

tainly," said O'Brien, "that is the only reason why we did not rebel." "If you had the power then you would go into open rebellion." "Undoubtedly," answered Mr. O'Brien, adding that he was in advance of most Irishmen. "Doubtless they are in advance," continues Mr. O'Brien, "as regards such near contemplation of the horrors of civil war. But I should like to have asked Mr. O'Brien whether the Irish nation regard the Act of Union as possessed of the same moral authority as they would ascribe to the laws against theft and murder, or, indeed, as possessed of any authority at all. There may, indeed, be immorality in this calculated resistance even to immoral laws, but such resistance is not in itself immoral."

Dividing the capital charge against the Union policy into two grand heads of Fraud and Violence, each of them is sufficient to invalidate the moral authority of the Act. Mr. Gladstone gives abundant proofs that both fraud and violence were employed in forcing the Act of Union, and that, therefore, outside of the bayonets which support it, the Act of Irish Union is not worth the parchment upon which it is written, because, as he lays down: "Instruments obtained by fraud are voidable at law." Then a contrast is drawn between the maddening, ferocious and prolonged oppression of the Irish, with the merciful, patient and honorable demeanor of the latter. For instance, General Gordon says of the rebellion in '98: "Amid all their atrocities the chastity of the fair sex was respected by the rebels. I have not been able to ascertain one instance to the contrary in the County of Wexford, though many beautiful young women were absolutely in their power." Not so with the king's forces, who were supposed to be under discipline: "For many of the female relatives, taken promiscuously with the men, suffered in regard of their chastity and also with regard to health, by their brutally constrained acquaintance with the soldiery."

"On the 7th of June, after the massacre at Scullabogue, Father Roche, so active in arms," says Mr. Gladstone, "issued a Proclamation, containing the following passages:

"In the moment of triumph, my countrymen, let not your victories be tarnished with any wanton act of cruelty. . . . To promote a union of brotherhood and affection among our countrymen of all religious persuasions has been the principal object. We have sworn in our most solemn manner: we have associated for this laudable purpose, and no power on earth shall shake our resolution."

And General Harvey, then Commander-in-Chief (of the Irish), on the 6th of June, issued general orders, which contained these words:

"Any goods that shall have been plundered from any house, or returned immediately to the houses of owners that (sic), all persons so plundering as aforesaid shall, on being convicted thereof, suffer death. It is also resolved that any person or persons who shall take upon them to kill or murder any person or persons, burn any house, or commit any plunder without special written orders from the Commander-in-Chief shall suffer death. And this, be it borne in mind, while plunder, incendiarism, rape, torture, and murder were carried on wholesale in the name of law and order before the rebellion, during it, and (as Lord Cornwallis has borne witness) after it."

How Irish life was valued wholesale we may judge from the following narrative: On May 28th two thousand men collected in arms made a proposal to surrender them, and to go home, which was wisely accepted. But one of them said he would only give his gun empty and he discharged it with the muzzle upwards. Hereupon the (British) soldier and a troop of fencible cavalry slew two hundred men, and many more would have perished had not the General recalled his force. So in an early copy of (I think) the Times dated on September 17th, 1798, which I have seen, an officer reports to his superior—without shame and apparently with every confidence of good service—that he met a body of men who had taken arms on the landing of General Humbert and slaughtered about seventy of them, though they made no attempt at resistance! It would be idle to relate the very large numbers of those slain in action.

Every effort was indeed made to prevent the rebels from observing the laws of war, as when they sent a flag of truce it was fired upon. After relating how one Furlong was shot in the execution of such a mission Gordon adds a note:

To shoot all persons carrying flags of truce from the rebels appears to have been a maxim with His Majesty's forces. It is not the vast destruction of rebel life which constitutes the gravamen of the case, but the reckless and lawless spirit in which the proceedings as a rule were carried on. Gordon gives one or two instances. A Protestant clergyman saw in Newtownbarr on the 25th of May a number of women and children on their knees. They were praying for leave to extricate some of their effects from their burning cabins. Not only was this refused but the clergyman, who three days after distinguished himself on the Royal side at Enniscorthy, had to secure his personal safety by flight. A flogging was given by order of Lord Kingsborough to two men on suspicion of their being rebels on what ground none except His Lordship knew. While the drummers were cutting the backs of these miserable men His Lordship was employed in throwing salt into the cuts; nor were their wounds allowed to be dressed for twenty-four hours, notwithstanding the pressing remonstrances of the surgeon. This noblemen's attention was not, however, wholly given to cruelty. On the day after his liberation

from Wexford, says Gordon, he went to Mr. Cornelius Grogan's house and took out of the stable two coach horses to sell. And again:

Many instances might be given of (Irish) men who, at the hazard of their own lives, concealed and maintained loyalists until the storm passed away.

On the other hand some soldiers of the Ancient British Regiment cut open the dead body of Father Michael Murphy after the battle of Arklow, took out his heart, roasted the body, and oiled their boots with the grease that dripped from it. The statement was disputed, but Gordon sustains it.

Captain Holmes of the Durham Regiment told me in the presence of several persons that he himself had assisted in cutting open the breast with an axe and pulling out his heart.

The work of destruction was so indiscriminate that many loyalists became victims. After mentioning extensive incendiarism, Gordon says:

Their sufferings were not the work of the rebels alone. A great part was done by the soldiery. The Hessians were employed by the humanity of Government to put down the Irish. As might be expected, they exceeded all others in ferocity, and many loyalists who had escaped from the rebels were put to death by these foreigners. It was in truth a madhouse of murders.

#### THE GLORIOUS TWELFTH.

The inconsistencies of Protestantism never appear so glaringly as in the celebrations of the Battle of the Boyne. In almost every speech uttered on the 12th instant by Orange Grand Masters and R. V. Chaplains, "equal rights" were promised all and privileges asked for none. Yet, it is very evident from the experience of the past that the Catholics of Toronto and other cities would not be permitted with impunity to parade as the Orangemen did. They would not be allowed to insult, in violent open-air speeches, their Protestant neighbors, to ridicule their Church ceremonies and teachings, and threaten to break up and destroy whatever blessings were guaranteed them by the Constitution. Neither would they be permitted all these liberties nor would they ever attempt such outrages, with or without permission, on the feelings of their Protestant fellow citizens. The speakers at all the celebrations in different parts of the Province were almost a unit in denouncing the Jesuits and in threatening to deprive Catholics of the privilege guaranteed them by the constitution of educating their own children in their own Catholic separate schools. The drift of Orange bigotry seems directed, not so much against the Jesuits or the Ultramontanes of Quebec, as against the Catholics of Ontario. Past Grand Master Bennett said in Toronto:

"The enactment of the Jesuits' Estate Act had brought home to Ontario a realization of their danger, for here in Ontario we had more to fear from Roman Catholicism and Jesuitism than they had in Quebec."

What the Protestants, who are six to one, as against the Catholics, have to fear from them, and about a dozen Jesuits, can only penetrate the lucid brains of such cowards as Bennett. But tyrants are always cowards.

At Exeter Mr. James L. Hughes, school inspector, said: "The Roman Catholics have started a crusade against the education of every Protestant country." What Hughes means by such an outrageous statement it would be difficult to surmise. "Every day," he continued, "\$16,000 of public funds go to the Roman Catholics. I am going to try to stop this." (Loud applause.) Mr. James L. Hughes has no doubt whatever but that he will be elected in West Middlesex in place of Hon. G. W. Ross, that he will be appointed Minister of Education and that he will in such capacity break up the Catholic separate school system in Ontario. It would be a pity indeed not to indulge the vaulting ambition of Mr. James L. Hughes and invest him with a little bit of authority, that the world might witness the fantastic tricks he would play before high heaven, as Shakespeare says, "To make the angels weep."

N. C. Wallace, M. P., the Grand Master of British America, said at Lindsay: "I think our duty here to-day is to emulate the spirit of our forefathers in that respect, and show that we, as Protestants and Orangemen, will never submit to aggression of the Popish hierarchy either in the Dominion or in this Province of Ontario." The papers state that Mr. N. C. Wallace, M. P., who is one of the "Devil's Thirteen," worked himself up into such a violent wrath and excitement that towards the end of his speech his voice completely gave out, and that he was unable to proceed. The white heat into which Mr. Wallace wrought himself was occasioned by his fury against the few families of French-Canadian origin who have crossed the Ottawa and made settlements in the county of Prescott. It was roused still more against Premier Mercer for saying in the 24th of June celebration, "that the French Catholics had no fear of Orange bluster or Protestant aggression, but that all parties, Blues and Rouges in Quebec, would unite under one flag to repel the threatened invasion of their Church, their language and their liberties." Any determination on the part of Catholics to resist Orange aggression or set

at defiance Orange threats, suffices to put Orangemen into a white heat of impatient rage, under which they collapse and utterly give out.

One or two notable exceptions to the general shout of insane bigotry ought to be recorded. At St. Mary's Major H. A. L. Waite, P. G. M., said, among other good things: "To his mind the Province of Quebec acted entirely within its constitutional powers when it passed the bill. It was all very well to harp about equal rights, but Orangemen were liberal enough to allow any province in the Dominion, no matter what its religion was, the full privilege to exercise the rights conferred upon it by the British North America Act. To endeavor to create dissensions was not the way to build up a country. If Canada was ever to take a stand among the great nations of the earth it could only be brought about by all the provinces and all her people standing shoulder to shoulder." More power to you, Mr. H. A. L. Waite. If all the speeches at the Orange celebration had this ring of toleration and patriotism in them the 12th of July would be welcomed every year as destined to produce the heavenly gifts of peace and good will to men.

At Gananoque Mr. Taylor, M. P., also rebuked the fanatics who are hounding down the Jesuits, and said he admitted the right of Quebec to incorporate the Jesuits just the same as those provinces had incorporated the Orange body. He was prepared to discuss the Jesuit question in any hall. He was a true Orangeman, however, and should govern himself accordingly, he would never allow a vote of censure being passed on the Queen.

#### PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH IN AMERICA.

Mr. Hugh McElrhone, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who is said to be a thoughtful writer and an earnest Catholic, has an article in the Independent in which the position of the Church in the United States is treated. Mr. McElrhone claims that within the union there are twelve million Catholics. This number is much in excess of the estimate formed in the latest Catholic directories, but Mr. McElrhone says that the returns given in the directories are incomplete. Hoffman's directory gives the population at eight millions, but a close examination of details shows that this is only approximate, yet we think that Mr. McElrhone's estimate places the number too high. The population of the country is now estimated at sixty-five millions.

A hundred years ago the population of the United States was 3,200,000, and the number of Catholics was 30,000, whose spiritual needs were attended to by about 35 priests. New York City then had only 100 Catholics, and Boston 4,000. There are now in the United States 6,000 Catholic schools, with 900,000 Catholic pupils in attendance. These schools are managed with great economy, a large proportion of them being taught by religious orders, especially the Christian Brothers, and ladies of different orders, Franciscans, St. Joseph's, Benedictines, etc., and the expense of their teaching is small. There are lay teachers in many localities, and in most cases the standard of the schools is good. In the matter of higher education great progress is also visible. There are 75 colleges and a great number of convent schools for girls which are doing good work in every case, and provision is made for a new university which will cost \$10,000,000. There are now 88 Archbishops and Bishops, 8,000 priests, 7,000 churches, and about 2,000 students for the priesthood in the United States.

These statistics, taken alone, would be very encouraging as to the immense progress of the Church. "But there is a dark side to the picture also. There must have been immense losses to the Church, taking into consideration the very large Catholic immigration, both Irish and German, which has taken place. Mr. McElrhone estimates that twenty-five millions of the sixty-five millions who constitute the population of the country are Irish, either by birth or descent. Of these, he says, fifteen millions should be Catholics, and he adds that the German Catholic population should be five millions, whereas they amount to only three millions.

If these estimates are correct, notwithstanding the extraordinary gain in the Catholic population during the last century, the losses are immense also, even if we take Mr. McElrhone's figures of the Catholic increase of population as correct. We know that there have been great losses both in the United States and Canada. There are many localities where the large number of Irish, German, French and Italian names lead to the suspicion that many settlers who were themselves, or whose parents were, Catholics have fallen from the faith. On enquiring into their antecedents, we frequently find that in these cases the faith was lost through the fact that in early times the supply of priests was limited, and that many localities were only rarely visited by them, so that the settlers became lukewarm, and finally became alienated from the Church. The children of these parents

were, in many cases, not even aware that their parents had once been Catholics; still we cannot think that the defections from the Church have been nearly so numerous as Mr. McElrhone represents. The closest enquiry will scarcely show in any locality so great a proportionate loss as he estimates; but his calculations are instructive, as they show that there should be greater vigilance exercised in bringing home to every locality all the facilities for the exercise of religion. Past losses can only be deplored, but every effort should be made to prevent similar losses in the future.

Mr. McElrhone takes a pessimistic view of the human means adopted by the Church to preserve her influence. He says it is a very erroneous idea to suppose that it is managed with consummate wisdom. He adds:

"Of all institutions on the earth, the government of the Catholic Church, in its human side, is the most remarkable, airy, dissipated, foolish, and often corrupt. Not only are stupendous blunders of frequent recurrence, but there is a continuous instability of purpose, wavering and capriciousness every day, and a general letting of things go at loose ends. The government of a little village run upon the principles of policy which prevail among the authorities of this world-wide institution, could not last a single day. It is a monstrous, a subject for gibes and sneers, a perpetual scandal and disgrace. From the earliest ages this has been the case. While the factions of two opposing Popes were making the streets of Rome run red with blood, it spared time to crush with its censures and anathemas such names as Origen, Augustine, and Tertullian."

Mr. McElrhone is evidently in error in putting St. Augustine's name in the catalogue of those who have been lost to the Church by being "crushed with censures and anathemas." St. Augustine's name stands to this day as one of her most illustrious and honored doctors. Tertullian was undoubtedly a writer of great power and varied learning and his testimonies to the belief of the Church in his day are invaluable historical evidences of the one faith which has been handed down from generation to generation, but the vagaries into which he wandered could not be tolerated in a fold which requires that the one doctrine revealed by Christ to His Apostles should be preserved unchanged. Unity of doctrine is essential to the very existence of the Church, and there is no means of forcing men of learning to retain it. If, therefore, like Tertullian, members of the Church persist in following their own vagaries in preference to the unchanged and unchangeable doctrines revealed by Christ, the only course is to let them go.

In the case of Origen, learned as this writer undoubtedly was, he in some things wandered from truth also, but Mr. McElrhone is quite astray in his statement that either Origen or Tertullian was subject to persecution while the factions of two opposing Popes were "making the streets of Rome run red with blood." The persecutions of hostile Pagan Emperors certainly was a supreme effort to destroy Christianity during the first three centuries of the existence of the Christian religion, but it is a great anachronism to confound this period with subsequent ages when the Popes held the government of the city in their hands. The Church was able to survive these trying periods of her history, and she has the inward vitality which will enable her to survive and prosper under all the difficulties which beset her at the present day.

Several Protestant journals have commented on Mr. McElrhone's strictures as if they considered them very worthy of being regarded as almost conclusive evidence that the Church is decaying on this continent. The evident blunders of the gentleman ought to be enough to convince readers of his article that his views should be received with great circumspection. It is undoubted that there have been local cases of unsuccessful management in the government of the Church, but this is not to be wondered at in an organization so great and so widespread. But, on the whole, the pastors of the Church in America, both Bishops and priests, have done their work well.

Mr. McElrhone says the Church "is ever advancing its weakest, sometimes its most vicious adherents to the commanding offices of the Church, at the very moment it tramples its best to the dust." The Church has to deal with men having all the frailties of humanity, but this statement is altogether unwarranted. There have been, from one cause or another, some occupants of high positions in the Church who have not been successful in their management, but could anything else be expected in so great an association? We can say with great assurance that failures have been very few in comparison with successes; and even where there have been some failures, they have been usually compensations owing to the great virtues and abilities of Church officials in subordinate positions. While, therefore, we regret the losses which the Church has certainly experienced during the past century, we are of opinion that, for the most part, they were unavoidable. We would urge, indeed, greater vigilance

than ever on pastors for the preservation of their flocks, but we do not think that Mr. McElrhone's dark prognostications are a correct forecast of the future, any more than that his statements are correct as regards the past.

#### THE AGITATION AND ITS INEVITABLE RESULTS.

The course of the Toronto Mail in raising a racial and religious cry against our French Canadian fellow-citizens in order to create discord in the country is so notorious that the public are rather taken by surprise on witnessing its desperate efforts to prove that the raising of racial issues is not its work, but that of the people of Quebec. Last Saturday's issue of that journal contains one of the articles in which it endeavors to show that the Mail is quite innocent of any such conduct, but that Mr. Laurier "and his reactionary allies" have been guilty of this base and unpatriotic conduct. Old Esop's fable of the wolf that found fault with the lamb because the latter was disturbing the water which was really running from the direction of the wolf toward the lamb is exactly the case in which the Mail stands towards the people of Quebec, with this difference, however, that it will likely be found that the latter will not stand to be so quietly devoured; and just as when the arguments of the wolf were rebutted by the plain statement of the facts of the case, it had recourse to some imaginary acts of aggression committed by the lamb's grandfathers, so the Mail also tells us that not only the French Canadians of to-day are guilty of aggressiveness against the people of Ontario, but that as far back as 1763, the grandfathers of the present generation of French-Canadians were aggressive also by raising race issues against the British or English-speaking population.

The Mail says:

"When he (Mr. Laurier) accuses us of fomenting racial issues, we need only remind him that the race issue has been with us since 1763, is, in fact, inherent in the nature of our polity and constitution."

It is true that the polity and constitution of Canada admit that the two races should grow up side by side with each other. There was no provision made by which the French people living in the country were to be annihilated or suppressed; but would it have been wise, would it even have been possible to have made such a provision? It is very easy now for the Mail and its adherents to say, as they have said over and over again, that such provision should have been made, as the French were the conquered race, but in making this assertion the Mail altogether ignores the military relations which then existed between the two peoples. The French had been beaten from the Quebec citadel, but the victorious general was the best judge of the terms of capitulation which he could impose upon a vanquished but not dishonored garrison, who could still have appealed to arms, and who might have been sustained in further resistance by the population of the country, if dishonorable terms of capitulation had been proposed. The Treaty of Paris also was not made under circumstances in which one party could impose whatever terms it pleased. It was a treaty concluded between two powers whose soldiers still held their arms in their hands; and as England was not at the time friendly to the Catholic religion, it may well be presumed that when granting liberty to the French people of Canada to practice their religion without intolerant interference, and to continue the use of their language and laws, she knew very well the course which was dictated by prudence as well as generosity. It was not demanded that the French population should cease to be French as far as race, language, laws, and religion were concerned. They were to become faithful British subjects, and they kept their engagement, to such an extent that when thirteen British colonies of America threw off the ties which bound them to their mother country, the French-Canadians alone remained faithful to the British Crown, and retained to Great Britain the vast territory which is now the Dominion of Canada.

Later still, in the war of 1812 the fidelity of the French-Canadians was the sole obstacle which barred the Americans from annexing the Dominion. Where, then, was the racial issue of which the Mail speaks so flippantly? As far as the French-Canadians were concerned, they were quite willing, as long as they were treated as British subjects and freemen, to remain faithful to their engagements, and to live in peace and harmony with their fellow subjects of British origin. Is it on account of all this that they are to be told to-day that they must amalgamate more closely with the population of Ontario by giving up all that they hold most dear?

The Lower-Canadians have in no way violated their compact. They have been as tolerant and friendly to their British compatriots as possibly itself would permit. The union of the two Provinces was framed with the scarcely-concealed

object of securing Protestant ascendancy in both, which was expected to follow as a matter of course. But united Canada would not endure such an ascendancy as England still exercises over Ireland, and equality of races and religions is the somewhat unexpected result. With this the Mail and its followers are not satisfied. Their wish is to secure Protestant, or, as they say, "British Ascendancy." If the latter be meant, we maintain that the only way it can be secured is by making all loyal British subjects in the country equal, whether they be by origin English, Irish, Scotch or French; but if Protestant ascendancy be intended, as we know to be the case, the first obstacle which the promoters of the scheme will meet is the determined opposition of the whole Catholic population of all the Provinces from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island—nearly half the entire population of the Dominion; and if any attempt be made to place us in an inferior position, we expect to bring it to naught at the polls. The Mail and the bogus Equal Rights' Association have been threatening us with more vigorous measures, but we are not to be cowed by such bluster. Empty be believe it to be; but if the attempt be made on behalf of Orangemen and persons to put their threats into execution, the result may be very different from what they expect.

The Mail itself the other day acknowledged that it is very probable that what we suggest would be the case. It admitted in its issue of the 15th inst.:

"There is no blinking the fact that the French occupy a strong vantage ground."

It then states that there is one alternative by which the people of Quebec can bring to naught the designs of the Ontario agitators, viz. "by joining the United States." "In this case," it adds, "they could force us to join also, since we could not exist either as a British colony, or as an independent community with the St. Lawrence in hostile hands; and they think, to use a Nationalist phrase, that this would tear our hearts."

On this theme the wisecracks expatiates further:

"It is preposterous to talk of checking the growth of French nationalism or, if it come to that, of preventing the entrance of French Canada into the Republic by force of arms. The money market would not lend us a dollar for the purposes of civil war, but if it lend us a hundred millions, we could not emerge from such a conflict with a united country. The struggle would at once assume the aspect of a religious war, and including the Irish Catholics, the adherents of the Roman Church in the Dominion stand to the non-Catholics as three to four."

We are glad to see that the Mail is at last coming to the conclusion that the bigots of Ontario cannot have altogether their own way. We do not by any means offer the process which that journal tells us of as the solution which we would desire for the French problem which has been raised, not by the French, nor by the Irish Catholics of the Dominion, but by the Mail, the persons and the Orangemen; but if ever these fanatics attempt to carry out their threats, it is well they should know that there is some means whereby their designs to establish Protestant ascendancy can be frustrated; and should the crisis of civil war with which they are threatening us be ever precipitated upon our beloved country, they who bring it about must take the responsibility of the consequences.

It will be seen from the Mail's admissions that the bogus Equal Rights' Association, by continuing the aggressive course which they are now pursuing, are with their eyes open to the consequences, aiming at the inevitable result which the Mail itself foresees and prognosticates, the breaking up of our united country, and ultimately perhaps the annexation of all Canada.

These bigots ought to have considered the consequences of their persistent efforts to create dissension before exciting the whole country to that degree of enmity which has undoubtedly been the result of the agitation to override the autonomy of Quebec. Quebec will not tolerate any such interference, whatever may be the consequence, and it would have been much easier not to have roused the demon of discord than it will be now to lay it.

A great deal has been said concerning Col. Amyot's warning to the French-Canadian volunteers that they may be called upon to defend their Province and their institutions from the aggression of intolerant neighbors. It should be remembered that Col. Amyot did not say this until from hundreds of Protestant pulpits, from the Orange lodges, and from the platform of the Toronto Convention, threats were uttered without stint that a horde of Ontarians would invade Quebec or camp on the Plains of Abraham to expel the Jesuits, and force upon the Quebec people Ontario ascendancy. Nothing less could be expected than that threats of this kind should be met with defiance. Col. Amyot very properly replied that if visitors from Ontario enter Quebec as friends, as friends they will be welcome, but if as enemies, they will be treated accordingly.