

## PALL MALL GAZETTE

*An Evening Newspaper and Review.*

No. 3444—Vol. XXXV.

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1884.

Price One Penny.

## FRESH PROOF.

THE TIME this morning has found out a capital joke. The newly-impoverished Conservator for Clive has issued a circular to his subscribers, directing them that "even on suspicion of an attempt, they should at once on their becoming to prevent the best possibility," and "if more should accidentally commit an error in sending any 'press on suspicion of that person being about to commit an error, I shall prosecute them by sending forward and printing this document." What this comes to is, not that the police may defend themselves or Mr. LEVY when threatened with attack, but that, if they are unphlegmatically within shooting distance of Mr. LEVY, they are at liberty to do as they will, and if they should chance to make a mistake and shoot an innocent man, then they are to prosecute the circular, and the Inspector will see that no more is said about the matter. The issue of a circular of this sort, without legal sanction, ticks the Times kindly. It cannot understand how it is that the people of Clive and the Irish members do not take the joke. "One of the 'same apostles,' our illustrious orators, of the apostles' apostles is in extinction of the honour which has done much to keep the Irish clannishness." "The subject," to be sure, "is a serious and even a grim one, but there is something 'exceedingly comic about the document.'" Quite inevitable: here is an agent of the law, openly forbidding other agents of the law to go in for law-shooting, legal or illegal, but as a man, public or private. And yet the Irish do not take the joke! And the same writer, who is so puzzled at the want of humour in the Irish, who cannot make out why they do not share their own side with "invariably comic" mistakes, in a minute or two has been blown into a passion of good feeling and righteousness, the kind of which it has not been our fortune to see for a long time. We must begin by making a clear view of the whole machinery "of justice." And here? "We have only to throw aside our ill-learned teachers in order to make very short work of Irish 'reflections.' It is time to point out that if we choose to adopt 'the proper measures we could make an end of the whole 'Irish agitation in a couple of months.' Certainly it is time, and high time, to point out such proper measures, if they are to be had. We can only say that there has never been an Irish agitation yet of anything like the present dimensions which was made an end of in two months. The counter-stroke at the beginning of this century took a good deal more than two months or two years; so did the Franco-Preservation Act of 1844, and the famous Insurrection Act of 1849, which was renewed again and again, and the Insurrection Act of 1854, and the Coercion Act in the Title War. Does the history of our policy in Ireland teach these people nothing? If it does, how can they persist in their theory—that if the repression is only further enough, it is sure to succeed? And why should this moment, of all others, be chosen for a renewal of the policy? It is now known that the No. 1000 mandarin is proving practically a failure. His no random arrests involved for the enjoyment of the day, but the actual truth, that there are now being paid in Ireland—perhaps better paid than they are in England. Surely this is a time, when the Legislature is here from Belfast, and when orders issue the whole slowly beginning to revive (in spite of all the business of what is mentioned above)—this is the very time when we should avoid these fraudulent appeals. Let our repression be hence, clearer, more legal, more concentrated, not merely more angry, more wild and more violent.

Even the Conservative organs now admit that they have been on the wrong tack. The *Quarterly Review* only says what other Conservative papers say, in such a passage as this—

There are nearly seven hundred men in jail, and yet examples of all kinds have been named rather than punished. Some of these men are sent to be out of prison, and have much better of all the cases in the Government have been placed than in it?

And what did Mr. STONE say last night—

We would not do down without asking the Government whether they intended the kind of thing to go on or even. There was a division war between the people of Ireland and the Government. They might go on to that extent to peace, and the thing would seem more to us and. A policy entirely unchangeable and inflexible was required and if the Government were not prepared to take another course the case of Ireland would go from bad to worse. And Mr. STONE, be it remembered, has sacrificed his position in

his own party and his own country, to his desire to help the British Government. The League have communicated him with both, both, and ready. He is the "order and regular" authority to whom Ministers have always applied. This time it is Mr. O'CONNOR POWER, Mr. de MASH, it is in the name of the League with the Irreconcilable section. He, too, shot a decidedly remarkable light on Mr. FORTESCUE's system. In reply to the toast from his own side that he and Mr. STONE were in the Chief Secretary's confidence, Mr. O'CONNOR POWER

was able to say, both on his own behalf and that of his friend, that the Chief Secretary had no confidence in him; he believed that he committed any single representative line instead to support of the policy. Finally, in conversation with an Irish Liberal member, he said, "I suppose you are not likely to see the Chief Secretary, so don't you presume his confidence. And the answer returned was that the Chief Secretary never called him a question about Ireland. And during the same month Irish members, Mr. Charles Stewart, had lately asked that the Chief Secretary was to policy otherwise to obtain Irish confidence or assistance."

We wonder that in such a system as this or unutilized, or unutilized, or prevent, Mr. FORTESCUE does not find out the secret of managing the country?

We have no inclination to make too much of the clerks which like the Press with such unaccountable jealousy. It only illustrates the system, and shows that Mr. FORTESCUE has not got his subordinates in hand. Mr. LEVY's protestant had right against Mr. FORTESCUE being made a victim. "The Chief Secretary's policy" was the policy of the Government—it was the policy of the "liberal party." Quite true. This is what was admitted here three weeks ago, and here we may drop a passing word of contempt on the effort that has been made to set down a piece of honest criticism as the fruit of we know not what more design or personal prejudice. It is surprising that the writers who so readily imagine motives of this kind to an honourable journalist do not see that they are exposing the pretensions of their own position, that they are degrading themselves, and degrading their own nation. What was said here was that "in an ordinary case such a conclusion [as Mr. FORTESCUE's] that they had undervalued the 'lessons of dissential' under circumstances so critical and important, might very well lead to the fall of the Ministry and to 'the breakdown of whatever prepared with another policy.' Reasons were then given—our party received, but reasons of character—only objects of Ministry would be individual and their character as Ireland. But we were so, though the country cannot change the Ministry, it is hard that after all should be more necessary to be left in the hands of an individual administration who has not shown that he understands how to deal with them. You will find a new policy, a more intelligent, a more informed policy, and the fact that you want a new Irish Parliament. To that you are very emphatically agreed, but last night's proceedings do not seem to make it less feasible, but more so.

## THE DEATH OF MR. DARWIN

IT SEEMS now the most important incident in a great man's life, the news that Mr. Darwin is no more, and so would be the most momentous announcement that the civilized world has heard for many a year past. The loss of an early pioneer in the broadest and best of our century, compared with the vast effect of his labours, of the studies which he has so bravely begun in his little English village about the world, it is perhaps the most to say that Mr. Darwin's work was done, but it is impossible to know what new thoughts might have come into that wide and fertile mind if the very best had been that he could persist to him. But it is not probable that he would have made material additions to the monumental revolution which was inaugurated with such remarkable consequences upon the sea of contemporary thought to wrap those years ago. In this sense his work was done; and the nation with which he departed reaches this morning not only English but European philosophers and science is asked with an sense of regret of irreparable advancement. His friends will be the loss of one of the most admirable characters in the whole list of great intellectual agents. There is but few names, among those who have and are compared to him, as to his simplicity, his love, culture, his unutilized administration, his family nobility. From his past years one of the two most successful instances in the course was taken

to call upon him on Sunday afternoon. Mr. Darwin accompanied his visitor to the gate, and with cheerful complacency, watched his departing figure through the fields. "It is a wonderful honour to me," he said in his hearty and bright way to one of the younger of the company, "to have a visit from such a great man, just as a little child might have said. Yet Sir Isaac Newton was a more important man for the world than Sir Robert Walpole, and Locke than Seneca. When we think of the impulse which Darwin's speculation has given to thought, not only in natural science, but over the whole field of thought, in philosophy, in literature, and even in connection with the activities of politics, we see that, so far as contemporaries can judge, Darwin deserves nothing less than to rank with those lofty names. He has given exactly the same stimulus, the same direction, to all that is most characteristic in the intellectual energies of the nineteenth century, as did Locke and Newton in the eighteenth. More definite considerations as to the quality and influence of his labours may well be left for another time. For the moment we need only mark the impression of the day, that one member of the great lights of our generation has gone out. We have lost a man whose name is a glory to his country—one who belongs to that illustrious band of whom the Greek statesman said that the "whole world is their tomb."

CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE FORCES OF DISTURBANCE IN IRELAND."

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

Sir,—Perhaps you will allow me to say a few words supplementing the article which appeared in your issue of yesterday under the above head. A chief cause, it seems to me, of the partial failure of the English Government in Ireland before and since the Union has been the want of a true appreciation of the disturbing forces at work from time to time in that country. At one moment the power of those forces has been instantly recognised, and another very much under-estimated. When the first Whiteboy movement sprang up, in 1762, a Commission was appointed to inquire into the causes of the disturbances. The Commissioners reported that the movement was entirely agrarian. But the landlords and the magistracy desired the contents of this report, and represented the disorders as arising from political disaffection. The views of the Commission were disregarded, and the opinions of the landlords and magistracy acted on. The Executive set to work to avert a political revolution, instead of seriously endeavouring to grapple with a social disturbance. Innocent persons were punished as "rebels," while guilty Whiteboys violated and defied the law with impunity. The Government spent its force in striking at the shadow of an Irish rebellion, while the substance of Whiteboyness remained untouched. What was the result? The Whiteboyness continued unchecked for nine years. But this was not all. Public opinion was turned against the Government in consequence of the harsh treatment to which offending citizens were subjected. Many persons felt that there were really two centres of disturbance in the country—the Whiteboys and the Government—and a feeling arose several of the latter class, who might have been won to the side of order by judicious and capable management on the part of the Executive, seems to have arisen that both might be left "to fight it out" between them. Anyhow, popular sympathy was completely withdrawn from the Executive, and the Whiteboys became masters of the situation.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April 20.

AN IRISHMAN.

COLONIAL STOCKS AS INVESTMENTS.

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

Sir,—I have read with considerable interest your article in to-day's issue upon the above-named subject, and would crave permission to make some remarks thereon with regard to what you say about South Africa, "I hope," you say, "that your project of settlement is invariably designated. You point out very fully that the object of the project is to develop and utilize the buying power as conceived, in place of a peculiarly disastrous consumption with other colonies on account of the ever-threatening native difficulty. Your estimate is only too painfully aware of this; but at the same time it is necessary to bear in mind that our misadventures in this respect are mainly due to the course, or rather no course, of Imperial policy pursued from time to time. For a great number of years South Africa, to its suffering and sorrow, has borne the Colonial Office's refuse round its neck. It is only now showing distinct signs of recovering an upright position. The fact alone of its being a moral and military station of no mean importance, and of its having so many military officers connected in its government, has given it a peculiar noteworthy liability to be whenever the slightest provocation offered. We all know that war carried on by the British Government in any dependency invariably means a vast and needless expenditure of money, and that the perpetual quartering of Imperial troops in any locality requires that locality—apparently, at all events. We know that there are in all, and especially in newly formed, communities a fair sprinkling of individuals who, through sheer unaccountableness or carelessness and ignorance, care very little whether war breaks out or not—indeed, they often rejoice when it does. Thus like the two recently pronounced in South Africa gave highly respectable employment, and the necessary means brought forward, to a vast number, and for the time transformed the ordinarily productive industries of the districts which covered the actual seat and hope of operations. But these wars—and even the Boer war, for which Sir Bartle

Erve was almost wholly responsible—still due to impatience: it is the ever-readily-hand position of British troops that brings war. I will endeavour to explain why. The colonies under Imperial domination, as a consequence, feel very little responsibility—individually, none at all. The free sale of guns by Act of Cape Parliament is sufficiently indicative of this. Now, ignorant, since the Cape Colony proper, exclusive of Natal, Transvaal, and Orange Free State, has felt the pinch upon its own resources it is no longer regarded as a military land to be neglected. Sir Bartle Frere and his all-powerful and boasted leading of "patrols" followed by soldiers and soldiers have entirely despoiled two millions, and the colonies have been left to their own luck, resources, those who sold guns and openly rejoiced at the prospect of a "Kafir War" assume a very different demeanour. All arms, more or less, led freely their helplessness under recent circumstances, and the money pressure will not run, as it once goes by, to be left only by the British taxpayer but by the colonies for their own sake.

But to revert to the borrowing question. We want your money all the same—or, however, to have it readily squandered by incompetent Imperial officers—merely to spend it, or rather to live in, means of covering up against these disastrous wars, which can never in the long run benefit any community. We want to make railways, harbours, wharves; establish adequate police forces, facilitate free immigration from Europe, possess agriculture, build public offices, garrisons, barracks; provide for education and for the adequate administration of justice; and, in fact, do everything possible to secure our country against internal disturbances. Under Imperial administration any attempt of the kind were necessarily abortive, if only on account of constantly changing Colonial Ministers. Every one had a new set of officers. Under local administration the greatest good of the greatest number is bound to be studied, and what is to be carried out. This must include natives, without whose kindness, co-operation, and confidence in South Africa no colonists know only too well we can never hope to prosper.

I hope I have been so some extent successful in my endeavour to show that we really benefit by you when we ask for your money, and necessarily that our liability to repay capital and interest is by ourselves undiminished. We have perfect faith in your own resources. What, as you say, have always been perfect hands, as you say, but now, when you are assuming the very root of the evil in the shape of Imperial troops, all we say is, "Lend us some of the money you spend freely on your own account in years past, and we will never ourselves against war—indeed, the law of self-preservation compels us to do so—and pay you back with interest." Without money we are helpless; with it, as a loan, we must stand upright and march forward. With apologies for occupying so much valuable space—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIST.

London, April 19.

A CORRECTION.

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

Sir,—A sense of justice to the writer of your Occasional Note relating to a printing issued by this society to a press in Devonshire built we ask you to print the following addition to my remarks which you kindly published last Tuesday. The assessor I give there is absolutely correct as regards a case which occurred in the early part of the present month—to which, in the absence of names and dates, I naturally thought your Occasional Note referred rather than to another written quoted in last week's *Field* (which I have only just now read) relating to an assessor's duties such as far as last October. The latter consisted of the assessor's opinion as to the value of the man of a horse sent to his kennel for slaughter, and to enter a description of the animal in a book, as provided by 12 and 13 Y.C., cap. 99, when horses arrive in kennels as well as in kennels' yards. Our clerk, in filling in the printed section form in this case, certainly did misquote the title of the Act under which we were proceeding, and misled the Assessor, perhaps; but this was a clerical error entirely. An endorsement made on the papers, directing a mistake to be given for "an assessor of the man," shows this. The Inspector had, however, headed his report sent to this office:—"Slaughterer without licence and not rating of the man;" and this headline will probably account for the clerk's oversight—though I sincerely regret his blunder. At the same time, it should be stated that the letter in the *Field*, on which doubtless your Occasional Note was founded, shows clearly enough (and this is corroborated by the inspector's report) that at the time (November 5, 1881) the sections read to the Assessor by our office were 8, 9, and 10 of 12 and 13 Victoria, cap. 99 (not of 25 Geo. III, cap. 71), which ought to have prevented the misquotations, or at all events lessened it, caused by the clerical error in the submission.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April 20.

JOHN COLMAN, Secretary.

THE LIBRARIES OF THE INNS OF COURT

To the Editor of the PALL MALL GAZETTE.

Sir,—As a specimen of the management of the laws of *Covent* in our particular branch—namely, the *Doctors*—the following facts are interesting. In the *Inns of Chancery Library* there is to be found Chalmers' "Digest of Bills of Exchange," first edition, but no second edition, though the latter was published in 1821. "Hobson on Bankruptcy" is not in the library either, though a second edition of this excellent work was published last year. The second edition of Rance's "Adversary Law and Practice," published more than a month ago, is absent, and so is the first edition of Blandin's "Law of Building, Leases, Agreements, &c.," which was published six weeks ago last. I take these books because they touch upon quite separate branches of law. The above facts show how inefficiently the laws of *Covent* are managed even in the smallest details.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April 20.

LXX.