

THE TRUE WITNESS
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The Post Printing & Publishing Co.
761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum \$1.50
Paid strictly in advance \$1.00
TO ADVERTISERS
A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS at 15c per line (space) 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. Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter Post Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to each copy. Subscribers will see by date on the address label when their subscription expires.

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, SEPTEMBER 16, 1885

The English health authorities are sorely exercised over the importation of "artificial honey," composed of wheat or corn starch treated with acid, the product of American ingenuity. Detection by the taste is said to be impossible.

WOMAN SUFFRAGISTS in the State of Maine, who have been petitioning for a commutation of the death sentence of Mrs. Barrons, on the ground that she will be the only woman ever hanged in the State, have had their petition weakened by the discovery that two women have been hanged before in the State. The suffragists now claim that mercy should be shown because the prisoner was tried by men and would be hanged by men, which they think is not fair.

MR. GLADSTONE, whose fondness for place and prominence in the political world has not diminished under the weight of years, does not appear to be very sanguine as to the result of the next general elections, or he would not have declined to state his intentions to the deputation which desired to ascertain the prospects of his leading the Liberals in the coming campaign. He is apparently watching the antics of the great electoral cat, and waiting to see what way the fickle feline may jump. The grand old man prefers to have some prospect or guarantee that it is a sure victory and not a forlorn hope that he will have to lead, before committing himself.

RENEWED energy and life are being put into the Irish national movement in America. Now more than at any other time it is necessary that the National League should make its usefulness felt. Mr. Parnell and the Irish party need all the assistance that Irishmen abroad can give them. The special and duly authorized channel through which that assistance ought to pass is the National League. It is to be hoped that Montreal will not remain behind the other leading cities of the continent in doing its share towards strengthening the hands of the League and thus aid in advancing the cause. The Irishmen of the metropolis should show their fellow-countrymen throughout the Dominion a good example in this respect.

Two little boys were arraigned before the Recorder yesterday on a charge of stealing apples from a garden. His Honor, who must have been in a severe mood, sentenced the lads to three and two years respectively in the Reformatory. The severity of this sentence for an offence trifling in itself, would be fully justified if the boys were known as incorrigible rascals or were without parental protection. But the prosecution apparently did not prove them to be such. The reason for such harsh punishment is, consequently, not quite clear. If the boys were really bad and incorrigible, their parents should have been consulted by the Recorder before placing them in confinement for a period of two and three years. A pathetic scene which was enacted in the Court shows that at least the mother of one of the boys was not thankful for the action of His Honor. On hearing the sentence, the distressed mother swooned and fell heavily to the floor in a dead faint, and had to be conveyed to home in a carriage.

WHEN the Herald published a letter containing vile calumnies and insults against the Catholic clergy and our French fellow-citizens, we considered it our duty to protest against the action of our contemporary, and to demand a repudiation of the infamous charges, and an apology for their publication. For some time the Herald did not appear inclined to squarely repudiate or honestly apologize; but this morning our contemporary meets the situation in a manly and straightforward manner and acknowledges its error. The objectionable letter was published without having passed through the editor's hands, in his absence and without his knowledge. In

justice to our contemporary we give its reputation in full:—
"But when criticism takes the form of a wicked calumny, as in the case of the anonymous article against Roman Catholic clergy, there can be no difference of opinion and no room for controversy. That was a most wicked and malignant statement, which should never have been written nor published. Then there were the allegations against the doctors; these were far too strong, and when applied to a whole class they were calumnious. But who could defend, or what defence could be offered, for the principle of discharging all French employes from the factories, warehouses, etc.? With this point we dealt fully in a former issue, and do not need to refer further to the insanity and criminality of the proposition."

This act of contrition deserves much pardon, and as a humble acknowledgment of a grave fault, is creditable to our confere. Would there were more such among some of our contemporaries who would have the honesty and manliness to apologize and repent when they are caught in error or found injuring their neighbor!
SOME interesting light is thrown upon the subject of personal incomes in Ireland, by a parliamentary return, recently issued. It gives particulars of the assessments to income tax in the years 1874, 1879, and 1884, and distinguishes the gradations of income derived from trades and professions in those years. It appears that, in 1884, there were 6,985 persons in Ireland whose incomes varied from £150 to £200 a year; there were 4,532 who had incomes of £200 to £300 a year; 2,071 who had between £300 and £400 a year; 871 who had between £400 and £500 a year; 577 who had between £500 and £600 a year; 369 who had between £600 and £700; 196 who had between £700 and £800; 192 who had between £800 and £900; 88 who had between £900 and £1,000; 506 persons who had incomes varying from £1,000 to £1,200; 122 had incomes ranging from £2,000 to £3,000; 67 persons enjoyed yearly incomes varying from £4,000 to £5,000; 59 from £5,000 to £10,000, and 33 from £10,000 to £50,000. Three persons are returned as having over £50,000 a year. The foregoing incomes were derived from trades and professions.

WHIMSICAL JUSTICE.
The trial of Thomas Scott, known as the "white rebel from Prince Albert," has been conducted and concluded in a manner most satisfactory to the prisoner. He was charged with treason felony. His judge was the same that tried Riel. The evidence that convicted Riel was pretty much the same that liberated Scott.

The judge that charged the jury straight against the French-Canadian rebel was unusually tender and solicitous for the English-Canadian rebel.

In the former case His Honor demanded and obtained a verdict against Riel; in the latter he as much as directed the jury to let Scott go, and they did.

The jury which tried Riel were opposed to him in creed and blood; but Scott was not so situated.

The half-breed rebel was given no opportunity to escape from a sentence of death, while the white rebel was denied no advantage to ensure his safety and freedom.

These facts may appear strange, but they are facts all the same, and are suggestive of something very like a miscarriage or a misdirection of justice. They warrant the people of Canada in asking if Riel is to be hanged because he happens to be a half-breed or French-Canadian rebel, and if Scott is to be set free because he is a white or English rebel?

That's the question.

SERMON BY A REFORMED JOURNALIST.

Our evening contemporary, the Daily Star, has an article on the ethics of journalism, which we are happy to endorse and which makes us feel more or less proud. In the course of it we read as follows:—
"Of all the newspapers of a great city are vast and filthy, it shows that the people of that city are low minded and vulgar, and a dozen 'endowed organs' would have no influence, because they would be of no use, except, perhaps, for supplying people with wrapping paper. There is not a city in which there are not clean, able and upright organs, so far as Canada is concerned we can go further and say that on half the fingers of one hand can be counted the sheets which open their columns to all unclean news. Every man has his choice of papers, and at least in some cases he purchases the paper which he likes best, and then he reads it, and then he lifts his hands in holy horror at the wickedness of the newspaper. Of one thing the public can be sure, and that is that there are but few journals that are as good as their constitutions will permit—clean, upright and true."

It was with much pleasure that we read the above in the columns of our evening contemporary; for we flatter ourselves that THE POST, more than any other influence, was instrumental in forcing the Daily Star to abandon the ways of "unclean journalism" and to adopt a more moral and respectable line of conduct.

We have yet to cure it of its inclination to sensationalism, but of that we do not despair, and expect, some fine day, to hear our contemporary lecture on sensational journalism, as it has just done, so feelingly and eloquently, on the depravity and evils of unclean journals.

None can appreciate and laud the benefits of temperance and virtue so well as the reformed drunkard and the repentant sinner; and it is our sincere expectation that there will be no relapse on the part of our contemporary, but that it will continue from this out to reduce its preaching to practice, and lead a decent, honest life, as it will take a long time for the Star to clean up what it has dirtied.

"A DELICATE QUESTION."

THE Earl of Carnarvon, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, who is at present touring it through the island, says he was much struck by the vast natural resources of the West of Ireland which remain undeveloped, owing to the absence of railways and markets, and His Excellency added that it was a delicate

question whether or not the Government should aid in the development of these resources. Now that is just one of the strongest reasons and arguments the Irish people have to advance in support of their demand for a home government. The country is allowed to go to waste and to the dogs because the British Government consider it a very delicate thing to aid in the development of some of the finest natural resources in Europe. If the Irish people had their own national legislature, all that delicacy would vanish, and there would be no suicidal hesitation in making the country and the people benefit by the inherent wealth of the one and by the skill and muscle of the other. The railways and markets that are now wanting to create and spread prosperity through the land, would be brought into existence, and what is more, the Irish Parliament would see to it that the people remain in the country to feed the railways and to get fed at the markets. The deserted villages, decayed towns and cities, the bogs and waste lands, would soon be replaced by populous centres of life, activity and progress, and by rich and fruitful fields.

LECTURES ON CANADA.

Mr. W. H. H. Murray inaugurated his course of lectures on Canadian history last evening in the Queen's Hall. The audience was so delighted in what the lecturer had to say and show to them that after the lecture, which lasted two hours, was over they actually remained seated to hear and see more. Mr. Murray kindly consented to continue his effort, but finding that there was no sign of his audience retiring he was in the end reluctantly compelled to ask them to go home and dream over the beauty and grandeur of their country. Such eagerness to listen to a lecture on the part of a Montreal audience, we believe, unprecedented. The fact speaks volumes for the excellence of the intellectual treat. It was a marked compliment to the lecturer, and an expressive appreciation of the historical value and romantic interest of his lecture. We consider that these lectures, which are to be delivered abroad, as well as at home, are destined to work an immense good to Canada. They are calculated, on the one hand, to stir up a sentiment of patriotism in the breast of Canadians, to make them feel proud of their country, and to make them consider it a duty to contribute their quota towards building up a great Canadian nationality on the northern part of the American continent. On the other hand, these lectures cannot but produce a most wholesome effect on the outside world. They will help beyond measure to dispel the many prejudices that exist abroad as to our material and social condition and our political prospects; they will bring enlightenment to the ignorant and will help to create a foreign public opinion that will be more favorable to Canada and its institutions than it is now.

As to the literary and intellectual merits of the lecture, they attain to a standard which is rarely known to the public platform. We venture to say, without exaggeration, that Canada and its history have never been treated with such polish of style, such truthfulness of description, such warmth of sentiment, such a keen insight into and powerful grasp of the leading events and characters of the time, and with such honest appreciation and impartial judgment as characterized the effort of Mr. Murray. This result is all the more remarkable as the lecturer had to tell the story of nearly four hundred eventful years in the space of two hours.

LIBERTY FOR THE ENGLISH REBEL, AND DEATH FOR THE FRENCH.

Scott goes free and Riel to the gallows. The one was as much a rebel as the other—a fact which cannot be disputed and which there is no pretension of disputing.

The former was the white rebel leader, the latter was the half-breed rebel leader. Riel and Scott were in the same boat, the one pulling to win the stakes for the French, the other pulling to share them with the English.

How is it then that the judge, jury and evidence that liberated the English champion convicted the French? That question we propounded in these columns last week, and as yet nobody has been either able or willing to answer it.

We suppose that as the question was put to nobody in particular, nobody in particular considered it incumbent upon him to offer a solution.

To-day we renew the question, but this time we put it directly and in particular to the Minister of Justice. We ask him to examine into an administration of justice that is capable of reaching the most contradictory results on the same issue and under the same circumstances.

We ask him to explain to the people of Canada how one prisoner is sentenced to death while his coadjutor and full partner in the crime charged is given his liberty. We ask, in the name of fair play, why the advantages and the facilities which were cordially accorded to one rebel to effect his escape, were rigorously denied the other, so as to make sure of his condemnation?

If these questions are not satisfactorily answered, the outside world, with the Canadian public, will be forced to the conclusion that the administration of justice in Canada is not free from the trammels of race and creed, and that it is regulated to suit the exigencies and the dictates of the one and the other.

History will want, and will exact no stronger proof of this undying shame than to see Scott free and alive, with Riel in chains and dead.

As the majority of English and Scotchmen in the Dominion, with the totality of the Irish population, do not desire and do not demand any more favors, privileges and rights than can be equally enjoyed by their French fellow-citizens, would it not be advisable and proper for

the English-speaking people to make some organized effort towards impressing that fact upon the Government?

Let them by petition or by mass meeting, or by both, tell the Government that they did not expect any more immunity for a rebel leader, because he was English, than they would have done for one who is French.

But since justice has taken such divergent paths, leading in opposite directions, let the English-speaking citizens, here and elsewhere, respectfully, but firmly, demand of the Government that as the white rebel has been liberated so shall the half-breed leader; let them demand that the right of life and liberty which was secured to Scott, whether by fair or unfair means, by the wise leniency or the unjust partiality of the court, shall also be granted to Riel through the clemency of the Executive.

HENDRICKS' SPEECH APPROVED.

THE POST has already given its opinion of Mr. Hendricks' notable speech, in which he endorsed the programme of Mr. Parnell and the Irish party, and urged Ireland to continue the fight for self-government. It affords us much gratification to find that the brightest, fairest and most intelligent organ of public opinion in the United States is of the same mind as THE POST. The New York Sun, which is that organ, publishes an article on the subject that cannot be but pleasing and of much interest to the Canadian public. We make room for it with pleasure:—

"There is a strange mixture of forgetfulness, ignorance and impotence in the resentment shown by English newspapers at an expression of sympathy by an American citizen with the Irish struggle for home rule. The inordinate amount of taffy administered by Mr. Lowell and Mr. Phelps seems to have left the British stomach in a supersensitive condition. The sole ground of the irritation now betrayed is the fact that Mr. Hendricks, who happens to be Vice-President, permitted himself to avow at a meeting in Indianapolis his satisfaction at the prospect of Ireland's obtaining the same measure of self-government as is enjoyed by the inhabitants of one of the United States or of the Canadian Dominion.

"Even if there were anything improper or offensive in such a declaration, it would not lie in English mouths to call us to account for it. Had Mr. Hendricks gone much further than he actually went, had he encouraged Ireland to strive by civil war for complete independence of Great Britain, he would simply have followed the example of Mr. Gladstone, who, while Chancellor of the Exchequer, publicly announced that in his judgment Mr. Jefferson Davis had created a nation. The wish was father to the thought, and the thought had huge capabilities of mischief, proclaimed, as it was at the crisis of our desperate contention with rebellion, when a formal recognition of the Southern Confederacy might have turned the scale against us. Notwithstanding the interchange of fulsome and hollow compliments between official representatives of Great Britain and the United States, Americans have not forgotten the attitude assumed by our transatlantic kinsmen when the republic hung upon the verge of ruin. Neither have they forgotten how generally and how cynically the British Liberals, whose spokesman Mr. Gladstone was then as he is now, disclaimed the unctious professions of abhorrence for the crime of slavery of which they had been lavish for more than a generation.

"The assumption, moreover, that it is unseemly or unfriendly for Americans to applaud the aspirations of Irishmen for Home Rule is a piece of insufferable impertinence. It is tantamount to saying that we ought to be ashamed of our methods of State Government, and should hang our heads, instead of exultantly acclaiming the adoption of our system in Canada and in Australia, and the prospect of its early reproduction in Ireland. To pretend that when Americans hail the promise of a State Legislature at Dublin they wish for the destruction of the British empire is to beg the very point in controversy. For us who are familiar with the easy adjustment of State and Federal machinery the assumption seems ridiculous. But had experience proved that the misgiving was only too well founded, were Ireland actually in successful revolt notwithstanding all the efforts of England to enforce the imperial authority, and had a prominent member of Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet seized the occasion to declare his satisfaction at Ireland's conquest of independence—even then he would have done no more than Mr. Gladstone did in our hour of peril and of sorrow."

GENERAL MIDDLETON UNMASKS A FRAUD.

The most gigantic fraud of the late campaign in the North-West was beyond question the notorious Gatling gun. Capt. Howard with his Gatling gun received more attention and more praise at the hands of the war correspondents and the Canadian Press generally than the commander-in-chief himself, or any score of officers lumped together. It was the Gatling gun to the right, to the left, to the rear and everywhere. It was the Gatling gun with its gallant captain that threw terror and death into the ranks of the half-breeds; and that on one or two occasions was so effective as to preserve the entire forces from annihilation. In fact, the Gatling gun got the credit of suppressing, as Louis Riel got the credit of raising, the rebellion. Of course, the Canadian people, relying on the truthful and reliable war correspondents for the news of the campaign, had no alternative but to feel proud of the Gatling gun, to cheer it in public and to mention it most favorably in private conversation. The brilliant and enthusiastic description of the exploits of Capt. Howard, with his half-breed destroyer, by these war correspondents, were calculated to evoke nothing but admiration and gratitude from the Cana-

dian heart, and there is no contesting the fact that there were lots of gratitude and admiration showered upon the man and the weapon that saved the lives of our volunteers and the integrity of our Dominion. But what will not be the disgust and the vexation of the Canadian people when they learn that the object of their kindness, their gratitude and their admiration was nothing but a sickening, good-for-nothing fraud? Canadians have been thoroughly fooled and bamboozled by our special war correspondents. They have lied and misrepresented the situation from the word "go." They heartlessly got the public to go into ecstasies over exploits that never occurred, and to give honor and credit where neither was due. The Gatling gun is and was nothing better than a farce, a mockery and a snare. It is General Middleton himself who says it. The general cannot even guess what use the gun could be in warfare amongst civilized nations. He even goes further and states that for Indian warfare in Canada the Gatling gun "is absolutely valueless." Do the war correspondents hear that? Will they listen to the description the Commander of the Forces gives of its usefulness and of its achievements during the campaign? The general says:—"The Gatling gun surprised the Indians at first; but the real effect of the gun on them could be imagined when, after the first surprise, they fired on the gun with the result of forcing it to retire with the loss of one man seriously wounded (he died afterwards) and one horse killed. In another case Captain Howard fired on a house three stories high, and only built of inch planks, behind which the body of rebels were lurking, with the result of one shot hitting the corner of the house out of eighteen fired. The house was afterwards found to have fifty women, children and priests in it, not one of whom was hurt, though a priest was shot in the leg by a rebel armed with a Winchester."

And that is the gun that was said to have saved the army and the nation. Now, if our Canadian journals and newspaper correspondents have been so far and so much astray as to the merits of the Gatling, what guarantee have we that the Canadian people have not been made to swallow the grossest misrepresentation and false information about other features of the rise and fall of the half-breed revolt? Has the public mind been poisoned as to the merits of the half-breed cause? Who can say that it has not?

THREE CHILDREN ATTAIN THEIR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

THREE Catholic children, after seven months detention in a non-Catholic charitable institution in this city, have been liberated at last and handed over to the authority and care of their father, who will now place them in an institution where their creed will not be interfered with, and where they can attend to their religious duties.

This act of justice has been secured through the instrumentality of THE POST. A few weeks ago we called attention to the case, and demanded that the management of the institution release the children.

The institution replied that it could not do so without an order from the Recorder.

The Recorder, when applied to, answered in turn that it would be necessary for the father to appeal to the Lieutenant Governor, who in turn had to convoke his Cabinet and have an order-in-council issued for the liberation of the children.

On Saturday we were informed that the required order-in-council had been forwarded. Now, if that is not red-tape with a vengeance, we would like to know what is? The father of the children, however, got to the end of it with the kind assistance of Mr. C. J. Doherty.

In closing we would beg to remind the Recorder that he has a duty to perform before justice has been satisfied and the freedom of conscience vindicated in this case. His Honor, when he sent these Catholic children to a Protestant institution, must have sentenced them on the sworn testimony of some one that "they were Protestants." The question is who is that "some one?"

The public will be interested in its solution, as it involves a double crime, that of perjury and that of forcing a miscarriage of justice. It is the duty and the business of the Recorder to ascertain and punish the party or parties who so successfully imposed upon His Honor and who actually got a Court of Justice to become an effective tool, and to accomplish the object of what was evidently a conspiracy to fraudulently deprive Canadian citizens of their religious rights.

This incident ought to teach the Recorder a lesson, and it is, that he cannot be too particular nor too careful in receiving the evidence of witnesses who are not watched and cross-questioned by counsel for the accused. In the present instance the father was not in a position to engage counsel to look after the interests of his children, and the perjurers as a consequence had it all their own way, deceiving the Magistrate and forcing the Court to lend itself to a flagrant injustice and a violation of religious freedom.

A NOTABLE SPEECH BY THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Hendricks, the Vice-President of the United States, has just given England and English politicians something to think about. In fact, the feeling of the latter is one of uneasiness and annoyance at the very remarkable figure in the Government of the Republic as the Vice-President has deemed it justifiable to assume on the issue between Ireland and England. At a large mass-meeting held at Indianapolis last evening, to endorse the programme of Mr. Parnell and the action of the Irish party, Mr. Hendricks figured as the principal speaker. His speech was a notable

and fearless one. It was a powerful arraignment of English misrule in Ireland, and a direct encouragement to the Irish National party to persevere in their struggle for right and freedom. No ruler or responsible government member of any other country would have dared to utter the opinions and sentiments as were declared by the American Vice-President. Considering his high official capacity, Mr. Hendricks' speech must challenge the attention of the world, which will await with interest and curiosity England's reply thereto. There is not the slightest doubt that if it had been pronounced by the ruler of a weaker nation than itself, England's demand for a retraction and an apology would be instantaneous; but it makes all the difference in the world when the speaker has such a country as the United States to his back. Apologies are not asked, and gunboats are not sent to enforce them. The tone of the speech was bold and aggressive. So far from Ireland having fair play from Great Britain since the reign of Henry I., she has, says Mr. Hendricks, been denied the rights of equal citizenship, and been despoiled of her lands. He charges that bad government and landlord cruelties have done more than famine or pestilence to depopulate the beautiful Isle, and to reduce its flourishing population of 9,000,000 to less than 5,000,000 within half a century. The landlord must become a useful element in the country or he must go; the rents he draws from hovels and destitute tenants must no longer be spent in London and Paris. This land trouble must be regulated "by legislators from the soil." It is, says Mr. Hendricks, against reason and justice that the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland should be fixed in London. The Vice-President goes a step further, and openly accuses a "friendly power" of exercising tyranny over a portion of its subjects. Mr. Hendricks' language is plain and unmistakable, and we quote what ought to put England on its mettle, if it has any:—"It cannot always be that the people of Ireland are to be oppressed. I think the day of tyranny in every form is to pass away, and that the day is soon to come when all men will be blessed with good government and just laws."

The Vice-President applauds Mr. Parnell in his demand for national self-government, and prophesies the formation of an Irish party which will be restless, for "there will be no shams, no frauds," at the next elections, as "Ireland is tremendously in earnest." He points out that each of the two great English parties, seeking strength from the Irish vote, will help to place Ireland where she has the right to stand and where she ought to be in her political relations with the world. Mr. Hendricks concluded his calm and deliberate speech with the following prophetic announcement:—"I think this cause will go further than has been yet mentioned. It will result in just what we have in Indiana—a written constitution. You remember in the Declaration of Independence we asserted the right of men to govern themselves. That is the great foundation idea of America, and is now being applied in Ireland, a cause to which you are to give your sympathy and support—the right of man to govern himself and to abolish laws that are inimical to his welfare. In hope that principle was asserted at Bunker Hill, and in glorious triumph was proclaimed at Yorktown."

The immense assemblage of American citizens cheered the speaker with wild enthusiasm. This noble and disinterested pronouncement by the Vice-President of the United States will accomplish three things: it will bring more comfort and greater hope to the heart of Ireland; it will bring increased shame and humiliation upon England, and it will raise still higher in the esteem and admiration of all free men and of those struggling to be free, the proud and honored name of the great American Republic.

THE STAR ATTACKS MR. HENDRICKS FOR HIS IRISH SPEECH.

The Montreal Daily Star, which has no sympathy with the Irish people in their plucky and persevering fight for the right of self-government, cannot appreciate, and much less, approve the notable declaration which Mr. Hendricks, the Vice-President of the United States, has just made on the issue between Great Britain and Ireland. Our evening contemporary is even quite vexed with the Vice-President. It cannot understand how such a high and important personage could condescend to advocate the cause of the mere Irish against the interests of our beloved mutual Mother Country. The Daily Star says Mr. Hendricks had no business to go back to the Declaration of Independence and to remind his hearers that the foundation idea of that historic document was the "right of men to govern themselves and to abolish laws that are inimical to their welfare." He had no right to recall that, in hope, this immortal principle was asserted at Bunker Hill, and in glorious triumph was proclaimed at Yorktown when the British were smashed and routed never to return. He had no right to suggest that this great American principle was now being applied to Ireland and to ask that Americans give their sympathy and support to the cause of the Irish people. The Daily Star did not want to listen to any of these "old reminders." Vice-President Hendricks "went too far back" for its taste and for its sympathies. It dragged up the Civil War of twenty-five years ago to throw it in his face, and to ask him to explain his inconsistency in then fighting against the South, which asserted the principle that men had the right to govern themselves.

The Star's dishonesty in putting the case in such a false light is too transparent to deceive anybody. It is a contemptible thing