

THE TRUE WITNESS IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY The Post Printing & Publishing Co. 67 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

TO ADVERTISERS. A distinct number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS"...

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.

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...

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 3, 1886

REV. PRINCIPAL MACVICAR, whom we called to task for reviving an old exploded calumny of thirty-three years ago, and palming it off on an intelligent body of men...

THE TORONTO GLOBE remarks that the Orange Sentinel will have nothing but blood. A few weeks ago the Orange organ shrieked in the ears of the French of Quebec...

"Let it be proclaimed that the rights and liberties of Britons in an English colony hang upon the breath of an alien race. But English Canadians will not longer suffer the galling bondage; and the day may not be far distant when the call to arms will again resound throughout the Dominion."

Now the Home Rule policy of Mr. Parnell is the object of its revolutionary wrath, and it urges:-

"Humiliation and expulsion from the House if necessary of the rebellious faction which has endangered so much discord and strife."

CONCERNING changes in political views an Irish journal points out that instances of complete reversals of opinions are common. "Lord Castlereagh began as a burning Nationalist, and drank, in 1790, at a dinner to the Northern Whig Club, 'to the Revolution!'"

THE practice of American officers seeking foreign decorations has received a check. No officer can receive such decoration without the consent of the Senate Committee, and it has just refused General Howard permission to receive the Legion of Honor.

THE Gazette has made the discovery of this statement for the purpose of reading THE POST a lecture. Well, we wouldn't mind being lectured by competent and authorized parties, but for the Gazette to attempt the role! It's too funny to produce the desired effect.

WRECKED ON THE ROCK OF COERCION. THE Tories have gone out of office never to return! It was the Parnellites who gave them the parting kick, as it was the Parnellites who lifted them into place and power at the far end of the last Parliament.

because of their threat to renew "the more equitable provisions of the Coercion Act." Mr. Parnell gave Lord Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach their ticket-of-leave last evening for their brutal threat to suppress the National League and re-establish another regime of terror.

DEBAUCHING THE CONSTITUENCIES.

THE HON. MR. CHAPLEAU, in an interview with a representative of the Ottawa Evening Journal, is reported to have used the following language in reference to the meeting lately held at St. Jerome:—"Of the gentlemen who signed the resolutions submitted to the meeting, eight were mayors and councillors, representing as many new parishes north of St. Jerome."

COME IT MUST.

JUST so sure as grass grows and water runs; just so sure as there is a valley between two hills; just so sure as water finds its level; just so sure as the shamrocks cluster "in the brake and the mireland" in the old land; and just so sure as snow flakes tumble around us like feathers playing tick in our Canadian winter; just so sure as we are going to have Home Rule in Ireland. And when it comes it will come not only as a blessing to the Irish "at home," but as a blessing to the Irish abroad as well.

THE GAZETTE ON COERCION AND RETALIATION.

IT has taken the Montreal Gazette about two weeks to find out that THE POST said plainly and distinctly if the Orange Tory rulers of Great Britain undertook to deprive the Irish people of constitutional methods of agitation and attempted to govern the nation by the sword, buckshot and the scaffold or pith caps, then those Orange and Tory statesmen should not be surprised if the Irish people, whether abroad or at home, took measures to defend themselves and to retaliate as best they could with, as Mr. Gladstone once said, the resources of modern civilization.

THE Gazette thinks THE POST had no right to put it so straight to the British Government, and to say that if they practised coercion against Ireland they should expect scientific retaliation. But the Gazette is so partisan that it would like to have all the fun on one side; we are more independent and just and we would like to see the people who are unfairly and inhumanly dealt with return tit for tat.

THE Tories have gone out of office never to return! It was the Parnellites who gave them the parting kick, as it was the Parnellites who lifted them into place and power at the far end of the last Parliament. Mr. Parnell ousted Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals

because of their threat to renew "the more equitable provisions of the Coercion Act." Mr. Parnell gave Lord Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach their ticket-of-leave last evening for their brutal threat to suppress the National League and re-establish another regime of terror.

THE CABINET SECRET.

A contemporary taunts us about our "Cabinet secret." It insinuates that, as the Minister of Railways and Canals once said:—"There 'haint' nothing in it." But our contemporary cannot taunt us enough to induce us to give what we know away. The cat will get out of the bag in good time, and when it does we promise that it will be about as ugly looking a creature as ever disgraced Sir John A. Macdonald's political ruffian.

REV. PRINCIPAL MACVICAR REVIVING EXPLODED CALUMNIES.

THE Montreal Daily Witness of 27th inst. contained the report of the annual meeting of the Montreal Auxiliary Bible Society, which was attended by the leading divines of the many reformed churches. The chief feature of the report and of the meeting was an address by the Rev. Principal MacVicar. The address was remarkable as a combination of bombastic abuse of Father Gibaud, one of our city clergymen, and of calumny against the Most Rev. Dr. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia.

THE attack made on Father Gibaud was based on the warning which the rev. gentleman recently gave his flock in Notre Dame, not to use the adulterated and falsified Protestant editions of the Bible. As such editions of the Bible did not contain the true word, Father Gibaud strongly advised his hearers to burn them. They should read only the authorized editions of the Bible.

Now for Principal MacVicar's calumny against Archbishop Ryan. The Protestant Divine quoted a passage from a newspaper called the Shepherd of the Valley, and the sentiments contained in which he represented as being those of Archbishop Ryan, as the above paper was the organ of His Grace.

THE Gazette has made the discovery of this statement for the purpose of reading THE POST a lecture. Well, we wouldn't mind being lectured by competent and authorized parties, but for the Gazette to attempt the role! It's too funny to produce the desired effect.

THE Gazette thinks THE POST had no right to put it so straight to the British Government, and to say that if they practised coercion against Ireland they should expect scientific retaliation. But the Gazette is so partisan that it would like to have all the fun on one side; we are more independent and just and we would like to see the people who are unfairly and inhumanly dealt with return tit for tat.

acts the part of task mastery, and refuses to give to the Irish people what it has unjustly taken and withheld from them.

Our contemporary concludes by saying that Ireland, in the magnificent and heroic fight she has made for centuries past, to save her national honor and faith, has won and acquired superior titles to a high social and political destiny. It is in vain that England will stubbornly try to resist the accomplishment of those destinies; they must be accomplished.

THE FISHERIES.

In the United States the Republican party is just at present engaged in the task of opposing the proposed renewal of the trade arrangements with Canada in connection with the fisheries. But this is acknowledged to be on purely party grounds, even by some of the leading Republican papers.

But, owing to Archbishop Ryan having been lately translated from St. Louis to Philadelphia, the calumniators (whether in ignorance or malice it needs not to inquire) have made him, instead of Archbishop Kenrick, the object of their false assertions.

Here we might stop. But as, without reference to the real author of the article, which has been so shamelessly misrepresented, the garbled extract is every now and then quoted by persons who would gladly excite public prejudice against Catholics, it is not amiss for us to enter into some fuller details.

In the first place, the garblers struck out of the middle of the sentence the significant and important qualifying clause, "as at present understood." In the second place they stopped short in their quotation, thus omitting all mention of the important fact that the obnoxious declaration was one which the writer charged the enemies of the Catholic Church with making, and which was only true in an entirely different and opposite sense from that which they attached to it.

The true version of the misquoted sentence is as follows:—"If Catholics ever attain, which they surely will, though at a distant day, the immense numerical majority in the United States, religious liberty, as at present understood, will be at an end. So say our enemies."

The words which we have italicized—"as at present understood," and "so say our enemies," were deliberately, and for a purpose, omitted by anti-Catholic newspapers of the day; and though attention has been repeatedly called to these omissions, the garbled extract is republished from time to time, without supplying them.

We make no comments, however, upon this. It is simply a specimen of how shameless and inveterate in its malice anti-Catholic prejudice is. For our non-Catholic friends who are open to conviction and wish to know what the doctrine of the Church really is as regards religious freedom, we quote a sentence from the recent Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Constitution of the Christian State. It is a recent utterance, but is only an explanation and reiteration of what the Church has often previously declared. The sentence referred to reads:-

FRENCH CANADIAN OPINION ON THE IRISH STRUGGLE.

OUR esteemed contemporary L'Eclair contains a remarkable article on the downfall of the Salisbury Government and on the political relations between England and Ireland. Our confreres give proof equally of a correct and fair appreciation of the situation, and of a warm sympathy for the cause of the Irish people. It holds that the downfall of the Tory Cabinet is nothing else but a victory for the Parnellites. Apart from the Tories there is no group of fair-minded men who do not consider that the ultimate success of the Irish party would be an eminently happy event of great social importance.

L'Eclair congratulates the Irish for having cut aloof from both English parties and for having ceased to be their dupes, which only served to prolong and ensure the ruin of Ireland. On this it remarks that one would imagine that this humiliating role, which the Irish have abandoned with so much patriotism, is henceforth to be taken up by the French-Canadians. For, while scarcely forming a seventh part of the British House of Commons, the Irish members can make and unmake Ministries, we find the French-Canadians, who constitute nearly a third of the representation, becoming the impotent slaves of Canadian parties.

IT strikes our contemporary as a singular thing that there is not an Englishman who may be intelligent, educated and sensible, who is not ready to acknowledge the grievances of Ireland; and still, as a nation, England refuses to respect right and justice. The secret of this lies in the fact that England has always sacrificed everything to its egotism, which has become an uncontrollable monster. In this respect the nation is exactly what the individual is in his relations with citizens of other nationalities; he must rule, keep everything, and still have the name of making large concessions! That is one of these numerous and strange inconsistencies of which the history of England furnishes so many examples. In presence of the all-powerful sword of Russia, for instance, English pride and haughtiness were kept in the background, but towards Ireland, which cannot, like Russia, France or Germany, brandish a sword that could and would exact an immediate solution, England

acts the part of task mastery, and refuses to give to the Irish people what it has unjustly taken and withheld from them. Our contemporary concludes by saying that Ireland, in the magnificent and heroic fight she has made for centuries past, to save her national honor and faith, has won and acquired superior titles to a high social and political destiny.

THE RIGHT OF REBELLION.

HON. MR. CHAPLEAU, the Secretary of State, made the assertion at the St. Jerome meeting that "rebellion was never justifiable, and that all human and Divine laws forbade it." The assertion simply demonstrated the Minister's ignorance of these same human and Divine laws. Admit it as an absolute principle, backed by human and Divine laws, that a people can never rebel, and you thereby make tyranny and misgovernment unassailable, the tyrant and the oppressor inviolable. There could be no liberty in this world without the right to rebel—that is, the right to destroy the ruler or the institution which would be antagonistic to liberty.

The right to rebel against tyranny and illegitimate power is admitted in Catholic doctrine and teaching. Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, has made this clear in his admirable Pastoral Letter, which we published the other day, and which proclaimed the Pope's Encyclical Immortale Dei. His Grace says:—"The Church does not condemn the rising of a whole people against an illegitimate power or tyranny which unjustly works for the ruin of the people in general, showing clearly that the charge of her favoring oppression and tyranny is utterly false."

THE CONTRADICTION—THE COSTS.

AND so it appears that they are going to have a "military demonstration" in the North-West in the spring. It is now said that 1200 men, horse, foot and artillery, are to form "a flying column" and make "demonstrations" at some of the supposed points of danger. The Indians are to be "overawed" and peace is to be assured by the pomp and parade of authority. But how does this proposal agree with all the Government party papers have been saying for the last two months? Have we not been told, over and over again, by the Tory press that there was "no danger of a rising!" Has it not been said that "Order reigned in Waraw," and that the Crees, the Blackfeet, the Bloods and all the kindred tribes in the once Lone Land would bother us no more. And yet in face of all these bland assurances we now see the announcement of a military demonstration, under the command of that "renowned warrior" and "brilliant strategist," Sir Frederick Middleton! Does it not look as if there is some danger of an Indian rising, after all, and that the Tory papers only gave an additional proof of the heedlessness with which they were willing to swear holes through ladders provided it was necessary to support the supposed "policy of the Government" to do so. But let us hope that there will be no "rising" and that the country will be saved the expense of a serious difficulty with the Indians. Suppressing North-West insurrections might become a mean victory for the Dominion. If it is to cost \$5,000,000 or \$9,000,000 to beat one band of Crees and two or three hundred half-breeds in a sedentary campaign, what would it cost to fight three or four Indian tribes in a running revolt? And then, only think of it. If General Middleton got a knighthood, \$20,000 from Canada and \$500 a year for life from the old country for his "distinguished services" in beating a handful of half-armed men, how much would he expect if he beat tribes of warriors in arms? Think of that and weep, ye Canadian tax payers.

THE REASON WHY.

Why are the English and Scotch leaving the Province of Quebec? Not because the French Canadians are "driving" them out? No, that is not a correct answer. The English and Scotch are "leaving" of their own free will, and they are not being "driven" by anyone. Why then are they selling their farms and leaving? The cause is this—the English are accustomed to govern. Wherever they go, in the colonies, to Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, East Indies, West India Islands, the Gold Coast, or any part of Canada, except this province, their word is law. This is the only part of this dominion in which they are obliged to take a back seat, and they do not like it, and they will not stand it, and so they leave for the more congenial atmosphere of Ontario or the North-West. So long as they could hold their own in the different parishes by electing the majority of councillors or in the County Councils by securing the majority of mayors, they held on to power, but the instant they become a minority of the aldermen or the mayors they were off. They could no longer rule and they thought it time to go. An Englishman will consent to live under laws made by a foreign government, such as the United States, China, Japan, South America or Turkey, but he will not consent to live under French Canadians as a British colony. That is the secret reason why the English "people" are leaving the Eastern Townships. It calls them to see the Catholic element so powerful under the Union Jack. And so

AMERICA AND IRELAND.

Glorious America! Grateful Ireland! Let us look back a little. When the "rebel" cause was overwhelmed by the terrors of that terrible winter at Valley Forge in 1780, and a war fund of a million of dollars was proposed to help the famished soldiers of Washington to take the field again, how did the Irishmen of Pennsylvania show their gratitude to Young America in its hour of financial distress? How but by subscribing more than one-half of the total sum asked for, and twenty-one Irishmen and sons of Irishmen in Pennsylvania alone gave \$42,500 to fight the battle of liberty. Even Goldwin Smith was forced to acknowledge that "in the American war the Irish emigrant bonds held the main share in spoiling England of the most magnificent and promising of all her colonies." And Gardner, the historian, says:—"I am assured from the best authority that the major part of Washington's army was composed of Irish emigrants, and that the Irish language was a commonly spoken in the American ranks as the English, and in fact it was the daring, dashing and valor of the Irish which determined the contest." And how did America behave to the Irish? Once on the eve of the revolution, Congress addressed the Irish "people" in these words:—"Friends,—We are desirous of possessing the good opinion of the virtuous and humane. We are peculiarly desirous of furnishing them

they go "anywhere, everywhere," out of Quebec. The province, no doubt, loses many excellent settlers by this exodus; but even Englishmen must bow the head to the stern command that the majority, ruler in all lands, a law they put in force whenever they can, and put it, too, with a vengeance. Protestant England gives her 1,500,000 Catholics one representative, Mr. Lewis, to Parliament; the Catholics in one constituency putting in another in spite of her; Catholic Ireland sends many Protestants to the House of Commons, and that too from purely Catholic constituencies. But there is a good time coming, and it will come out in the washing.

THE RIGHT OF REBELLION.

HON. MR. CHAPLEAU, the Secretary of State, made the assertion at the St. Jerome meeting that "rebellion was never justifiable, and that all human and Divine laws forbade it." The assertion simply demonstrated the Minister's ignorance of these same human and Divine laws. Admit it as an absolute principle, backed by human and Divine laws, that a people can never rebel, and you thereby make tyranny and misgovernment unassailable, the tyrant and the oppressor inviolable. There could be no liberty in this world without the right to rebel—that is, the right to destroy the ruler or the institution which would be antagonistic to liberty.

The right to rebel against tyranny and illegitimate power is admitted in Catholic doctrine and teaching. Archbishop Lynch, of Toronto, has made this clear in his admirable Pastoral Letter, which we published the other day, and which proclaimed the Pope's Encyclical Immortale Dei. His Grace says:—"The Church does not condemn the rising of a whole people against an illegitimate power or tyranny which unjustly works for the ruin of the people in general, showing clearly that the charge of her favoring oppression and tyranny is utterly false."

THE CONTRADICTION—THE COSTS.

AND so it appears that they are going to have a "military demonstration" in the North-West in the spring. It is now said that 1200 men, horse, foot and artillery, are to form "a flying column" and make "demonstrations" at some of the supposed points of danger. The Indians are to be "overawed" and peace is to be assured by the pomp and parade of authority. But how does this proposal agree with all the Government party papers have been saying for the last two months? Have we not been told, over and over again, by the Tory press that there was "no danger of a rising!" Has it not been said that "Order reigned in Waraw," and that the Crees, the Blackfeet, the Bloods and all the kindred tribes in the once Lone Land would bother us no more. And yet in face of all these bland assurances we now see the announcement of a military demonstration, under the command of that "renowned warrior" and "brilliant strategist," Sir Frederick Middleton! Does it not look as if there is some danger of an Indian rising, after all, and that the Tory papers only gave an additional proof of the heedlessness with which they were willing to swear holes through ladders provided it was necessary to support the supposed "policy of the Government" to do so. But let us hope that there will be no "rising" and that the country will be saved the expense of a serious difficulty with the Indians. Suppressing North-West insurrections might become a mean victory for the Dominion. If it is to cost \$5,000,000 or \$9,000,000 to beat one band of Crees and two or three hundred half-breeds in a sedentary campaign, what would it cost to fight three or four Indian tribes in a running revolt? And then, only think of it. If General Middleton got a knighthood, \$20,000 from Canada and \$500 a year for life from the old country for his "distinguished services" in beating a handful of half-armed men, how much would he expect if he beat tribes of warriors in arms? Think of that and weep, ye Canadian tax payers.

THE REASON WHY.

Why are the English and Scotch leaving the Province of Quebec? Not because the French Canadians are "driving" them out? No, that is not a correct answer. The English and Scotch are "leaving" of their own free will, and they are not being "driven" by anyone. Why then are they selling their farms and leaving? The cause is this—the English are accustomed to govern. Wherever they go, in the colonies, to Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, East Indies, West India Islands, the Gold Coast, or any part of Canada, except this province, their word is law. This is the only part of this dominion in which they are obliged to take a back seat, and they do not like it, and they will not stand it, and so they leave for the more congenial atmosphere of Ontario or the North-West. So long as they could hold their own in the different parishes by electing the majority of councillors or in the County Councils by securing the majority of mayors, they held on to power, but the instant they become a minority of the aldermen or the mayors they were off. They could no longer rule and they thought it time to go. An Englishman will consent to live under laws made by a foreign government, such as the United States, China, Japan, South America or Turkey, but he will not consent to live under French Canadians as a British colony. That is the secret reason why the English "people" are leaving the Eastern Townships. It calls them to see the Catholic element so powerful under the Union Jack. And so

AMERICA AND IRELAND.

Glorious America! Grateful Ireland! Let us look back a little. When the "rebel" cause was overwhelmed by the terrors of that terrible winter at Valley Forge in 1780, and a war fund of a million of dollars was proposed to help the famished soldiers of Washington to take the field again, how did the Irishmen of Pennsylvania show their gratitude to Young America in its hour of financial distress? How but by subscribing more than one-half of the total sum asked for, and twenty-one Irishmen and sons of Irishmen in Pennsylvania alone gave \$42,500 to fight the battle of liberty. Even Goldwin Smith was forced to acknowledge that "in the American war the Irish emigrant bonds held the main share in spoiling England of the most magnificent and promising of all her colonies." And Gardner, the historian, says:—"I am assured from the best authority that the major part of Washington's army was composed of Irish emigrants, and that the Irish language was a commonly spoken in the American ranks as the English, and in fact it was the daring, dashing and valor of the Irish which determined the contest." And how did America behave to the Irish? Once on the eve of the revolution, Congress addressed the Irish "people" in these words:—"Friends,—We are desirous of possessing the good opinion of the virtuous and humane. We are peculiarly desirous of furnishing them