mary Ellen Murphy, and that an inaccurate one. This is to be found in C.D. Greaves' *The Life and Times of James Connolly* and runs:

> Protected by the staves of the Citizen Army, Connolly now [after the formation of the army's first companies on Sunday, November 23] led processions past Mountjoy to sing rebel songs for Frank Moss, who was on hunger strike. He skilfully outwitted the police so as to pass singing by the convent where Mary Murphy was imprisoned.[liii]

In fact the police had not been preventing demonstrations taking place in the vicinity of Mountjoy prior to the advent of the Citizen Army - although they were to become selectively active in doing so after its appearance - and no Labour demonstration passed by High Park convent. As we have seen, the demonstration which it was planned would take place outside High Park could only have done so if the police cordon at Fairview had been breached. Engineering such a breach might have been feasible - the march which approached the cordon was a large one and `many of the marchers were armed with hurleys; others with staves, while branches of trees were borne by a large number'.[liv] But, as the speech Connolly delivered later that day indicates, larger strategic considerations brought into play by renewed efforts to reach an industrial settlement made it desirable to avoid riotous clashes with the police.

It was Connolly, according to the *Irish Times* report[lv], to whom Superintendent Quinn spoke at the police cordon in Fairview Strand. In keeping the march on the move towards the city, rather than engaging the Superintendent in a dispute about where precedence lay as between citizen rights and police powers, he made the crucial contribution to resolving `a menacing situation' in such a way that `the tension lasted only for a minute'.[lvi] This, it appears, was a decision he had to make on the spot. There is no suggestion in any of the reports that advance notification of the ban the police intended to impose had been given to the demonstration organisers. `While the strikers were performing their military evolutions the

thoroughfares adjoining Croydon Park were lined by policemen'[lvii] and only when the head of the march approached Fairview Strand did the police deploy a cordon across it.

The policeman's lot was not quite such a happy one in another instance occurring over the same weekend where a prisoner-focused demonstration was interfered with but the leaders of the demonstration did not perceive themselves as having an incentive to avoid getting caught up in disorder. On Friday, November 28, Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington was charged with assaulting a policeman while engaged in women's suffrage campaigning of a lawful kind. She denied the charge and claimed that, instead of being the perpetrator of the assault, she had been its victim. Taken to Mountjoy after refusing to find bail to be of good behaviour, she immediately began a hunger strike.[lviii] A protest demonstration was called by her fellow suffragists for the afternoon of the following day at Royse Road, a cul-de-sac off Phibsborough Road close to, and visible from, Mountjoy's female prison. When the organisers arrived to hold their meeting, they found a police cordon denying them access to Royse Road. Repeated attempts were made to break through this cordon as hand-to-hand conflict ensued.[lix]

Later on Saturday evening Francis Sheehy-Skeffington, who had been in the thick of the Phibsborough melee, attended a meeting in Beresford Place at which Connolly spoke, making reference to what had taken place at Royse Road and telling his audience that `we'll see whether they will stop us from holding a meeting outside Mountjoy tomorrow. The Citizen Army will be there and will not come empty-handed'.[lx] But, having been obstructed on the road to High Park, the Labour demonstrators approached Mountjoy unmolested on that Sunday afternoon. As they halted and cheered on the prison's south side, women's suffrage militants were returning without advance announcement to its west side. With the attention of the authorities distracted by the much larger Labour gathering, the women entered Royse Road without hindrance and began to hold a meeting. Arriving belatedly, the police sought to break this meeting up: scuffles broke out as their efforts were resisted and one woman - Kathleen Emerson - was arrested on a charge of assaulting a policeman.[lxi]

Later, at the end of a day which had taken him on foot from Liberty Hall first to Fairview, then to Phibsborough and finally back to Liberty Hall where he had delivered a speech, Connolly

was to be found in attendance at a meeting of the Independent Labour Party of Ireland in the Antient Concert Buildings. There he lent his support to the motion: `that this meeting, having heard of the uncalled for and dastardly treatment of the women of the I.W.F.L. by the Dublin police at a meeting held this evening at Phibsboro', condemns the government that allows a gang of organised and armed bullies who masquerade as guardians of the peace to attack and brutally ill-treat defenceless women, and calls on the Executive to at once hold its promised inquiry into the doings of the police of Dublin'.[lxii]

NOTES

i. A Magdalen Memorial Committee held a public meeting on the issue, opened a book of condolence which the public were asked to sign outside the GPO and organised its own commemorative event after calling without success on the Archbishop of Dublin to organise a public funeral for the Magdalens, to forbid any building on their former graves and to make a substantial donation towards a public memorial for them `at a prominent place in Dublin as a permanent reminder of past injustices'.

ii. See, for instance, *Irish Times*, 4 September, 1993: 8 September, 1993: 13 September, 1993: 21 September, 1993: *Sunday Tribune*, 5 September, 1993: *Sunday Press*, 12 September, 1993. A photograph taken during the reburial ceremony held in Glasnevin cemetery was published on the front page of the *Irish Times*, 13 September, 1993.

iii. F. O'Toole `GPA, Magdalen women and the underground connection' *Irish Times,* September 8, 1993.

iv. On Saturday August 30 1913, the company dismissed three men who had refused to unload a consignment of flour from Shackleton's mill in Lucan and a notice was posted instructing its employees that they must handle all goods tendered. On the same day a regulation was issued forbidding the wearing of union badges in the factory. On the following Monday, September 1, 670 of Jacob's 1,059 male employees stayed away as did about 303 of its 2,095 female employees.

v. This account is derived from P. McCaffrey `Jacob's Women Workers During the 1913 Lock-Out', *Saothar* 16, 1991, pp. 118-129.

vi. A.P. Magill, Irish Office, Old Queen Street, London S.W. to G.A. Touche M.P., 21 November, 1913. This letter was reproduced in the *Evening Telegraph*, 26 November, 1913.

vii. *Freeman's Journal*, 15 November, 1913.

viii. *Freeman's Journal*, 17 November, 1913: *Irish Times*, 17 November, 1913.

ix. *Evening Telegraph*, 17 November, 1913. The *Leader*, 22 November, 1913, also retorted to Connolly's speech: `Connolly, who probably thinks that the Vatican should takes its orders from the Transport Union bosses, remarked "and if there was any shame left in the custodians of our public morality, the clergy, they would denounce it (the allegation which subsequently proved to be incorrect) in every pulpit on Sunday". Note the gracious phrase of this Liberty Hall gentleman, "if there was any shame left" in the priests. The Catholic priests of Ireland ought to be thankful that Connolly leaves it open as a matter of doubt that they are not absolutely devoid of all shame!' But it seemed less sanguine about the prospects of a rank-and-file revolt against abuse directed at the clergy: `There was a real hero among his audience for "a voice" said "Leave the clergy alone". Surely that "voice" represented a hero. Think of all the dumb, slave-driven men who had listened without protest to other references to the clergy and say if that solitary voice in that environment that burst forth into a protesting "Leave the clergy alone" was not the voice of a hero.'

x. *Times*, 20 November, 1913. Responding to Larkin's prisoner figures, John Irwin, Chairman of the prison's Visting Justices Committee, wrote to the Dublin newspapers stating that `the actual numbers of male and female prisoners at present confined in Mountjoy Prison in connection with the "strikes"' were 69 males and 10 females: *Evening Telegraph*, 21 November, 1913. A manifesto issued over the signatures of Larkin and Connolly before Larkin began his British round of meetings states that `he [Larkin] left behind him in prison scores of loyal and devoted men and women and girls jailed like him for their devotion to the cause of Labour': *Evening Telegraph*, 14 November, 1913.

xi.*Evening Telegraph*, 20 November, 1913.

xii. *The Times*, 25 November, 1913.

xiii. *Freeman's Journal*, 26 November, 1913.

xiv. *Evening Telegraph*, November 26, 1913.

xv. *Evening Telegraph*, 27 November, 1913. The headlines to this article read, in descending order: `Falsehood Repeated. By Mr James Larkin. The High Park Home Case'. The article was also reprinted in the following day's *Freeman's Journal*. A much shorter piece headed `Mr. Larkin Repeats A Canard' appeared in the *Irish Independent*, 28 November, 1913. In this the number of entrances issue was dealt with and visiting by the girl's parents was referred to. Here it was stated that `the father has conveyed his thanks to the nuns for their kindness and attention'.

xvi. A copy of the statement, witnessed by Michael McKeown and James Connolly, is in the William O'Brien Papers, National Library of Ireland, Ms. 13,921.

xvii. *Evening Telegraph*, 29 November, 1913.

xviii. *ibid.*, 29 November, 1913.

xix. *Freeman's Journal*, 1 December, 1913.

xx. *Irish Times*, 1 December, 1913.

xxi. *Evening Telegraph*, 29 November, 1913.

xxii. *Irish Times*, 1 December, 1913.

xxiii. *ibid.*, 1 December, 1913.

xxiv. *Freeman's Journal*, 1 December, 1913. The final sentence here may refer to a statement in the letter of `A City Curate' published in the *Evening Telegraph*, 17 November, 1913: `A girl of sixteen years had been convicted of intimidation and, through the clemency of the magistrate, instead of being sent to jail, was sent to the reformatory at High Park, under the charge of the nuns' and/or an implication to the same effect in Father Fleming's letter. Under the Children Act 1908 a young person (aged from 14 to 16 years) could be given a prison sentence upon conviction only if he or she was unruly and depraved.

xxv. *Irish Times*, 1 December, 1913.

xxvi. *Irish Times*, 6 December, 1913.

xxvii. This settlement attempt is described in detail in a report the Joint Board Delegation submitted to the Special Conference of the Trade Union Congress held in London on Tuesday, December 9, 1913. There is a copy of this report in the Thomas McPartlin Papers, UCD Archives Department, P 19/D/37.

xxviii.Catherine Morris to Sir John Ross, 8 December, 1913, National Archives, Criminal Index File 105 M 1913, Carton 5352 3/787.

xxix. Catherine Morris to G. Farrell, 10 December, 1913, *ibid.*

xxx. Handwritten note on telegram from Magill to A.U.S. 9 December, 1913 `1 Send order of discharge to Refy School 2 Inspectors of Reformatories to Note': *ibid*.

xxxi. Fifty-second Report of the Chief Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Ireland, Appendix II (A), Parliamentary Papers, 1914, Vol. XLVII, pp. 658-659.

xxxii. Thomas Kettle, who was actively involved in mediation efforts, wrote of this period of the lockout that the employers `rejected with open contempt all attempts at conciliatory intervention by a Citizens' Peace Committee, overturning Lord Mayors, Privy Councillors, Deans, doctors and professors like disregarded ninepins. They glanced at Sir George Askwith's Dublin Castle Report, and pitched it forthwith in the fire': T. Kettle *The Day's Burden* (Dublin, 1968), p. 122.

xxxiii. *Evening Telegraph*, November 17, 1913.

xxxiv. *Daily Express*, 24 November, 1913.

xxxv. James Byrne was the secretary of the Kingstown Branch of the ITGWU. Arrested in October and initially refused bail, he spent four days on hunger strike before bail was allowed. He died of pneumonia shortly after his release. Five thousand people were reported to have attended his funeral following which James Connolly gave an address in which he said `their comrade had been murdered as surely as any of the martyrs in the long list of those who had suffered for the sacred cause of liberty' *Irish Worker*, 8 November, 1913. See also *Irish Citizen*, 8 November, 1913.

xxxvi. James Connolly went on hunger strike on Sunday, September 7 after being jailed on the previous day for refusing to give a guarantee of good behaviour. He continued it until his release was authorised by the Lord Lieutenant on Saturday, September 13: A. Morgan *James Connolly: A Political Biography* (Manchester, 1988), p. 114.

xxxvii. The Swords organiser of the ITGWU, Moss was serving three months hard labour for intimidation. On November 11 the *Evening Telegraph* printed a piece headlined `Another Comedy in Mountjoy' which purported to describe how a hunger-striking Michael Mullen had succumbed to temptation after the authorities placed stout and biscuits in his hospital room. On the following day it was stated that the story related not to Mullen but to Frank Moss. A letter from Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington published by the *Evening Telegraph* on November 13 states that the story is `evidently a concoction' as Moss is being forcibly fed. It also denounces the authorities for endangering the health of hunger-striking prisoners by using the tactics described in the story, stating that both Connolly and women's suffrage militants had been subjected to them `but, to the credit of the Mountjoy medical officer, I am bound to say that we were warned of the extreme danger of taking any solid food for some days after our release'. The letter concludes with a scathing condemnation of the jocose manner in which the *Evening Telegraph* had handled the Mullen/Moss story: `the type of mentality that gloats over such a disgusting episode is one for pity... the agonies of a starving man and his temptations are no fit subject for buffoonery'.

xxxviii. R.C. Owens *Smashing Times: A History of the Irish Women's Suffrage Movement 1889-1922* (Dublin, 1984), pp. 64-67.

xxxix. C. Murphy *The Women's Suffrage Movement and Irish Society in the Early Twentieth Century* (London, 1989), p. 99.

xl. In Manchester, for instance, James Larkin told a meeting that `when he was in prison he was a first class prisoner by himself. He was in the limelight but the others were third class': *Daily Express*, 17 November, 1913.

xli. The Irish Trade Union Congress passed identical resolutions condemning this interference with `legitimate labour' and expressing the opinion that `the Act empowering the Board to teach convicts skilled trades should be amended' in 1909 and 1910.

xlii. See M. Luddy `Prostitution and Rescue Work in Nineteenth Century Ireland' in M. Luddy and C. Murphy (Eds.) *Women Surviving: Studies in Irish Women's History in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Dublin, 1989), p.65.

xliii. `With petrol supplies under threat during the Emergency the collection and delivery service of commercial laundries became restricted and further competition came from institutional laundries using cheap labour and under cutting established prices with a notable lack of regard for the rights of organised labour. In 1941 the IWWU urged the Heads of Institutions not to take work away from the public laundries. While the Reverend Mothers of Donnybrook and Stanhope Street Convents had `friendly but inconclusive' talks with Miss Brennan and Miss Chenevix, the Reverend Mothers of High Park and St. Joseph's, Dun Laoghaire, failed even to reply to letters from the Union. In April Bloomfield Laundry lost a military contract to the Magdalen Asylum, Donnybrook, and twenty-five girls at Bloomfield were given notice': M. Jones *These Obstreperous Lassies: A History of the IWWU* (Dublin, 1988), p. 176.

xliv. For a study of this obsession see W.L. Arnstein *Protestant Versus Catholic in Mid-Victorian England: Mr Newdigate and the Nuns* (London, 1982). On its centrality to the politics and polemics of sectarianism see P.J. Waller *Democracy and Sectarianism: A Political and Social History of Liverpool 1868-1939* (Liverpool, 1981), pp. 140-141 and, with specific reference to convent laundries, J.W. Boyle `The Belfast Protestant Association and the Independent Orange Order, 1901-1910' *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. XIII, 1962, pp. 119-121. On controversy concerning the role of nuns as employers of free wage factory labour in the west of Ireland see P. Murray `Novels, Nuns and the Revival of Irish Industries: The Rector of Westport and the Foxford Woollen Mill, 1905-1907' *Cathair na Mart*, Vol. 8, 1988, pp. 86-99.

xlv. C. Murphy *op. cit.*, p. 99.

xlvi. J.V. O'Brien *"Dear, Dirty Dublin": A City in Distress, 1899-1916* (London, 1982), p. 197. The whole of Chapter 7 provides useful background to the present discussion.

xlvii.M. Luddy *op. cit.*, p. 71, argues that `the general impression gained from reading any of the contemporary literature published about the asylums.. that they were virtual prisons and that the women who entered them were unlikely ever to leave' is disproved by evidence from the registers of inmates kept by these institutions. Instead `entering a refuge was, for the majority of women, a matter of choice. While it is true that many such women had only the workhouse or the Magdalen asylum to turn to in times of utter distress, it would appear that the second was the favoured option of many. The length of stay in the asylums varied from one day for some women to an entire lifetime, of thirty or forty years, for others'.

xlviii. T. Fahey `Catholicism and Industrial Society in Ireland' in J.H. Goldthorpe and C.T. Whelan (Eds.) *The Development of Industrial Society in Ireland* (Oxford, 1992), p. 252. On this subject see also C. Clear *Nuns in Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Dublin, 1987) and T. Inglis *Moral Monopoly: The Catholic Church in Modern Irish Society* (Dublin, 1987).

xlix. *Evening Telegraph*, 14 November, 1913.

l. For accounts of this episode see E. Larkin *James Larkin Irish Labour Leader 1876-1947* (London, 1965), pp. 137-140: C.D. Greaves *The Irish Transport and General Workers Union: The Formative Years 1909-1923* (Dublin, 1982), pp. 107-108: D. Keogh *The Rise of the Irish Working Class* (Belfast, 1982), pp. 219-224.

li. J.V. O'Brien *op. cit.*, p. 233 and p. 235.

lii. `The newspapers of Dublin - we do not include in this category such scurrilous sheets as "The Irish Worker" - are one and all opposed to him [Larkin] and the Press reflects the opinion of its readers':

editorial, `The Labour Troubles', *Daily Express*, 19 November, 1913. The researcher's reliance on daily newspaper sources for the materials with which to attempt this controversy's reconstruction is increased by frustrating gaps in administrative record series such as the General Prisons Board Penal Records or the Chief Secretary's Office Registered Papers. Thus, while correspondence regarding Mary Ellen Murphy's early release was turned up, a prisoner case file of the kind described in C. Crowe `Some Sources in the National Archives for Women's History' *Saothar* 19, 1994, pp. 112-113 could not be found for her. The Registry of the Chief Secretary's Office Papers refers to communication with the General Prisons Board on 18 November `on statement by J. Larkin that a girl arrested in Dublin for intimidation was brought to a home for fallen women'. Another entry, of November 25, refers to communication with the Dublin Metropolitan Police regarding the `case of Mary Murphy on strike from Jacobs sentenced for intimidation and sent to High Park Refy'. Neither of these files could be traced in the National Archives. An inquiry to High Park convent also failed to lead to reformatory school records that might cast further light on the episode or on its elusive central character. I am indebted to Catriona Crowe and to Sister Ann Marie Ryan for their assistance in my attempts to locate relevant material.

liii. C.D. Greaves *The Life and Times of James Connolly* (London, 1961), p. 266.

liv. *Irish Times*, 1 December, 1913.

lv. *Ibid.*, 1 December, 1913. In the other Dublin newspapers reports, Superintendent Quinn `spoke to people in the front ranks' (*Freeman's Journal*), `spoke to those who were foremost in the ranks' (*Daily Express*) or `informed the crowd' (*Irish Independent*).

lvi. *Freeman's Journal*, 1 December, 1913.

lvii. *Irish Times*, 1 December, 1913.

lviii. *Freeman's Journal*, 29 November, 1913: *Irish Citizen*, 6 December, 1913.

lix. *Freeman's Journal*, 1 December, 1913: *Irish Citizen*, 6 December, 1913.

lx. *Freeman's Journal*, 1 December, 1913.

lxi. *ibid.*, 1 December, 1913.

lxii. *Irish Citizen*, 6 December, 1913.