

## IRISH WRITERS IN ENGLAND

In every field of human endeavor and in almost every land under the sun Irishmen have added lustre and fame to the old sod which gave them or their forefathers birth. While Irish names are to be found amongst the most illustrious in the sciences and art, it is perhaps in the domain of literature in which they excel. This is particularly true of journalism, and in all the great cities of America and England to-day there are men of Irish birth or parentage who are second to none in all the equipments of up to date and progressive journalism. This is especially true of London, and has been especially true for many generations.

Alluding to those men and women of the past, an interesting brochure compiled by Messrs. Fahy and O'Donoghue, two well known Irish writers resident in London, has this to say:—

John Francis O'Donnell was one of those writers; William Allingham was another Irishman who received many kindnesses from Dickens; and finally Rosa Mulholland wrote for his journal some of her earliest and most idyllic stories, notably 'Hester's History,' 'The Late Miss Hollingford,' 'The Wicked Woods of Tobereevil,' and one or two shorter works. And we cannot conclude our reference to the monthly and other magazines without mentioning in terms of praise Dr. J. F. Waller's able essays and poems in *Cassell's Family Magazine*.

Among the daily papers, the *Daily News* has been most remarkable for its Irish writers. Its first number came out on January 21, 1846. Its earliest editor was Dickens; its politics were described as advanced Liberal. The eminent novelist only edited seventeen numbers, having grown quite tired of editorial duties, and John Forster became its acting editor for a short time. Towards the end of 1846, Eyre Evans Crowe was appointed editor, and filled that post with great success. As a forcible and sparkling leader-writer he had won his reputation; and William McCullagh Torrens was another of its most effective contributors.

Justin McCarthy, who preceded John Morley as editor of a daily paper of some vogue at one time—the *Morning Star*—also joined its brilliant band of writers later on, and among other Irish writers at various times have been Lady Blessington, Thomas Wallis, Dudley Costello, James Bodkin, E. L. Godkin (now an American editor), E. M. Whitty, and others. Its foreign correspondents, at one time or another, included Dr. Lardner (Paris), 'Father Prout' (Rome), and at this time its Paris correspondent is Mrs. Emily Crawford, a brilliant Irishwoman. Thackeray advised G. M. Crawford, who formerly held the post, if he ever married to choose an Irishwoman, there being, as he said, 'No such good wife as a daughter of Erin.' Crawford took his advice, and married the distinguished lady who succeeded her husband as Paris correspondent. As for the famous 'specials' who have served on the staff of the *Daily News*, their names are familiar to all careful readers of recent events.

The thrilling story of the Bulgarian atrocities, which roused the world, was sent to its columns by J. A. McGahan, the son of Irish parents, but of American birth. Another of its 'specials' was Edmund O'Donovan, who saw many remarkable sights in foreign lands, and through the columns of this paper acquainted the world with them. James J. O'Kelly (now M.P.) chronicled several important wars in the *Daily News*, and ranks as one of the most dashing of military journalists; and John Murphy completes the list of its Irish special correspondents. Its two prominent Dublin correspondents have been Daniel Owen Madden and Martin Haverty.

The *Daily Telegraph* has not had many distinguished Irishmen on its staff. H. W. Russell was its most notable Irish special; and two others of some repute have been the Hon. Lewis Wingfield, who described in its columns the siege of Paris and other stirring events, and Lord Dunraven, who acted as its correspondent during part of the Franco-German and

Abyssinian wars. A well-known Dublin journalist, Edward O'Farrell, was sub-editor of the *Telegraph* for some years, and W. H. K. Wilde, a clever son of Lady Wilde, is at present on its staff as leader-writer.

## Recalling the Nuns to France

We had occasion to notice some weeks ago (writes the special correspondent of the *Catholic Times*) the action of one of the municipal councillors of Paris, who, in the name of liberty, advocates the return of the nursing Sisters to the hospitals from which they have been so cruelly expelled. Contrary to what would have been taken place some years ago, his proposal is to be duly examined. This proposal is founded on three reasons: first, on motives of economy; secondly, on the opinion of the physicians; and thirdly, on the wishes of the sick people themselves.

In point of economy, the difference is a notable one, for whereas the Nursing Sisters were content to be paid 200 francs a year, the lay sick nurses require at least 1100 francs, and although they are better paid, give inferior service. This is now abundantly proved, and both the doctors and the sick are unanimous in signifying their

### Preference for the Nuns,

whose brutal expulsion has been the means of making them appreciated as they deserve. Throughout France, a perceptible movement in their favor has taken place among medical men, who, although they did not protest with sufficient energy against their removal, now proclaim the necessity of their return. At Lille, the medical men sent in a petition to this effect to the Chambers; at Cherbourg, Toulouse, Annecy, Avignon, and other towns, generally on the occasion of an epidemic having broken out among the sick, the nuns have been recalled by the municipal authorities; in Paris, M. de Puymaigre's initiative will probably bring about their return, in some hospitals, if not in all. He proposes that proper attention should be paid to the wishes expressed by the sick. Owing to the replacing of the nuns only in certain hospitals, those who prefer them to the lay nurses can satisfy their preference, while those who think differently can continue to frequent the lay hospitals.

It is a positive fact that the lay nurses, except, of course, those who belong to one or other of the Red Cross Associations, are not equal to the task that they have to fulfil and that, in this respect, they leave much to be desired. It is no less certain that in many hospitals nothing is more difficult than to send for a priest. A few days ago a poor woman, whose little girl was dangerously ill, startled by the gravity of the child's condition, expressed a wish that a priest should be called in immediately. After having been sent from one functionary to another, she was informed that her request could only be granted if the petition was signed by the child's father: 'But there is no time to lose; my child is dying.' 'No, no, you exaggerate; at any rate, the rule must be observed.' Next morning at eight, the poor mother returned with a paper signed by her husband, a working man. She was received with rough words, because she came 'too early,' and when, with much trouble, she secured a hearing and held out the paper, now duly signed, 'It is too late, your child died yesterday afternoon,' was the answer of the functionary to whom she proffered her request.

Similar incidents are of daily occurrence; where a grown person is concerned, a paper written by the sick or dying patient himself is rigorously exacted, before a priest is permitted to enter the ward. To many of these poor people, writing a letter, when in health, is a matter of difficulty: how much more so when weak, feverish, depressed by illness and awed by strange and unsympathetic surroundings! Moreover, they know that the request they are about to make is unpopular, and, though few among them would deliberately choose to die without a priest, many are lax and indifferent Catholics who would gladly yield to a friendly suggestion, but who lack courage to take the initiative.