TO CORRESPONDENTS.

O'B. (Cork).—"The Friesian Song" was published, with music, by H. M. Higgins, 117, Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. Whether it can still be purchased we do not know. We have never seen it for sale in this country. — The "Rallying Song" ("Shooting the Battle-ery of Freedom") is included in the People's Musical Calendar. No. 88, 8c.; "Garryowen" is in No. 93 of Honolulu's Musical Union.
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NOTES ON NEWS.

The Coercion Bill is being slowly dragged through committees, and attacks are being made on its details with more or less success, so that there are not wanting genuine anti-coercitionists who are beginning to feel elated at the prospect of the bill coming out of the mill something quite different from what was intended. It would require no little of them to think that it will in any case still be a coercion bill for Ireland; that is to say a bill for the manufacture of special crimes in that country, which do not exist in England, Scotland, or Wales, and that the Tory government and their liberal allies will be quite satisfied with it in that form: a few words more or less, what do they matter?

In fact this struggle over the bill in committee illustrates very well the impotency of minorities in Parliament, even when they are important, respectable, and numerous, and the futility of attempting to use that body as a means of safeguarding the people from oppression. The bill becomes law after all this sifting out of parts of it that are always suitable; nor, as the division on Sir W. Harcourt's amendment shows, can the Opposition get rid of any of its principle; nevertheless anti-coercitionists, and those as aforesaid, not of the mildest, are already beginning to look with some kind of comfort on the altered bill, and considering it to a certain extent as the work of their own hands, as indeed it is or will be; the effect of their guardianship of the liberties of the people will be visible in it, and will take the edge off the resist ance of moderate opponents of the measure, or timid people, who will say, we have done all we can do in the matter—through our representatives in Parliament—and it isn't so bad after all: now let us go eat our dinners and forget the Irish question.

That is of course just what all Governments reckon on in such cases; they don't expect to carry a measure condemned by the democracy by the mere force of the absolute majority of that democracy and a boodle of a bodle of the voters of the United Kingdom; they have always the fraud of Parliamentary representation to help that force, and can depend on the juggler of "determined opposition in committee" to do all they want for them and enable them to pose as persons who are carrying out the will of the people and are trying, so far as is possible, even to satisfy the perhaps not unreasonable prejudices of the minority.

How different a figure the bill would have cut if instead of going night after night to fight the air in committee, the real opponents of coercion had said after the second reading: Well, the force of the majority is yours and the bill is carried; we have opposed it as well as we could, and henceforth it will have none of our handiwork in it; the whole measure is yours, face the public with it in your hands as the only persons responsible for it. If they had said that and then gone home till the business was done, I fancy auto-coercion have been by now in a better position than it is? Possibly in that case the Government might have put forward the bill in all its hideous nakedness and so have courted open revol, thereby driving the movement into serious opposition more probably with all have felt extremely nervous under their illomened freedom from opposition, and would not have ventured as far as they are venturing now under opposition; but in that case the Commons would have stood clearly enough that their forbearance was caused by cowardice, whereas they now suppose that they have yielded to reason as expressed by the Opposition. In either case the Coercion Bill would have been more obvious what it was; and what is the elementary liberties of the country. The Parliamentary sham-fight of compromise and expediency has once more served the purpose it is sustained for, that is keeping the people down; and in spite of our thoroughly organised and sincere opposition of the Irish members, who have done everything that they could have done—as a Parliamentary party. For the kind of abetment I have alluded to could not be done by a Parliamentary party.

Something has already been said in the Commons about the case of the pic-browed lawyer, but owing to Mr. Burt's amendment of the Mines Regulation Bill the matter is again before the public, and is now put before them with sentiment and even theatrical embellishment, which tends to say more than the case in question deserves. Here are a few lines from Mr. Havelock Ellis's essay on the "Condition of Women":

Are they to go on being in two classes: 'working women' and 'housewives'—the first, as it were, 'decayed women,' and the latter, with the greater number, 'merely women'? This is: These women to be used for doing work which is unfit for women for the purpose of reducing the wages of working people! The capitalists very naturally answer "Yes," the working men as naturally answer "No." The public, confused as it will be by the fact, amongst others, that the women engaged in this beastly work (also quite naturally under the present mulled slavery of labour) do not wish to lose their present employment. But, if you state the beastly work to be done, and therefore explain to them once more that the women would not be employed unless at lower wages than men would have to be paid, and that this is the case whenever women are employed on work which the men are not especially fitted for. Whatever beon, there may be no more interest in the case on the part of the men who are not employed, having been engaged for women. But they may be employed in the work by allowing them amidst filth for a small wage, it will be no boon to the working people in general.

A word may here be said to the "women's rights" group. They are far too apt to put women forward as competitors with men, and thereby injure the cause of the emancipation of women which every Socialist is bound to further. They are therefore blind to the fact that the women's capitalist employment of women for the general cleansing of labour is founded on that very dependence of women which they (and we) want to get rid of. Under reasonable conditions of society every woman will be free to earn her own livelihood as every man will be, but for that very reason there will be no competition between the sexes; and women will neither get nor seek employment in work which can be done better by men. They accept such work now—at starvation wages; just as it forces males to accept work which is not fit for him in being. As long as men are slaves, the women's rights societies adopt that last sentence as a motto and set it on.

The East-end people may be congratulated on the new "palace" they are getting, though the word is an unsavoury one in the mouth of the people. But what a number of East-enders there will be whose poverty will prevent them from using it! People too ragged, dirty, ignorant—in a word, too degraded to use it. And even those of the workers who can use it, can they do so with due pleasure and content? Surely not, when they contrast its magnificence with their own narrow, inconvenient, sordid dwellings for which their wretched handiwork has procured a private home. Their handiwork is rotty, comfortable, and pleasant, they cannot really enjoy splendid public buildings; they have got to go back again to their narrow, shabby lodgings, and beastly workshops—and live there. If the people in charge of the place do not use it for the people, then it will be a splendid and magnificent halls with their surroundings for the use of all. But the contrast will not then be between splendour and sordidness, between splendid and sordid, but between the dwelling of a private person which is quite consistent with beauty and convenience.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

SHORT DRAMA IN TWO SCENES.—First scene: Millionaire seated in an easy chair; by his side a poor man. Millionaire: "Ahem! Very sorry, my young friend, that I can do nothing for you. Can you give me a word of good advice—economy? Poor Man: But a man has such a heart that is no way I can part with any advice. Millionaire: "Nonsense! Under such circumstances a man must know how to save." Second scene: The Millionaire is drowning in a pond; the Poor Man calmly regarding him from the shore.

Poor Man: "Very sorry, friend; I can do nothing for you, but I can give you a word of good advice—swim." Millionaire (shaking): "I hate to swim when a man can't swim!" Poor Man: "Nonsense! Under such circumstances a man must know how to swim."—Newcastle Chronicle.