

ing, but the intoxication cases are finishing. Altogether the state continues to be very satisfactory as a rule, but we fear an exception must be made of an extremely important case. It is unfortunately the fact that in the last three months, or less, an enormous number of minor burglaries has broken out, and the authorities have as yet been unable to provide a cure. Many cases have been reported in which houses temporarily left vacant, and their accustomed inmates have been robbed, who carried off something from the premises. One house has been burgled, bedding stolen. In another case a burglar effected an entrance but carried off only articles of little value. Again in the rear of a dwelling has been some articles of apparel that had been left and were there for drying. In one instance a case of brandy rewarded the hands of the looters. In themselves the articles of burglary are of little consequence as the value of the plunder is small. They are, however, the cause of great uneasiness to those exposed to the attention of the nightly prowlers, and the loss of security in one's home is exceedingly important. Especially is it the case at this season of the year when the members of the family go off for a few days leaving the children and servants in charge of the house. The greatest precautions are taken in barring windows and securing doors, and every noise at night is dreaded as the approach of undesired visitors. The sense of things is intolerable, for of all the pleasures possessed by a civilised community the sense of security is one of the most precious. No arrests have been made in connection with these burglaries, and it is not at all probable that those petty thieves may be deterred with their present impunity. The total inefficiency of the Night Watch is being referred to over and over again, and that worthless relic of bye-gone times is allowed still to continue and usurp the place of the ancient guardians of the slumbering city. It is now high time for the citizens to move in the defence of their dwellings. The plundering vagabonds that are carrying out these depredations are the cause of a great deal of annoyance to the timid and unprotected, and before the evil grows more serious an effort ought to be made towards providing adequate security for the citizens, and bringing a speedy stop to the operations of the nocturnal prowler. These petty burglaries are quite a novel importation, for

THE ROYAL MARRIAGE.

In answer to the resolution of congratulation of the County Grand Jury on Thursday, and which was telegraphed to the Duke of York, the following reply, dated yesterday, has been received:—"St James's street, S.W., to the Secretary of the County Grand Jury Limerick—Best thanks for kind congratulations from the Grand Jury—GEORGE."

THE ROYAL WEDDING.

We have received a copy of a school song on the Royal wedding, the words being by the Rev Frederick Langbridge, M.A., St John's Limerick, and the music by Sir William Cusins, late Master of the Music to the Queen. It is written in Treble Sol Fa and staff notation, and is a very harmonious piece, in which a marriage-bell symphony is effectively introduced. We need hardly say it will become most popular, and is particularly suitable at festivals in connection with the Royal wedding. Copies may be had from Messrs J Curwen and Sons, Musical publishers, 8 and 9, Warwick Lane, London, E.C.

THE LATE MR JAMES O'MARA, JUNIOR.

The remains of the late Mr James O'Mara, son of Mr James O'Mara, J.P., who died on Thursday at Peckham, London, after a short illness, arrived here to-day by the mid-day train from Dublin. At the station a very large number of the citizens was assembled, including the Mayor and several members of the Corporation, Mr Joseph Matterson, J.P.; Mr Wm Walsh, Secretary of Cannock and Company; Mr James Flynn, Mr Bourke, George street; Mr Tracey, Mr John Guinane, J.P.; Mr Myles, J.P.; Mr M Lenihan, J.P.; Mr Ebrill, Mr Barry, Mr A O'Keefe, and a very large number connected with the bacon trade. Everywhere the utmost sympathy was shown with Mr James O'Mara in his great affliction. The coffin was borne to a hearse in waiting, and conveyed to St Michael's R.C. Church, and the funeral will leave from there to-morrow at two o'clock for Mount St Laurence Cemetery. The chief mourners were—Mr James O'Mara, father of the deceased; Alderman Stephen O'Mara, Dr Frank O'Mara, Mr Joseph O'Mara, and Mr John O'Mara, brothers; Mr M Spain, City High Sheriff; Mr Ray, Mr Michael Lawlor, London; Mr M'Kenna, etc. Quite a mass of wreaths arrived with the coffin. At the Church the coffin was received by the Rev Dr Hallinan, Father Cregan, Father O'Grady, and Father O'Donnell, C.C.

MIXED TRAINS ON THE WATERFORD AND LIMERICK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

IMPORTANT RESOLUTIONS.

At the County Grand Jury on Thursday, Mr William Lane-Joynt, D.L., referred to the great public inconvenience caused by the operation of the Board of Trade rule, which reduces the number of mixed trains per day, on railways generally. This subject was also referred to in the report of Lord Montague, the County Director of the Limerick and Kerry Railway, which states that the action of the Board of Trade in not allowing more than one mixed train (passenger and goods) a day, was likely to seriously impair the passenger train service on that line, and his lordship considered that steps should be taken to bring the matter before Parliament. Mr Joynt proposed the following resolution which was seconded by the Hon Gaston Monsell, and unanimously adopted—"That the attention of the Chairman of the Board of Trade be respectfully drawn to the inconvenience which has arisen from the discontinuance of certain passenger trains on the railways which run from the city, resulting from the operation of the rule

Counsel for the plaintiffs—Mr D B Sullivan Q.C., and Mr Redmond Barry, B.L. (instructed by Mr B Barrington, solicitor).
For defendant—Mr W F Kenny, B.L., and Jasper White, B.L. (instructed by Mr Ra Nash, solicitor).
Mr Sullivan, in stating the case, said the R Committee had acquired land at Greenpark, the purpose of holding race meetings, and it found it desirable, in order to protect the course, to build a substantial wall, lieu of the road fence, to prevent trespassers. In the construction of the wall the defendant's land was trespassed upon, and brought an action before the County Court Judge obtaining a decree for £10. Some time afterwards, and while the defendant was acting under notice to quit, she caused the wall to be levelled at two places, and pulled down other portions. The County Court Judge, after being in possession of all the facts, described this as a very wanton act, and gave a decree for £50 costs.
Michael Ryan, contractor for building the wall was examined, and stated that to reconstruct the wall as before would cost £60 or £70; some portions were levelled to the ground.
In reply to Mr Kenny witness said that the building of the wall prevented Mrs Fitzgibbon from access by the road to the fields, and in the construction of the wall the crop was trespassed on; there was an old dry wall there previously about three feet high.
Mr M J Kenny, Secretary to the Race Company, examined, stated that permission to build the wall was obtained from Mr Kearney, solicitor.
Mr Kenny, B.L.—You did not as a matter of fact communicate directly or indirectly with Fitzgibbon.
Mr Sullivan said the tenant was under notice to quit and the tenancy was about to terminate. His Lordship said that if she was a tenant for a week she was entitled to knock the wall down if it was an obstruction. He thought, however, that her action in knocking down the wall in the way described was very unreasonable.
In reply to Mr Kenny the witness said he received a letter from Mr Nash while the wall was in course of construction, on behalf of Fitzgibbon; witness added that the Race Company wished to avoid litigation with Mrs Fitzgibbon.
Mr Kenny, on behalf of the defendant, argued that from point of law and in point of merit the defendant was justified in her action. As regards the first of these points it was clearly proved that there was trespass, and it was not necessary for him (counsel) to call his lordship's attention to the case of Holmes v. Wilson, in which that point was dealt with. And what was the action of the Race Company in this case? They were in possession of this property and without any communication good, bad, or indifferent they built this wall ten feet high which prevented the defendant from having access to her land.
The defendant was examined by Mr White in reply to whom she stated that she had received any notice that the wall was to be built as soon as she saw it building she communicated with her solicitor; she had sustained considerable loss owing to the trespass on the land.
In cross-examination by Mr Sullivan, she stated the contractor had purchased stones from which were used in the construction of the wall but she was not aware at the time of the construction of the purpose for which they were to be used.
After hearing further evidence, His Lordship said he considered the act of the defendant in knocking down the wall very unreasonable, and his sympathies, having regard to her action, were altogether against her. She was, however, entitled to knock down the wall, but the extent to which she was trespassed on, and the loss so far as reducing it to its original height, was not to be taken into consideration. The plaintiffs had, of course, sustained a serious loss. He would affirm the decision of the court but would reduce the amount to £10, allow the costs of appeal to plaintiffs, and reduce the costs in the court below to the ordinary costs.