

## THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The Post Printing &amp; 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, 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 20c per line. Special rates for contracts in application. Advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, &c., 50c per insertion (not to exceed 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 remittance 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 &amp; 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 4, 1887

Those Canadian journals who are showing their fangs against the advocates of Irish rights are referred to the report, published in to-day's Post, of the great meeting of Protestant Home Rulers at Dublin. Particularly would we direct their attention to the speech of Mr. David Briggs, of Belfast, who uttered a rock-bottom truth when he said that the only Coercion Bill Ireland required was one to keep the Orangemen in order.

The Montreal Patriot makes this kindly reference in its last issue:—

"We congratulate THE POST on its fearless advocacy of the cause of the despotically ruled Irish tenants and we also extend to our contemporary our warm appreciation of the fact that THE POST is published, not in oppressed Ireland, but in free Canada—in the former country it dare not speak so plain. No, for the despotic hand of justice (?) would soon stop its mouth."

The Canadian "navy" has gone to sea, and our Yankee friends will have to keep off. The fleet consists of the flagship Acadia, the Lansdowne, La Canadienne, General Middleton, L. Howlette, F. E. Conrad, Terror, Lizzie Lund ay, Critic and the confiscated Highland Light. The vessels will carry 130 men, 30 officers and 16 guns.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S vote against the Home Rule resolution was what we expected. We have the old dodger at last where we wanted him. He may go to all the pic-nics in the country next summer, but he will not be able to say, as he did at A'monte, that he was an out and out Home Ruler. Nor need he hope his vote will be forgotten by the Irishmen of Canada.

The following parody is sung nightly at the Victoria Hall, London:—

"Then down with the Castle wall!  
Home Rule once for all!  
On Gladstone yet  
Our hearts are set,  
And you may bet  
He'll never forget  
How the wishes of Ireland must be met,  
Down with the Castle wall!"

SYDNEY SMITH'S Scotchman, who had to have a surgical operation performed on him before he could understand a joke, was a humorist of the most delightful kind compared to our Ontario Tory contemporaries. They are howling with indignation over Mr. Lemieux's "Crucifix bill." They do not see that it is an old-fashioned way which Quebec has taken to reply to the Tory Popery howl raised by The Mail.

"SUFFERER'S" letter in this issue calls attention to the most important matter that could engage the minds of our citizens. The flood is very likely to be followed by disease if effective means are not taken at once to ward off the danger. Our correspondent is a gentleman of high scientific attainments and has, besides, good reason for urging this question, having had to bear a heavy affliction through former civic neglect. Surely it will not be necessary to have his experience extended to many more homes in the city in order to show the need of sanitation.

PROHIBITION having been defeated at the polls in Michigan, by a small majority, the Legislature is now giving attention to the enactment of a higher license law. It is proposed to fix the saloon license for towns of 10,000 and upwards at \$700, and the bond at \$10,000, the license and bond decreasing in amount as the size of the town decreases. The minimum license, however, is fixed at \$300. There is thought to be little doubt of this measure passing the Legislature. If Michigan cannot do as it would, it will do the best it can, and keep doing.

MR. MERCIER has been sustained by a majority of eight, the vote standing 36 to 28. Counting the Speaker the actual strength of the Ministry is 37 in a house of 65 members. The Opposition made a desperate fight, but the result has been to confirm and strengthen the government of Mr. Mercier. It is to be hoped

that there will be no more exhibitions of faction, and that the gentlemen entrusted by the people with the management of Provincial affairs will be left free to perform their duties till such time as criticism may fairly be offered on their performances. As yet they have not had time sufficient to get the kinks out of the financial tangle left them by their predecessors.

It would seem that the Coercion Bill is having one of its intended effects. We read in the cables that Queenstown is crowded with emigrants flying from the country, so that those who are awaiting passage are too numerous to find accommodation in the hotels and lodging houses, and many are camping in the streets. It is the old, old story. "The Irish are going with a vengeance." If they followed the advice of an English patriot, Henry Labouchere, they would stay, with and for a vengeance. "War," he says, "must be met with war. If the Government uses the arms of despotism to crush out liberty, the people must reply by the use of those means which oppressed nationalities have ever had at their command, and have ever used in their struggles for their rights." \* \* \* The blood-and-iron policy of oppression has never yet been successfully resisted with rose-water.

The Government at Ottawa has been sustained by a majority of 32 on a question which involved a fundamental principle of representative government. It was a victory that only shows this parliament to be hardly less depraved than that which preceded it. A House which surrenders the principle of its own existence to an unscrupulous minister cannot be regarded with confidence. The event, however, has peculiar significance. Sir John was sustained by a majority of 32; the demand made by THE POST in the name of the Irish people was granted by a majority of 78. Thus it will be seen that the Irish people of Canada are more powerful than the Prime Minister. Let the Tory press of England, who are now lecturing Canada for showing her Home Rule proclivities, make note of the fact.

In the esteemed *Kazoo's* Ottawa correspondence this morning we read:—

"The vote on the anti-coercion resolutions last night gave a larger majority than had been anticipated, and Mr. Curran has received numerous congratulations personally and by wire to-day on the immense support he rallied. An analysis of the vote shows that the majority was made up of 53 Conservatives, 10 Nationalists and 70 Liberals, and the minority of 47 Conservatives, 33 of whom are from Ontario and from the North-West and British Columbia, and the balance from the Lower Provinces."

"The indications thrown out since the opening of the session warrant the statement that in a full house the Government majority will not be less than 35."

This does not hang together. How can the Government have a majority of 35, if the figures set down by the correspondent be correct? Several Liberals were absent who may be counted as supporters of the resolution. But perhaps the *Kazoo* counts the ten Nationalists as Ministerialists. If so why does it give them as a group of ten? The only way we can understand it is that the Government claims a majority of 25, with a hope of getting the "Bleu Bolters" to swell it to 35.

It appears from a closer inspection of the new law conferring the right of suffrage upon women in Kansas that only such women as have been born in the United States are entitled to the privilege. This explains the discrepancy between the male and female vote as registered, and also shows why it is that in some towns fully one-half of the registered female vote is colored. Under these conditions women suffrage in Kansas amounts to nothing more than a party device, and cannot by any application of terms be construed as a recognition of women as a sex. The women of Kansas do not vote because they are women, but because a political party, feeling the necessity of having some help in carrying out certain policies, believes that they will be of service to it. It is supposed that women of foreign birth are inimical to prohibitory laws, as many men of foreign birth undoubtedly are. To disfranchise the foreign born citizens of Kansas was not feasible, but the enfranchisement of native women suggested itself to the Kuon Nothings, and by this means the same ends were sought after.

A PAMPHLET just issued by the Bureau of Statistics, Washington, contains much interesting information on the drink problem, from which it appears that while the amount of money spent for liquor is large in the aggregate the American people spend for the necessities of life from \$12 to \$17 for every dollar that is spent for beer, wines, or spirits. The total drink bill per annum is computed at \$700,000,000, more than one-half of which is set down as profit to the retailer. The drinking population is placed at 15,000,000, and the average expense per capita is therefore about \$45. In round numbers the consumption of distilled spirits of all sorts has increased from 43,000,000 gallons in 1840 to 72,000,000 gallons in 1886; of wines from 4,800,000 gallons to 22,000,000, and of malt liquors from 23,000,000 gallons to 612,000,000. As touching the consumption per capita, it may be said that during the period mentioned there has been a decrease in the matter of spirits from about two and a-half gallons to about one and a quarter gallons; an increase in wines from about one-quarter to about one-third of a gallon, and an increase in malt liquors of from less than one and a-half to more than eleven gallons. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that the milder drinks are gradually taking the place of the stronger ones, and this is still further substantiated by the fact that the consumption of coffee per capita has largely increased during the last fifty years. It is estimated that only 10 per cent of the distilled liquor consumed in the United States is used for manufacturing and medicinal purposes.

LANDLORDISM in America has received a severe check. The Legislature of Illinois has passed a State law similar to the Alien Landlord's bill passed at the last session of Congress. The Illinois law provides that hereafter aliens shall not be allowed to buy land in that State until they shall become citizens; that unless they shall become citizens within six years their lands shall revert to the State, and that all

aliens now holding lands in Illinois must become citizens within three years. This bill is aimed at one William Scully, an Irishman, who is said to have imitated in Illinois the practices that have made English landlords objects of hatred in Ireland. Scully owns in the State from 75,000 to 100,000 acres, which are tilled by wretched tenants upon almost hopeless terms. The leases are said to contain some of the worst features of the Irish leases in use ten years ago. Scully also owns about 100,000 acres in Kansas. He lives in London. The people of Illinois appear to have determined that he must either sell out or become a citizen. If he does become a citizen he will be no acquisition to the United States.

If the *Witness* really desired to know the state of Irish feeling it should not have consulted Government employes and rabid Tories, but it should have consulted the columns of THE POST, in which Irish feeling is expressed truly every day. Mr. O'Brien is coming to Canada and will be welcomed by all true Irishmen, Tory and Toidy to the contrary notwithstanding. Some of our French evening contemporaries have fallen into a mistake concerning Mr. O'Brien. He is a great statesman, the author of "the Plan of Campaign," the editor of the leading Irish newspaper of the world and a member of the British House of Commons, he comes to Canada, not to "dynamite" Lord Lansdowne, but to show how Irish landlordism, represented by the Governor-General, is trying to exterminate the Irish peasantry. Let our French contemporaries consider the conduct of Bismarck towards the French people of Alsace, and they will know how Lord Lansdowne is inspired in his action toward the Irish. The men of blood and iron must be met by men of iron and blood.

It is enough to make a sensible man sick to hear the arguments advanced for destroying personal liberty in Ireland. If there is any principle imbedded in the British constitution it is that which the Crimes bill abolishes. The first law against arbitrary committing to prison is 9, Henry III. That was followed by 5, Edward III., Cap. 9. 25, Edward III., Cap. 4. 28, Edward III., Cap. 3. 37, Edward III., Cap. 18. 38, Edward III., Cap. 9, and 42, Edward III., Cap. 3. Besides these statutes we have *Magna Charta*, *Habeas Corpus*, Bill of Rights, Petition of Right and other enactments which ordain that no man shall be imprisoned, or stripped, or restrained, or outlawed, or condemned, or corporally punished, but by presentment and trial by his peers. That informers who deceive the Crown into unjust commitments shall be bound over to prosecute, and be answerable for damages by suffering the punishment they designed to bring on the innocent, or be obliged to satisfy the injured. Yet all these statutory laws, which form the boasted bulwark of British freedom, are swept away from Ireland forever! How long, let Englishmen consider, will it be before the Tories will apply to England the same law they are now trying to force upon Ireland? Is British manliness passing away, that Englishmen can be found in a majority in Parliament ready to destroy the fundamental principles of the constitution? Or are the nobility of England inviting the fate that befall the nobility of France and restored the land to the people.

IN THE Crimes Bill we see the first overt act of the upper classes of England to repress the spirit of liberty. Its folly and stupidity is all the more glaring when we reflect that exactly such legislation has invariably preceded revolution in every country in Europe. We see in it the first act in a terrible drama, the end of which must be the triumph of democracy. By this bill the aristocracy invite sentence on themselves of confiscation and banishment, and it will be carried out unless they take warning in time. Anyone can see the rising wave of Radicalism, which no power on earth can resist. The conflict between the Red and Purple Terrors has really begun. The latter has had things pretty much its own way for centuries, the former is soon to have its innings.

IMMIGRANTS at the rate of over 2,000 a day have landed at Castle Garden during the past month. Should this continue during the next six months it will greatly exceed the number (300,918) that arrived last year. So far Ireland has furnished only a small percentage, Germany and Italy furnishing the majority, with England, Russia and Spain sending a liberal number.

THE *Michigan Catholic* remarks, concerning the visit of Mr. O'Brien, that "the project seems to be the last resort of the poor people who live on the Lansdowne estates. In the meantime, Mr. Curran, of Montreal, the Canadian-born son of a good Irishman, is preparing the way for Mr. O'Brien by proposing a motion in the Canadian parliament condemnatory of coercion. This will start the Orange ire so that Mr. O'Brien will not need to do so. It is strange, too, that Mr. Curran should take this step, for he is a leading member of what may be called the Tory party of Canada. On the whole it would seem that Mr. O'Brien will not be quite unwelcome in Canada. But, no matter what the consequences, the Irish have of late got the habit of boarding lions in their dens, and we think the result of Mr. O'Brien's visit will be to make the Marquis of Lansdowne very sick of his eviction business."

## TRUTH.

"The Peoria, Ill., Transcript strikes right home in bringing to mind the scenes in the American Congress before the civil war, and showing how closely the proceedings in the present Coercion debate resemble the proceedings of those days. The *Transcript* remarks how the able and conservative London *Times* has branched out a good deal like the pro-slavery Democratic papers were in the habit of doing about that time. Like causes

produce like results. In America the Democrats were trying to rivet the chains on several million blackmen. In England the only difference is that they are trying to keep white men in virtual slavery. For weeks the London *Times* has charged Mr. Parnell almost daily with connivance, complicity and conspiracy in murder, assassination or their encouragement, and has taunted Mr. Gladstone and his followers with aiding murderers to dismember the empire. It would be hard, away from some Western cities, to match the virulence of the London *Times* in these charges in any American paper, and the natural result of this course was shown in Parliament in Colonel Sanderson's charge of murder against Mr. Egan, Mr. Sullivan and others. This is the beginning of the end of English domination in Ireland. The coercion bill may be passed, but it will be the death of the party that brings it about. This is what every right thinking man believes, and when the party does die and stays dead, it will be a happy day, not only for Ireland, but for mankind.

## MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN'S VISIT TO CANADA.

We are at a loss to understand the motives of those persons who are raising a howl against the coming of Mr. William O'Brien to this country. He was not invited by any one. He simply announced that he would come and tell all who cared to hear him the true story of the Lansdowne evictions and to present the appeal of the persecuted peasantry of Ireland to liberty-loving Canadians. There is nothing wrong in that. He is acting strictly within his right as a member of the British House of Commons representing that peasantry, in laying their case before what he believes to be a free and generous people. In doing so he pays a high tribute to Canadian intelligence and love of fair play. Yet it would seem there are men calling themselves Canadians, and even Irishmen, who would play into the hands of English Tories and Irish rackrenters by joining with the howlers against the visit of one of the best and greatest of living Irish patriots. Archbishop Lynch, whose wisdom and patriotism are proverbial, is reported as disapproving Mr. O'Brien's visit. If the report be true, His Grace, we feel certain, does so, not that he disapproves of Mr. O'Brien's action, but because he fears an explosion of Orange bigotry and insolence. But the Orangemen are not the people of Canada; nor do they form to any very large extent the ruling elements, nor yet are all Orangemen opposed to the principles advocated by Mr. O'Brien. We know a number of Orangemen, readers of THE POST, who are devoted to the National cause. The great meeting in Dublin is an irresistible proof of this fact.

At the bottom of the objection to the visit we can discover fear of trouble in the Tory camp. It will place a good many of our Tory friends on the horns of a very uncomfortable dilemma. But we can endure the misfortunes of such friends with a great deal of equanimity, not untouched, we may as well confess, with pleasure. The sooner, however, that the impossibility of those persons remaining Tories and professing Home Rule at the same time is demonstrated, the better it will be for all parties. It will be rare fun to see them coming down out of their hats and up out of their boots.

One thing is certain. Every Canadian, as well as every Irishman, is bound to see that Mr. O'Brien is given a fair hearing. He appeals to their love of freedom and justice, and it would be a national misfortune were any set of men among them to treat him with anything but courtesy. All who do not want to hear him can stay at home, and there they will be neither offended, frightened nor hurt.

For once the leading city Tory organ has overcome its *Kazoo's* prejudices, and expresses the same views in this matter that have already been advanced by THE POST in relation to the Ottawa *Citizen's* proposed indignation meeting. The *Gazette* this morning echoes THE POST in the following words:—

"Some very loyal people in Ottawa, indignant at the manner in which the Governor-General is being attacked, both in Ireland and Canada, are urging that a mass meeting of citizens should be called to protest against the visit of Mr. William O'Brien, for the purpose, as he has announced, of stirring up in this country a popular prejudice against the Queen's representative. There is not one word to be said in favor of the proposition. Our legislative bodies have talked enough on the Irish question to more than satisfy the majority of Canadians. Let the matter now rest as far as possible. The resolutions of such a meeting would have as little effect in staying Mr. O'Brien as the deliberations of our Parliament will have on the course of Imperial legislation. Opposition would only give zest to Mr. O'Brien's attacks. The wisest course is to let him alone. Those who object to him should abstain from going to hear him."

## A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT.

It is somewhat curious that the living lights of English literature should bewail the appearance in their own country of that spirit which they promoted in other lands. Tennyson, Swinburne, and, in a lesser degree, Goldwin Smith, have embedded in the literature of the day the most revolutionary doctrines. But now that masses of their countrymen have accepted those doctrines for gospel, they wheel about and, with astonishing turgidity, belie all that they have written. Look at the author of "In Memoriam" assailing with dotard impotency the principle for the advocacy of which he was rewarded with fame and fortune. Look also at the author of "Lines before a Crucifix," the devoted admirer of Victor Hugo, the poet and apostle of revolution, assailing Mr. Gladstone in doggerel worse than the worst to be found in "Leaves of Grass." As for the Professor, he seems, like the others, to have lost his head, and gravely talks nonsense in the face of that grim spirit which he helped to raise when he encouraged handbills in their assaults on the Catholic Church. We wonder if these men have yet realized that as the offspring of rebellion they must endure the fate

of rebels. The apostate nobles and learned men, who helped a depraved king to despoil the Church and shift the burden of national defence and public charity from the shoulders of the nobility to those of the working class, should not complain too loud when the people accept their Whig doctrines and apply them to themselves. England, who has been the nurse of revolution in every land, who has become great by piracy and the enslavement of whites and blacks, cannot cherish the hope that her wealth and her strength will enable her Government to resist the disease that runs in her blood. Nations have no hereafter save what amusement they may give to a Gibbon in literary gymnastics. Nations are punished for their sins on this earth. Let him who has stood on the shores of the Euphrates or the Nile, or looked upon the ruins in Mexico, tell how terribly the wrath of God fell upon the peoples who neglected and disobeyed Him. As these once powerful empires have left nothing but ruins and the traditions of their greatness and their size, so will it be with England. As they are now, so shall she be in the fulness of time. Goldwin Smith bewails the fate he sees approaching. Assuming the role of a Daniel, he translates the handwriting on the wall.

## MR. O'BRIEN COMING.

The following cable message was received, by the gentleman to whom it is addressed:

DUBLIN, April 27th, 1886.  
To H. J. CLORAN, President of the Irish National League, Montreal:

Lord Lansdowne has shamefully violated his agreement with his tenants. Kilbride and myself will start by Cunard steamer on Sunday (May 1st). Will you arrange meetings in Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa and Toronto?

WILLIAM O'BRIEN.

The other day we bowed to the judgment of Archbishop Lynch and Mr. Blake and advised Mr. O'Brien not to come to Canada on his proposed mission. Now, however, that Lord Lansdowne has, by his action, shown no intention of relenting, we will not take upon ourselves the responsibility of shielding him from the wrath he has invoked. While accepting the report that His Grace of Toronto did send the alleged message to Mr. O'Brien, we must be permitted to doubt its authenticity. For it is strange that the Irish press have as yet shown no knowledge of Mr. O'Brien having received such a message. Meantime arrangements have been made for Mr. O'Brien to address public meetings as follows:—

Montreal.....May 11th.  
Quebec.....May 12th.  
Ottawa.....May 14th.  
Toronto.....May 16th.

LINCOLN, Nebraska, U.S.,  
May 3rd, 1887.

To H. J. CLORAN, Montreal:

O'Brien pleads for the justice due from man to man against the titled, hereditary upholder of rack-rents and injustice.

Ireland looks with confidence to Canadian freemen of every class and creed to support her in this struggle for fair play for the tiller of the soil, for protection against evictions, which Gladstone truly describes as "SANTONES OF DEATH" executed on the Irish people.

This is not a question of creed and politics, but one of justice and humanity, a question of the rights of honest labor, of the masses against the classes.

JOHN FITZGERALD,  
President Irish National League of America.

## THE HOME RULE DEBATE.

Last night a division was reached on the resolution condemning coercion, moved by Mr. Curran. As the reports are somewhat mixed, we will briefly review the debate and give the several amendments.

The original motion read as follows: (Commons Debates, p. 54.)

"That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882 adopted a humble address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of Home Rule would be granted to the people of Ireland; and

That in the year 1886, by Resolution of the House of Commons, the sentiments of said Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated, and the hope again expressed that a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland would be passed by the Imperial Parliament; and

That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but, on the contrary, there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a bill, the object of which is to coerce measures for Ireland, by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects."

That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland."

That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, whilst satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole."

That the granting of Home Rule to Ireland will fittingly crown the already glorious reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty as a constitutional sovereign, will come with special appropriateness in this her jubilee year, and, if possible, render a full Majesty more glorious than the hearts of her already devoted and loyal subjects."

That the present resolutions be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and Charles Stewart Parnell, M.P.

Mr. McNeil, in a speech of great bitterness, assailed the principle of the resolutions, and moved in amendment:

"That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following words substituted therefor: 'This House desires to repeat the expressions of its deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of the people of Ireland and its attention to the sentiments on the subject of Home Rule, enunciated in the joint address to Her Majesty from both Houses of the Canadian Parliament, passed in the session of 1882, and in the resolution adopted by this House in 1886. This House is, however, unable to form or express an opinion as to the merits or demerits of the bill for the amendment of the criminal law with respect to Ireland, now before the Imperial Parliament, in the absence of the measure itself and of the papers and evidence on which it is based.

After a number of gentlemen had spoken Mr.

Blake, in supporting the substantive motion, said, he would prefer to see the resolution so worded as to make the desire of the House appear to be a hope that the Coercion Bill should not become law rather than a protest against the measure. Referring to the clause of the motion which asked that such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in Canada be granted in Ireland, he said he would prefer that some of the phrases which they had used before should be used again, and that the motion should not specifically define the character or measure of Home Rule that we felt ought to be given. He also thought that the resolutions should be referred to a committee of the whole House in order that they might be fully debated, and that as a result of their labors they might be as nearly unanimous as it was possible to be. He would not move any amendment, as he was anxious to leave to the mover all that was to be gained by his action in this matter.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy, after the debate had been continued into Friday, moved the following amendment to the amendment:—

"That this House, while justly jealous of any interference in the least affairs of Canada within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, or of the Dominion either by the Imperial Parliament or other legislative body of the British Empire, cannot without invading such interference fail to recognize it as within the exclusive right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate respecting matters solely pertaining to the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, that which none can be more absolutely of local concern than the due and proper administration of the law within the bounds of Great Britain and Ireland; and

"Resolved, therefore, that it is inexpedient and unwise for this House to express any opinion in any way to interfere with the Imperial Parliament as to the course to be adopted by it respecting the bill now before the House of Commons for the amendment of the Criminal and Procedure in Ireland."

On Monday, Mr. Curran closed the debate by accepting Mr. Blake's suggestion and amended his motion, the amended clauses reading as follows:—

"That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and hopes that such measure, being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland, may not become law."

"That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland a substantial measure of Home Rule, which, while satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole."

The House then divided on Mr. McCarthy's amendment, which was defeated, the vote standing 133 to 49.

Mr. Davin then proposed the following amendment:—

"That this House learns with regret that it has been considered necessary to pass a coercion measure for Ireland, and it reaffirms its conviction, as expressed in the resolutions of 1882 to 1886, that a plan of local government for Ireland, which would leave unimpaired the links connecting Ireland with the British Empire and guard the rights of the minority would be conducive to the prosperity of Ireland and the stability of the Empire, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Marquis of Salisbury."

This was also lost on a division: yeas 59, nays 133. Finally, last night Mr. Curran withdrew his original motion and substituted for it his amended one. The house divided and the motion was carried: yeas 135, nays 47. Mr. Davin voted for the motion.

From the foregoing it will be seen that efforts were repeatedly made from the Conservative side of the House to weaken Mr. Curran's resolution. The only suggestion from the Liberal side was that by Mr. Blake, which strengthened and made it more emphatic. Mr. Curran endeavored to make a point for himself by saying that he accepted Mr. Blake's amendment, as he had last session accepted that of Mr. Costigan. This action would deserve commendation were it not for the fatal fact that Mr. Costigan's amendment was to weaken and, in fact, destroy the spirit of Mr. Blake's resolution, whereas, in the present instance, the amendment suggested by Mr. Blake was to strengthen the expression of Mr. Curran's motion.

In the brief space at our disposal to-day we cannot refer to the speeches, nor to the remarks which Mr. Curran thought proper to make concerning THE POST and its editor. We must content ourselves with a reference to the one great point that the object for which we have been striving is attained. The Parliament of Canada, by an overwhelming vote, has sustained the cause of Ireland, and vindicated the course taken by THE POST.

## LIBERTY OF SPEECH AND WRITING ON POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

Recent events in the House of Commons call for a few reflections. The duties and privileges of members of Parliament and public writers seem to be anything but clearly defined in the minds of some people. In a petition to Parliament, a bill in Chancery, and proceedings at law, libelous words are not punishable; because freedom of speech and writing are indispensably necessary to the carrying on of business. It has been asserted, however, that there is no necessity for a private person in his character as a writer to be indulged in the liberty of attacking the conduct of those who take upon themselves to govern the State. Under the British constitution the answer to this is plain, viz.: That all history shows the necessity, in order to the preservation of liberty, of every subject's having a watchful eye on the conduct of ministers and parliaments, and of every subject's being not only secured but encouraged in alarming his fellow-subjects when those in power deviate from rectitude in public affairs. Men of independence only are likely to give faithful warning, their superiors, as to rank and for gane, being more likely to conceal than to detect public abuses. If, therefore, writers on the press are to be intimidated in showing their fidelity to their country, the principal security to liberty is taken away.

"Punishing libels," says Burgh in his Political Disquisitions, "public or private, is foolish, because it does not answer the end, and because the end is a bad one, if it could be answered." A member, speaking in the House (Rule debate, said certain writings to which he alluded were of a sort that had caused the death of a brilliant Irishman. This is not according to fact; for every one knows