

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

BY THE PROPRIETOR, JOHN GILLIES,

AT NO. 125 FORTIFICATION LANE.

Editor—M. W. KIRWAN.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars.

To all City Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, March 30, 1877.

REVIEWS.

We are forced to hold over several notices of Magazines, &c., until next week.

THE REV. A. J. BRAY

ON THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Like dead-sea fruit, the Rev. A. J. Bray is becoming nauseous to our taste. From the "distinguished pastor of Zion Church," he is degenerating into a sensationalist of the Baxter type. He aimed at higher game, but he has missed his mark. He hoped to become a Spurgeon in his way, but he is more likely to become a Chiniquy. Even his present congregation is not satisfied with his doctrines, and symptoms of rebellion have marked the conduct of some of the members of his flock. He is sowing the dragons teeth with a vengeance. One would think that he was ordained to abuse the "Churches of Christendom." His last lecture was on the "Episcopal Church of England," and he assailed it as a political institution, while invoking God's blessing on the "great enfranchised Church." As usual, the Rev. A. J. Bray made history. He is a good hand at that kind of thing. He spoke of Luther and of Leo, of Wickliff and Erasmus, of Harry the VIII. and his "virgin" daughter, Elizabeth, of Mary and of Edward VI., and he spoke of them all in a way that has the merit of originality. What is the testimony of Macaulay, of Lingard, of Cobbett and the rest, to that of the Rev. A. J. Bray, "the distinguished pastor" of Zion Church, Montreal? Of course they are nothing. The Rev. A. J. is the master of them all. He is the clerical aurora of our spiritual world. Astonished mankind look with amazement on the brilliancy of his intellectual flashes. Behold ye miserable sinners all, now is the accepted time—glory hallelujah—the Rev. A. J. Bray is at hand. But let us take another aspect of this gentleman's sayings, and his prophecies about the "Churches of Christendom." We wonder how he and of his few supporters would feel if we gave our version of the "Reformation." We wonder what the Protestants of Montreal would say if we gave them our reading of the character of Luther and of Calvin, of Henry the VIII. and of Elizabeth, of Mary and of Edward VI. Suppose some Catholic gave a lecture upon the "Reformation" and held up all that had ever been bad in the Episcopal Church, we wonder what the Protestants of Montreal would say?

What a storm would arise in the Protestant press, and how the "firebrand" would be relegated to other climes and pastures new. We hope no Catholic will be drawn into such a position. It may have to be done in self-defence, but we confess we are anxious to see it avoided. There is enough of bad blood already between the few followers of the Rev. A. J. Bray and the Catholics of Montreal, and it is our wish to limit the current rather than to direct it into a deeper channel. But what a counter picture, to that traced by Mr. Bray, could be drawn. Aye what a picture, Protestant authority would furnish us. How Hallam could be quoted as showing that the "Reformation" appealed to the ignorant, and that a knowledge of the true character of its agents "cools every honest man's zeal for the cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." How Buckle shows that Catholic parents were obliged to send their children to Protestant colleges, and how the "Reformation" triumphed, mainly because of the coercive measures used to enforce it. How Macaulay could be quoted to show that "the years during which the political power of the Anglican hierarchy was in the zenith were precisely the years during which the national virtue was at the lowest point." How Lecky tells us that "the corrupt suppression of the conventual system was very far from a benefit to women or to the world, and no fact in modern history is to be more deeply deplored." How Professor Merivall says that the authority which the Pope lost, was seized not to increase liberty, but to place the power of the State over the Church. The "Change of Masters," of which Hallam wrote, was a change, for the worse for human freedom. What would the Calvinists think if we drew a harrowing picture of the burning of

Cervitas, because he was an Unitarian. And as to that "Reformation," how was it begun? We can scarcely mention it without hurting Protestant feeling. But what a tale of horrors we could disclose. How the Reformation was begun by Henry the murderer of his wives, continued by Somerset the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth the murderess of her guest. Yes we could a tale unfold of all those great "reformers" of the day. Of Luther, of whom Hallam said, that "he spent his life in bellowing bad latin." Yes it was a sad time when the pulpit took the place of the altar. Did the Rev. Mr. Bray ever read the *Church News*. That journal called "Cranmer Ridley, Latimer and Jewell, apostates, traitors, perjurers, robbers, and persecutors," while Dr. Littledale said that they were "unredeemed villains." Did not the Rev. Baring Gould—a non-Catholic too—say that the "Reformation was a miserable apostasy." Was not the early Church of England reproached by Guizot and Lecky, for its "extreme servility," because of its policy of non-resistance to the crown? Did not Grindal and Coxe suggest the application of torture to Catholic priests, and does not Froude tell us that they were hunted in every county in England as if they were beasts and wolves. Did not both Houses of Convocation urge Elizabeth to put Mary to death "being an idolator." Was not the cruelty of Protestant prelates and statesmen in Ireland such that Dr. Samuel Johnson said "there is no instance even in the ten persecutions of such severity as that which they exercised against the Catholics." Did not Calvin say of Luther, "would to God that he would think a little more of his own vices," while Bucer said of Calvin that he was "a mad dog." Did not the biographer of Tilford after describing the frightful state of Scotland up to the close of the last century say "that in early times a degree of civilisation and prosperity prevailed from which the country had gradually fallen. As in England" he adds, "so in Scotland, the reclamation of lands, the improvement of agriculture and the building of bridges were mainly due to the skill and industry of the old churchmen. When their ecclesiastical organization was destroyed, the country speedily relapsed into a state from which they roused it." Did not morals decline when the Reformation became a fact. Does not Protestantism in the present hour teach one religion which can hardly be distinguished from Deism, another which is almost identical with our own, and another which may be defined as a sort of Calvinistic Methodism, and can all be true? And do we rejoice at those things—not at all, not at all—we deplore and regret them. Do we attack the errors of the Church of England or assail the convictions which must be so dear to every conscientious Protestant in the world? Do we wish to rake up all the bad the Episcopal Church has done, and revive the bitter religious feuds, which can do no good, and which always do harm. Every conscientious and educated Protestant knows as well as we do, that the early Episcopal Church committed many excesses, just as we are prepared to admit that some men among our own ranks made serious mistakes. Religious fanaticism ran high in those days, but we are prepared to argue that no church in the world resisted persecution so much as our own. One or two Popes may have gone astray, a few bishops may have become Arians, and many clergymen may have been lost, but the old Church has never wavered—it cannot waver.—IT CANNOT ERR. Yes, if we gave our reading of the Reformation, we are satisfied we could draw a different picture to that presented by the Rev. Mr. Bray. But we have no wish to do so. We are not mad enough to hold the Protestants of to-day responsible for the errors of their forefathers, as the Rev. A. J. Bray holds our priesthood as having inherited all the "errors and the colossal of crime," which he charges against the fathers of our Church in the past. If in self-defence we may be forced to show what Protestants say of the "Reformation" and of its leaders, we are not insane enough to think that that spirit of persecution or of bigotry is the prevalent passion with the Protestants of 1877. We know better, and we know too, that the vast majority of the Protestants of Montreal desire no quarrel with us. But Mr. Bray is not only bigoted against the "Romish" Church—he is greedy as well. We certainly do not envy him his \$5,000 a year, his share in the profits of Zion Church and the proceeds of his lectures. If his congregation is satisfied, we would be very sorry to cast reflection upon Mr. Bray because of his handsome income. We are sure he earns it all, but he might be satisfied without wishing for a share in such a poor concern as the TRUE WITNESS. As to the omission of the explanation about the word "Romish" not being intended to offend his "Roman Catholic friends" that is easily explained. The word "Romish" became insignificant before the array of insults he heaped upon our Church. It was

the least offensive of fifty insulting phrases, and it was used after the Rev. A. J. Bray had disclaimed his intention of not meaning to insult "his Roman Catholic friends." His "Roman Catholic friends" must be singular fish indeed.

THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

The Catholic who would place the interest of either Reform or Conservative politics before the interest of his religion, is a man that ought to be shunned. Such a man has ceased to be a Catholic, and he has become a mere politician. He pleads "independence" in order to cover his apostasy. He may outwardly conform to the usages of the Catholic Church, but he has no inward devotion. He is simply a hypocrite, and he should be regarded as a dangerous man. Upon purely political questions, however—independence of thought and of political action is the right of every man, and the Catholic Church gives the amplest latitude to all her children, to act as they think best. They may be Reformers or Conservatives, Grit or Tory, as they think fit. But when Catholic interests are affected, then mere political interests must stand aside, and the true Catholic will stand by the banner of his faith, against all and every combination. In pursuance of this policy we search for such influences as may be likely, either in the present or in the future, to have an influence upon our Church. One of those influences is the question of Immigration, to which we have already given some attention. We frankly confess too that we expected the Catholic press of the Dominion would assist us in our undertaking, and we were not disappointed.—The St. John Freeman—Mr. Anglin's paper—has stood by us, and the *Irish Canadian* too has championed our cause from the very first moment that we sounded the tocsin of alarm. They both recognised the danger which would arise if this influx of Orange Immigration was permitted to continue. The *Tribune*, however, has thrown its lot in with the present administration from the commencement, and it has declared its belief that we have been "misinformed." When we brought facts to light to sustain us, the *Tribune* was silent, but still we remained "misinformed." When we proved from the blue books that there was but one "agent" in Ireland, and that that agent was an Orangeman, the *Tribune* was still silent, but we remained "misinformed." We have pointed out the exceptional powers wielded by this Orange agent—Mr. Foy—how he printed 40,000 pamphlets for distribution in Ulster, and how no "special agent" dare write pamphlets, yet the *Tribune*, this Catholic *Tribune*, said not a word about that, but yet we were "misinformed." When we declared our readiness to produce, a man who was ready to swear that Mr. Foy received \$500 dollars as a special grant to encourage Orange Immigration from Ulster, while not one dollar as a special grant was given to encourage emigration from any other part of Ireland, still we were miserably "misinformed." When we produce a gentleman who has been an emigration agent himself, and when he substantiates every word we have written,—no matter it all means nothing,—and we continue to be "misinformed." All the facts we have placed before the public have been met by the assertion that we have been "misinformed" and the *Tribune* still champions the policy of the administration, and that upon a subject which vitally affects the interests of the Catholic people of the Dominion. Up to the present we have been slow to notice this singular policy upon the part of the *Tribune* of Toronto, as we are anxious to avoid conflict between two journals which ought to run, on Catholic questions, upon parallel lines. Let it however not be considered that we regard the *Tribune* as the prototype of the dangerous Catholic to whom we referred, or that we think the editor wilfully champions an anti-Catholic League. By no means. But we think it odd that a Catholic journal, should give no substantial weight to the facts we placed before the public—facts which have not been denied, and when combatted by Mr. Lowe, only had the effect of making our case stronger than before. The *Tribune* has placed itself in a very delicate position, and while we do not charge it with a wilful betrayal of Catholic interests, yet we must confess our surprise, that it persistently avoids all that tells against the Reform administration, even when those damaging facts affect the interests of the Catholic people of the Dominion. Now we shall put a few questions to the *Tribune*, and we shall pin our position to a fair reply. Here then they are.

Is it not a fact that Mr. Foy—the emigration agent of the Dominion in Ireland—was known to be an Orangeman before he went to Ireland, at all?

Is it not a fact—proved by the blue books—that he is the only "agent" in Ireland, the rest being "special agents" and consequently not vested with as much power?

Is it not a fact—also proved by the blue books—that he caused to be printed 40,000 pamphlets, written by himself and by the authority of the administration, while no special agent in Ireland dare write a pamphlet by his own, or by any other authority?

And what about the \$500.

What about Mr. Foy daring Dr. Taylor to encroach upon his preserves.

The *Tribune* says that it must have been in the interest of the Conservative party that Mr. Foy was acting. Well suppose we grant it. What then? Has not the Reform administration perpetuated the evil, and is not Mr. Foy still the Orange agent of the Dominion in Belfast.

What about the right he possessed to send out emigrants without being compelled to write to London for "forms of application?"

Will the *Tribune* answer these questions, in a frank and in a Catholic spirit. Mark some of them we have proved, and the others we shall prove before we have done with this question of Orange Immigration. It will not do for the *Tribune* to say that we have not proved all we have asserted. As a Catholic journal we looked to our Catholic contemporaries to assist us in our efforts, and we must say that the *Tribune* has done nothing of the kind. It has screened the Government as openly as a Catholic journal dare, and we think, more openly, than a Catholic journal should. The *Tribune* cannot deny that there was ground for strong suspicion, and that alone should have induced it to approach the question with anxiety for Catholic interest, irrespective of Reform or Conservative policy. But from the commencement the *Tribune* has thrown cold water upon this important question, has ignored our facts, and has bolstered up the policy of the Government, apparently irrespective of Catholic interests. What is the position of an Orange Immigration agent in the North of Ireland? He is shunned by the Catholic people. The bitter feud which unhappily rages there cuts away nearly all social intercourse, and the Orange agent is thrown entirely among his Orange fellows. But we shall see the question out if it is in our power. Mr. Sheil's letter which we publish in another column is an additional proof in our favour, and our readers may rest assured that the battle is not half fought yet.

MR. DEVLIN, M.P.

Mr. Devlin, M.P., has done good service for the Catholics of the Dominion. His speech on the representation of minorities was a masterly production, and as an oratorical effort, was a great success. Considering the state of Mr. Devlin's health it is a marvel that he was equal to the task, and we hope that he will soon find his health restored, and that he may be able to enter upon his duties with fresh vigour and renewed energy. We regret that the corrected report of the speech comes to us at an inopportune time, and that we are forced to go to press without being able to find space for it all in the columns of our paper. The speech is very long, and we can only refer to those passages which directly interest the Catholics of the Dominion. And those passages are important. In speaking of the "humiliating position in which the minority in the Dominion find themselves to-day, Mr. Devlin says:—

The population of Ontario, according to the last census, is set down at 1,320,851, and the various elements of which it is composed may be thus summarised. English, 439,429, represented in the House by 24 members, all English and all Protestants. Irish Protestants 285,280, represented by 12 members, all Irish Protestants. Scotch, 328,889, represented by 42 members, all Scotch and all Protestants, with one exception, the member for Cornwall. French Canadians, 75,383, represented by one member, a French-Canadian and a Catholic. Unnamed nationalities, 217,708, represented, I presume, by the six members whom I notice are not credited with any particular creed or nationality, and by three members two of whom are stated to be Germans, and the third of the United States, making altogether 88 members charged with the representation of the English, the Irish Protestants, the Scotch, the French Canadian and the undescribed nationalities. But, Mr. Speaker, the same census tells us there is an Irish Catholic population of upwards 200,000 souls also in the Province of Ontario. Then let me ask how many representatives of their creed and nationality have they got in this House elected from Ontario?

Mr. Devlin.—The answer, I grieve to say, is not one. And why not one? Can any good or sufficient reason be given for their total exclusion from all participation in the government of the country? Have they repudiated their allegiance and committed treason against the State, that they should be treated as an outlawed class, denied the privileges of the constitution, compelled to wear the badge of inferiority, and forced to submit to political degradation? This, I apprehend, will not be pretended. What, then, is the reason? Is it the fault of the law? No doubt it is to a certain, perhaps to a great extent, due to this cause, but not wholly so. The remarkable indifference in this matter of the leaders of both the great parties which divide this country into what may be styled two hostile camps, has contributed in no small degree to the shameful proscription of the Irish Catholic people in Ontario, for I cannot bring myself to believe that they would be as they are to-day, and as they have unfortunately been for many long years in a state of political bondage, if the Reform and Conservative leaders had resolved to make a serious and an honest effort to secure for them some representation in the Councils of the country. But, as the law now stands, and is taken advantage of the door of the Chamber might well be labelled with these words: "No Irish Catholic from Ontario can enter here." Sir, this grievance is intolerable, and demands an immediate, an effective, remedy, and assuredly no one can affect surprise if at the

next general election, which is not very far distant, the entire strength and influence of the Irish Catholic body should be found arrayed, as it undoubtedly will be, against the party, be it Reform or Conservative, that denies them a fair and reasonable share in the representation of the country, and refuses to place them upon, in this respect, an equality with the rest of their fellow citizens. Sir, I heartily regret that there should exist a necessity for making these remarks, the subject is far from being a pleasant or agreeable one to deal with, but the cause of this disgraceful political disability can no longer be kept out of sight, or remain buried in oblivion, unless, indeed, they who have it in their power, certainly, to mitigate, if not wholly to eradicate the evil, are prepared to maintain that the Irish Catholic in Canada is not entitled to the rights and privileges of citizenship, that he must contribute his share to the revenue of the country, bear his equal proportion of its burdens, but without being permitted to take any part in the making of its laws, or in the administration of its Government.

And here, sir, let me invite attention to the marked difference between Quebec and Ontario, in the matter of representation. The population of the Province of Quebec was, according to the last census, 1,196,115; of that number, 1,019,850 are Catholics, and 171,000 Protestants. Well, sir, Quebec is represented in this House by 65 members, 13 of whom are Protestants—one of them, the Honourable Post Master General, a Minister of the Crown, and elected, he it remarked, by constituencies, in many of which Catholics had, and still have, the majority of votes. Sir, if the example of Quebec was more closely followed, if her liberal and enlightened policy in this matter was more generally adopted, the 500,000 Irish Catholics, whose hearts, and homes, and interests are centred and fixed in this Dominion, would not find themselves to-day, with all told only six representatives from their ranks in the House of Commons.

Sir, as I have already said, this branch of my subject is not its most agreeable one, but I trust to the honest, fair-minded Protestants of this Dominion for a just appreciation of the reasons which have induced me to bring so prominently before the House the humiliating position in which the Irish Catholics are politically placed. Sir, I believe they will agree with me in the opinion that they should be acknowledged in the representation of the country, and not left, as they now are, without a single representative from Ontario upon the floor of the House of Commons.

We endorse every word of this. Nay more, we can add additional weight to the arguments. Let us look at the Province of Quebec again. Let us take the Legislative Council, and let us see how Irish Catholics of the Province are represented in that Assembly. In the Legislative Council there ought to be 24 members, and there are six Protestants representing the Protestant Minority. This is more than they are numerically entitled to, but we should be sorry to see it reduced by a single member. But where is the Irish Catholic? What have we done to insure our exclusion from the Legislative Council in Quebec? In Ottawa we are sent right about by Reform Ministers, and in Quebec we are sent off by the Conservative Administration. We are insulted by "both their houses." There are at present three vacancies in the Legislative Council of Quebec, and the Irish Catholics of the Province have a right to expect that two of their number will be called to take their places in the chambers. Even this is not one-half of what is due to us. We are more numerous than the Protestants, who have six representatives, and the time is come when the Irish Catholics of the Province must see that they are fairly represented in the Council. We promise our readers that we shall not loose sight of this question, and that we shall continue to ask—What is the reason that the Irish Catholics of the Province of Quebec have not a single representative in the Legislative Council?

MAYOR WALLER OF OTTAWA.

Mr. Waller has made a speech in Ottawa that has attracted much attention, and one which is likely to challenge comment from the Catholic people of the Dominion. He expressed himself in favour of the abolition of the "Catholic vote." He said the Methodist and the Presbyterian vote was never mentioned, and he saw no reason why the "Catholic vote" should be held in terror over the conflicting elements of party warfare. He praised the Scotch for their industry, and their desire for learning, and encouraged his hearers to imitate their example. We differ from one and all these remarks. In the first place we cannot see how it is possible to abolish the Catholic vote. Let anyone read Mr. Devlin's speech and then say whether it would be judicious or not to hear no more of the "Catholic vote." In our opinion we do not hear enough of the "Catholic vote." Do away with it and goodbye to Catholic influence. If we do not hear of the Methodist, or of the Presbyterian vote, it is because there is no necessity. Both Methodists and Presbyterians are safely housed. They can afford to assume a virtue. They are in power—not because of their superior intelligence, but just because we do not hear enough of the Catholic vote. Anyone who reads Mr. Devlin's speech and our comment upon it, will, we are sure, rest satisfied that the "Catholic vote" is more necessary now than ever, and that it behoves every Catholic in the land to stand to his colours. We would say more upon this important question, but we think what we publish in another column, must set it at rest.

CANVASSERS for this paper, in Cities and Towns, make more money than at anything else. Send for terms, and go to work. Terms sent free.