

prosperous, and far more pretentious neighbours—but first, let us add, that Professor Levi attributes an increase in Irish crime in '71-2 and '79-80 to "the crimes which had occurred in the unhappy relations between landlord and tenant." Ireland, then, through all the ten years was less criminal than Great Britain—notwithstanding this rise in crime owing to the agrarian hardship.—The Professor stated, says the *Times*' report "that the number of indictable offences reported to the police within the last ten years showed a slight increase in England and Wales—from 1.97 per thousand in 1871 to 2.05 in 1880, and in Ireland, from 1.51 to 1.62. The ten years included five of great prosperity and high wages, and five bad years. The number of crimes reported in Ireland was uniformly smaller in proportion than in England. As to Ireland, the larger number of crimes at the commencement and end of the period—viz., in 1871-2 and in 1879-80—was clearly due to the crimes which occurred in the unhappy relations between landlord and tenant." But what will many of our worthy friends think when they learn in what particular respects Ireland ranked above the lands of which they make so loud a boasting—the roaring Paddy above the orderly Englishman, and the douce Scotchman? "Offences against public order and justice, riots, breaches of the peace were—in England and Wales, 16 per thousand of the population; in Scotland, 5.13; and in Ireland, 1.24. The proportion for offences against morals was—0.21 per 1000 in England and Wales; 0.08 in Scotland; and in Ireland 0.04." But even in murder Ireland was, after all, not so very much in advance of her neighbours.—The Hon. Mr. Oliver, for example, may learn from these statistics, if they be worth the notice of a man of his money, that murders may not be actually counted by the hundred in Ireland—or if so, they must be counted by fifties in Scotland and twenty-fives in England. Murder and manslaughter—in England and Wales, 0.01; in Scotland, 0.02; and in Ireland, 0.04 per 1000. Assaults—in England and Wales, 2.81; Scotland, 11.55; and Ireland, 6.50." In offences against property, again Ireland has the advantage. "Offences against property were—per 1000 of the population, in England and Wales, 3.31; in Scotland, 4.66; in Ireland 2.27." But the particulars as to the greater powers of the English and Scotch to contain alcohol with steadiness and propriety may be gained from these figures. "Offences against public decorum and drunkenness were—6.77 in England and Wales; 7.26 in Scotland; and 16.60 in Ireland, per 1000 persons." To sum up, we are told that "honour and property were safest in Ireland, the person was safest in Great Britain, drunkenness was worst in Ireland." The Professor also made this statement: "Prosperity moved hand in hand with virtue; misery with depression and crime. The bulk of criminals were generally found to be illiterate, and drunkenness was both a direct and indirect cause of crime." All honour to old Ireland, then, where, although whole districts are in a condition to which, the *Times* says, Englishmen would not condemn their horses or dogs, the race as a whole is acknowledged to be the superiors of the British race, so much more fortunately situated than they are. And all honour to the Catholic Church that has the power to keep even her illiterate children more virtuous than those without her pale whose education is the boast of the world. What, finally, shall we say of a drunken Ireland that is more virtuous in its riotous cups, than John Bull and Sandy, able to stand steady on their legs and hold their tongues? Here are marvels inexplicable to many people.

It is, moreover, particularly pleasing to us to find that there are Englishmen ready to come forward at the present time, and give us practical proofs, bearing out the statements of the *Spectator*, that they know nothing of the hatred which Mr. Godkin has spoken of. The letter of such an Englishman, for example, we find has been lately published even in the columns of the *Times* itself—which also devotes a leading article to this letter. He writes for English readers, to whom he gives a description of things as they were witnessed by him in Ireland, where he says he had gone "with that large amount of ignorance of things Irish which is usual among educated Englishmen." This traveller, then, first of all fell in with representatives of the landlord class, whom he perceived to be filled with wrath and indignation at Mr. Gladstone and the land commissioners. The sole business of the commissioners they vowed was to reduce rents, regardless of everything in the way of fairness or justice, and they accused Mr. Gladstone of having given them instructions to such an effect. When this accusation was objected to they claimed that it was Mr. Gladstone's duty to give the commissioners a hint that they were going too far. The traveller did not feel himself equal to the task of setting these gentlemen right, so he says: "I listened in silence to an amount of abuse of the idleness and general wickedness of the Irish tenant, which showed me that I had come into a country in which, however fair the prospect, man at any rate was exceedingly vile." The argument of a Protestant bishop, given a little further on, is too fine to be curtailed, and we quote it entire as follows:—"He told me that the Protestant Church in Ireland depends chiefly on the landowners, and that it cannot with unconcern see them deprived of a quarter of their income by the

commissioners under the Land Act. I suggested that, as the commissioners were fixing fair rents, the inference was that the quarter of their income of which the Protestant landowners were being deprived was an unfair exaction to which they had no moral right, but this he would not allow, maintaining that the commissioners were making it their business not to fix fair rents, but to reduce them in every case without any reference to their fairness or unfairness. I could only deplore, if this were, indeed, the case, the lamentable appointment of such an unrighteous set of Commissioners." The traveller, nevertheless, had fortunately not fallen altogether among thieves. Some honest men there were also to whom he could have recourse, and among them was a certain correspondent for an American paper, with whom he made an arrangement to accompany him in a tour through the country parts. But before leaving Dublin he was taken to the office of the Ladies' Land League and introduced to several of the ladies. "I was introduced especially," he says, "to Miss Reynolds, a young lady who had twice been imprisoned under the Coercion Act in default of bail. I asked her of what crime she had been accused, and she said the charge was intimidation of the police. I further inquired in what way she had intimidated a body of public servants not usually supposed to be timorous, and she informed me that on the first occasion she had told them that, although they might seize upon a man's car if they wanted a drive, they could not compel him to drive it for them; while on the second she had been present at an eviction and had shaken her head at the police." At this the traveller within his mind made query and answer: "I felt inclined to ask, with the clown in Hamlet, 'Is this law?' but refrained, foreseeing the obvious answer—'Ay, marry, is't; Coercion Act law.'" These ladies had, nevertheless, some other information to afford him: "They told me that there had been an enormous number of evictions, and that they had seen evicted tenants sleeping in ditches by the roadside even in winter, but that this could not happen now, as the League is always ready to supply them with huts. There had lately been a lull in the camp of the evictors, but they were afraid it would not last long. The fight was being kept up most vigorously on the estate of Lord Cloncurry, who seemed to be put forward as the especial champion of the landlords. Outrages, they feared, were to be expected to continue as long as eviction for non-payment of exorbitant rents went on. The Land League had always denounced them, but the Government, by suppressing their organisation, had taken all responsibility away from them, and must now put them down as best they could with the help of their Coercion Acts. They told us that two educated girls, farmers' daughters, had the other day been sentenced to a fortnight's hard labour by a magistrate under the new Act for groaning when some 'emergency men' passed by. The hard labour had been remitted but the imprisonment remained, and one lady remarked that the hardest part of the imprisonment was the wearing of the convict dress. A lady's opinion on a question of dress is, of course, always valuable. She went on to remark that outrages were to be expected in that district after such tyranny as that, but I am glad to say that as yet none have taken place there. They agreed that there could be no end to the agitation as long as the leaseholders were kept out of the benefits of the Land Act, as many of them had only signed their leases under threat of eviction, although they could not prove this in court, as naturally the threat had not been reduced to writing; and they highly praised the conduct of the Duke of Leinster in tearing up his famous leases, which debarred his tenants from all access to any of the courts, saying that the FitzGeralds would never be boycotted in Ireland." During the course of another day or two in Dublin the traveller met, among others, with several Land Leaguers, from whom he learned that "many evictions had taken place with the view of preventing the tenants from going into the court, and that the landlords now refused to accept the full amount of the arrears, rather than allow their formerly recalcitrant tenants to get the benefit of the Land Act." The traveller, however, determined to see the state of the country with his own eyes, started for Loughrea, in company with the American correspondent already alluded to—and in whom we may most probably recognise Mr. Henry George, lately arrested in that town together with a gentleman whose name we have for the moment forgotten, but whom we believe to have been this traveller. He took a place by train to Ballinasloe, and on the journey made acquaintance with a labouring man, whom he found to be anything rather than what the English Press especially has represented the Irish peasantry as being. The man's personal appearance even, strange to say, was quite different from those pictures of the typical Irishman now published under the editorship of the excellent Mr. Burnand, of the London *Punch*, and concerning whose Catholic zeal for religion, and admirable domestic virtues so much is related. But who, nevertheless, takes the same advantage of his editorial position that is taken by the editor of the *London Tablet*, and, apparently at least, endeavours to clear himself of the imputations made by Mr. Gladstone in his "Vaticanism" very cheaply, if not in quite the true spirit of the Catholic religion, by giving free rein to his innate dislike of Irishmen. The description of this man whom our traveller met with is also worthy of full quotation—indeed the whole letter in