

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY The Post Printing & Publishing Co., AT THEIR OFFICES: 76 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum, \$1.50 in advance. Single copies, 5c.

TO ADVERTISERS. A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS at the rate of 15c per line (agato) first insertion, 10c per line each subsequent insertion.

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.

WEDNESDAY APRIL 14, 1886

A CFFQUEICR FIFTY POUNDS.

Is a recent speech in the British House of Commons, John Dillon, while calling attention to the distress and starvation of the people in the West of Ireland, touched a chord of human sympathy with a result which he never anticipated, and which few would ever look for in the fat and wealthy surroundings of Westminster.

"A GOOD PAPER"

Under the above heading our esteemed contemporary, the Canadian Freeman, of Kingston, Ont., has the following in its last issue:

"Our esteemed and enterprising contemporary, the Montreal DAILY POST, is now considered in Ontario, especially by the Irish Catholic element, to be the epistola daily paper in the metropolitan city of Canada. And so well it ought to be, for if ever a journal truly and honestly represented the Irish Catholics of Canada, that paper is, without doubt, the Montreal DAILY POST.

"NEVER."

Twelve or thirteen years ago the late Isaac Butt, M.P., asked for a Parliamentary enquiry into the demand made by the Irish people for a domestic legislature. Home Rule was then in its infancy, but the novelty of the demand caused a good deal of excitement in England.

MOWAT AND HIS COLLEAGUES.

What a wonderful Government they have in the Province of Ontario! Year after year they jog along, keeping their handsome surpluses at their bankers, passing laws which simplify legislation, encouraging arbitration for the settlement of disputes, without a whisper of corruption breathed against their good name, doing justice to all and holding the scales as evenly as they were ever held by constitutional rulers.

proved against the administration. They have guarded the public trust as carefully as if it were their own private property, and the six millions of surplus they have to their credit is a proof of their good management and honesty. Conservative politicians think it their duty to pick all the holes they can in the Government of the Hon. O'Leary Mowat, but there is not a Conservative in Ontario who does not know that Mowat has been a faithful servant of the people, and that were it not for the hope of office that even his opponents would join in the cry "Long may he reign."

SO PERISH ALL TRAITORS!

It looks as though some of the "bolters" had gone back to the Government again. Well, let them. It does not matter much for one session what they do. Those who remain firm will be sent back to the House of Commons at the next general elections, and those who do not will be sent back to mind their business at home. So far as the general result at the next election goes, it does not matter what way the "bolters" vote. The people who made them members of Parliament can unmake them, if they are not faithful to the pledges they signed after Riel was done to death according to law. At the next election Quebec will sweep the traitors from her path. And she will sweep them, not because of "Rice or Revenge," but because of humanity. They are doomed to be left out in the cold, not because Riel was a French Canadian Half Breed and a Catholic, but because he was a victim of Orange hate and revenge, and because it is against the spirit of the age to hang men for political offences. And so the "bolters" had better look out. These are them who have betrayed the people will be, by the people, chastised, and all the sympathy on earth cannot save them from political extinction. So perish traitors!

"CROPPERS LIE DOWN"

The late John Gray was an Irish Catholic. He was born in Prescott, Ont., and lived there the greater part of his life. He was a Conservative in politics, and he was respected for the honesty of his convictions even by those who differed from him. He possessed brilliant conversational powers, and, as a statesman, he had few, if any, equals in the Dominion. He had a phenomenal memory, and the ablest reformers shrank from meeting him on the hustings. To the Conservative party he was invaluable. They sent him everywhere. He stump'd Ontario from end to end, and from one decade to another. The ambition of his life was to get an appointment in his native town. After twenty years service in the ranks of the party he at last succeeded, and he was made Collector of Inland Revenue at Prescott. For a few days John Gray was a happy man. But Orangeism was on his trail. His appointment was no sooner made than a deputation, inspired by the "brethren," went to Ottawa. Some of the very M. P.'s for whom he had worked assisted the "brethren" in their work. They demanded that the appointment of John Gray should be rescinded. A "Papist" should not have the position of Collector of Inland Revenue at Prescott. And rescinded it was! That is the way they make the "croppers lie down," and now we want to know, how long is this state of things to last?

THE WITNESS AND BUCKSHOT.

The Montreal Daily Witness and the late Buckshot Forster were very fast friends. The more women and children were shot down, or evicted and left to die of hunger and exposure on the road side by the piousness of the Secretary for Ireland, the more did "the only religious daily" admire and sing the praises of the Buckshot exterminator. Now that he lies in his grave, the Daily Witness tries to lift the infamy that attaches to his memory by piling it on to the names of Parnell, Dillon, Suxton and Healy. It says that "the Irish Land League encouraged lawlessness, and Mr. Forster, firm as he was kindly, had a coercion bill passed, and, with singular boldness, struck down the real offenders, Parnell, Dillon, Sertown, Healy and other leaders, whom he clapped into gaol." It takes a sanctimonious sheet like the Witness to fill the role of common villifier and perverter of truth. The Witness knows that its charges against Mr. Parnell and the Irish leaders are as false as Satan could make them, but then its hatred of anything Irish is opposed to any frank acknowledgment of the truth, which would increase the infamy of British coercionists or which would add to the fame of the champions of Irish freedom.

"DON'T."

When Parnell and Biggar began their policy of obstruction in the House of Commons there were a number of "patriotic" and "Home Rule" M.P.'s who said "Don't." These men told Parnell and Biggar that they would "arouse English prejudices" and that if that once happened "all chance of Home Rule was gone." Then, again, when the Land League started and the "no rent" manifesto electrified the people, hundreds of "patriots" said "Don't, don't." And it has been the same story with every great undertaking, the timid tremblingly shouting "Don't" while the earnest and brave say "Go on, go on." And what has happened in Ireland has happened here. The snufflings and the faint hearted say "Don't" attack Orangism. "Don't, don't." But the men who win in all fights—the brave, the earnest, the true—say "Go on, go on," and these are the men who mould fortune and frame the fate of empires. Orangism has no business in this land. It is strong only in its unity. Before a vigorous public opinion it must wither away, and it is the duty of our people to fight it wherever they meet it, for Right and Wrong can never

lie down in peace and harmony. An Orangeman may be a good neighbor, but Orangism is a thing accursed, and it is not by "don't" that it is to be beaten—to where it belongs—the gutter.

THE PROTESTANT MINORITY.

The Toronto Mail objects to Home Rule for Ireland. Among other things it implies that "Home Rule means Rome Rule," for it says "the absence of securities for the Irish Protestants ought of itself to be fatal to the bill." Now the Mail must know that Mr. Parnell requires, and the Irish Catholics cheerfully acquiesce, that one-fourth the members of the Irish House of Commons should belong to the church of the minority. Mr. Parnell has said that out of a House of 300 members 75 of them would be Protestants, and there is not a constituency in Ireland that will object to the arrangement. What could be fairer than this? The Mail cannot truthfully say that the Catholic minority in Great Britain have any such "securities" as the minority in Ireland are promised by the Nationalists. Out of 602 members in the Imperial House of Commons there are only two Catholics from Great Britain, yet the Mail does not champion the cause of the minority in England, Scotland or Wales. The Catholics of Great Britain are as one in thirteen to the population, and yet they are as one to 200 to representation. What about "the absence of securities" there? Or look at the number of Irish Protestant Nationalists returned for Irish Catholic constituencies, and is that not proof enough that the Irish people echo the patriotic words which have been the key note of their existence: "What matter if at different shrines we kneel unto our God?"

AN ONTARIO M.P. CENSURED.

MR. ROBILLARD, M.P. for the county of Russell was one of those Conservative members who wanted the Ontario Legislature to adopt resolutions congratulating Sir John and his Orange Tory Government on their administration of affairs in the Northwest, and especially for having hanged Robt. Mr. Robillard made a most inflammatory speech in the Ontario Assembly in support of the resolutions and he described those who were leading the agitation in Quebec as demagogues. In so conducting himself, Mr. Robillard, like many another representative, aimed at pleasing his political masters, and not giving voice to the sentiments of his constituents. He has already been made to suffer for it. The electors of Russell held a mass meeting and passed resolutions of censure on the conduct of their representative in the Legislature. On his return home Mr. Robillard set to work to recapture the confidence of the electors, but they have refused point blank to withdraw their resolutions of censure. They could not give their adhesion to a man who is prepared to sacrifice the sacred cause of justice, and of good government, to the interests and exactions of party, and who is ready to condone the most criminal administration of affairs any country could suffer from. This is the feeling in Ontario as well as in Quebec and the rest of the country.

"TREASON AND LOYALTY."

The Orange Grand Master of British North America has issued a call for funds in aid of the "loyalists" of Ireland. So far as the Orangemen go this is no more than what we expected. But we would like to ask if the Grand Master has seriously studied the meaning of that word "loyalist," which he so flippantly uses! Does he not know that the "loyalist" is the man who is obedient to the will of the people. The men who are termed "loyalist" in Ireland are "traitors" to the popular opinion; "traitors" to the majority who are demanding a change; "traitors" to constitutional government; and "traitors" to their native land. Treason, or what is wrongly called "treason," is under some circumstances a lofty virtue. It was a virtue in the men who razed the Bastille, if they stopped there; it was a virtue in the men who threw the chests of tea into Boston harbor, and who did more; it was a virtue in the rebels of '37 to whom we in Canada owe so much; it was a virtue in "the patriot" Tell, the Bruce of Bannockburn," but the treason of a man against his native land is worse than treason, for it is only a little removed from the treachery of Satan to the Great God. Such "loyalty" as the Orangemen boast of in the hydrophobia of politics, and dogs die of a poison less virulent than that which "loyalists" profess to take in homophagous doses.

AN ANSWER TO THE DUKE OF NORFOLK.

At a recent public gathering in England the Duke of Norfolk, a Tory Catholic peer, assailed the Irish clergy and people for daring to aspire to the management of their own affairs, temporal as well as spiritual. The Duke was exceedingly vindictive, and some of his remarks were nothing short of insult. His speech attracted considerable attention as a specimen of English Tory Catholic sentiment towards Ireland. The Duke has just received his answer from another English nobleman, Lord Ashburnham, who, in a stinging letter to the London Catholic Tablet, exposes the hypocrisy and prejudices of such men as His Grace of Norfolk.

Coming from an Englishman and an aristocrat, the rebuke is certainly more severe upon that miserable faction of Tory Catholics than anything ever uttered against them since the day O'Connell said he thought he should ask pardon of Heaven for having extended the benefits of emancipation to such a crew.

Lord Ashburnham's words are worth repeating. He wrote:—"But it may be alleged, and often is alleged, that the Irish are so naturally and inoubably

disloyal that it would be dangerous to entrust them with the powers which they would certainly use for disloyal purposes. To this I am able to reply by so positive a denial of the premises as to dispense me from the not very arduous task of disputing the inference. I deny that the Irish people are disloyal. I maintain, moreover, that they are pre-eminently loyal; and I affirm that all their most cruel sufferings have been brought upon them by their loyalty to just and holy causes which English disloyalty had betrayed and abandoned; and if there be in the world one body of men which less than another has a right to transcribe Irish loyalty, it is most assuredly the body of English Catholics. There are a few who look back to a long line of ancestors faithful to their God and to their King; but most of us descend from forefathers who deserted their God to follow false prophets, and drove their King into exile that they might be free to fawn at the feet of a foreign usurper. And what have we done ourselves to qualify as heroes or confessors? I believe that there are no people in the world more unfit than ourselves to give instruction, and few who need it less than the Irish. I know, at least, that they never betrayed God at the bidding of Caesar, and murdered Caesar at the bidding of a mob."

A KNIGHT OF THE KNUCKLES.

Dr. Orton, M.P., appears to be a professional man in more than one sense. He is one according to medical science, and also according to the pugilistic art. We do not know anything about him as a doctor, and cannot say how much he shines in that capacity, but, as a pugilist, he does not rise very high in our estimation, at least his performance in the lobbies of the House of Commons, yesterday, would not entitle him to take a high rank among the knights of the knuckles. He had taken offence at an item that appeared in the Toronto Globe concerning some of his antics. After venting his indignation on the floor of the House, he threatened to take the law into his own hands. Subsequently meeting Mr. Thomson, the Globe representative in the House, the latter Doctor asked him if he would fight him in question. Mr. Thomson replied that he was not used to being what he called "fought," but he would take the responsibility for the one complained of. Without any further ado or warning, says the chronicler, "Dr. Orton suddenly struck Mr. Thomson in the face, and again before Mr. Thomson recovered himself. They then closed and struggled fiercely, both being powerful men. They were separated by the few dozen members and newspaper men who had assembled, but while Mr. Mackintosh, the member for Ottawa, was holding Mr. Thomson, Dr. Orton sprang forward and struck Mr. Thomson a cowardly blow in the face. Most of the members then shouted "let him go and let them have it out," which was done, and, surrounded by about twenty, the combatants renewed the fight and fought with bleeding noses for several minutes, when they were again separated.

In this disgraceful scene Dr. Orton evidently played the role of a coward by taking his adversary unawares and slugging him while at a disadvantage. That is why we say that we do not entertain a very high opinion of his pugilistic prowess. We are, however, pleased to learn that the newspaper man in the long run proved equal to the occasion, and that although the doctor had the advantage at first, the journalist's superior staying powers told in his favor and forced Dr. Orton to retire from the ring thoroughly exhausted and badly whipped. Our congratulations to our confrere. The incident will teach the salutary lesson that newspaper men are not to be bulldozed, even by M. P.'s, nor intimidated in the full and honest discharge of their duties.

THE SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE DENOUNCED BY A MINISTERIAL ORGAN.

The Gazette, a Government sub-organ and the direct mouthpiece of the Minister of the Interior, has brought very serious charges of incapacity and indifference to maintain order against Speaker Kirkpatrick and Deputy Speaker Daly of the House of Commons. The Gazette in fact shows very sharp teeth in the matter. It charges that under the presidency and rulings of the first two commoners "the House has got into a state of demoralization which promises to make the scenes almost nightly witnessed in it one of the farces of the capital." This is a rather gloomy picture of the parliamentary situation; and the demoralization of the House must be very apparent for the Gazette to notice it and hold it up for public condemnation. But the Ministerial organ goes further, and makes its attack on the two speakers more pointed and personal by saying that "at times the uproar" is little short of disgraceful, and yet the "presiding officers manifest an apparent indifference, and have lost control of the House so completely that their feeble attempts to preserve the dignity and decorum of the proceedings and to confine the range of debate within the lines prescribed by the rules are scarcely heeded. It is a time a reform was made."

If the facts are such as described by the Gazette, there remains but one alternative, viz., to summarily dismiss the presiding officers. Inefficiency or neglect of duty in the Speaker should not be tolerated. But if the case is not as the Gazette put it, and the charges against the two Speakers are unfounded, then Parliament should deal with a journal which so fiercely and vindictively impugned its honor and its respectability in the person of its presiding officers. We have reason to believe that the Gazette has oversteered the mark in this attack on the capacity of the Speakers and the dignity of the House. As our esteemed contemporary, the Herald,

very properly remarks, the Parliamentary reports of the Gazette have contained nothing whatever to warrant such an attack on the Speaker and Deputy Speaker, nothing to show that there is "laxity of order," "demoralization of the House," or "disgraceful scenes and uproar," or that the Speaker has lost control of the House. In view of this fact the Herald puts the rather pointed query: "Which is the lying chronicler, the Gazette itself, which brings these charges against two of the most prominent members of its own party, or the Gazette's Parliamentary reports, which have been utterly silent on the subject? If the Gazette is true, then its reports are shame; while if the reports are a faithful mirror of the proceedings of Parliament, then the Gazette itself is indulging in very gross abuse of its position. In either case, the paper is inconsistent and unreliable; and we have no doubt that it is moved by improper motives in its attack upon Speaker Kirkpatrick and Deputy Speaker Daly, who are eminently fair-minded gentlemen, and possess the confidence and esteem of members on both sides of the House."

It is now in order for the two Speakers to demand an explanation why they should have been made the object of such a sudden and vicious attack on the part of a ministerial organ, and it is also in order for the Hon. Thomas White, the Minister of the Interior, who knows more about the Gazette than anybody else, to supply the explanation. The developments will be awaited with interest, especially as the Gazette declared "it is time a reform was made."

GLADSTONE AND HOME RULE.

GLADSTONE has listened not in vain to the voice of the Irish people and their demands for freedom and justice. He has, with a courage that will do undying honor to the name of the venerable and veteran statesman, turned a deaf ear to the "craven consuls" of his most trusted colleagues, and in the midst of ministerial and party defections and secessions he has, like another Demosthenes, stood up fearless and confident in the national forum to plead the cause of an oppressed and a suffering people. He has sounded the first trumpet note of Ireland's resurrection as a nation. That this note will find a responsive echo in the present Parliament is not yet a certainty; but that the day must come when it will be taken up by the people of Great Britain there can be no doubt. Then Parliament will of necessity have to yield to the popular verdict. Whatever party is at the head of government, Ireland's claims must and will be heard. The day of sneers and of oppressive legislation has gone by. It is now the interest as well as the duty of England to entirely reverse its attitude toward Ireland, abandoning the whole theory of the relation of the soil and its cultivators to the English aggressors, and making Ireland henceforth a field of contented and profitable labor for her own children. This can only be accomplished by Irish legislation in an Irish Parliament. While Ireland enjoyed her own Parliament, peace and prosperity reigned throughout the country. Prosperity was apparent in every department and in every branch of individual and national life—commerce was fostered and increased, agriculture was encouraged, while manufactures were promoted and extended the field of labor—villages grew into towns, towns into cities, and the population accumulated with corresponding wealth. Then peace, happiness and prosperity gladdened the land at every side. During her fourteen years of legislative independence, no country on the face of the earth made such rapid progress in improvement of every kind as Ireland did. Ireland to-day wants to renew that happy experience of a hundred years ago. The old methods of government and official treatment under the act of Union, which, as Lord Plunket said, stands out in its native deformity, the mere creature of fraud, bribery, terror, and the source of all the evils of Ireland, are palpably and irrevocably condemned by their fruits. Such methods of government have effected the annihilation of Irish trade and commerce, and have introduced into the country nothing but discontent, destitution, misery, starvation and the scaffold. Upon such notorious facts, the conscience, the honor, and the interests of the people and Parliament of Great Britain alike, demand that they should take in hand, earnestly and unflinchingly, the reparation of the shocking injustice inflicted in the past upon the sister Island. The greatest of all Englishmen—the aged statesman, whose spirits are as buoyant, whose vision is as keen, and whose hand is as strong as when he entered Parliament over half a century ago, is the first to put his hand to that task of separation. He has understood that it is the duty of the Crown to undo the wrong which it has itself committed. It was the crown that effected the conquest of Ireland; it is the Crown that has continued to treat Ireland as a conquered nation; it is therefore incumbent upon the Crown to put an end to that condition of conquest—that long and savage oppression of man by man which is the most disgraceful spectacle the civilized world has ever seen.

Mr. Gladstone will, therefore, have the approval and the support of the living as well as the admiration and blessings of future generations, in the formation and execution of his project of reconciling England and Ireland by obliterating the last traces of the gigantic and cruel injustice committed during ages by English rulers against the Irish people.

A LETTER from the thriving Mexican town of Toluca relates that St. Patrick's Day was gloriously celebrated there, although there is only one Irishman, Pat Tobin, in the town. Pat, however, was equal to a host in himself, and made every one in the place wild with Irish enthusiasm.

ULSTER AND LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE.

The notion that some special provision must be made for the safety of the Protestants of Ulster under a native Legislature in Ireland is but a mere delusion, entertained for the purpose of standing in the way of immediate action and settlement of the Home Rule scheme. Ordinary observation of the state of things in Ulster shows that the Orange clamor in that quarter is meant to confuse the real situation, and obtain by vulgar threats what they dare not accomplish by manly action. That game has worked here in Canada, as it has worked for many years in Ireland, but it has become obsolete. The common sense and independence of both countries have revolted against it, and if Orangemen want to carry on their ascendancy antics they will have to do so with something more solid than Orange clamor. To hear them talk one would imagine that they were all Ulster, if not all Ireland. But what are the facts? Of the 1,738,884 inhabitants of Ulster, 831,764 are Roman Catholics. This leaves a majority of only 75,670 to the Protestants,—chiefly Episcopalian and Presbyterian. As all the Roman Catholics are Nationalists, and at least 100,000 Protestants are so, the Nationalists are a majority in the province, as they showed by electing a majority of the members of Parliament last year. The resistant elements, which would kick against the establishment of Home Rule, are probably about 400,000 in all, and are concentrated in Antrim, Northern Down, and the northeast corner of Armagh. After five years of Home Rule had shown them that their Catholic countrymen had no intention of imitating their persecution and their ascendancy practices, this minority would dwindle into insignificance, and constituencies which voted for Tory members last year would be as National as the rest.

The Presbyterians outnumber the Episcopalian in Ulster, and except in rare cases they are neither Orange nor Tory. Nationalist traditions, dating from '83, are still strong among many of them. It was the Presbyterians who organized the conspiracy of the United Irishmen which came to grief in that unhappy year, and many families among them cherish the memories of ancestors who died on the scaffold as martyrs in the cause of Irish independence. Both before and since the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Ireland the Presbyterians have been treated as an inferior class by the English government. It was not until the close of last century that they were allowed to sit in Parliament.

The American points out that there has been very little recognition of their worth as an element of the population in later times, and in earlier times they were so ill-treated that a majority of them left Ulster for America. They have had many grievances in common with their Catholic countrymen, and they will have a better position under Home Rule than they ever held under the alien rule of England. That the hope is shared by many of them is no secret to those who have watched the drift of Ulster opinion. A majority of their ministers are against Home Rule; but the effort to rally them with unanimity to oppose it brought out the fact that a considerable and determined minority are of another mind. These look forward to the new era for Ireland without fear and with confident hopes. Ten years hence this minority will be the majority of the General Assembly, and the Scotch-Irish colony will have taken its former place among the defenders of Ireland's national rights.

LORD WOLSELEY.

Lord Wolseley opposes Home Rule for Ireland. As a soldier it would have been more becoming of Lord Wolseley to have held his tongue. His duty is to obey the civil power, not to presume to command it. Lord Wolseley should remember that he is, in a sense, Gladstone's servant, but in no sense his chief. As a soldier it was his duty to say nothing about Home Rule or any other political issue. Politicians make the laws and define the nation's policy; soldiers obey orders and nothing more. But not only did Lord Wolseley set a bad example to the army by expressing a bold opinion on a great political struggle, but his views about Home Rule were bumptious and illogical. He is reported to have said that "stand off to any one who, whoever he might be, who should dare to try to break or dismember the Empire, thereby ruthlessly destroying it." Home Rule would neither "break," "dismember" nor "destroy" the Empire, but just as sure as Home Rule is refused the people of Ireland, so sure will "the Empire" be torn to pieces as carrion is torn by famished wolves in winter. Ireland has done too much for "the Empire." She has done more, a thousand times more, than she will ever do again, unless she puts a Parliament of her own. In 1829 the Duke of Wellington said that "it is mainly owing to the Irish Catholics, who compose one-half our armies, that we all owe our present preponderance in our military career, and that I personally am indebted for the laurels with which you have pleased to decorate my brow. We must confess that without Irish Catholic blood and Irish Catholic valor no victory could ever have been obtained, and the first military talents might have been exercised in vain." But the Irish Catholics will never be guilty of so much "loyalty" again unless they first get a native Parliament in Ireland. If that is refused then let England look after her empire herself. Irishmen will have other work on hands. What we say will, of course, never reach Lord Wolseley, but it may reach those who think like him, and whoever they are they may rest assured that if the English people say "stand off" to the just demands for Home Rule in Ireland, then from that day the long gathering storm will commence to burst about her ears. This is a last appeal for justice; if it is denied them, welcome vengeance.