

and prolonged; and the fierce light which the speakers threw upon the whole machinery of Balfourism must produce such a horror of the infernal system in the public mind as to consign its authors and instruments to eternal infamy. From the lips of William O'Brien and John Dillon and Edward Harrington the people of England have got such a picture of the Caddells, the Cecil Roches, and others of the same tribe, as only men who have had personal acquaintance with their lawless brutality could give; and to the overwhelming testimony borne to their rowdy and boorish conduct not a single syllable of denial was possible, nor was it attempted. This is a fact which must make a tremendous impression on the public mind. The only defence attempted by the Chief Secretary was in favour of Colonel Caddell, whose public career he set forth in very eulogistic terms. But he did not venture to give a denial of the charges that this distinguished soldier had stuck out his tongue at a priest, had used foul language to a young girl, and had admitted that he acted in a dual capacity, magisterial and executive, in the famous baton incidents which marked the opening of New Tipperary.

Similarly, when the Prisons Vote came to be discussed, Mr. Balfour did not venture to deny or defend any of the countless brutalities committed under his sanction, if not by his express direction. He only answered with a gibe or a sneer, and mockingly complimented those who had gone through the ordeal of his savagery on their healthy appearance. Not a word did he say in defence of the scandalous differences in treatment meted out to imprisoned Pressmen in Ireland and England respectively. Perhaps most interesting in connection with these all-important exposures was the admission dragged from the Government—though it almost took wild horses to do it—that the expenses of Inspector Concannon's defence in the two trials of Nolan's action against him would be defrayed by the Crown. All the resources of evasion, quibbling, and shuffling were exhausted by the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General before this was got from them, and so fierce and prolonged was the debate to which it gave rise that the vote was only carried by the application of the closure, at about three o'clock in the morning. Many a scandal has been perpetrated and defended under the shield of the Irish Chief Secretary, but this eclipses them all in brazen injustice and flagrant defiance of law, justice and decency.

The edifying struggle between the drunken exterminator, Lord Massereene, and Messrs. Dudgeon and Emerson, who discharged the double duties of solicitors and bumbailiffs on the estate, still, we are glad to see, continues with unabated vigilance. The contract of Messrs. Dudgeon and Emerson was very much the same as that of the estimable Dodson and Fogg in the Pickwick Papers. Those sharp practitioners, we read, agreed to take their costs out of Mr. Pickwick. In the same magnanimous way Messrs. Dudgeon and Emerson agreed to take their costs out of the unfortunate tenants. All they claimed was the privilege of squeezing them quite dry. It was found, however, that the Plan of Campaign interfered unconsciously with the little arrangement. The tenants ungraciously refused to be squeezed, and Dudgeon and Emerson, like Dodson and Fogg, have now turned hungrier than ever on their employer. Judge Warren has decided that, as the wicked Plan of Campaign spoiled their little game, they are released from their original contract and are entitled to their full pound of flesh out of Lord Massereene. A pleasant prospect this to other embarrassed exterminators who have called sharp attorneys to their aid against the Plan of Campaign.

It was really very fine to hear the brave Mr. Balfour declaiming against any attack on his trusty Removables under cover of Parliamentary privilege. Is it possible he forgets the incident of Peggy Dillon? Does he forget that it was under cover of Parliamentary privilege he calumniated the midwife, and that he appealed to Parliamentary privilege for protection when she strove to make him answer for his calumnies in court? Mr. Balfour is now as virtually indignant on behalf of Removable Cad of Tipperary as he was formerly on behalf of Removable Segrave of Mitchelstown. It will be remembered that when Dr. Tanner first denounced the convicted swindler, Segrave, who was in supreme command at the Mitchelstown massacre, and who for years polluted the bench of justice sentencing priests and members of Parliament to prison, the Removable's champion, Mr. Balfour, who had appointed him, was in great wrath at the bad taste of such an attack on "a distinguished and honourable gentleman and impartial magistrate." Dr. Tanner impolitely persisted. He proved that this man, who was at first a private and then a sergeant in the South African auxiliary forces, had been convicted of embezzling the canteen fund; had been convicted of embezzling the pay of the troops; and finally—worst and meanest of all—had been convicted of embezzling a five-pound note which was given him by a sick comrade for his family. He was cashiered in disgrace from the South African army before he was elevated to the Bench in Ireland.

Dr. Tanner gave names, dates, and minute details of his charges. The smallest inquiry would have convinced the Government of their truth. But no inquiries were made. On the contrary, the inconveniently persistent Dr. Tanner was put out of the way as quickly as might be by some bogus charge before the Removables. But the Government did not escape so easily. The question was taken up by Mr. Dillon and Mr. Sexton, and the proofs pressed home so conclusively that "the distinguished and honourable gentleman," convicted swindler, Segrave, who, by the way, is a close and worthy relative of Pether the Packer, was "permitted to resign." We do not deny that there are some honourable gentlemen amongst the Removables, but we believe that swindler Segrave is a fair average specimen of the gang who are employed most on the active service of Coercion. It may be necessary before long to show up another specimen or two for the edification of the public.

A judge exhorting the people to rise up and take to lynch law is the latest novelty that the Irish bench furnishes. Such advice was given in very unambiguous phraseology by Judge Harrison on Friday, July 18, with reference to the eastern portion of the county Galway. He thought, he said, it would be a happy day for the administration of the law that the people should rise up and take the law into their own hands, as at present it is in a state of par-

alysis. Language of this sort in the mouth of Judge Harrison sounds odd. Hitherto that functionary has done nothing more shocking than pass fulsome eulogies upon Orange bigwigs; and there is hardly anything in the atmospherical condition to suggest the influence of the dog-star on ordinarily calm minds. What are the indications of the terrible condition of things in the eastern part of the county Galway which would excuse such an anarchical remedy as Lynch law his lordship did not condescend to say. The public Press, or at least that portion of it which delights in blood-curdling tales of agrarian outrage, and invents some when they are not otherwise procurable, has been dumb over the matter. The only perturbation which we hear of in eastern Galway is the result of the raiding operations by Mr. Tener, on behalf of Lord Clanricarde; and surely Judge Harrison doesn't suggest that people should rise up and lynch Mr. Tener. Perhaps he would kindly explain.

We concur for once with the *Daily Express* in considering the extraordinary charge of Judge Harrison, mainly important as indicating the utter breakdown of coercion in the district to which he refers. A mad sheep is proverbially a dangerous animal. We imagine he is a nuisance, particularly to his proprietors. Judge Harrison's injudicious candour lands Mr. Balfour in a very ugly predicament. This judge declares that the firm administration of the law, or, in plainer language, unrelenting coercion, has been an absolute failure in the east riding of Galway, of which the Marquis of Clanricarde is the principal proprietor. We can discount Judge Harrison's strong language easily enough. He is a fossil, but not dishonest, old Tory. For tenants to combine against rack-rents and eviction is to him "abominable lawlessness." Their refusal to facilitate and encourage land-grabbers and emergency men is "intolerable tyranny," for which lynch law is the only appropriate remedy. Sensible men may well smile at these incoherent ravings. But when Judge Harrison tells us that "the administration of the law now seems completely paralysed throughout this district," we may accept the statement as absolutely true—for "the administration of law" understanding the enforcement of coercion, of course. The *Daily Express* takes the same view very strongly. It rather inclines to the judge's opinion that lynch law should be adopted, but very plainly confesses with him that coercion has absolutely failed. "Such an utterance," writes the *Express* very truly, "never fell from the bench before. Probably," it adds, "because never before was the same spirit of lawlessness abroad." If the judge's picture of society in these regions be correct, what are we to think of the rose-coloured views so often presented to England from the platform and in the House of Commons? We commend the question heartily to the brave Mr. Balfour and his flatterers when they are next disposed, in the House of Commons or out of it, to indulge in grotesque raptures over the triumph of coercion in Ireland.

The Nationalists and the Plan of Campaign have conquered Mr. Balfour and Coercion on the estate of the Marquis of Clanricarde. It was a terrible conflict. Coercion did its worst there. To borrow the emphatic language of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, "the district was saturated with coercion." Every respectable man he met in the district was either going to prison or returning from prison. Every form of coercion has for the last four years been rampant in the district. The right of public meeting was sternly proclaimed, and Mr. Blunt was hurried off to Galway gaol as a common criminal for presuming to exercise the first privilege of an Englishman in Ireland. Over three hundred persons were imprisoned from that district under one coercion pretence or another. Over a thousand were evicted. The district was flooded with police until there was a helmet behind every bush. The Star Chamber was set up all over the place. The Removables worked double tides in convicting and sentencing. The most virulent Crown Prosecutor in Ireland, Mr. James N. Blake, was aiding and abetting. The appellant judge, the Recorder of Galway, Mr. Henn, Q.C., was as reliable as a Removable. Even the eminent services of Pether the Packer were called into requisition, and he packed a jury of Wicklow Protestant coercionists in his best style for the conviction of a number of Galway Nationalists who had assisted an evicted widow in the saving of her hay. Coercion, undoubtedly, did its strongest and worst in the district. It was helped along by the covert aid and sympathy of the coadjutor-bishop. As to the final result of the struggle let Judge Harrison and the *Daily Express* testify. It is about time that we heard the last of that outrageous absurdity, the glorious success of Mr. Balfour's administration in Ireland. The bladder is effectively pricked by sharp-pointed truths. It will never hold air again.

From the Clanricarde estate the *Daily Express* looks North, still with angry and discontented eyes. It draws the distinction which Nationalists are always anxious to draw between two things which Coercionists, as a rule, are anxious to confound—crime and crimeless agrarian combination. It directs attention to Judge Fitzgibbon's testimony to the crimelessness of Ireland—"Lord Justice Fitzgibbon in his charge to the grand jury of Antrim, drew attention to the unique absence of agrarian crime in the north-eastern counties. The Commission which he opened in Belfast included six counties—Meath, Louth, Monaghan, Armagh, Down, and Antrim. The population of these counties is 1,130,000, or more than one-fifth of the whole population of Ireland. Yet in this large and populous area he had met with not one single instance, even by report, of a crime arising from combination and conspiracy. This, no doubt, very satisfactory in its way, and of course, the Judge was amply justified in using very complimentary language to East Ulster, and suggesting that it would be a very happy thing if the rest of Ireland would fall into line with counties so law-abiding."

Still the editor of the *Daily Express* is not happy. In truth it is not crime the landlords and their organs hate or fear, but the steady peaceful, legal, unconquerable combination which has taken the place of crime. The *Daily Express* lets the cat out of the bag with brutal frankness. It is not by any means satisfied with the almost total absence of crime. "We must point out," writes the *Express*, "that the absence of crime arising from combination and conspiracy by no means proves that illegal combinations do not prevail in parts, at least, of these counties. Are there no boycotted farms on the