

THE TRUE WITNESS... THE POST PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., 761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum... \$1.50... If paid strictly in advance...

TO ADVERTISERS... A limited number of advertisements... at approved rates...

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS... Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office...

THE POST PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO. 25% DISCOUNT FROM THE REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF \$1.50 PER ANNUM...

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1886

A NEW YORK despatch says that O'Donovan Rossa has suspended the publication of the United Irishman...

OUR esteemed contemporary The Colonist, of St. John's, Newfoundland, says: "The pettiest official correspondence on record is the letters of members of Sir John Macdonald's Cabinet..."

THE Ottawa correspondent of the Globe writes that Senator O'Donoghue intends bringing the question of his appointment to and subsequent exclusion from the Dominion Cabinet formally before the Senate...

ARCHBISHOP TACHE'S LETTER. HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP TACHE has written to Mr. J. J. Curran, member for Montreal Centre, accepting his explanations regarding what the latter had said in his speech...

MONTREAL, March 17. DEAR MR. CURRAN,—I should regret very much that the incident of Monday last should cause you annoyance. No doubt it pained me when I heard the application you made of my refusal to go to Regina...

THE CABINET SECRET. The public have been patiently waiting for explanations from Senator O'Donoghue regarding the "Cabinet Secret." Sir John has made a partial statement on the question admitting the truth of our exposures...

ANOTHER IRISH ORGAN. The Irish people in Newfoundland have suffered much in the past from the want of an organ. Nearly all the press have been at the service of their enemies. We are pleased to learn that the battle in the newspaper arena is not to continue to be one-sided...

because its constitution will cause prejudice and bigotry to trickle through the every vein of the body politic. "Instead of securing confidence, it creates distrust; instead of promoting peace it countenances ill will."

NEW JERSEY TO IRELAND.

ANOTHER American Legislature has placed itself on record in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. The moral influence which public opinion in America exercises in political circles in Great Britain will be powerful for good.

Whereas, On this day Charles Stewart Parnell, a grandson of a distinguished Jerseyman, issues his ultimatum to the British Government, demanding Home Rule for Ireland; and Whereas, in the dark days of the Revolution and Rebellion Irishmen were ever ready to lay down their lives that this Republic might live and that this Union of States might be cemented and perpetuated; and Whereas, it is eminently fit and proper that we should express our approval of the gallant struggle which a warm-hearted people are making in a great cause; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this House extends to Parnell and his co-laborers its earnest sympathy and best wishes for their success in the great contest for local self-government.

THE COERCIONIST A HOME-RULER.

EARL SPENCER, from being the most cruel coercionist, and the most detested Lord Lieutenant that ever ruled with a high hand in Dublin Castle, has, according to Justin McCarthy, M.P., who ought to know, become the strongest ally of Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule scheme.

Mr. McCarthy holds that there is nothing illogical or inconsistent about Lord Spencer's position, for in substance it is this: "There is no alternative to home rule but coercion. They have tried coercion to the utmost, with all the resources of the State to back it, and have found it a miserable failure. There is nothing left, therefore, but home rule." This is a clear, forcible and succinct statement of the whole case. The time for coercive measures has gone by, and nothing would be more foolish or more dangerous than to re-assert them. As the New York Herald very pointedly remarks, the Ireland which has waked up during the last twelve months would under the pressure of the present situation be stung to uncontrollable madness. "A civil war," says our contemporary, "would be inaugurated, which England might find it hard to handle. No nation on the globe has recently undergone such rapid changes as Ireland. The ambition of the people has been roused. It is too late now to rule them with bayonets."

THE RADICAL RAT.

Joe Chamberlain, who has stood for so many years before Great Britain as the Radical of modern times and the champion of democratic institutions and popular liberties for the whole English people, has thrown off the mask. While trying to make his way up in parliamentary life, Mr. Chamberlain pretended warm friendship for the Irish cause and especially for its representatives on the floor of Parliament; but time has proved that his smiles and caresses were but a cloak to a heartless treachery which he has just consummated by ratting from the Cabinet because Mr. Gladstone insists on introducing land and legislative reforms for Ireland.

It remains to be seen whether Chamberlain will succeed in thwarting the designs of the Premier. The popular sentiment in England appears to be against the unmasked Radical. The Liberal newspapers remind their readers that it is not to Mr. Chamberlain but to Mr. Gladstone that the party and the country look for a settlement of the Home Rule question.

The Pall Mall Gazette hit home when it dismissed the subject of the Ministerial resignations with the remark that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan are out, making room for better men.

THE SALARIED PRESS.

THE Hon. Edward Blake is the recipient of much violent abuse from the salaried organs and other purchased sheets of the Government because he had the courage of his convictions, and gave an honest, intelligent and fearless vote on the Landry motion. One of these sheets, in this town, rebuked the hon. leader of the opposition for not having seen the main point, and now implores him to depose himself from the leadership. Truly a little government pap is capable of wonderful effects; it not only makes politicians and ward wire-pullers act treacherously and dishonestly towards the electoral body, it makes journalists and public writers utterly regardless of the public intelligence, of common decency and truth. As an illustration of what we advance we have but to quote the leading article of the Quebec Chronicle on Mr. Blake. See if it is not as disgusting as it is contemptible. The Chronicle writes:—"Mr. Blake voted as if he were ashamed of his conduct, and knowing as we do the character and principles of the man, we may

readily concede that he felt crushed in his heart for having committed an act which his conscience condemned, and against which his better judgment rebelled. When the result was known, he crept away alone and mortified, injured in his pride and deeply chagrined. It was then that he must have felt how terribly deceived he and some of his friends had been. At one blow the splendid prestige which had taken him years to win in Ontario, was lost, while the gain that he had made in Quebec was infinitesimal and immaterial."

That is the kind of insouciance which comes from the pens of men who are under the influence of the thirty pieces of silver, taken from the public treasury. Imagine Edward Blake ashamed of his vote and creeping home along the highways of the capital afraid to be seen or to look anybody in the face! But that is what the Government pays its organs and vena sheets to write about its opponents.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Mr. Charlton, M.P., does not like long speeches in Parliament, and has given notice of a resolution condemning "elaborately prepared essays in the Dominion Parliament, and suggesting that rules for conducting debate in the House, in substance as follows, be adopted: The speech of the Finance Minister and the reply to the same, or the speech of the member moving a motion or resolution, not to exceed two hours, except by unanimous consent of the House; that all other members do not exceed one hour and a half, except the acting leaders of the Government and Opposition, who shall not exceed two hours; that after any question has been under consideration of the House for three days speeches upon it be limited to one hour, except the leaders of the Government and the Opposition, who may speak two hours; that after a question has been under consideration of the House for five days, the House may, by a three-fourths vote, restrict speeches to not less than fifteen minutes each, except the leaders of the Government and the Opposition. These restrictions as to time to apply also when the House is in committee and to be suspended at any time on motion and with the unanimous consent of the House."

This is all very well. But it is like Satan reproving Sin, for no one is a worse offender in the matter of long-winded speeches than Mr. Charlton himself. There is an element of danger in endeavoring to check freedom of speech unless wilfully abused, and in that case, the precedent of closure is on the Parliamentary books for centuries. This limitation might enable some very sharp unconstitutional and unjust tricks to be performed. The better remedy would be to limit the space in the Hansard, that terrible fount of unspoken and useless "speeches," and appeal to the good sense of the members to refrain from following the example of the North Carolina member of Congress, who used so to address his orations to his country—Buncombe—that at last he made himself a proverb. Let members understand they are a Parliament—study the history of that institution and learn what it is, and the evil complained of will disappear without cast iron bands.

MR. COSTIGAN'S ENDORSEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT'S COURSE.

AFTER making his complaint to Parliament and the country that THE POST had dared to criticize and assail him for his ministerial misconduct, and denying that this paper was published in the interest of the Irish Catholic population of the Dominion, the Hon. John Costigan informed the House that "as to the merits of the Riel question he had not changed his opinion from that which he first entertained, that the course the Government had taken was the only proper one in the interests of the country." Mr. Costigan has formed an opinion upon the question, which ninety-nine out of a hundred of his countrymen repudiate with derision and indignation. Ireland, France, Italy, the United States, and even England, protested against the opinion held by our Irish representative in the Cabinet. The leading members of the Irish party in the British House of Commons, and distinguished English members themselves, spoke in terms of reproach against the Canadian Government for having pursued what Mr. Costigan is pleased to term, the only proper course that could be taken by the Ministers.

We are afraid that Mr. Costigan formed his favorable opinion of the Government's course not so much because it was in the interests of the country as it was in the interests of the party and of self. It cannot be explained otherwise. But what is specially reprehensible in the attitude of the Honorable Minister on the question, is his sanction and endorsement of the barbarous practice of hanging for a political offence. Riel's offence, like that of many an Irish patriot, was purely political. His blow was aimed at oppression and injustice, and he was hanged for it as an outrage upon civilization and a disgrace to the Canadian name. "In vain," said Archbishop O'Brien, "will the sword that twice in three luses, trums stopped the march of land robbers, and secured for the half-breeds the legal recognition of their rights, be called 'accused.'" And yet Mr. Costigan would have us believe that the Government had achieved a noble and daring deed in sending to the scaffold the man who wielded that sword. It is fortunate that Her Majesty the Queen has had no such Privy Counsellors as Mr. Costigan or the martyrology of Irish patriots would be considerably augmented. No! the opinion which our Irish representative has formed and entertains of the course of the Canadian Government is entirely opposed to the national sentiment, to all considerations of justice, and to that feeling of magnanimity which pervades every civilized people. Mr. Costigan, if none of the other Ministers did, should have risen above all petty calculations as to the expediency or inexpediency of hanging Louis Riel. He should, above all, have looked the question in the face from a higher level and said:—"Gentle-

men, to place the rope around Riel's neck is to strangle freedom; it is to deny the sacred right of resistance against oppression. Riel may have been as bad as you say, but he represented and he fought for the eternal principle of right and justice. Personally he may have been an unfit and unworthy instrument to accomplish the end, but he was the chosen one of the Half-breeds whom we have neglected and allowed to be oppressed and unfairly dealt with, and in that capacity we must deal with him. We must not be guilty of his blood. Or if you decide to put him to death, then I refuse to be a party to the murder, especially when the execution of the prisoner is to satisfy the bloodthirsty appeals of the Orange lodges. Every humane sentiment, the practice of civilization and justice forbid us from stepping our hands in his blood. Hang the prisoner and I leave the Cabinet at once." That is the stand the Hon. John Costigan should have taken, and these are the words he should have poured into the ears of his Orange Tory colleagues.

On those grounds Mr. Costigan would have been upheld by the voice of his country by the applause of the world and by what is sweeter of all, the approval of his conscience. Let us not be told that it is all fudge to make such a noise about a mere half-breed. No, our views of justice and fair play are broader than that, and we hold that what is an injury to one, even to the meanest and weakest, should be made the common concern of all. The weaker the victim of oppression the more ready should an Irishman be to champion his cause, and not to fall into line with the oppressor.

These are the true merits of the question, and if the Hon. John Costigan had only been guided by them he would not to-day be in such discredit with the people of whom he is now the mis-representative, and he would have a disgraceful fact that among the men who ordered the execution of Louis Riel for the political offence of fighting for the rights of his people, there was an Irishman by the name of John Costigan.

OUR CABINET REPRESENTATIVE.

THE Hon. John Costigan gave utterance to a very strange view when he repudiated the idea that any public man should consider himself as representing a particular class or creed. We would ask him: Who does Mr. Mackenzie Bowell represent but the Orange Lodges? What is Mr. Pope in the Cabinet for? All know it is not on account of his abilities or eloquence. His greatest stretch of tongue in a debate or in the settlement of a public question covers but the five words "There hain't nothing to it." Mr. Pope is purely and simply in the Cabinet to represent the English Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec. Why are Messrs. Langevin, Caron and Chapleau Cabinet Ministers? Simply because the constitution says the French Canadian people shall at least have three representatives in the Government. And so on through the whole ministerial catalogue until we come to Mr. Costigan, who protests and repudiates the idea that any public man should consider himself as representing a particular class or creed. Then, if Mr. Costigan declines to be looked upon as representing a particular class, who does he represent? If he is not in the Cabinet to watch over and speak in the interests of the Irish Catholic portion of the population, what is he there for? Surely the acquisition of timber limits, the filling of public offices and the drawing of salaries from the public treasury are not to be the only occupation and principal care of a Minister of the Crown. No! Mr. Costigan cannot snirk his duty and his obligations as the representative of the Irish Canadian people in the government of the country, by any repudiation of the idea that a public man should consider himself as representing a particular class or creed. As long as the Orange lodges, the English speaking Protestants, and the French Canadians have their representatives in the Cabinet, and that they act as such, we can see no valid reason why the Irish should be made an exception to the common rule, and their representatives refuse to place themselves on a common level. It would indeed be far better for the country at large if there were no such thing as representatives of particular classes and creeds; but we have got to deal with the situation as we find it. We have had no hand in the shaping of this policy of creed and class representation; but until the circumstances and conditions of the country justify a change in the system, we intend to have our rights recognized, and to have our representatives give their undivided and honest attention to the interests of the Irish Canadian people.

The principal charge made against the Liberals by Mr. Costigan, in the course of his speech, was that the Mackenzie Government, when they introduced resolutions granting amnesty to Riel and Lepine, did not include Professor O'Donoghue. The reasons for making an exception of O'Donoghue were stated at the time, and it is unnecessary to refer to them now. The man was shortly afterwards amnestied by the same Government. Mr. Costigan of course charged that Mr. O'Donoghue was excluded from the amnesty because he was an Irishman, and the anti-Irish Home Rule Orangemen, whose game he was playing, cheered the foolish assertion. Now, what will those who talk of Mr. Costigan's "honesty" think when they learn that he himself voted for the resolution which excluded O'Donoghue from amnesty? The resolutions introduced by Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, granting amnesty to Riel and Lepine, but excluding O'Donoghue, were voted for by the same Mr. Costigan who now condemns them. There is honesty for you. This man voted for a resolution which he now condemns the late Government for passing. And more. An examination of the records of the session of 1875 shows that

Mr. Costigan not only voted for Mr. Mackenzie's resolution, but he voted against Mr. Mousseau's amendment in favor of a complete and unconditional amnesty to all who participated in the North-West troubles, including Riel, O'Donoghue, Lepine, and everybody else. Had Mr. Mousseau's proposition been adopted O'Donoghue would have been free, but Mr. Costigan voted against it. To-day this honest and chivalrous man complains because his views were accepted by the House. Now, what did Mr. Costigan want? He voted for the resolution excluding O'Donoghue. He voted against a resolution to pardon him completely. These are the facts, and they were given by Mr. Casey, M.P., on the floor of the House during the Riel debate, and no amount of abuse of THE POST will alter them. We leave our readers to judge of Mr. Costigan's honesty. He was also indiscreet enough to refer to the New Brunswick school question and to charge the Liberals with refusing to get the British North America act amended so as to give separate schools to the Catholics of New Brunswick. But now Mr. Costigan is a Cabinet Minister and his friends in power, why don't they get the British North America act changed as they urged the Liberals to change it? If Mr. Costigan is wise he will avoid the O'Donoghue and New Brunswick school questions in future.

MR. BLAKE AND THE WEARING OF THE SHAMROCK.

In his speech on the Landry motion Hon. John Costigan charged the Opposition with making a cry on the Riel question to enable them to cross the floor of the House and take possession of the Treasury benches. This was the most serious offence that could be charged against the Hon. Edward Blake and his followers. Such presumption or ambition was not to be tolerated. The idea of these gentlemen trying to oust the Government was in Mr. Costigan's mind, simply preposterous as well as revolting. Turn out the Ministry and what will become of me? There's the rub; there's the secret of the corrupt and scandalous tactics that Sir John and his colleagues are always ready to adopt to retain the reins of power and the strings of the national purse. Mr. Costigan's uneasiness at the thought of an honest and true Irishman like Blake coming into power, reveals the true inwardness of the Orange Tory administration. Portfolios, salaries, judgeships, timber limits, etc., are of more importance to the Ministerialists than honest and just Government.

The gem of the Hon. John Costigan's speech is probably contained in the following paragraph:—

"The member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) had made a violent speech in denunciation of the Government and had received the endorsement of THE MONTREAL POST. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues expected that the whole Irish support would be handed over to them by this newspaper. This he was sure, was a contract that this newspaper would find it could not carry out. To carry out this programme the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) and the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) wore shamrocks on the 17th instant. The hon. gentleman had shown a quickened interest in their welfare lately by his wearing of the shamrock, and his enquiries about the facts in connection with Senator O'Donoghue.

Such utterances falling from the lips of an Irish representative in the Government of the country are really astounding, and are calculated to produce nothing but pity and contempt. The sentiments thus expressed by Mr. Costigan towards such true Irishmen as Blake and Casey, who would be a credit to any nationality, are disgraceful; and in the name of the Irish people of this Dominion we repudiate the undeserved and unworthy insinuations made by the Honorable Minister against them. What! A Blake and a Casey not to wear Shamrocks on the 17th of March, without this open testimony of their patriotism and love of fatherland being made a subject of sneer and an insult by the Hon. John Costigan, the so-called Irish representative, on the floor of the Canadian Parliament?

And who, of the Irish race, not only in Canada, but throughout the world, has a better right and a stronger claim to wear the divine symbol of Irish brotherly love, union and patriotism than the man who pleaded for Home Rule for Ireland with matches eloquence and surpassing force in an alien parliament, and the man who, in an incomparable speech, exposed, denounced and fought, with everything to lose and nothing to gain, the demon of Orangeman—that common foe to Irish peace and union. And to that man, the Hon. Edward Blake, leader of the opposition, the Hon. John Costigan would deny the right of wearing a shamrock on St. Patrick's Day, and in wearing it would charge him with being actuated by the basest of motives. Shame! The Ottawa Journal, notwithstanding its Tory leanings could not suppress its sense of indignation at the proceeding, and remarks that "Mr. Costigan must really have been hard pushed for points last night when he had to charge Mr. Blake and Mr. Casey with wearing shamrocks in their button holes on St. Patrick's Day for the purpose of inveigling Irishmen into supporting them. If Mr. Blake is not an Irishman, to what nationality does he belong? And as for Mr. Casey, does he not come from a family of Westmeath which has some slight claims of belonging to Ireland? And any way, even if they had not a drop of Irish blood in their veins, it would not be a criminal offence on their part to wear a shamrock on the seventeenth of March. As the saying goes, "St. Patrick was gentleman enough for anyone to wear a shamrock in his honor."

Now as to the complaint that Mr. M. C. Cameron, the member for Huron, made a violent speech in denunciation of the Government, we must say that Mr. Costigan does not either catch or convey the true and full significance of Mr. Cameron's speech. It was more than anything

else a denunciation of Orangeman and a charge against the Government that it yielded to Orange clamor in hanging Louis Riel. And it is a Scotch Protestant, but an honest and fearless one, who says it and proves his assertion. If Mr. Costigan had anything to say to Mr. Cameron it should have been in the nature of a compliment and of thanks for his crushing exposure and flagellation of the Orange demon. But Mr. Costigan has too many Orange alliances and ex-Grand Masters as colleagues in the Cabinet to be grateful to Mr. Cameron. It is the old story of a man trying to serve two masters: the devil often gets the better and larger share of the service. THE POST, having no such entangling alliances and mindful of what it owes to the country, gave its warm and undivided adhesion to Mr. Cameron's noble and patriotic speech. The Irish people, as well as all the intelligent and fair-minded citizens in the Dominion, have equally endorsed it, and it is only so much the worse for Mr. Costigan if he has failed in his duty as a Canadian and an Irishman in not subscribing to the views and the sentiments of the honest and fearless Protestant Scotchman. Mr. Costigan's talk about THE POST handing over the Irish vote to this or that party is pure twaddle. THE POST has no "handing over" to do. Our duty and our mission are to publish the news, watch and chronicle events, expose falsehood, wrongs and injustices, advocate what is right and just and then let our readers judge for themselves and act accordingly. That is the only contract we are bound to and it is a contract we will carry out to the very letter without fear or favor.

THE TEST OF PUBLIC CRITICISM.

Our readers and the Irish people generally throughout the Dominion have, no doubt, perused the Hon. Mr. Costigan's speech delivered in the House on the Riel question. We reproduced it in yesterday's issue from the columns of the Gazette, a Ministerial organ. It was far from being a notable pronouncement in defence of the Government, but, on the other hand, was a rather singular effort in the way of an attack on THE POST, and of a justification of the position held by Mr. Costigan as the representative of the Irish Canadian people in Sir John's Cabinet. We do not refuse or deny the Honorable Minister the right to vindicate himself or to denounce ourselves on the floor of Parliament; but we also reserve and intend to use the right of examining and judging the grounds upon which he bases both his own vindication and his denunciation of this paper. So as to do no injustice to Mr. Costigan, we will take his speech point by point and discuss his statements *seriatim*, as they were delivered and reported.

The Hon. Minister opened his speech with the complaint that "he had been bitterly assailed by a paper in this Province, claiming to be published in the interest of the Irish Catholic population of the Dominion." Mr. Costigan may consider our criticisms of his public acts and official conduct to be of the nature of a "bitter assault." We do not wonder at that. A representative who has been accustomed to words of praise and to favors in and out of season, and who, by his peculiar position, had nothing worse to fear from his political opponents than their silence, must indeed feel a rude shock and count it a bitter awakening when public criticism is adversely directed against him. Both the Irish people and their representatives in every sphere, whether civic, provincial or federal, of public life in this Dominion, have been educated in a false political school, where the unreasonableness and dangerous doctrine was laid down that the Irish representatives were always to be held immaculate and inviolable. The result was that no tongue or pen could utter a word against them, without having the worst of motives attributed to the critic who had fault to find with their official conduct.

This silly and childish custom of sparing, and shielding, and siding with our representatives, whether they be in the right or the wrong obtains among no other nationality, and they are all the better and stronger for it. It was this pernicious false respect for its public men that weakened and killed the best energies of Ireland for years. It was only when the National Press threw off the yoke and dared to say who was fit and who was not fit to fight the country's battles and represent its interests in Westminster that the people got representatives in whom they could put their trust, and on whom they could stake the very nation's life. It was only by a fierce and bitter application of the lash of public criticism that the drones, the lukewarm and traitors were weeded out of the Irish representation. In Ireland a man who cannot stand the test of public criticism goes to the wall. And, remember, it is not only the rank and file who come in for public washing and press criticism, but the highest and greatest in the land. Mr. Parnell himself, as well as the other leaders in the political world, and Archbishop Croke and the other dignitaries of the Church are amenable to public opinion, and have to take the consequences of any errors they may commit in their relations with the concerns of the country. The result is that to-day no nation has a nobler, truer or abler body of representatives, whether in Church or State, than the Irish people. We have had the first stage of Ireland's experience long enough in this Dominion, and now it is about time that we enter upon the second stage.

Our public men must henceforth stand on their merits and be judged accordingly. Immunity from strictures begets in a representative a sense of self-efficiency which must be brooked under all circumstances. He cultivates the feeling that no matter what line of policy he may choose to adopt, that line must be followed by the people he represents. To challenge his views or his conduct on