

TOOK ANOTHER'S BICYCLE WHILE DRUNK

"GOD help this country if you're an example of the type of young man it's raising now. Drinking at seventeen, going to dances at eighteen in such a state that not only are you unable to dance but unable to know that you're in a dance hall at all, and then robbing other people."

Justice O'Brien said this at Ballyneely Court to John O'Shea, a young farm labourer, who appeared on a charge of taking a bicycle without the owner's permission.

O'Shea pleaded guilty. He was represented by Mr. J. O'Donovan, solicitor. James McDermott said he recently went to a dance in the Monaghan School on a bicycle borrowed from a friend. When the dance finished at two in the morning the bicycle was gone and he had to walk home.

Guard Murphy said O'Shea made a statement admitting having taken the bicycle. O'Shea, the statement said, got very drunk. He staggered into the dance at 11.30 p.m. and fell asleep. Somebody called him when the dance was over and he left. Outside he found a number of bicycles. He took one of them and rode home, falling several times. He abandoned the bicycle outside Morrison's public house in Ballyvaughan.

Represented by Mr. O'Donovan, the Guard said the defendant only cycled about a mile on the bicycle.

Mr. O'Donovan said O'Shea was a good, honest workman; whose employer didn't want to lose him. In order to get the bicycle back to the boy's father.

Justice. Are you long drinking? Defendant. About a year.

The Justice, having made the statement given at the outset, discharged the defendant on condition that he pay a fine of £10 or 12 months' imprisonment.

Superintendent E. O'Riordan, prosecuting, said the bicycle had been returned, undamaged, to the owner.

Decree Given For Trespass

ALLEGED trespass on Castleconnell meadowing was the subject of a claim brought in the Limerick Circuit Court on Thursday last by Timothy Ryan, Wood Road, Castleconnell, against Toby Burke, Waterpark, Castleconnell.

Ryan swore that he took and mowed three or four acres of meadowing in 1950, on the lands of Martin Kennedy at Waterpark in July, 1950. Every day since he took the meadowing the defendant's cattle trespassed on it, eventually reducing the 180 worth of hay to worthless bedding he had to throw away. Every time he told the defendant about it, Burke just laughed at him. "I lost ten tons of good hay for which I'd have got £6 a ton," Ryan said.

Burke said he was a labourer working for the Tipperary County Council. He was a tenant of Martin Kennedy, who owned the land taken by the plaintiff. He owned a cow and two young calves. During July his calves or cow never trespassed. In August and September the animals did trespass on the plot taken by a number of persons. But they did not trespass on the plaintiff's plot before October. The plaintiff never complained to him of trespass before November.

Martin Kennedy, the owner of the land, said the plaintiff's claim was ridiculous. Ryan had been levelled by the worst summer for some time. Ryan didn't cut his hay until October.

Judge Barra O'Brien gave a decree for £7 7s. Appearance in the case were: Mr. V. Fitzgerald, B.L. (instructed by P. J. G. Lyons, solr.), for Ryan; Mr. W. Binchy, B.L. (instructed by Messrs. M. Tynan and Co.), for Burke.

No One In The Bar At The Time

WITHOUT hearing evidence for the defence, a summons for an alleged breach of the licensing laws brought against James J. McNamara, publican, Patrickswell, was dismissed by Justice R. D. Johnson at Adare Court.

Superintendent J. Conroy prosecuted, and Mr. Roger O'Sullivan, solicitor, appeared for the licensee.

Guard Guinane gave evidence of inspecting the premises at 11.55 p.m. on the 18th August. There was no one in the bar at the time.

Siege Tercentenary: The Galwey Family In Limerick History

(SPECIALLY CONTRIBUTED)

SIR GEOFFREY GALWEY was one of Ireton's victims three hundred years ago. Strangely enough little is known of his life. In fact, we may say nothing is known. Consulting the usual books of reference one is surprised to find his name absent. Paradoxically we may say we know more about his death than his life. In the last week or two of the siege (the last two weeks of October, 1651) there was an urgent meeting of the patriots in a secret church to consider the offer by one of the patriot bishops to give his life if the others were spared. The offer was not accepted. It was against the laws of the time. The life, if offered, of some minor figure would be allowed, but not that of a bishop, a mayor, a governor, or a high ranking military officer. Geoffrey Galwey attended that meeting. His name was in the list of those whom the cruel Ireton doomed to die. Geoffrey did not offer himself. Perhaps he saw that it was only a question of time. In fact it was a matter of ten days or so. Geoffrey freely handed himself over. He was one of the ten who hung themselves on Cromwellian mercy. There is definite evidence that four of them were hanged, and that three of them were pardoned. The fate of the remaining three is unknown, but there is indirect evidence that two of the three in all probability suffered the supreme penalty. Four men of the exempted list in the pasthouse, and three of them were hanged; in point of time they were the first three. One man hid elsewhere, and on capture he was hanged. Two others were hanged, but the evidence is contradictory when they were hanged.

MUST HAVE PLAYED A MAN'S PART. Geoffrey Galwey must have played a man's part in the conduct of the siege. It was not for nothing that his name was put on the list of traitors inside. Unfortunately, we shall never know more of this grand hero of these stirring times. But there is plenty of information, however, on his forbears. The name Galwey goes back to 1361 in city records. A Geoffrey Galwey died in Limerick in 1411 (January). His wife, Margaret, was one of the Bultingford family. The imposing tomb in the south transept of St. Mary's Cathedral holds the ashes of Geoffrey Galwey, who is described in the legend (trans. from Latin) as "Reader, what thy eyes behold graven on these sacred walls are the armorial bearings of John Galwey."

Margaret Galwey was a daughter of Richard Bultingford (obit. 1405), who was Mayor five times in the last quarter of the 14th century. Her son, Edmund, who was likely responsible for the erection of the tomb, must have died towards the middle of the 15th century. There was a family of nobles bearing the arms of both families on of near the tomb. Part of the design on the Galwey shield is a drawing of Beaulieu Bridge with five arches. Architecturally it is a poorly executed splendid stone monument next to it.

QUEEN ELIZABETH'S METHODS. The next Galwey to figure in city life was James, Mayor in 1581, 1604, 1614, 1616. In the last mentioned year he refused to take the oath of supremacy, or to attend Protestant worship. For his he was deposed from office. In between was the famous Mayor Geoffrey, grandfather of the martyr, who in year 1600, the time of George Carey and Mountjoy, Elizabeth decided that the only way to deal with the people of Munster was to burn every habitation in it to burn every field of corn and to gather all the cattle, sheep and horses, as spoils. The country was impoverished by these marauding raids. In one raid for instance, Sir Charles Wilnot returned with 4,000 cows, keels, sheep and garra (little horses). Only the most light-footed and nimble could escape the man-hunt. All prisoners taken were hanged. Elizabeth further decided to erect citadels at Limerick, Cork, and Waterford, to ensure the towns from revolt. To pay for these fortifications required money. Geoffrey Galwey was the Mayor of Limerick at the time and it was determined to make an example of him. He was wealthy, the owner of much property. An excuse would have to be found to molest him.

Stafford, in his "Pacata Hibernia" (1810 ed., p. 196), relates how it was done. It appears that the cities of Munster chose professional lawyers to be their Mayors, magistrates, and chief officers. This "proceedeth not from any loyal or dutiful disposition." The lawyer Mayors, it was feared, might know too much of the law, and might unduly prolong any case needing immediate attention. "LAWLESS LAWYERS."

Stafford calls them "lawless lawyers" among the rebels, and maintaining the towns in obstinate superstition. Geoffrey Galwey was one of them. He was "a man that had spent many years in England, studying the Common Laws, and returning to Ireland about three years since" (i.e., 1607). He perverted the city of Limerick was said, by his malicious counsel and perjurous example. He withdrew the Aldermen and generally the whole city from coming to church (i.e., Protestant worship). These things were bad enough, but he actually entered the city of Limerick twice, in 1607, with the Lord Crawford, himself. That was the last straw. It was a manifest contempt of the Government.

But the quarrel was not of Geoffrey's making. As Mayor of the city he was empowered to punish minor offences by imprisonment. A soldier of the Earl of Thomond Company stole a hatchet. Acting within his rights the Mayor punished the archery. The soldier was put in goal. Carey, aware of this, to hand over the prisoner to the military for trial, Geoffrey required a warrant of Carey. A warrant was delivered but it was legally deemed insufficient. Geoffrey knew that if the soldier was released there would be more rioting and breaches of the peace. The soldiers were constantly harassing the townspeople, Geoffrey asserted the authority given him by Charter. Carey scorned the Charter. The Mayor had offered contempt against the Queen. He would be punished. He would have to pay a fine of £400. And until it was paid he must live as a prisoner in a castle in the country.

PAID FINE TO RETURN TO HIS FAMILY. The Mayor was then deposed from office. The townspeople sent a message to London to try to get the fine remitted. But her Majesty's secretary, Robert Cecil, wrote to James from Whitehall, April 27th, 1607, "concerning the fine imposed on the Mayor of Limerick we wish in no wise to remit it, but rather to bestow it on the repair of the castle there. Geoffrey paid the fine in order to return to his family in the city. But the sum was large and some years later we find him mortgaging his houses and gardens in Munster St., to Thomas Arthur, M.D., for the loan of £100. He died at Limerick on 26th March, 1636.

Galwey's Castle was situated at the corner of Bridge St.-Nicholas St. The family were originally a branch of the Clanrickard Burkes, of Galway. This explains the chained wildcat, the Burke emblem, in their crest. The castle was a stone castellated house. In this house was born the martyr of the siege, Sir Geoffrey, the grandson of 1600. He suffered death at the early age of 34. And in this same house, too, was born Catherine Galwey, daughter of Mayor Geoffrey, and mother of Bishop Terence O'Brien.

A DOUBLE CLAIM ON OUR INTEREST. The castle house, as it was called, has thus a double claim on our interest this tercentenary year. After the killing of the martyr, it was handed over as spoil to some Dutch adventurers who were invited to Limerick. They made alterations in its structure, adding a Dutch gable in front of red brick. And so it remained until 1893. That year it was knocked down in spite of the protest of the evergreen antiquarian, Mr. James Grene Barry, in his fair to the Dean and Chapter of St. Mary's preserved it (after the adjoining buildings were taken down) until it, too, became unsafe. Mr. Barry thought it unlikely that Ireton ever lived in it. There are two photographs of it in the Society of Antiquaries Journal for 1893.

The writer is much indebted for all the above information to Mr. Jack Walsh, 11 Lower Mallow St., the energetic Secretary of the Old Limerick Society. Besides, he will show any interested person his fine collection of photographs and views of this castle, many of which are unavailable elsewhere.

WORKER WHO HAD FOUR OPERATIONS PRICK OF THORN LEADS TO COURT CLAIM

A WEST Limerick man who has had four operations for hernia—two on the left and two on the right—must never again unduly strain himself, doctors told Judge Barra O'Brien in the Limerick Circuit Court.

The case at hearing was an application for workmen's compensation brought by Michael Matthews, Upper Atha, against Atha Co-operative Creamery Society, Ltd. Mr. Wm. Binchy, B.L. (instructed by Messrs. Marshall and Macaulay, solrs.), appeared for the applicant. Mr. G. Lee, B.L. (instructed by Mr. R. J. Cussen, solr.), was for the respondent Society.

NO DISPUTE ABOUT THE FACTS.

Mr. Binchy said there was no dispute about the facts. It was agreed that, two years ago, the applicant sustained a hernia of the right side as the result of strain from lifting heavy tankards in the Creamery. It was also agreed that the hernia recurred in the early 1950 spring. Total incapacity up to July last was admitted and full compensation was paid. The respondents denied continuing incapacity, after partial total, after that. The applicant's claim was for partial incapacity which, under Section 24 of the Act, he was entitled to have treated as total inability to work.

APPLICANT'S CASE.

The applicant described how the 1949 accident occurred and occurred in 1950. He said he had sustained a hernia of the right side in 1948 at the same job. That also recurred soon afterwards. As a result of the two operations on each of his two sides he was now unable to do any kind of heavy work. He was afraid that with the least strain a fifth hernia might occur. He had approached his former employers—for whom he had worked 23 years—for light, suitable work, but they hadn't any. He had also approached twelve farmers and shopkeepers in his area, and they had all refused to employ him. He was able to do. They all had heavy work but hadn't any jobs he would be capable of handling.

DOCTORS' EVIDENCE.

Dr. John F. O'Connor, Croom, said the wounds of the four operations had healed perfectly but on account of the applicant's history he had a serious risk for him to do any heavy work that would put an undue strain on the abdominal muscles. A fifth operation would be really serious.

Dr. Phillip McGrath, Atha, said that by appearing would be leaving himself open to the positive risk of a fifth hernia operation which might be a strangulum (one bearing the danger of death). "I have told him of that danger," he said.

For the respondents, Dr. Edmund A. O'Connor, Limerick, said he could see no reason why the applicant could not do ordinary labouring work. The applicant, after his first two operations, had worked for a considerable number of years before he had any trouble with the right side. It was possible he could do the same again.

Cross-examined, Dr. O'Connor agreed that there was a risk that a strain would bring on a fifth hernia. He agreed such an eventuality would be undesirable.

UNWISE TO ATTEMPT HEAVY WORK.

The Judge said that, having regard to the applicant's history and to the views of the different doctors, he was forced to the conclusion that it would be unwise for the applicant even to attempt heavy work. He found the applicant partially incapacitated. Having regard to the provisions of Section 24 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, he thought the applicant was entitled to have that treated as total incapacity. Therefore, he awarded the applicant weekly compensation of £2 10s. as from July 23rd last—the date compensation ended until further notice. He gave the applicant his costs.

LAST February, Thomas Ryan, of Limerick, Brittas, Ballacorney, got a thorn in one of the fingers of his right hand. Now, because of a spread of infection the whole right arm is useless.

On Tuesday last Judge Barra O'Brien in the Limerick Circuit Court was asked to decide: Did the prick of the thorn itself cause the infection? Or was the present condition of the arm due to the fact that Ryan went back to work as a labourer for Michael Leahy, building contractor, Ryan, or three days and that he handled cement with the injured finger?

Ryan sued the contractor for compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. J. McMahon, B.L. (instructed by Mr. J. O'Malley, solr.), appeared for the applicant. The respondent was represented by Mr. J. Kenny, B.L. (instructed by Messrs. J. J. Dundon and Son, solrs.).

IN CONTACT WITH CEMENT DUST.

Mr. McMahon said the applicant was a workman employed by the respondent. He pricked his finger with a thorn at home one day last February. On the following day, the two subsequent days, Ryan went to work. During that time he was in constant contact with cement dust in the mixing of concrete and the clearing out of newly-built houses. At the end of three days, the applicant developed severe infection in the finger, since then the infection had spread, rendering him entirely incapable of the type of work he had been doing.

The main issue in the case was, Counsel said, did the applicant's present condition arise directly out of his employment. The applicant's case was that it did.

Dr. Cecil Molony said that the thorn prick was a master like cement would be likely to spread the bacilli already in existence. The applicant's right hand was still totally incapacitated, most of the fingers being stiff rigid. Ryan had a considerable time in the Co. Infirmary with the infected arm.

Cross-examined, Dr. Molony said he had not heard that a neighbour in Clonlara had pricked the thorn with a razor blade. That, of course, would be very liable to aggravate the condition caused by the thorn. It would not, however, rule out the very big probability that the infection became infected so badly solely because of the contact of the open wound with the cement dust.

APPLICANT'S EVIDENCE.

Ryan said he had been working for respondent for four or five years before the accident. He had worked three days after the accident, he didn't notice anything wrong with his finger. Then he found a lump in his armpit and his finger was sore. On the morning of the third day some cement got on the thorn wound. He had a cloth bandage on the wound while at work after the accident. His average weekly earnings, pre-accident, were £3 5s.

Cross-examined, the applicant said a neighbour named Pat Ryan took out the thorn with a needle soon after the accident. The neighbour used a razor blade to cut away some of the skin of his finger near the thorn wound.

For the respondent, Dr. John J. Ryan said he examined the applicant last July and found the bone on the tip of the little finger a little deficient. There was great disability in his hand and arm. The thorn prick, or the use of the razor blade, could have caused the condition he found. It would have taken some few days before the glands under the armpit would become swollen from the finger wound. Therefore it was much more probable that the present disability was caused by the thorn and not by the invasion of cement particles.

The respondent said that when he noticed the applicant away from work he called on him. Ryan said he had got a prick of a thorn. Later he told witness that Dr. Molony had told him he was entitled to compensation because cement had got into his hand.

COMPENSATION AWARDED.

The Judge said it was clear the applicant had suffered a poisoning of the hand and arm. It was quite impossible to say as a certainty to what cause the man's present incapacity was due. There was a conflict of evidence between the doctors and he thought the evidence of Dr. Molony just tipped the scales in the workman's favour. Accordingly, he awarded compensation at the rate of 48/9d. a week from the date of the accident until further notice. He gave the applicant his costs.

Oola G.A.A. Why Match Was Not Played

(To the Editor, "Limerick Leader.")

Sir—Please allow me space in your widely read paper to let our followers know why we did not replay our junior football match with South Liberties after the drawn game, which took place at Caherconlish. We informed the East Limerick Board we would not agree to Caherconlish as the venue for the re-play as it is fourteen miles

No Owner Turned Up: