

Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, the ends of which were at their absolute limit. Finally, in supporting the resolution granted the company a week to settle their employees, he announced that if next Sunday morning he "did not see that the directors had met them, then a week he should expect them to play out as men, and to do it in a legitimate way, and one which would not bring down on the condemnation of the general public whose servants in a certain sense they are."

This ultimatum, for it is nothing less, a somewhat high-handed proceeding on the part of the men who, on their own admission, have spent four years in preparation for a strike. Other speakers adopted a tone much more confident in addressing the men. Mr. M.P., who presided, thought no strike should be organised till all other means were exhausted, and he told the men they should remember that if a strike took place on the Southern and Western Railway the places would immediately be filled from among the number of applicants belonging to the agricultural labouring classes who have taken place on other railways. Employees have left their work, and in many cases they have never been taken up.

They have plunged themselves and their families into hopeless poverty from which they cannot emerge. To meet this state of things, Mr Field, M.P., with a "full sense of responsibility," threw out the suggestion that if any particular railway refused to consider the claims of their men it might be a question for the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants as to whether or not they should order a general strike of railway servants over the United Kingdom, warning that company to its senses. The Amalgamated Society is hardly likely to propose such a "large order" as a general strike of railway employees all over the United Kingdom. In the meantime it is for the interests of the Great Southern and Western Railway not to mind the United Kingdom, but to confine their thoughts to what concerns themselves. It has been repeated over and over again that strikes ruin the little trade left to this country. If left to themselves the men would never think of adopting a rash course which would paralyse industry, ruin the trade, and bring ruin upon themselves. The paid organiser must air his eloquence, and men often ignorantly shout with the speaker, and not till afterwards does bitter experience open their eyes to what they have done with a light heart. Four years ago the matter was threshed out, and it was decided that a settlement had been arrived at which would put an end to any further dispute between the directors and the men in employment. Liberal advances were made, and it is admitted the directors are content in the treatment of their employees.

ENNISCORTHY K.C. CATHEDRAL.—MR AUGUSTINE Fitzgerald, a young Limerick musician who for the past few years has been organist of the Roman Catholic Cathedral at Enniscorthy, has from time to time given the people of that town ample proof of his talents. The music which was sung on Sunday week by a choir consisting of past and present pupils of the Presentation Convent Schools, was, we learn, his own composition. The numbers produced included the "Kyrie" in three movements, and an Offertory solo full of imitative passages between organ and voice. There are other pieces of a very high standard, and the entire composition is melodious and refined. A new Mass by Mr Fitzgerald is in preparation, and will be sung by a full choir at Christmas. The *Enniscorthy Guardian* describes Mr Fitzgerald as an "energetic and efficient organist," and well he deserves such a description. His success will be heard of with pleasure by numerous Limerick friends.

#### DEATH OF COLONEL GEORGE WILLIAM STACPOOLE.

We regret to notice in our obituary column the announcement of the death of Colonel George William Stacpoole, which took place yesterday at his residence, 16 Walton Place, London, S.W. The gallant officer was connected with several of the leading families of Limerick and Clare. He was youngest and last surviving son of the late Mr Richard John Stacpoole, D.L., of Edenvale; was brother of Mrs Heaton-Armstrong, of George street, and also of the late Mr Richard Stacpoole, D.L., who has pre-deceased him a few years. In 1863 Colonel Stacpoole married the Dowager Lady Rossmore, who survives him. He had a distinguished and varied war service. Born on the 18th November, 1832, he obtained his commission on the 18th April, 1851, and on the 4th January, 1861 (when he became unattached) attained the rank of Substantive Major. He served with distinction with the 18th Royal Irish (now stationed in Limerick) in the Burmese campaign of 1852-53 (medal), and also in the Crimea from 30th December, 1854, to the 11th April 1855, including the siege of Sebastopol, for which engagements he obtained medal and clasp, and also Turkish medal. On the 1st July, 1881, he retired from active service on retired pay with the honorary rank of Colonel. Colonel Stacpoole was a frequent visitor at Edenvale, and very popular in Clare, while in military circles he was held in the highest esteem and regard. His demise at the comparatively early age of 62 years is universally regretted.

#### THEATRE ROYAL.

##### MY SWEETHEART.

This celebrated musical comedy will be produced at the Theatre Royal on next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings, and promises to be a most enjoyable performance. "Few pieces," a contemporary says, "has stood the test of time better than this delightful, simple, and unconventional piece. Its plot is of the slenderest, but it is instinct with strong human interest, and one watches the development of the story with compassionate sympathy for the troubles of the tuneful couple who sing and dance so gaily, and who make love with such artless grace." The details are of a very fascinating nature, and undoubtedly *My Sweetheart* should be well supported by the public.

#### FAILURE OF AN EVICTION AT BODYKE.

Major Cullinan, Sub-Sheriff of Clare, attempted to carry out the eviction at Fort Anne, on the estate of Colonel O'Callaghan, of a tenant named Cudmore for non-payment of rent, on Thursday. The sheriff was accompanied by a single bailiff, and only a small force of police under Head-Constable Layden, Tulla, was present. The agent, Mr S McAdam, attended to receive possession of the holding. Quite unexpectedly the tenant declined to give up peaceable possession, as he would not accept the terms offered by the landlord of an eleven months' letting. The

tenant committed the offence, and the Bench imposed a minimum penalty, £4.

A farmer named Michael Dillon, was prosecuted for a similar offence.

Mr James Coffey, solicitor, who appeared for the defence, raised the point that the summons was defective, inasmuch as Mr Hosford as an officer of the Fishery Board, was the complainant.

Mr Counihan said that question had been raised before and decided, and the same system of issuing summons had been in practice for the last fifty years. Any member of the public could act as complainant in the case.

The Bench held with Mr Counihan.

Evidence was then given by Head Water Bailiff Connell, that on the morning of the 24th September, at half-past nine o'clock, he saw the defendant using a gaff in the Mulcaire river; the defendant decamped when he observed witness who was about fifty yards from him at the time.

In reply to Mr Coffey, witness said he knew the defendant by appearance, and he could not be mistaken as to his identity.

Mr Coffey said his defence was that the case was one of mistaken identity, and he would produce evidence to prove that about the same hour on the day in question the defendant was at Brittas, and could not possibly have been at the place mentioned by the water bailiff.

Mrs Creagh, a shopkeeper at Brittas, was examined for the defence. She stated that on the morning in question at some time about 10 o'clock, the defendant came to her place for the purpose of paying a bill; the book and the document on the receipt brought her recollection back to this particular date, and she was able to give the hour, as the family were only after breakfast.

The witness was cross-examined by Mr Counihan, to whom she stated that she had not taken note of the hour; her house was about two miles from the place where the defendant was alleged to have been gaffing the fish.

Two other witnesses were examined for the defence, but their evidence gave it no assistance and Connell was re-called, and in reply to the bench, swore positively that the defendant was the man whom he had seen on the occasion.

The Bench decided to convict, the Chairman marking that they did not discredit Mrs Creagh's evidence in the smallest way, but she might have been mistaken as to the hour. They would impose a fine of £4 and costs.

Mr Coffey asked would the bench sign a memorial for a reduction of the penalty.

Mr Counihan opposed the application, as the defendant had set up a most vigorous defence.

Mr Irwin—I think the proper course would be for the defendant to appeal.

Mr Coffey—Very well, I will adopt your wisdom's suggestion. He thought, however, that under the circumstances the bench should consider the application for a memorial.

An expression was understood to come from the bench that they would consider the matter, and Mr Coffey withdrew his intention of appealing.

#### CURIOUS DISPUTE ABOUT A GRAVE.

Michael Fitzgerald summoned a farmer named Martin Ryan for having unlawfully and without his consent placed a corpse in a private grave in Abington Churchyard belonging to the complainant.

Mr W E Connihan, solicitor, appeared for the defence.

The complainant, an old man of seventy, stated that the defendant had buried a relative of his "right on top of his father," and as witness expected to die soon, he had intended that he himself should be buried on that particular spot; the defendant had taken this action without the knowledge of witness; when he discovered what had been done he asked the defendant to remove the coffin, which was done, but the defendant placed it in another grave which also belonged to the complainant.

Mr Counihan said there had been a mistake as regards the grave, and this had been rectified by removing the coffin to another grave which was merely waste ground and did not belong to the complainant.

Complainant said the grave into which the coffin had been removed was also his property. He would have given the grave had he been asked, as he had no one to put into it.