

ment for political offences in Ireland was no punishment was untrue and unjust, inasmuch as he was confined in a cell some 12ft. square for 22 hours of the 24, although he acknowledged fully that the prison officials other than the doctor were most kind and courteous. The case of the Government in asking for coercive powers was that the law was set aside, and the decrees of the Land League were enforced by a set of ruffians. It was now clear, however, that the Land League was the outcome of the public opinion in Ireland, otherwise thousands of men, women, and children would not have turned out in crowds to be shot, and to protest against the arbitrary and horrible conduct of the Irish executive. The House could form no idea of the terrible state of things in which the constabulary were obliged to keep a register in order to have always a sufficient number of "suspects" to send up to the Chief Secretary whenever the right hon. gentleman happened to be spurred on by his political opponents. The Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, when asking Parliament to give him the powers contained in the Coercion Act, said he desired those powers in order that he might lay hands on persons who had committed outrages and were well known to the police. This might have been so, but the statistics which had been published since the passing of the Act showed that very few of the persons who might have been supposed to come within the scheme had been arrested, and he asked the Government to adopt a principle of forbearance in dealing with a people who were—and justly so, in his view—saturated with disaffection towards their rulers. (Hear, hear.) He believed the Irish tenants were willing to do what was just, but if they were driven to desperation he could not say how long they would remain in that state of mind. The whole administration of the law in Ireland had been brought into contempt (ironical cheering) simply because the Government had ignored the just claims of the tenants. Why should not the Government now be guided by the advice given them by Archbishop Croke and by the example set them by Lord Portarlington? If they allowed things to go on as they were going on now, he, for one, would not be responsible for the result. The result, he feared, would be great loss of life, and most probably the loss of the entire property of the landlords. The tenants were now willing to pay a fair rent. It had been said that they had been advised to pay no rent at all, but he had always heretofore opposed that advice. He did not know how much longer he could continue to do so. (Hear, and a laugh.) Events were advancing very rapidly in Ireland, and it was impossible to say what might be the position that day four weeks. It might happen, and very likely it would happen, if the Government went on in their course of aggression (laughter)—yes, aggression and irritation—that they would find themselves face to face with a strike against all rents, and, if that were so, did they think that they would find it easy to get them to pay any rent at all? The outlook was a very serious one for the Irish landlords. He knew no class which had so much interest in the settlement of the question as they had. The Government had the prospect before them of being utterly discredited in Ireland. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) They were teaching the people of Ireland very dangerous lessons, and the leaders, who occupied a middle position now, did not know how soon they might find others very much in advance of them. Unless the Government did something to stop evictions in Ireland he feared there would be an increase of outrage in Ireland. If blood was shed by the police and military there would no doubt be retaliation, and landlords would be murdered in Ireland. Nobody would regret such a thing more than he would do. He could not help saying—and he did not at all say it in the nature of a threat—that if things went on as they were going on the lives of many landlords and tenants would undoubtedly be lost. Her Majesty's Government had the control of events. Let them try the experiment in the premier county in Ireland recommended by Archbishop Croke; let them leave to the clergy of the county the responsibility for the maintenance of order and peace, and he believed that neither landlord nor tenant would regret the result. (Hear, hear.)

The Marquis of Hartington then addressed the House, and Mr. O'Connor Power asked what would be the effect of adopting the resolution of the hon. member for Longford? It was a very able and clearly drawn resolution, but it did not go to the heart of the present difficulty. It said that the Government had done wrong here and done wrong there; but the important part of the resolution was the concluding section, which declared that the Government were doing wrong in employing the armed forces of the Crown in executing wanton and cruel evictions. Suppose they assumed that proposition, how did that improve the position in Ireland? If the Government were not to employ the armed forces of the Crown in carrying out wanton and cruel evictions, they must determine what were wanton and cruel evictions and what were not. If it were not presumptuous in him, he would say that the speech of the Solicitor-General of England that night was a statesmanlike utterance from beginning to end (hear, hear); but it had scarcely grappled with the difficulty with which the Government must contend in a crisis like that through which they were passing. The hon. member for the city of Cork had recommended the Government to adopt the advice of the Archbishop of Cashel. He was sorry that the hon. member had not adopted the advice of the Archbishop of Cashel in reference to the second reading of the Land Bill. (Hear, hear.) If the Land League succeeded by its power in inducing those tenants who were not subjected to unjust rents to resist rents that were fair, the landlords would in time be avenged, but they still would be only at cross purposes, and would have made no real advance towards establishing the just rights of either class of the community in Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Considering the powers vested in the Irish Government by the Coercion Acts, he thought the number of arrests which had been made was not very extraordinary. He could not think of accusing the Chief Secretary of having been wanting in sufficient consideration of those cases before he signed the warrants under which those men were arrested; but there were some things that the right hon. gentleman might have done which he thought he had not done in regard to those cases. He could not understand why opportunity should not be given to a person within 24 hours

after he had been placed in custody to lay before the Secretary of State grounds calculated in the opinion of the prisoner to rebut the accusation against him. (Hear.)

Mr. McCarthy replied briefly, and announced that he felt it to be his duty to go to a division.

The House divided, and the numbers were—

For the motion	22
Against	180
Majority	108

IMMACULATE ENGLAND.

THE Birmingham *Daily Post* referring to the ever increasing crime of England, says:—At home our increasing barbarism seems to be drawing us nearer and nearer to the darkness predicted by Mober Shipton as destined to envelop us at the end of the next three years. No English paper appears without an article headed "State of Ireland," wherein the most serious accounts of burning and shooting and stabbing are set forth with all due attention to sensational details, sure to produce the household thanksgiving at the English hearth, "Thank God, we are not like unto these men!" Now, supposing the Irish papers were to give their readers a corresponding daily column on the "State of England," would they not find an ample equivalent of crime? Have we not, to begin with, the late prize fight on Epsom Downs, wherein two men, who had never fought before, were excited to try their skill against each other. The fight continued until both men were so severely bruised, and one of them so completely battered about the face that, according to the expression of an eye-witness, "he was carried from the field senseless and featureless." Next comes the great "punching" case at Liverpool, where a poor fellow called "Steeple Jack" was kicked to death by a band of roughs, while men stood by smoking and looking on without affording that help to the victim which he had sought to bestow on the girl his assailants had been cruelly ill-treating. Can there be in all the annals of brutality a worse method of attack than this "punching," which is not only accepted but approved in Lancashire? The blows of an iron-tipped clog on the ribs while the victim lies helpless on the ground—a kick or two upon the side of the head—and life is extinct before the assailant has time to repeat the blow. Then comes the "state of London," which would make an interesting column of itself. George Reed, a labourer, is convicted of having beaten his wife with violence; then, after throwing her to the ground, of breaking a paraffin lamp over her prostrate form with the intention of setting her on fire. Fortunately for the wife she must have been a bad manager, for nowhere could a match be found, so that compensation had to be sought in flinging her out of the window. This was an easy task, for George Reed a sturdy, hulking, beer-swollen fellow, while his wife, starved, and beaten, and emaciated, must have weighed but a feather in his lusty arms. It was the affair of a moment. Out flew the woman, whose convulsive clutching of her husband's sleeve and frantic cries for mercy were of no avail—and she lay smashed and bleeding on the pavement below! Then we have another case of a hatchet whereby a wife's skull was split in twain—"exactly as you would split a cocoa nut," said one of the witnesses. And as to the child-torturing and murder, the examples are too numerous to be quoted. Nay, even the poor animals come in for their share of the evil influence of that original sin which, according to Calvin, no men can resist if once he allows it to take hold upon his mind; for three horses grazing in a field were frightfully hacked and cut by some villains not long ago and vitriol poured into their wounds. No reason can be given for the cruelty save that the owner was "rather unpopular in the neighbourhood." Now, would not all these examples sufficiently warrant the Irish reporters in giving a regular account of the "state of England," even without the agrarian reasons for committing the outrages which comes under our notice every day? Dr. Mitchell's simple questing of "What is civilisation?" becomes more difficult to answer as education becomes more general. The late Mr. Ellis, whose sole care was for the boys, was wont to say, "Real civilisation has no present—it must for ever remain a thing of the future."

The announcement made on Monday last in the German Parliament that German immigration had reached a higher figure during the past month than at any period of the last ten years is ominously significant. It becomes doubly so from being coupled by its utterer—the leader of the Progressist Party—with the assertion that this is so because "the labourers and artisans are in such a miserable condition." This is the price paid by Germany for the triumphs of 1870, and for Prince Bismarck's audacious experiments in political economy. But such a tribute is too exhausting to last. The rapid diminution of a class which is the life and marrow of Germany, which fills her coffers and recruits her armies, will deplete her as Spain was depleted by the Moorish exodus. She does not, however, suffer alone. Norway and Sweden are being gradually dispeopled by the same cause. Russia has in vain tried to meet it by the increased rigour in her passport system. The passports of passengers going by sea from St. Petersburg to Sweden are not examined at starting, and in this way many emigrants escape undetected to America.

Drunkenness is surely one of the greatest of sins. It is the destroyer of happy homes, and the death of thousands, who have unfortunately yielded to its terrible curse. In an interview lately, the keeper of the Morgue of this city (New York), where 5000 bodies are annually brought from hospitals, accidents and rivers, declared that the great feeder of the Morgue is not disappointed love, broken ambition, dire want, or cruel neglect, but drunkenness. "Eight cases out of ten," said the keeper, "can be attributed to that in the indirect cause," or, in other words, that 4000 of the 5000 violent deaths are due to this cause. It is a terrible temperance lecture.—*Catholic Review.*