

James O'Kelly asked the following question (we quote from the 'Glasgow Observer' of September 7, 1907):—

'Mr. James O'Kelly—To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the principal police officers who inquired into the alleged outrage at Drumdoe have been recently rewarded by the police authorities for their exertions in this case; whether they proved that the outrage was committed by somebody within the house; and whether he can see his way to recommend the appointment of these same officers to inquire into and report on the recent occurrence at Lord Ashtown's house in County Tipperary.'

'Mr. Birrell', says the 'Observer', 'professed himself unable to give any further answer than he had previously given on the subject.' Mr. Birrell's previous answer stated that the police investigation revealed the fact that the shots at Drumdoe were fired, not into, but out of, the house that was the scene of the alleged outrage. A sensational report of the incident was cabled to the daily press of Australasia. The results of the investigation were, however, never made the subject of a cable message.

Here is another question (this time by a Nationalist member) regarding an 'agrarian outrage' which was reported by the Dublin 'Daily Express' of May 20, 1907, and laid by that journal to the charge of the Abbeylax branch of the United Irish League (we quote from the 'Weekly Freeman' of August 10, 1907):—

'In the House of Commons on Wednesday, Mr. Meehan asked the Chief Secretary whether his attention had been called to the report of an outrage at Abbeylax, Queen's County, in which it was stated that a two-year-old filly was disembowelled and left to die in agony; whether a claim for malicious injury was made by the owner of the animal; and, if the claim was investigated by the County Court Judge on the 20th June last, could he say what was the result of the investigation.'

'Mr. Birrell—The alleged malicious injury referred to in the question was investigated by the local police, who formed the opinion that the injury had probably resulted from an accident. The owner made a claim for compensation for malicious injury, but the County Court Judge disallowed it, as he, too, came to the conclusion that the horse was accidentally killed.'

In reply to a supplementary question, Mr. Birrell (Chief Secretary for Ireland) expressed the hope that the 'Express' would give the same publicity to his denial as it had given to the story of the alleged outrage.

On March 20, 1907, Captain Craig (one of the Irish Orange members who took the leading part in the outrage campaign both in and out of the House) had the following question upon the notice paper:—

'To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Royal Irish Constabulary authorities have yet ascertained if a dynamite outrage was recently perpetrated near Cloghroe, in the Parliamentary Division of Mid-Cork.'

When the question was put, Mr. Birrell replied: 'The police authorities have not yet completed their investigation of the matter.' The question was repeated by Captain Craig on April 17. Mr. Birrell replied:—

'The police authorities have carefully investigated this case and have come to the conclusion that no explosion by dynamite or any other agency took place.'

On June 3, 1907, the following question stood on the order paper of the House of Commons, in the name of Captain Craig:—

'To ask the Prime Minister whether his attention had been directed to the statement of Mr. Justice Curran at the opening of the Quarter Sessions for King's County on the 29th of May, that though officially reported as peaceable, it was his emphatic declaration that the King's County was never in a worse state of disorder and disruption than at present; and whether the Government will withdraw their recent

official instruction to the Royal Irish Constabulary authorities limiting prosecutions to such cases of outrage as were witnessed by independent persons; or will the Prime Minister inform the House what course the Cabinet intend to pursue to vindicate justice in the South and west of Ireland.'

(County Court Judge Curran was erroneously styled 'Mr. Justice Curran' in the question). Before Captain Craig had put the question, however, Judge Curran, although a strong Tory placeman, had declared the statement attributed to him a fabrication. We quote in point the following paragraph which went the rounds of the Irish press early in June, 1907:—

'At the Birr Quarter Sessions, County Court Judge Curran repudiated as wholly untrue the reports of a speech by him, in which he was represented as speaking of the prevalence of crime in King's County. His Honor's repudiation was endorsed by the county Crown and sessional solicitors, and applauded by a crowded court. The judge said it was clear that there was some underhand work in the matter.'

An article by Mr. William J. Flynn in the 'Weekly Freeman' of June 29, 1907, records the fate of the question put by Captain Craig:—

'Captain Craig, like the gallant soldier he is, executed a strategic movement to the rear by not putting the question when the time came for doing so. This foul libel on the King's County, and its inhabitants, and, indeed, upon the learned judge, was freely circulated to members of the House of Commons, and to the members of the Press, and even to the visitors to the Galleries of the House, on the 3rd of June; but no word of explanation or apology was ever made. The Attorney-General for Ireland was ready with an answer. The question, however, not having been formally put, his mouth was shut. But the matter did not rest there, for actually the very next day, in the debate raised in the House of Lords by Lord Londonderry, Lord Dunboyne repeated the exactly same libel.'

The cabled story of Judge Curran's fabled pronouncement appeared in the daily papers of Australia and New Zealand on May 31, 1907. But, true to its customary policy, the Press Association never announced, or even hinted at, the strong denial that was made a few days later at Birr.

In our next issue we will deal with a further 'charming variety' of other 'Irish outrages' that were 'discovered', 'adapted', or invented by the Orange-Tory ascendancy party.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE

LECTURE BY THE COADJUTOR - BISHOP OF HOBART

(Continued from last week.)

The Government promptly adopted this Delpech's motion, and the erstwhile authorised teaching Orders were now involved in the general destruction. As it would cost the Treasury £2,400,000 to provide school accommodation for the children thus evicted with their teachers and £320,000 a year in salaries to additional lay teachers, Parliament thoughtfully allowed the Government a period of ten years to get rid of the congregations in question. M. Combes had little scruples on the score of national economy. Personally, he evicted the religious from over 13,000 establishments. His last official act was to sign the order for the suppression of a batch of 400. Indeed, last January M. Piau stated publicly at Lyons that 16,000 religious establishments had then been closed. What has become of

Those Religious and of Their Property?

They were thrust into the public street utterly unprovided. A Government liquidator put their houses and all contained therein under seal. If any of the expelled proprietors dared to enter in, or take any of the goods or chattels, he was liable to imprisonment for any period from six days to twelve months. If a kind-hearted Catholic sheltered the expelled religious, he was liable to the same penalty—he was guilty of encouraging an 'unlawful association.' Two nuns accepted their father's in-

DON'T argue; if your grocer hasn't "Hondai Lanka" Tea, go to one who does stock this exquisite brand!

INFERIOR Substitutes are cheap, but not so cheap as the genuine unadulterated Hondai Lanka Ceylon Tea.