

to all this: (1.) Our contemporary is easily comforted. The Irish in New Zealand are by no means proud, and, like ourselves, any one of more of them to whom he will post his paper will look it over. Either the direct mail or the San Francisco mail will bring any paper he posts, just as it does that he now and then sends us, quite safe, and there is nothing in the matter to surprise him in the least. (2.) The *Tablet* from which the N. Z. TABLET took its name was the admirable newspaper conducted by Frederick Lucas. We should be ashamed to have anything in common with the priggish production that now bears the name. (3.) For the *Whitehall Review* to say that we are personal in our terms, is for the pot to call the kettle black. His own columns are grossly personal, and he spares neither the living nor the dead. But does not an editor court personal remarks when he sticks his name up in the middle of his paper, and tells his readers that he, and he only, is accountable for every word published. If we have been personal, we have been so on his own invitation. The vulgarity we admit. "*Je suis vilain, et très vilain.*" We have nothing at all in common with Lady Vere de Vere, but a good deal in common with the plain woman who called her ladyship by a name she richly deserved, and which truly belonged to her. For our part we do not enter into genteel competition with our contemporary, and are not advanced one step higher than fresh eggs, as he is by many steps. We may also be incoherent and incomprehensible, but our contemporary proves to us that we can easily make ourselves understood and that is all we aim at. When he understands us no one else can be far out. (4.) Our contemporary finds it convenient to overlook what we said about good Catholics in England in the reign of King Henry III. How did they show their allegiance to Rome? we ask again. He is, however, not of one mind with George Eliot, who says it is the province of common sense to hinder extremes. "The whole hog or none," is his sporting maxim. The Devil Advocate should have hard work to pick a whole in our contemporary's halo when he is brought up hereafter for canonization. But if he has no halo and is not brought up for canonization, it will not be hard for those of us who survive, to guess where he is to be found. A purgatory he perfectly despises, or any other *refugium peccatorum*. But every man to his taste. (5.) Oh, then, not a thing have we to do with Dr. O'Dwyer any more than with the man in the moon. And thank God for that same. (6.) The "most Catholic people" do not fill prisons to an extent disproportionate with their numbers in Great Britain. Their numbers there are compared with the whole population, including even Mayfair itself, and the comparison is misleading and unjust. Nor does the fact that large numbers of people who leave their own country and fall among thieves are demoralised by the process, tell against their nation. The Irish people who immigrate into Great Britain commonly encounter a degraded and degrading hatred, like that which disgraces our contemporary himself. It is not in human nature that it should fail in its effects. The black savage of Australia, the lowest of the human race, kills his fellow black, if, being the member of another tribe, he dares to enter upon his territory, and civilised white men, like our contemporary, sink to the level of the savage in giving way to a similar hatred. It degrades those who harbour it, as well as its victims. But even the Irish population of Great Britain which gives up a large proportion of its members to the prisons compares favourably with that higher section of society, whose actions do not enter into the criminal statistics of the country, but which, for example, is accountable for the state of things described a few years ago by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, described, perhaps, with some exaggeration, but fully confirmed as existing by abundant proofs. It compares well, moreover, with that class of the English population that yearly sacrifices thousands of infant lives to secure insurance money but which still goes undetected. As to the Irish women, again, in what are even the worst of them more degraded than those high-bred dames and damsels whom "Scrutator" in *Truth* exposed to us the other day as daughters discussing their mothers' frailty, and mothers winking at their daughters' licentiousness, who, besides, frequent those places of public entertainment where, as we are told by the same authority, "the half-drunk lean over the half-dressed." Neither let us be too sure that even the half-dressed are themselves perfectly sober, for according to the information given us some time ago in one of the London periodicals by the present Duchess of Rutland the drinking as well as the eating habits of high society are excessive even among ladies. "Madge," moreover, also tells us that cases of such excess were quite conspicuous last June at Ascot. Finally, *Modern Society* of July 7, gives us the details of poker-playing, to which ladies of the very highest rank are devoted, and in connection with which there is a good deal of dishonesty. We fancy, then, the easily detected Irishwoman sent to gaol for some petty offence, may not, after all, compare so ill with the great lady of May fair who follows the ordinary habits of the period. But, as the chief object of our contemporary's publication is to uphold high society in the unrestricted enjoyment of its privileges, we can make allowances for his zeal. The drunken Irishwoman taken off the streets of an English town, whither hatred such as that shown so shamelessly by the

*Whitehall Review* had largely contributed to drive her, is a disgrace to her nation. The high-bred English lady at whose licentiousness her mother winks, or who discusses her mother's frailty, who is not free from a suspicion of intemperance and of dishonest gambling, is a glory of the age, and one in whose support, hatred, malice, all uncharitableness, nay, even killing itself, is lawful and praiseworthy. Such is the argument we derive from the *Whitehall Review*. But if, indeed, our contemporary is a fair exponent of the party to which he belongs, not only the interests of Ireland but even those of humanity and civilisation at large, demand the overthrow of that party, and the permanent and final destruction of its influence.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* publishes an interview with A REVELATION. Mr. Parnell, in which he expresses himself favourable to the retention of Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament. He explains the opposition given to the proposal by the Irish party during the discussion of Mr. Gladstone's Bill as arising from their loyal determination to support the Grand Old Man, and not from any prejudice of their own in favour of it. But he believes, and no doubt believes rightly, that those who opposed Mr. Gladstone's measure because of the exclusion in question would have opposed it still more vigorously had that exclusion not been made. Mr. Parnell looks to the next measure for Home Rule introduced as making provision for the retention of Irish Members in the Imperial Parliament, which he believes is destined to take the character of a federal assembly, including Members from the various divisions of Great Britain—England, Scotland, Wales—and Ireland, as well as from the colonies—and to replace the present House of Lords, the House of Commons having become exclusively English. By entering into this scheme for federal union of the Empire, Mr. Parnell has secured the full sympathy and support of Mr. Rhodes, an ardent Imperialist, who has made a large fortune at the Kimberley diamond fields, and who has contributed £5,000, with the promise of another sum of equal amount, to the funds of the League, Mr. John Morrough, an Irish resident of Kimberley, contributing at the same time £1,000. Mr. Rhodes is an Englishman, and a graduate of one of the English universities, where he returned to prosecute his studies on meeting with success in South Africa. There are few of us, meantime, who will not agree that in the federation of the Empire the true solution of many difficult and all important questions is to be found, and that it is a splendid privilege for Ireland to have taken the leading place in a movement to bring it about, for this is in fact the ultimate meaning of Home Rule.

THE LIBEL ACTION. THE libel action taken by Mr. O'Donnell against the *Times*, in connection with the publication by that paper of the articles on Parnellism and Crime, terminated in a verdict in favour of the defendants. The effect, however, was not to criminate Mr. Parnell and his colleagues in the eyes of the public, but to evoke the general opinion that they had been unfairly treated. The Chief Justice himself, in fact, though no friend to the party, found fault with the manner in which they had been treated, and stigmatised it as grossly unfair, they having been accused but afforded no opportunity of defending themselves. What, however, produced a still more marked effect, was the determined refusal of the defendants to give any account of how they became possessed of letters asserted to be written by Mr. Parnell, among them that published a year or two ago, and commonly accepted as a forgery. Their refusal to do so was taken as a most suspicious circumstance, especially as the *Times* had always implied that an opportunity was all that it needed for the production of its proofs. And in this case proofs other than that of the authenticity of signatures is needed. Signatures are easily forged, so that even experts themselves may be deceived by them, or, if they be shown beyond all doubt to be genuine, there is still the possibility that the documents to which they are affixed are spurious and that their contents have been substituted for the original matter, by its being erased with the aid of chemicals, and their being written in its place. No proof, therefore, could be valid or convincing except that given by showing by irrefutable evidence of witnesses that the man accused had actually written the letters he was accused of writing. The fact that the *Times* flatly refused to bring forward such proofs leaves it open to the suspicion of knowing that the letters produced or published by it were forgeries—whereas so far the belief had prevailed that the *Times* officials had themselves been deceived. The disingenuousness of the *Times*, moreover, was taken up and repeated by the Government in refusing the Parliamentary committee which Mr. Parnell demanded to examine into the charges brought against him, and their resolution in appointing instead a commission of judges which it was competent for them to pack,—as well as in their insisting that instead of limiting the examination to the definite charges brought against Mr. Parnell an inquiry should be made into all the accusations affecting the party generally, so that the question of authenticity might be obscured and the time of the inquiry protracted indefinitely. It was on this unfair method of procedure that the Government