

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The Post Printing & Publishing Co.,
 AT THEIR OFFICES:
761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.
 Subscription, per annum, \$1.50
 if paid strictly in advance. — \$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS.
 Limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at 15c per line (space), first insertion, 100c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 50c per line. Space for contracts, advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, &c., 50c per insertion (not exceeding 10 lines). Ordinary notices of Births, Deaths and Marriages 50c each insertion.

The large and increasing circulation of "THE TRUE WITNESS" makes it the very best advertising medium in Canada.

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.

Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter or Post Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to paper. Subscribers will see by date on the address label when their subscription expires. Sample copies sent free on application.

Parties wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent, when there is none of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

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.....MAY 18, 1887

Let Canadians bear in mind this one great fact. Lord Lansdowne has depopulated five square miles of Irish territory and made between four and five hundred human beings homeless. It cannot be denied or disputed. And this is the man we are told should not be summoned to a bar of Canadian public opinion.

Irish landlords have touched bottom at last. At the last meeting of the Protestant Synod at Dublin, Mr. Cooke Trench moved that £10,000 of the funds be devoted to help the landlords. This the Irish papers describe wittily as "robbing the Protestant poor box." It is not astonishing that thieves should turn beggars.

A MEETING of Missourians recently pronounced upon coercion in very extreme terms of condemnation. One of the resolutions adopted refers to the Irish Secretary as "Dampfool Balfour." Just like Missouri. Its nomenclature cannot be improved.

THE attempt of certain "loyalists" at Toronto to prevent Mr. O'Brien speaking in that city is rather funny. A public meeting to put down free speech if perpetrated in Cork or Dublin would be regarded as an Irish bull of portentous proportions.

MONTREAL correspondents of "loyalist" papers can lie like Athenians. Their reports represent the O'Brien meeting here as a small affair. New York papers, on the contrary, who sent special correspondents with Mr. O'Brien, give truthful reports, and state that the meeting really was—large, enthusiastic, representative and entirely successful.

MR. CURRAN has written something about "moral assassination." Does he mean that somebody has been assassinating his morals? We would like to know what morality has to do with assassination anyway? There is too much looseness about this alleged connection between morals and the thing with a lap-lazuli handle. It should not be countenanced by a Queen's Counsel and a member of parliament.

THE Toronto World says, "it is sick of 'the Irish nuisance.'" Our esteemed friend will be sicker of it before the end. The intention is to make the world sick of the Irish nuisance and compel its English authors to abate it. Where ever there is a human creature who feels or voices sympathy with the robbers and murderers who are trying to make Ireland desolate, there is where Irishmen are ready to make that creature sick. Does the World envy?

It is significant of the alleged necessity of a Crimes Act in Ireland that at the recent Spring Assizes the criminal record of the whole county of Carlow was a blank. At Clonmel the presiding judge congratulated the Grand Jury on the absence of crime in Tipperary. Remarkable on this gratifying state of affairs in Ireland, the London Universe points to the fact that some fifteen murders were reported in Newcastle, England, during the past year, nearly all which went unpunished, and asks whether England does not require a Crimes Act more than Ireland?

A DR. PERFECT (he must be a perfect ass) headed a deputation to Mayor Howland, of Toronto, the other day, for the purpose of having His Worship call a public meeting to prohibit Mr. O'Brien speaking in that city! These Toronto British fair-play loyalists are a nice lot. When, we should like to know, has free speech been made subject to prohibition by men who, in asking for a public meeting, affirmed the right of free speech? Consistency, thy name is Tory Loyalty.

THE grand and enthusiastic reception given to Messrs. O'Brien and Kilbride in Quebec, a report of which will be found in another column, is most gratifying, although we never had any doubt that such would be the case. It must also be a matter of gratification to Irishmen and lovers of liberty and free speech all over the

world to note the fact that the Local Legislature of the great Province of Quebec extended to the eloquent pleader for Lansdowne's evicted tenants the courtesy of the floor of the House of Parliament, where he remained for a while in friendly conversation with the Ministers and members. Does not this circumstance alone give the lie to the statement industriously circulated by the Tory press that Canadian public sentiment was against the object of Mr. O'Brien's visit? No matter how they may twist and turn they cannot wriggle out of the fact or the significance of it.

In the published requisition to the Mayor of Ottawa to hold a public meeting with the object of booming Lord Lansdowne on his return from Toronto, as a protest against Mr. O'Brien's exposures of His Ex.'s cruelties at Luggacurran, we find the following names of Irish Catholics:—D. O'Connor, M. Kavanagh, Geo. P. Brophy, Joseph Kavanagh, Francis J. Lynch, Ambrose Duffy, Joseph Kavanagh (2), William Wall, Geo. H. Baskerville, J. H. Parnell, Jao. A. Bismode, M. L. Foley, J. Doherty and Martin J. Griffin. The list contains, the papers say, five hundred names, the greater number of which appear to be those of civil servants and persons dependent on the Government.

THE Ballykillpishier Citizen objects to THE Post's suggestion that Lord Lansdowne should hire a hall wherein to vent his grievances against Mr. William O'Brien. If His Excellency were at Luggacurran he would not need to hire a hall, for there are plenty empty houses in the five miles of the lovely valley he has desolated. But we made the suggestion out of a purely benevolent desire to see His Ex. justify himself before the public, and we are very sorry if our esteemed and terribly earnest Ballykillpishier friend should misunderstand our motive. If he did so designedly, it was real mean of him. We didn't think he'd do it.

THE Hamilton Times, referring to the suggestion made by Mr. White, of the Gazette, that the customs duties on printed show bills be increased, observes that "printers as a rule are not pay-suckers, and they don't want any favors from Tipper." If he would remove the duties from paper, ink, presses and machinery, the printers could get along without any of his help. To heavily tax the printer's raw materials and then throw him a sop in the shape of a duty on books or show bills may be enough to satisfy the representatives of printing offices which feed on immigration literature, but it is a swindle nevertheless.

In the London Truth of April 28th we find the following article, which is exceedingly apposite just now:—"Since so many different ways have been suggested for keeping the jubilee, it may not be out of place to refer to the Levitical instructions upon jubilee keeping. I commend them to the careful consideration of those who are so anxious to celebrate the Queen's jubilee by passing a Coercion Bill for Ireland. They are as follows:—Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto the people thereof. . . . Ye shall not, therefore, oppress one another. . . . And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor . . . thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God."

THE New York Herald asks:—"What can you expect Irishmen to do when they are sneered at, bullied and driven to the wall? Parnell has asked the Tories to appoint a committee to investigate the charges made by the Times. They stoutly refuse. Dillon begs them to give him a chance to clear himself from foul accusations made by his fellow members. Again, they stoutly refuse. In the meantime, the Tories lose no opportunity to fling their jibes and jeers at Ireland and do all that malicious ingenuity can devise to exasperate the Home Rulers. It is not to be wondered at that the Irish revolutionary party, with headquarters in Paris, have reorganized, and are talking violently about experiments with melinite. England seems determined to incite Irishmen to desperate deeds. She bespatters them with foul accusations, bustles them to the very verge of despair, and when they talk of resistance cries aloud that Ireland always was and always will be rebellious, and ought to be sunk in the middle of the Atlantic. No nation on the earth ever hated another as England hates Ireland."

HERE'S LAW FOR YOU. A young girl in New York is in jail for having estranged the affections of a middle-aged lawyer from his wife. This startling turning of the tables in these matters is explained by the fact that the young girl, who has a child, as a result of the "estranged affections" of the experienced lawyer, is about to fall heir to fifty thousand dollars from her grandfather's estate, being an orphan. Otherwise it is possible that the law had been sooner or later evoked to make the middle-aged lawyer disgorge some of his wealth for the benefit of the young orphan girl that he had seduced. The law is a facile instrument where \$50,000 are concerned. The lawyer's wife, by a strange coincidence, finds that her damages are precisely the amount of the young girl's inheritance, \$50,000. If she can get hold of that, both she and the middle-aged lawyer will feel content and have all their injuries properly salved.

THE new iron duties have, it is said by those in the trade, greatly disorganized business. Some very plain talk is indulged in. We even hear it alleged that certain merchants must have received a tip from Ottawa in advance of the announcement of the change, or why did they pile in such enormous stocks in anticipation? It is also hinted that a powerful ring has been formed and the Government has given it the monopoly of the iron market in Canada. Should these impressions turn out to be well founded, Canadians may felicitate themselves on the fact that another gigantic monopoly has been fastened upon them. A deputation is going from this city to Ottawa for the purpose of persuading Sir Charles Tupper to give the iron trade a chance for its life, or at least exempt

contracts made on the strength of the old tariff from the operation of the new. We shall wait with curiosity for the ministerial reply to these representations, but we fear they will be futile. The men whose grip has been fastened on the trade are men of iron in more senses than one, and our merchants are beginning to realize the fact much to their chagrin.

OLD COUNTRY papers received to-day contain harrowing reports of the Luggacurran evictions during the third week of April. We read that on the 23rd, under torrents of icy rain, the Governor-General of Canada concluded his series of heartless evictions on the Luggacurran estate. Lord Lansdowne has worked his will with a vengeance upon the aged and helpless. Hundreds of families are now homeless, and a fair portion of the Queen's County has been made desolate. The Dublin Freeman correspondent, writing on Saturday from the scene of the atrocity, says:—"Cruel—intensely cruel—weather was identified with surpassingly cruel weather. Centenarians almost—old and infirm women, and aged and sickly old men, some of them bereft of their sight—were remorselessly cast from their homes of so many fond recollections, and thrown out on the world there to end the span of their already almost terminated existence. Side by side with these old people, whose age, one would think, would secure them immunity, the babe in arms and the little nursing in the cradle walked piteously as the cold, biting blast blew round their tender forms, notwithstanding the efforts of the fond mother to shield the little one. And, perhaps, equally to be pitied were the strong, stalwart men who were forced to witness the eviction of their parents and their children from their homes. However, the sad scene has ended. The passion of the exterminating landlord has been satisfied, at least for the present, and over two hundred human beings have been deprived of the shelter of their homesteads."

SIR CHARLES LEWIS, who made the motion for a special parliamentary committee to inquire into the charges made by the London Times against Mr. Parnell and other Irish members, is an Orangeman. He contested Derry against Mr. Justin McCarthy, and was declared elected by a majority of three. A petition for review of the election proceedings was filed, and it resulted in the unseating of Mr. Lewis and the return of Mr. McCarthy. Soon afterward he was made a baronet, and a vacancy was found in North Antrim which he was elected to fill. He is, without doubt, the most unpopular man in the Tory ranks to-day. Like Major Sanderson, he is more concerned about his own advancement and about his success as a politician than he is about the fate or fortunes of the party to which he is attached. He is a fanatic in religion, a "fire-eater" in politics, and an eccentric individual generally. The London correspondent of the New York Times tells this story about him: "A year or so ago, at a board meeting of some directors where the presence of the United States consul-general was required, he assumed an arrogant and insulting tone to Mr. Waller, asking him, as if he were some clerk, how he dared to be late, whereupon Mr. Waller gave him the most vivid five minutes' tongue lashing the assembled Britons had ever listened to. Every blow knocked out the sparks, and at the end Lewis was compelled by the others to apologise, and Mr. Waller was formally thanked for coming. This by way of showing who Lewis is."

LIBEL.
 MR. CURRAN is non natu inter lupos sub terra incognito jubenat, et quid dicit:—

"Rumpus bellorum forum,
 Vim confer amorem,
 Morem valorem forum,
 Tu plena retorum."

Take it out of that now, and sue us for libel!

A PERTINENT LETTER.

The following letter was addressed by the editor of the Irish Tribune:—

"To the Right Hon. the Marquis of Hartington.
 "SIR,—In your speech in the House of Commons on the second reading of the Coercion Bill, you laid down the doctrine that it was the duty of the Irish members either to proceed against those newspapers in which charges had been made against them, or in default to accept the stigma of guilt which their failure to do so would necessarily imply."

"Now, sir, we beg to recall to your mind an incident in connection with the revelations made by the Pall Mall Gazette under the well known head of 'Modern Babylon.' In these revelations your name was mentioned as one who was guilty, not merely of being in communication with men who committed crimes, but of the very mention of which humanity shudders, but you were actually named as being one of those very men yourself. Did you proceed against the newspapers in which these statements appeared, and, if you did not, are we to infer that the charges made against you, much more scandalous than anything attributed to the Irish members, were perfectly true?" C. DIAMOND.

THE "TIMES" FORGERY.

Piggott, the person on whom suspicion has been fastened as the author of the Times forgery, started out as a H. H. Ruler under East, and joined the new movement in 1879. He was a Dublin journalist at the time, and, like all adventurers, was making his living by his wits. He soon began to barter his patriotism for gold, and succeeded in inducing the Land League to buy from him a worthless paper which he edited. This was at the time United Ireland was started. Mr. Egan was then treasurer of the league, and paid the money. At various times Piggott wrote letters to Egan asking for aid and making suggestions and proposals. When he could not make any more money out of the organization, he went over to the other side, and, like King-Harman, became the most bitter foe of the Nationalist party. When Lady Florence Dixie began her crusade against Parnell and his lieutenants, Piggott is understood to have joined her and to have become a very unpleasant and dangerous sort of person. He lived in London and was employed by the government on several occasions. Mr. Egan, with others well versed in the history of Irish politics, suspected Piggott of being the author of the forged letter. He held in his possession several blackmailing epistles from him, and when he saw the publication in the Times he recognized the handwriting. He engaged a committee of the best experts in the West, and submitted the letters and fac-similes for inspection and comparison. The result is that the experts declare that the same man

wrote the Piggott letters to Egan and the forgery in the Times. It is gratifying to all honorable men to know that Mr. Egan has laid bare this shallow and specious fraud. Nobody of sense believed that Mr. Parnell would or could be guilty of committing such a blunder as the Times claimed, but the machinery at work was unknown. Now it is fully exposed.

THE LANSDOWNE FAMILY.

Lansdowne family history is getting pretty well overhauled. The vice of this family on the ruins of Irish homes is one of the blackest pages in the dark record of Irish wrongs. Successive generations of lords, who have been foremost among the bloody and brutal landlords of Ireland, are well represented in the cowardly and malignant creature who now covers behind his privilege a Governor-General of Canada. The Boston Advertiser supplies a couple of touches quite apposite to the present discussion. Of the fourth marquess, father and predecessor of the present incumbent, it is commonly believed that he took King Rehoboth as his model, and sought to make his little finger heavier than his father's loins. Irishmen will not forget that it was this noble lord who proposed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in 1848, and concluded his speech by moving "that the public safety requires that the bill should be passed with all possible despatch." Thanks to his efforts the bill was passed without dissent through all its stages.

"Perhaps," says the Advertiser, "Mr. O'Brien may recall that on the estates of this typical landlord the 'office rule' regulating the marriage of the tenantry was most strictly enforced. He may remember the petition signed by the whole body of the tenantry in 1858 to this effect: 'We have been made keenly sensible of our object dependencies by certain rules and regulations which are now forced on this estate. By these rules no tenant can marry, or procure the marriage of his son or daughter, without permission from your lordship's agent, even when no change of tenancy would arise.' Some such sketch of the attitude of the noble lord and his ancestors towards his tenants might fitly preface the discussion of the present points at issue, the rights of the tenants and the assurances of the landlord. On these points we prefer to hear the statement of Mr. O'Brien and the reply of the Governor-General before discussing the merits of the case."

EVICTION SCENES.

One of the Irish constabulary, who left the force and came to America, had a talk with a New York reporter concerning the evictions he witnessed. He said:—

"God knows what will happen if the awful work goes on. There is no hope at all in the future. All that a man can profit by is by his utmost toil to keep body and soul together in himself and family. If he falls the least behind in his rent the landlords are upon him at once, and his cattle—frequently it is only a single cow—are seized upon and carried off. Then, if his land be left to him, it is only that he may grow a crop for the landlord, for he ploughs up heart enough to till the soil down comes sheriff upon him as a wily as the crop is grown, his little effects—a stool or two, perhaps a table and a bed—are flung out upon the road; a can of coal oil is scattered over the lot; that gave him shelter, the match is applied, and there he is with his helpless ones, with no roof to cover them and no morsel of food to stay the cravings of hunger."

Here is another picture given in simple language by another of the ex-police-men:

"Just how fiendish the thing is may be judged from the fact that hundreds and sometimes thousands of pounds are squandered in cases where the apparent purpose is to collect a few paltry pounds of rent, but where there is no expectation of accomplishing anything but the ousting of the tenant and the destruction of his rude shelter. Why, there was an illustration of that recently at Donagel, where £600 were spent to evict for a back rental of £18. Only six weeks ago there was a case at Dingle, county Kerry, where twelve families owed an average of £6 each. I was one of a party of 100 men who was sent there and kept there for five fortnights. The people could not pay because the land was so barren it wouldn't produce anything. The people of that who's section were in a most deplorable state. I saw about 2000 of the inhabitants, and out of the whole lot there weren't twenty who had a pair of boots on. We had to divide with them the lunches we carried in our haversacks. When we got a change of guard we split the loot and they would devour it ravenously. I saw a widow whose child was very sick go to the landlord and beg for God's sake to be allowed to remain a few days till the child improved, but the answer was, 'No, not if you were my own mother.'"

On these appalling pictures an American editor comments:—"A more fiendish set of tyrants and assassins do not exist on the face of the earth than the absentee landlords of Ireland. That they are permitted to live at all is the best proof that can be adduced of the patience and self-restraint of the people. In some parts of the United States they would be utilized to decorate lamp posts and stout trees by the highway."

THE TORONTO BIGOTS.

Toronto Orangemen held a meeting last Saturday for the purpose of showing the world what consummate fools and fanatics men can be when they know how. Cranks like Goldwin Smith, Dr. Potts and a person described as the Bishop of Algoma made declamatory inflammatory harangues down to the level of the mob they addressed.

The language attributed to these spouters in the reports of the meeting was simply abominable. Did we not see it in print, we would regard such an exhibition as incredible. How men pretending to education, professing Christianity and assuming to be leaders of opinion, could be guilty of such wild extravagance, is unaccountable on any hypothesis except blind religious bigotry and rabid racial hatred of Ireland and the Irish.

Bishop Sullivan, like Dalton McCarthy and O'Brien of Muskoka, is one of those men whose Irish names show them to be either renegades and apostates from their faith and fatherland or the sons of renegades and apostates. Perhaps after all it is only to be expected that they should show their venom, for we all know that such people are invariably the most unreasoning bigots. They are really incapable of logical thought in relation to Irish affairs. Their minds are warped by the misfortune of bad training, are tainted with lurid reflections from the cruel, blood-guilty fires of religious fanaticism. Pity rather than blame should be shown them, were it not for the mischief they may do. But all their frantic mouthings amount to nothing, so long as they do not meet the arguments and facts presented by Mr. William O'Brien on behalf of the four hundred poor

people whom Lord Lansdowne has so brutally and avariciously deprived of their ancestral homes.

Mr. O'Brien has not said one word which, by the greatest stretch of language, could be misconstrued into an insult to the Governor-General, unless the awful array of facts, which go to make up the most terrible indictment that could be brought against a human being, could be so considered. William O'Brien is a gentleman who would scorn to sully his lips by such language as was indulged in by the Toronto bigots. Nor would he injure the great, the holy cause he advocates by indulgence in words of improper import. He is a sedate, exact, logical speaker, who pleads in a manner to disarm criticism for the sorrow-stricken tenants of Luggacurran.

One of the Toronto bigots made the remark that "this fair Dominion is no place for rebels." Who were the rebels? What was he talking about? Would he have this fair Dominion, like Toronto, a paradise for cranks. If the Toronto worthies imagine the sun rises in the Dun and sets in the Humber, they will wake up one of these fine days to find that the universe is not bounded by such narrow limits, and that there are lunatics outside the provincial establishments for the care of such unfortunates. The Irish people are marching with eyes, multitudinous tread, and will crush greater obstacles under their feet than a Lansdowne, a Goldwin Smith and the handful of Toronto Orangemen.

THE NEW CODE.

The conduct of the coercionists in their "Parnellism and Crime" landings has resulted boomerang fashion. All England is now laughing at the spy details of personal history of leading coercionists brought out by the Opposition press. For example, says United Ireland, it is not very many months since all Europe was startled by the publication of the chronic scandalous of a certain Count V., who was pretty well known to be a prominent figure in European society. In Count V.'s book Lord Hartington was openly and by name accused of an offence not less grave than that which the Times' forger in-vinates against the Irish leader. Count V.'s book attracted far more notice than the Times' epileptic libels. It was read throughout Europe. The accusation against Lord Hartington was reproduced by more than one of the London papers. Why did not Lord Hartington resort to those legal methods of justifying his character to which he now refers the Irish leaders when he flings the filth of anonymous libels at them? He had a stronger motive than the Irish leaders have, for the reputation of another was involved with his own. Was the Marquis of Hartington ever taunted by Irish Nationalists with not having submitted himself to cross-examination to gratify the malice or prurency of Count V.?

Of another burning and shining light in the galaxy of coercionists we read:—"Colonel King-Harman, the new Under Secretary, now stands publicly accused among other things of having passed months at hard labor on the treadmill for a drunken brawl in a neighborhood of ill-fame; of having been at another time, the hero of a stabbing affray in reference to the charms of a Sligo barmaid; of having been a companion of Mr. Sheridan, of Tubbercurry, dined under his mahogany, and quaffed the flowing nectar in his merry company. It has not yet been announced that the Under Secretary has determined to 'vindicate his character in a court of law,' according to the new requirement of the Times' code of honor. We say nothing of the allegations that it was Mr. Patrick Egan who wrote and circulated King-Harman's election address for Roscommon, and contributed £10 towards his election expenses. If there is anybody entitled to bring an action for libel for the imputed connection between the two men, it would be Mr. Egan. The Colonel is not fit to tie the latchet of his shoe."

WHO GOVERNS IRELAND?

While the Tory Government are fighting the Coercion Bill through Parliament, the great work of educating public opinion in England is progressing. At the same time a new plan of campaign is being quietly matured in Ireland and will go into operation on the same day that the Crimes Act receives the Royal assent. John Dillon has stated that he had matured a plan of organization, which would be perfectly safe and absolutely indestructible even under the wildest and most drastic coercion bill. His scheme, he declared, involved neither crime nor violent resistance of the law, but comprehended a gigantic system of combination among the people, so simple that its terms and provisions would be understood at a glance by the commonest minds. The land agitation of the past seven years has trained the Irish people in the business of organization; it has taught them the potency of united action; it has welded them into a solid mass. The demon of discord has been exorcised; the ghostly forms of factional contention, of petty provincial jealousy, of religious hate and of treason to the sacred cause of nationality have been laid.

The beauty of Mr. Dillon's plan is contained in the fact that, without a parliament, and indifferent to Royal or governmental assent, it will go into law in Ireland and be accepted and carried out to the letter by the people for whom it was made. What a striking illustration we have here of the fact that in these days the people really govern themselves. Let parliaments, Kings, Lords and all the rest of the machinery, considered indispensable for the enactment of laws, go as they please.

When the trusted counsellors and accredited leaders of the great national movement issue a programme or plan of action, its popular acceptance and application are instantaneous, as well as effective. And so Mr. Dillon's new plan of campaign will soon be in operation in every county and hamlet in Ireland; it will precede the Balfour coercion act by several weeks and render the latter instrument as impotent as all its predecessors have proved to be. It is impossible to crush a nation animated with such lofty ideas of patriotism and held together by such a splendid system of organization. Eighty-six coercion acts failed to accomplish this much-desired object. Some of the ablest statesmen England ever produced applied their ingenuity to the drafting of these measures; and some of the most fearless and unscrupulous political tyrants ever sent across the channel to govern Ireland by force applied them. But in vain. The people came out of each and every struggle more deter-

mined and more agitated for self-government. If this was the result in bygone years, when there existed no great national organization, what may be expected to-day under such leadership as Ireland possesses, and with her people, irrespective of past religious differences, acting in perfect accord, marching shoulder to shoulder, keeping step to the music of national emancipation, and fully determined to float the Irish flag in College Green before they lay down their arms.

Talk of Home Rule. Ireland has Home Rule. All that remains for the British Parliament is to acknowledge the fact. Tories may kick and scream, force their Coercion Acts, but in the end they will swallow the dose, and, though it may purge them severely, it will do them great good and they will feel much better after it.

THE DAY OF NO JUDGMENT.

In the House of Commons once Mr. Pitt said, "I have no fear for England. She will last till the day of Judgment." Mr. Burke retorted: "It is not the day of Judgment I dread, but the day of no judgment." Were the great Irishman alive to-day he would doubtless admit that the day he dreaded had arrived. For who can peruse the reports of the proceedings in the British Parliament without being forced to the conclusion that Her Majesty's present advisers have taken leave of every principle which constitutes judgment in the management of affairs of state. The Salisbury ministry is, in fact, a laughing stock of the world. There is not a caricaturist in the world but is poking fun at them. Ferocious feebleness is always ridiculous, and Lord Salisbury himself appears to have arrived at the conclusion that he must do something heroic to rescue his government from universal contempt and execration. He is reported as having said at the banquet to Mr. Goschen on Saturday that "the time must soon come for the governors of England to take short, sharp expression of their will to put a stop to a state of things which makes them ridiculous." Then comes the report that he contemplated to arrest and imprison the whole of the Irish parliamentary party!

Without pausing to consider the outrageous character of such an attempt to silence a constitutional agitation for the recovery of popular rights, Lord Salisbury ought to be reminded of what followed like proceedings on the memorable occasion when Charles I. arrested members of parliament and sent them to the Tower. Does he imagine that a First Minister to-day violate with impunity a fundamental principle of representative government by initiating "conduct that cost a king his throne and his head over two hundred years ago?"

But it would seem that the determination of the Tory Government to level every barrier which the wisdom of many generations has erected for the preservation of freedom, has brought ministers to a point where they have roused the apprehensions of the masses of Englishmen. It is plain to all men who have given any study to politics that one of the three kingdoms cannot be enslaved without it is a very material manner curtailing the liberty of the other two. The great party of Reform, including Liberals or Radicals, in England at Scotland, which seeks the removal of abuses and the extension of political power to the masses, perceive that the Irish people are the natural allies; that, in fact, the battle for popular rights is now being fought by the Irish and that the defeat of the Irish cause would mean the triumph of the enemies of the democracy in England and the indefinite postponement of those reforms demanded in the interests of the whole people of the United Kingdom.

Thus it will be seen that around this Irish question swirls and surges all the passions, hopes, fears, loves and enmities of the two great divisions of the British people. For the probable result we can but draw conclusions from the past. Every step which England has taken in the path of freedom had to be won over just such obstacles as we see now presented; but in former times ministers, kings, parliament had to go down before the will of the people, we may rest assured will it be in the present instance. And men who are now most loud and bitter in opposition to the just demands of Ireland may live to see the day, as others before them did, when they will acknowledge the error and thank the happy fortune which defeated them.

MR. CURRAN AND THE DISMISSAL CANAL MEN.

The official report of the House of Commons Debates, containing the report of Mr. Curran's denial of the report of his alleged responsibility for the dismissal or suspension of the canal workmen, has not yet reached us. But accepting what is appeared in the Ottawa correspondence as substantially correct, we may be permitted on this, the first available opportunity after the matter came under our notice, to set the Post straight with reference to Mr. Curran, and what is of far greater moment, the public, whose respect and confidence was permitted to enjoy.

According to our custom in dealing with matters affecting the public interests, we have no private or business ends to serve in this matter,—we severely criticized what we thought, and still think, an act of oppression and injustice, not untinted with revenge. In doing so we said:—"There was now no doubt that J. J. Curran, the 'pretended Home Ruler and Anti-Coercionist,' had used his influence with his brother ship 'John Costigan, both sons of laboring Irishmen, to deprive a number of Irishmen of their means of livelihood, because they 'voted according to their consciences.'"

This was written in the heat of pardonable indignation aroused by the undoubted fact that the men had been suspended and told that they would have to see Mr. Curran before they could be allowed to resume their employment on the canal. But we are now glad to know that Mr. Curran has declined from his place in parliament all complicity in the disgraceful business. We accept his denial and cheerfully withdraw our remarks, so far as he is personally concerned. Although we do not approve of Mr. Curran's conduct and regard as a public man, we would not descend to the mean business of doing him an injustice. Heaven knows there is always a superabundance of solid facts in the actions of a follower of