

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY The Post Printing & Publishing Co., AT THEIR OFFICES: 761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum \$1.00 If paid strictly in advance \$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS. A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at the per line (agate), first insertion, 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 20c per line.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS. Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office.

The Post Printing & Publishing Co.

NO DISCOUNT FROM THE REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF \$1.50 PER ANNUM WILL BE ALLOWED IN ANY CASE EXCEPT WHEN PAYMENT IS MADE ABSOLUTELY IN ADVANCE, OR WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMMENCEMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION.

WEDNESDAY.....MARCH 10, 1886

The records of the French War Office show that during the first half of the eighteenth century, ending five days after the battle of Fontenoy, 450,000 Irishmen died in the service of France, and that during the last half of the century 150,000 Irishmen fell in battle under the banners of France.

The British Parliament is becoming alive to the exigencies of the labor situation. It had no opposition to offer to a motion of a most important and significant character, which was made in the House for the establishment of a Government Bureau similar to that in the United States, for the collection of labor statistics.

SAYS the Daily Witness:—The Bishop of Ottawa is reported to have said that the Knights of Labor were condemned by the Pope, their "constitution" having been submitted to him. The Post says the Pope only condemned a constitution which was not the constitution of the Knights of Labor. Which is right?

GENERAL MIDDLETON AND THE ROPE.

La Presse says that General Middleton wrote to Regina and asked the hangman, or some other official there, for a piece of the rope that hanged Riel! Our contemporary professes to have good authority for making this statement. If it is not true, General Middleton will of course deny it; if it is true, he will hold his tongue.

CORNERED.

If the "Cabinet Secret" is followed up Sir John A. Macdonald, for as he is, will be cornered. He cannot get out of it. Fortunately, for the sake of truth, the Catholic Bishops know all about it, and Sir John cannot bribe them. He may get all the rest, except the Hon. John O'Donohoe, to swear holes through ladders, but he must stop when he gets to the Bishops. True, they may not speak on the question, but they will deny the truth. They will not say that Sir John wrote each of them a letter. And, as to Sir John's, it will be found that he overreached himself in this matter, and that, no matter what he says "next week," he will stand convicted of having yielded to Orange clamor.

CRUEL EVICTIONS.

THERE were 956 evictions in the County Kerry in two years and 5,000 human beings were made homeless by them. We wonder if there were as many farmers from Ontario turned into the ditches by the landlords, how much timber would be required for coffins, or caskets, to bury the dead? The people of this country are behind the Irish people in many things, but there are some things the people of this country would not stand, and that is seeing their mothers, their wives, their sisters and their children die like dogs in the ditches, and for no fault of their own. But the fact that the Irish people suffer this murderous persecution without offering forcible resistance is only an additional proof of their virtue, and we doubt if there is another people in the world who would stand the strain to which they are subjected. And England may bless her stars she did not succeed in exterminating the

priests in Ireland when she set a price on their heads. If she had, and their influence over the people had been destroyed, the landlords would have had a lively time of it.

WELL DONE, ONTARIO.

The Ontario Government have nearly \$7,000,000 of a surplus. It is a magnificent showing. The business of the people has been conducted as a man would conduct a private enterprise, and jobbery, fraud and speculation are unknown. The taxpayers of Ontario have good reason to congratulate themselves on this result. Apart from the fact that the Hon. Mr. Mowat and his colleagues have attracted to themselves the support of the Catholic people, they have, too, appealed to their business interests, by husbanding their resources and saying to the world: "There, gentlemen, is our balance sheet; we have looked after your money with scrupulous exactness! We have saved \$7,000,000, and there are our books for your examination." And all the honest electors can say is: Well done, then good and faithful servant.

THE PARLIAMENT OF GRATAN.

The best thing the Orangemen can do at their big meeting at Toronto to-night is to pass a resolution in favor of restoring to Ireland the constitution of 1782. Then the Orangemen would be again in the ascendant. No "Papist" could sit in Parliament; "Popish education" would be banned, and Catholics would be denied the franchise. In fact the country would be governed as Lord Clonmel said South Africa was at one time. The Orangemen of Ireland would be like the Dutch planters; the followers of the Lord Lieutenant like the spies and swindlers found in South Africa, and the mere Irish "Papists," like the lions, leopards and other beasts of prey, hunted to their lairs. That programme should answer the Orangemen's book in the present as it has in the past.

ARCHBISHOP LERAY ON THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR.

A despatch from New Orleans says that the Most Rev. Dr. Leray, Archbishop of that diocese, was interviewed concerning his official opinion relative to the Knights of Labor. He said that the matter was now occupying his attention. He had lately been visited by two delegates from the Knights of Labor, with whom he conferred at length. They left with him a copy of the constitution of the order for examination. The Archbishop added:—"I can find nothing objectionable in it. Workingmen have an undeniable right to form co-operative, self-protecting, mutual and benevolent associations. They cannot be prevented from banding together, provided they do not intend to resort to violence or to injure property. From what I have learned, so far, of the Knights of Labor, they cannot fall under the proscription of the Church. There is no harm in the association, unless further investigation proves that the members are bound by solemn oath to obey blindly the orders of a chief or of a secret council."

A LABOR VICTORY.

The victory won by the car drivers in New York shows that the force of labor is asserting itself peacefully but powerfully. They are to be congratulated on the result, and it will have a moral effect that will be felt in the ranks of employers of labor generally. These corporate or individual monopolies are being taught gradually that they cannot ride rough shod over their employes, and that the latter have rights which must be regarded. The spirit of arbitration is seen strongly in the settlement, and when once this is accepted as the ruling principle in the arrangement of difficulties between capital and labor it will be the commencement of a better order of things. It would have been preferable had the question been entrusted in the first instance to the commissioner under the present conditions. In future difficulties this will probably be done. The car drivers may, however, reasonably feel proud of their victory.

AN ORANGE MEETING.

The Orangemen are going to have a big meeting at Toronto on Monday night. Before their public meeting they will damn the "Papists" in their lodges, but at the meeting they will preach Civil and Religious Liberty and all the eceteras. We understand all about that part of it. We know it as well as if we were present. Individually, there are, no doubt, good meaning men in the Orange body, but as an order, collectively and as one, it is after Papist scalps, wherever and however it can get them. It is not what Orangemen say in public that is so bad, although that is bad enough, but it is what it does in private, and its history, blood stained and barbarous; these are its fangs, and we Irish Catholics know it too well. But if it is necessary to watch and guard against its growth, we can laugh, and we thank God we can in this age laugh at such Orange songs as

"Holy Water, sleet and slaughter, We'll trample the Papists over one; Cut them asunder, make them lie under, The Protestant boys will carry their own."

THE MAIL'S SLANDER.

The Ottawa correspondent of the Irish Canadian has done us a service. He has found out something that we all believed, but he has established it officially. He asked one of the Civil Service examiners if the Irish Catholics who went up for examination before the board had as much success as the men of other nationalities, and he was told "yes," and that too, it appears, in a very emphatic manner. So far so good, and the Ottawa correspondent of our contemporary has given a fitting reply to the slander

of the Mail, when it said that our people were too ignorant to entitle them to their share of official patronage. No one doubted that the answer to such a question would be, but it is just as well to have it announced officially and recorded. We are very much afraid that the paper that charged the Irish with being too ignorant is a little bit like the boy who said that his father was a lot of things, "he was an Orangeman, a tinsmith, could draw teeth, make waggors, mend boots, and was a jacksass of all trades."

THE QUEEN'S SPITE.

The Queen does not consult her own interests or those of her family when she undertakes to "snub" popular representatives. Her manifestations of dislike for Gladstone have neither strengthened her throne nor won for her the good will of the people. Her Majesty, seemingly reckless of the consequences, extends her antipathy to the colleagues of the Premier in the Cabinet. Mr. Charles Russell, the Attorney-General, was called to receive the honor of knighthood. On his visit to Buckingham Palace he was left standing out in the cold for about an hour, when Her Majesty finally sent him word that she was too "fatigued" to see him, and that the ceremony of knighting him would have to be postponed. Her Majesty thus foolishly conducted herself to show Mr. Russell that she did not approve of his liberal views on the Home Rule question. There is one thing certain, and it is, that Mr. Russell can better afford to meet with the displeasure of the Queen than Her Majesty can afford to incur the enmity of such men as the attorney-general.

THE CABINET SECRET.

On the 21st May, 1882, Sir John A. Macdonald showed the Hon. John O'Donohoe a telegram signed "Lorne." That telegram was from the then Governor-General of Canada, and it contained the information that the Hon. John O'Donohoe had been appointed to a position in the Cabinet of the Dominion. Some of our contemporaries now think that that telegram was a forgery. The suspicion is a natural one. Sir John A. Macdonald would falsify the sermon on the Mount if he thought it would serve his purpose. But in this case there was no forgery. That telegram was genuine, and the Hon. John O'Donohoe was in solemn earnest appointed one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors. And the reason we know is that the Hon. Frank Smith admitted to a gentleman we can name, that the Hon. John O'Donohoe was for a short time a Privy Councillor! We know that the appointment of Mr. O'Donohoe was a bona fide appointment, and that Sir John yielded to Orange clamour, and, as we believe, had the appointment rescinded at a Cabinet meeting which took place at Ottawa. It was not a forgery—Orange aggression did it, and will do similar things again, if we are weak-kneed enough to allow them.

BOYCOTTING MEMBERS.

In making out the new lists of the standing Parliamentary committees for the session a petty and contemptible element of revenge was introduced by the Government. The names of three of the most intelligent and honest members in the House, Messrs. Desjardins, Bergeron and Col. Amyot, were deliberately ignored, and were not placed on any of the committees. The revengeful action of the administration would seem to say that any representative of the people who might pronounce against the government of the day would thereby forfeit his right to recognition in the House and be treated as if he had forfeited his responsibilities of membership. This ignoring of members is not only a contemptible mode of trying to punish representatives for their independence, it is also a flagrant violation of parliamentary rights and privileges, and we are pleased to see that the House did not hesitate to bring the "select committee" (appointed to strike the standing committee) to task for its omission of the names of Messrs. Desjardins, Bergeron and Amyot, and to order their names to be placed on all the committees on which they had served last year.

THE COMMONS AND THE LORDS.

The English democracy is no longer an element that can be ignored by the rulers of Great Britain, nor can its representatives in Parliament be laughed at or trifled with, as in the past. The motion of Labouchere that "a hereditary chamber of legislation such as the House of Lords is inconsistent with the principles of representative government," afforded an opportunity to display the strength of the members who are pledged to advocate the cause of democratic institutions. In a House of 368 members the motion was defeated by only a majority of 36 votes, 202 voting for and 166 voting against. It was not without cause, therefore, that Mr. O'Connor alluded to the prophetic warning of "the handwriting on the wall," when the speaker announced the result of the vote.

Mr. Labouchere during his speech in support of the motion said:—"I should no more think of refusing a thistle to a hungry, needy donkey than of refusing a baronetcy to anybody who wanted it. We have heard a great deal about a certain Land League from honorable members of the other House. When was there ever such a pernicious Land League, I should like to ask, as that which is gathered together to legislate upon us in the other House?" The Lords are no longer feared, they are contemned, and goodness knows it is about time.

A BRIBERY FUND.

The Dominion Government paid something over \$200,000 to Canadian papers last year. This sum was given for printing and advertise-

ments. No paper that did not support the Government got one cent of that money. Any paper, no matter how small its circulation, that was counted as a friend of the Tory party, was entitled to and received its share. A few independent papers came in for a little advertising, but the great bulk of the money went to such papers as the Montreal Gazette, the London Free Press, the Ottawa Citizen, the Quebec Chronicle and other dyed-in-the-wool Tory sheets. In fact, without the support thus given by the Government some of those papers could not exist. They do not make enough to cover expenses, and they are supported by Government patronage. Now, it will not do to tell us that "the Reformers did the same thing when they were in power." Well, perhaps they did; but no matter who did it or who did not, the system is wrong. It is an outrage to be thus using the money of the people as a bribery fund. When newspaper proprietors are made to understand that they can command Government patronage by supporting Government measures, through good repute and bad repute, a bribe is dangled before their eyes and the greed of gain too often overcomes them. When a public journal is subsidized at the rate of \$20,342, like the Montreal Gazette; \$22,777, like the Toronto Mail; \$8,369, like the Hamilton Spectator; \$10,454, like the Prescott Messenger; \$22,589, like the London Free Press, or \$10,840, like the Quebec Chronicle—how is it possible for these journals to be expected to criticize the Government fairly? And it is the same with every Tory sheet in the Dominion. No wonder they hurrah for Sir John, or that they claw those who wish to throw daylight on his actions.

OLD TO-MORROW AND THE CABINET SECRET.

Is the House of Commons yesterday afternoon, the Hon. Edward Blake brought up the O'Donohoe matter in a series of questions based on the revelations of THE POST and addressed to the Prime Minister. Mr. Blake made five distinct enquiries which ran as follows:—

- 1. Was it arranged between Mr. O'Donohoe and Sir John or any member of the Government that Mr. O'Donohoe should become a Cabinet Minister, and if so, when?
2. Was the office for Mr. O'Donohoe agreed on; if so, what was the office?
3. Was any communication addressed by the first minister to any ecclesiastical dignitaries intimating Mr. O'Donohoe's approaching accession to the Government, and to whom was it addressed?
4. Did the Governor-General communicate Mr. O'Donohoe's appointment to him?
5. For how long a time did the understanding between Mr. O'Donohoe and Sir John continue, and when was it broken off?

As Sir John could not give a negative reply to these questions, he had recourse to an extension of his "old-to-morrow" dodge, and informed Mr. Blake that if the latter would repeat the question "next week" he might be able to refresh his memory on the subject, and give an answer. Nothing more definite could be expected from the prince of tricksters. But is it not a disgrace to Canada to have such a man at the head of the National Government?

CHURCHILL'S SOMERSAULT.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL has lost immeasurably by his wildcat antics in Ulster. His attempt to prepare the Orange army to cross the Boyne as soon as Home Rule was granted has been creative of nothing but ridicule and contempt Justin McCarthy, M.P., in a cable letter, says that such a sudden change of front as Churchill's on the home rule question is not known in the English political life of our time. Only the other day he was a strong, outspoken advocate of the Irish national cause. He was a close ally of the Irish members, in continual communication with them, in counsel with them, and had been so for several years. Mr. Gladstone once taunted him with being the solitary supporter of the Irish members.

Lord Randolph has lost much by trying to cultivate the friendship of the noisy Orangemen of Belfast, whom he denounced but a few months ago in rather emphatic terms. He has not only injured himself personally by appealing to the prejudice and brutal instincts of Orangemen, but he has done harm to the Conservative party. As a special despatch points out he had the shortsightedness to raise a no-Popery cry sharply and distinctly, and with the result that English Catholics like the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Denbigh are bitterly indignant, and what is significant, the Vatican has taken the matter up and the Pope has declined to receive any more semi-official English diplomats like Sir George Errington, but makes Mgr. Kerby, who is a Paraulite, its sole medium for British intercourse. Thus has good come out of evil.

"WHO'S AFRAID?"

The Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal Gazette says that Sir John A. Macdonald is gaining political strength every day, and that his friends look forward to the next general election with "increased confidence." That is the kind of whistling they indulge in to keep up their courage. It is of the "Who's Afraid?" kind of argument, and its anatomical condition is one of trembling. But if the Gazette is amenable to discussion on the point, we would like to ask it where it supposes this increased political strength is to come from. Not from the French Canadians, that is certain. Apart from the number of M. Ps. from this Province who have abandoned the Government permanently, and the seven French Canadian papers that have gone over to the Reform side and are determined to remain there until Sir John A. Macdonald is out of power, thousands of electors in Quebec have changed sides "for keeps" as well. Well, if he is not gaining strength among the French Canadians, he is certainly not becoming stronger among the Irish Catholics. There is not even one Irish Catholic paper in Canada that can be called a supporter of the present administration. Last week even the Irish Canadian gave

indications that it was about to leap the fence. Sir John is, no doubt, stronger among the Orangemen than he was, but he will get no Reform vote, he is weaker among the French Canadians, and he can afford to make him a present of the hacks.

HANGED IN SPITE OF THE VERDICT.

Some days before the execution of Louis Riel THE POST strongly urged the Government to act upon that portion of the verdict which recommended the prisoner to mercy, for we held that the object of the jury in making a recommendation to mercy was to warn "the Government that, though technically guilty of rebellion, Riel under the circumstances should not be put to death; and we further held and stated that if the jury had thought that Sir John and his cabinet would order the execution of Riel, notwithstanding a recommendation to mercy, it would have brought in, in preference, a verdict of "not guilty." At the time we had nothing but mere circumstances, assumptions and human instincts to guide us in arriving at that conclusion. We spoke for human nature and justice and we did not refuse to believe that even in the breasts of men opposed to Riel, by race and religion and all worldly interests and ties, there was a strong sense of humanity and justice. We recognized that sense in their recommendation to mercy, and we gave the English Protestant jury credit for it. But base political calculations and inhuman Orange intrigue triumphed over the cause of justice and humanity, which the jury itself were the first to champion even in the very verdict by which they declared Riel guilty. To-day we are in a position to prove that the view taken by THE POST of the jury's verdict and recommendation to mercy, although prompted by circumstance and nature's instinct, was actually founded on fact.

One of the jurymen who tried Riel, a young English Canadian and a Protestant, and the son of a prominent judge of this province, has declared on more than one occasion that "THE UNANIMOUS DESIRE OF THE JURY IN RECOMMENDING THE ACCUSED TO THE CLEMENCY OF THE CROWN, WAS THAT HE, LOUIS RIEL, SHOULD NOT BE PUT TO DEATH."

Do you hear that, Sir John, and your Orange Catholic crew? It is not THE POST who says it this time; it is one of the men who tried Riel.

But, it will be asked, did Sir John and his Government know of this desire, this object of the jury in recommending Riel to mercy, from any other authority besides THE POST?

We answer and say, yes. Sir John and his Orange crew knew all about it, and their knowledge was obtained directly from the jury itself. We are in a position to prove that after the trial of Riel was concluded and the verdict rendered, THE JURY TOOK SPECIAL MEASURES TO CARRY TO THE GOVERNMENT AT OTTAWA THE REAL AND EXACT SENSE AND MEANING OF THEIR VERDICT, SO THAT THERE COULD POSSIBLY BE NO ERROR OR DECEPTION ABOUT IT. THEY GAVE THE GOVERNMENT TO UNDERSTAND THAT BY THEIR VERDICT THEY DID NOT WANT RIEL HANGED, AS, UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, THEY WERE UNANIMOUSLY OF OPINION THAT HE DID NOT DESERVE TO INCUR THE EXTREME PENALTY OF THE LAW.

But Sir John ignored everything to yield to Orange clamor, and Riel was sacrificed to please the Orange Moloch.

Is that charge plain enough? We think it is, and we defy Sir John and his Government to deny the facts as we have just set them forth.

And thus, four months before Riel is cold in his grave, do events develop to vindicate the position taken by THE POST in this agitation to overthrow a blood-stained Ministry; to demonstrate the truth of our statements, the logic of our arguments and the honesty of our pretensions; and to prove to this Canada of ours and to the world at large that the cause which we have so persistently advocated is not the cause of any race or creed over another, but the cause of humanity and justice outraged by an unworthy and corrupt administration.

SIR JOHN ADMITS HIS TREACHERY.

For an open confession of treachery towards an Irish Catholic the proceedings of last night in the House of Commons are without a parallel in the history of Canada. With brutal frankness, divested we may be sure of all evidence of shame, Sir John A. Macdonald admitted that the Hon. John O'Donohoe was appointed a Cabinet Minister in 1882. But for fear we should be misunderstood, here is what the Gazette of this morning says about it:—

Mr. Blake's question as to negotiations with Senator O'Donohoe in 1882, looking to

his entrance into the Government, brought out the information that the assent of the Governor-General to his becoming a Minister was obtained.

Now, who was right—the Post, or those who "pooh-poohed" our charge? Who now can say that this man, convicted of treachery to the Bishops of Ontario; admitting his deception towards one of our people; telling the world that he cheated us out of the representation he actually made—who, we repeat, can attempt to defend his policy? Is there one Irish Catholic in Canada, placeman or expectant placeman, who can uphold him? If there is, then we want to hear from him, and having heard, we will know what to say in reply. But had Sir John A. Macdonald no "excuse" to offer for his treachery? O, yes, he had, and here it is, as the Gazette puts it:—

"But finding that he would not prove a source of strength to the Cabinet, Mr. O'Donohoe accepted a seat in the Senate instead of a portfolio. No particular office was specified or promised Mr. O'Donohoe."

This is not true, and Sir John A. Macdonald knows it is not true. And as we have established one part of our case, so can we establish the other. We promised our readers that Sir John would be "cornered." Well, he has been "cornered," and that, too, when we are not half done with him. Now, we tell Sir John A. Macdonald that up to the PRESENT DAY the Hon. John O'Donohoe has not been officially informed that he is NOT a member of the Cabinet of the Dominion! After all the interviews that took place between Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. John O'Donohoe from May, '82, up to March, '86, Sir John has never denied that Mr. O'Donohoe was a Minister of the Privy Council! The Hon. John O'Donohoe knows nothing about the supposed rescinding of his appointment. He has not been told of it in an official way, and it was never hinted, even unofficially, until last night! Does Sir John remember the many times he told Mr. O'Donohoe that it would be all settled "next month," and "next month," down to the present hour? Nay more, does Sir John A. Macdonald not remember that he promised to take Mr. O'Donohoe into the Cabinet DURING THE PRESENT SESSION? Aye, even now, as the House is sitting, the Hon. John O'Donohoe was to take his place in the Cabinet, and Sir John knows it, and we know it, and the Irish Catholics of Canada will know it, and more, too, before this business is settled for ever. But that is only one of the "exigencies" Sir John made in the short passage we quoted from the Gazette. There was another when he said that the Hon. John O'Donohoe, "finding that he would not prove a source of strength to the Cabinet, he accepted a seat in the Senate instead of a portfolio." Not true again, and Sir John knows it is not. Not true. The Hon. John O'Donohoe was appointed a Cabinet Minister AFTER he was appointed to the Senate, and he was to hold both offices, just as the Hon. Frank Smith does now. That was the agreement until the Orangemen began to howl and threaten to kick over the traces if O'Donohoe became a Minister, and Sir John postponed his swearing in from that day to this. It was the clamor of the Orangemen did it. Sir John would not offend them, and he has trifled with O'Donohoe all through the piece. And here is how we can prove it: LET SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD PRODUCE A SOLITARY PAPER THAT CAN PROVE THAT HE NEVER TOLD O'DONOHOE THAT HE WAS NOT A CABINET MINISTER. Let him be asked for such a paper. He admits that O'Donohoe was appointed. Now let him tell us when his appointment was rescinded, and let him show copies of letters which will prove that O'Donohoe was informed of the fact that he was no longer in the Cabinet. And let Sir John remember that we may yet be able to induce those who are interested to produce documents which will prove all we say. We are not half through with our side of this story yet, but we have proved enough already to show the Irish Catholics of Canada the character of the man who is at the head of the present administration at Ottawa. We have proved that he deceived the Bishops and that he is making the lot of an Irish "Papist" as difficult as he can.

ROBERT EMMET'S ANNIVERSARY. To-day, the 4th of March, is the anniversary of the birth of Robert Emmet. It is a day that shall never be forgotten in the annals of liberty. As time rolls on, the memory of Emmet will become more cherished and his name will be recalled with more fervor and reverence until his country, having taken her place among the nations of the earth, will be in a position to accord the noblest and sweetest of her patriot martyrs a national apotheosis that will be in accord with his life's devotion and labors and with the glory of his death in the cause of human freedom. It is well to keep the memory of such unselfish and noble lives fresh in our minds. In the annual celebration of the anniversary of Robert Emmet will be seen how intimately connected the martyrdom of this illustrious champion of Irish liberty has been with the rise and progress of Ireland to prosperity and nationhood. He was one of the first of Irish patriots to teach Ireland that her people were capable of governing themselves and that they could become a nation independent of British rule. He was incensed at the degradation to which his fellow countrymen were reduced by the infamous Act of Union between England and Ireland, and he made a gallant but unsuccessful effort to drive the English garrison from his native land. The sacrifice he made in giving his life freely to prevent the destruction of the liberties of Ireland has not been without its abundant fruits, it has served as a powerful incentive to posterity to stand by the flag for which he fell, and to continue the struggle until Ireland is what Emmet wanted her to be—free, united and prosperous.