

New Zealand Gazette

TWENTY-SECOND YEAR OF PUBLICATION.

VOL. XLII. NO. 11.

DUNEDIN: FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1894

PRICE 6s.

Current Topics

AT HOME AND ABROAD.

CALL THE DOCTOR. WHY our "Civis" is quite out of sorts. Is colour-blindness a symptom of his illness, or is our festive friend suffering in the grasp of the green-eyed monster? Anyone can see that the covers of the TABLET are not, as he says they are, green. This, however, is but a trifle. Perhaps, after all, it is a joke—of some kind too subtle to appear. But who could have thought that our "Civis," however indisposed he might be, would include among the "charities of human life" the murder of President Carnot? The TABLET, he tells his readers, in effect, is persuaded that President Carnot was the victim of the inmost Masonic lodges—and therefore the TABLET has turned all the charities of human life to vitriol. Our "Civis," we may explain, also includes in these charities devil worship, and all the mischief of the time. Seeing, therefore, what his definition of charity is, we can hardly complain if our festive friend accredits us with turning it into vitriol. Supposing it capable of distillation at all, in fact, what other sort of liquor does he think it would make? Potheen, perhaps, or lemonade. But, oh no. We did not accuse the *Otago Daily Times* of getting its American letter written for any sinister purpose. What we accused the *Daily Times* of—and we stick to our charge—was publishing an incendiary paragraph sent it spontaneously by a bigot—and which it was a disgrace to its columns to publish at all—with the hope of influencing the election by raising the No-Popery cry. We made all the excuse possible for the action of the *Times*. We gave it the benefit of the doubt—and admitted that, under less pressing circumstances, it would have withheld the paragraph from publication. If our "Civis" were not out of sorts, moreover, he would perceive that it was not the Tuapeka election, but the A.P.A. that we had associated with sacrilege and arson. He would recognise, too, that, since the A.P.A. had just been engaged in a commemorative celebration of sacrilege and arson, we were justified in making the association. He acknowledges with thanks our charitable concession that the *Times* had no real desire to see the action of the Know-nothings repeated by the A.P.A.—and what our festive friend says in jest, we take in earnest. Under the circumstances, then, since our festive friend sees green, and ranks as charities of human life a whole lot of most shocking occurrences—assassination, devil-worship, and all the mischief of the time—it would be very foolish on our part to take offence at anything he has to say against us. We are accountable for a "disordered brain," "exquisite absurdities," and "bathos," are we? Far be it from us to contradict our accuser, considering his condition. Let him take a drop of Mother Seigel's syrup, or Clements' tonic, or something equally wholesome, and look again, and he will see that we are all right.

A VERY foolish proceeding, especially as judged from certain sentiments expressed on the occasion, and one calculated to nerve opposition to the Home Rule movement, was the commemoration of '98 made at Ranciscothy on Sunday, May 27. Under any circumstances it may be held doubtful that such a commemoration would be wise. No doubt the insurrection was excusable. Nay, more, it was forced on by the wicked tactics of the Government, and the barbarous cruelty of the military authorities. While, however, there was wickedness and barbarous cruelty on one side, the other side was not without its excesses. Lower down the river Slaney, for example, on Wexford bridge, a horrible slaughter in cold blood took place, for which there was absolutely no excuse. A body of prisoners, who had been shut up in the gaol, were marched down to the bridge, and there killed with pikes, their bleeding corpses being flung into the stream. We have heard an eye-witness describe the scene, and how afterwards the gore kept rising in bubbles to the surface of the water. The fact, we may remark in passing, that the eye-witness alluded to was a Protestant, and known to be such, of itself proves that Protestantism alone was not the cause of the murders. Nevertheless, the fact remains that all those put to death were of the religion in question. How, then,

can this celebration almost within sight of the fatal spot—it is but a few miles away—be expected not to stir up or, where they exist, increase the alarm and opposition of Protestants? The time is one at which the olive branch has been displayed, and its acceptance urgently invited, and any conduct inconsistent with the peace proposed, or capable of throwing doubt on its sincerity, is to be deplored and deprecated. So much for the general aspect of the matter. The particular utterance to which we have referred is the following. It was made by a Mr Henry Dixon, junr., of Dublin, the chief speaker on the occasion. Referring to what the speaker considered the mistake made by the insurgents in not seizing on Dublin—"The French people," he said, "had taught them a different lesson, and that was the seizure of the capital. They should therefore, make a resolution that, so far as they were concerned, they would work so that those who came after them would be worthy sons of the United Irishmen, and would be worthy to carry out the object of those men, the establishment in this country of a senate responsible to the people, and, if the country was so disposed, a Government on Republican lines (loud cheers)." How, then, can Irishmen complain if advantage is taken of language like this—supported by cheers—to repeat and confirm the charge that under the presence of Home Rule, separation is aimed at? It is true the name of no prominent Home Ruler occurs among those of the men present, but still an assemblage of some 5000 people from various centres must be admitted to have been of some importance. A strong protest against the principles enounced seems to be very necessary. Indeed, as we have said, the whole demonstration appears more than questionable.

A FAIR OFFER.

It is too late to get him in now, but it may result in getting for him a thumping big testimonial. Of course, we allude to the No-Popery cry and Mr Scobie Mackenzie. They botched the matter this time. They depended over-much on the cry being always ready at hand, and did not work it up in time. We learn from a writer of "Tuapeka Notes" in the *Evening Star* of Saturday, that they had seen their mistake. They only wanted a day or two more, he tells us, in effect, for it to send Mr Mackenzie in flying. The writer of notes, as usual among such scribes and others of the kind, finds it outrageous that the strong convictions on the subject of education entertained by Mr Mackenzie should be encountered by convictions quite as strong on the same subject entertained by Catholics. This is the effect of an intolerant bigotry it seems—at least in the eyes of an intolerant bigot. Mr Scobie Mackenzie's supporter, in this respect, seems of one feather with Mr Scobie Mackenzie himself, and therefore justifies the fact mentioned by him that Mr Mackenzie need look for no favour from Catholic electors. We can fully believe the writer also, when he tells us that Mr Mackenzie's reference to clerical influences were full of studied respect and courtesy. To have put in an appearance there at all, in fact, those qualities must have been very much studied. But who so apt to study them? Mr Scobie Mackenzie is nothing, if not "pawky." By the way "Nemo" in the same number of the *Star* wants to know what is the Irish for "pawky." "Soothing" it seems to us, might, on a pinch at least, serve the purpose. "Soothing Mike," for instance, would answer pretty well to "Pawky Jock." The TABLET, too, has given this writer of notes great cause for disgust. Why, we cannot tell, for, on his own showing, we have helped the party he advocates. He says that, so atrocious was our conduct, so barbarous our language, we actually got a good many people to vote against Mr Larnach. Is it not rather bad tactics, then, on the part of this note-writer to point out to us the error of our ways, and put us on our guard for the next time? However, we are quite used to that. Our foes always tell us that we have done the very thing they wanted us to do. That is why we always do it again. We are so good natured, you know. But, indeed, we made use of no disgraceful term, conditional or absolute, towards Mr Scobie Mackenzie. We called him "pawky," but that is a word that we are sure our Scotch friends with whom it originated would never think of applying to Yahoos or Hottentots. It was composed for decent bodies in the land o' cakes. The epithet we applied to Mr Allen was the one he had long since earned, "No-Popery." We have to congratulate this note-writer on perceiving its proper force. It certainly would, as he says, disgrace a Yahoo or a Hotten-

PHOTOGRAPHS, C. H. MANNING, Royal and Vice-Royal Photographer, Especially patronised by His Lordship BISHOP GRIMES, High-class CABINET PHOTOS from 10s per dozen. Studio: 150 Colombo Street, Christchurch.

UNIVERSAL

OPINION SAYS

Phoenix Jams, Peel and Marmalade

ARE THE BEST.

USE NO OTHER.