

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

BY THE PROPRIETOR,

JOHN GILLIES,

AT NO. 195 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 16, 1877.

LECTURE

BY M. W. KIRWAN,

IN REPLY TO

REVEREND MR. BRAY,

ON THE

“ROMISH” CHURCH,

DELIVERED IN THE

MECHANICS' HALL, MARCH 13, 1877.

A very large audience assembled in the Mechanics' Hall on Tuesday evening last, to hear the reply of the Editor of this Journal in answer to the attacks made on the Roman Catholic Church by the Rev. Mr. Bray, Pastor of Zion Church. The lecture being under the auspices of the Catholic Young Men's Society, the President, Mr. W. E. Mullen, occupied the chair. On the platform were the representatives of the Irish Catholic Societies. The Rev. Redemptorist Fathers, who conducted the mission in St. Patrick's church, and many prominent citizens were also on the platform. The chairman introduced the lecturer in a few well chosen remarks, who then came forward and spoke as follows:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,— For some years past I have been before my countrymen in public life. I am not unknown in Great Britain, and I may claim to be well known in Ireland. Many and many a time in that old kingdom by the sea I have stood side by side with men of Irish birth, defending the honor of, or battling for, the Fatherland. I always rejoiced when I could raise my voice and exercise my mind in defence of the old, old cause, doing, I hope one man's share in the effort to make my country a nation once again. Throughout many a stormy chapter in the history of the last decade, I have taken my share of glorious toil, and have been more than rewarded by the generous confidence and constituted trust of my countrymen at large. The ever changing current of events produced a change in the spirit of my dreams, and some time since I found myself in Canada, here to seek a peaceful occupation and a home. At the hands of my countrymen here I received that cordial welcome which I interpreted as an endorsement of the policy I advocated in the old land, and as encouragement to pursue a somewhat similar policy here. I came here to be loyal to your laws, obedient to the constitution, and desirous of living in peace with Protestants and Catholics, Jews and Gentiles alike. If I am proud of my own land, and proclaim my glory from the house tops, if I occasionally dwell upon the time when Ireland was the land of scholars and the nurse of arms; if now and then I like to picture anew, the time when the genius of Irishmen shone like a beacon light from pole to pole, and the virtue of whose daughters has for ages been the theme of universal admiration, then I only express myself as Deakman did when he wrote:—

Our Fatherland! Who speaks the name of Fatherland with a tear? The voice of love, the voice of fame, The voice of all we hold most dear, Tell us to love our Fatherland!

But as I have been all my life an Irishman, so have I been all my life a Catholic; and as I have often battled for the old land, so do I now find myself battling for the Faith. To-night I come before you in a new character—placing for awhile Ireland and her cause aside—I am here to-night to defend the Catholic Church. I neither sought nor desired this quarrel. I, as one member of that “Romish” Church which has been so much calumniated, had no wish to measure weapons with a foe. I certainly never would have commenced the assault, nor have stirred up religious feuds, which, in my opinion, have done much to retard the progress of Christian communities. But the worm has been trod upon and it has turned to sting. Unfortunately, perhaps, I am not of too amiable a mould, and when I am slapped upon one side of the face, I never turn the other to receive a like castigation. I generally try to give back blow for blow, and in self-defence to fight my corner as viciously and as determinedly as an Irishman can. I am by nature a hater of bigotry in any and in every form, and I care not from whence it comes, bigotry is to me a thing accursed, Christ died to save mankind—He suffered for us all, and while believing in no theory about a universal religion, such as Emerson desires, yet I hope to do my best to cultivate a kindly and a friendly feeling towards those who differ from us in matters of dogma or Faith. I am a friend to civil and religious liberty all the world around, and would defend my principles, I hope, if needs be, at any sacrifice. It is well indeed for us all that toleration is becoming universal and that men are ceasing to hate each other for His sake, and that a good and Christian spirit is day by day finding itself into men's hearts and understandings. But like the rest of those things which man disposes, there are exceptions to the rule, and one of those exceptions is I fear, the Rev. Mr. Bray, of Zion Church, Montreal. Like myself he is a new comer to Canada, and like myself he too was here before he thought that in Zion Church he would make a name, and in its precincts, find a local habitation. This gentleman has attempted to heap ridicule and contempt upon the Church of Rome, and in my humble way I am here this evening with Defence and not Defence as my motto. I see around me too such a gathering of the clans that I feel I am not alone, and that the Catholics of Montreal, one and all, say with me that the pastor of Zion Church has

grossly and gratuitously insulted our Faith. Our Church was “despotic” and “Romish,” and “used every weapon that would serve for the hour.” In the person of our Church, “the flesh and the devil had taken holy orders.” It was “Popery” and “Priestcraft.” The Pope although “infallible,” “was not happy” and the Church again “was a colossus of crime.” The Papal court at Avignon was the “most voluptuous in Europe,” the Jesuits should be turned out of Canada, and the priests in Spain would soon leave “her ancient halls of civility” because there was not much spoil to get there. The clergy had “bestial passions” they “broke marriage vows,” “invented miracles,” and “spared nothing” in order that they might wallow in riches. And yet, this gentleman said that he had no intention of offending his “Roman Catholic friends” and even after the lecture professed a kindly feeling towards the “Romish” men, and almost pitied us for the darkness which overshadowed our minds. Now let us look at the question. Our Church ridiculed, our priesthood belied and insulted, extermination to the Jesuits, and the people branded as priest-ridden, and yet no insult intended gentlemen—no insult. O yes, insult was intended, and has been accepted, and this magnificent assemblage of the wealth, and the intelligence and the Catholic manhood of Montreal is the reply. Yes, this is the reply. You Catholics here to-night will with me pledge your fidelity to that old Church which has outlived hurricanes of persecution—you will, you will declare yourselves anxious to offend none, but determined to defend your own—you will declare unflinching confidence in your old sagrant aroses.

SOGGARTH AROON.

As I the slave they say, Soggarth aroon? Since you did show the way, Soggarth aroon, Their slave no more to be, While they would work with me Ould Ireland's slavery, Soggarth aroon? Why not her poorest man, Soggarth aroon, Try and do all he can, Soggarth aroon, Her commands to fulfil Of his own heart and will, Side by side with you still, Soggarth aroon? Loyal and brave to you, Soggarth aroon, Yet be no slave to you, Soggarth aroon, Nor, out of fear to you, Stand up so near to you— Och! out of fear to you! Soggarth aroon? Who, in the winter's night, Soggarth aroon, When the cold blast did bite, Soggarth aroon, Came to my cabin-door, And, on my catenin-door, Knelt by me, sick and poor, Soggarth aroon? Who, on the marriage-day, Soggarth aroon, Made the poor cabin gay, Soggarth aroon, And did both laugh and sing, Making our hearts to ring, At the poor christening, Soggarth aroon? Who, as friend only met, Soggarth aroon, Never did flout me yet, Soggarth aroon? And when my head was dim, Gave, while his eye did him, What I should give to him, Soggarth aroon? Och! you, and only you, Soggarth aroon! And for this I was true to you, Soggarth aroon! In love they'll never shake, When for ould Ireland's sake, We true part did take, Soggarth aroon!

Men who insult the Catholic priests insult the Catholic man. Protestants should not estimate their feeling towards their clergy, as if we felt the same way towards ours. There is a vast difference. We reverence our priests, while I am sure I do not offend when I say that Protestants do not always even respect the clergymen of their creed. O yes there is a great difference in the way they are treated, and if we are quick to resent an insult heaped upon them, it is only because of the respect we owe to them, and the affection in which they are held. Yes the priests of the old Church, the old Faith, like an aged ship firm in plank and heading towards the sea, tosses off the successive assaults upon its bulwarks, as spray is thrown off in oft repeated showers from her impetuous sides. I claim therefore to have come to Montreal on a mission of peace, and I contend that the Rev. Mr. Bray, from the commencement declared his intention of coming on a mission of war. I have heard that when he was here some twelve or eighteen months ago, that he delivered what was described to me as a “splendid lecture or sermon” on “the Prodigal Son.” So far so good. At the end of the sermon or lecture however, the demon of bigotry broke forth and he expressed himself pleased with everything he saw in Canada—except the “Popery.” He returned to England and he came here again, this time as Pastor of Zion Church. I have heard that one of his very first sermons here was a declaration of war upon the “dominant religion”—that threat he has carried out, and now it is war indeed. Well within the precincts of Zion Church the Rev. Mr. Bray has a right, if he thinks fit, to reasonably and argumentatively combat the “dominant” religion. That may be his special calling, as it certainly is his special right, if he chooses to exercise it. No one could object to such a procedure. But he should do it without insulting us. He should do it without denouncing Pope and Popery and by telling us that our priesthood are bad and ourselves blind. He should in fact do it like a Christian clergyman, with due respect to those Catholics in Montreal, who wish to live at peace with their Protestant neighbors. But the Rev. Mr. Bray pursued another course. He jibed and slandered and all the while said he meant “no insult.” Gratuitously and un-called for, he violently assailed the “Romish” Church; at a time when all was peace, he throws the brand of bigotry and hate among the people, and he is astonished that we have this manliness to give him back measure for measure. He professed to be surprised that I should call him hard names, and appeared to expect that I, as well as all the mere Irish and Catholics of Montreal, should be taught, courteously and manner from the maker of a silly and an offensive pun upon—“No no, Pio Nono!” Of course he criticised my reply which appeared in the True Witness. And now let me inform you that the True Witness was printed and published the very morning that his lecture first appeared, so that his charge about talking seven days to give my answer is a mistake. The writing of my reply took just about as many hours. Then strangely enough he passed over the many imperfections of style which I recognised in my reply when I saw it in print and found fault with the literary construction of a quotation I made from Macaulay. I thought all the world had read these beautiful essays, but I find I was mistaken. To the admirers of Macaulay I hand the structure of the Rev. Mr. Bray.

*Priest Dear.

Pagan predecessor. Grant that the Golden age of Roman literature was during the Augustan era. He found Rome a city of brick and left it one of marble. Christianity was then proscribed and the Christians were hiding in the Catacombs. At this time slavery was prevalent all over the world. The marts of Sparta, of Athens and of Rome were full of them. In Athens alone there were forty thousand slaves to twenty thousand freemen. Was it the civilization of Pagan Rome that grappled with the emancipation of those helots of Sparta or those slaves of Rome? Was it not the early Catholic Church which from the commencement declared that all men were born free, and that all men should be equal in presence of the law? Did not Pagan Rome lay down rules for the perpetual servitude of the serfs, and did not the philosophers of the time declare that slaves were created by the Gods for the use of freemen? Plato and Aristotle said so, and all the Pagan world accepted the philosophy as a wise provision for the happiness of mankind. The serfs were treated as things not as persons. Who was it that combated this evil from the first and recognized the nobility of soul, without distinction of creed or to class? Who but the Catholic Church—the first emancipator of the bondsmen. It was she first recognized that slavery was a bitter draught, and struck the shackles from the limbs of serfdom, and elevated man into the dignity and the glory of a freeman. The Protestant historian so well known for his leaning Guizot admits this and all the world acknowledges it. Slaves were freed by the decrees of ecclesiastical councils, and, as Balme tells us, the very sacred vessels from the altars were sold to purchase their emancipation. Yes, it was the Catholic Church that first raised the standard of freedom, for all men that freedom

“Whose battle once begun Reached the spiriting sire to son Though often lost is ever won.” But time goes on—Goth and Hun, Visigoth and Ostrogoth, brought ruin in their wake. Italy was overrun: the “Empire which was to last for ever” passed away, and Rome fell to rise as Pagan Rome—no more. The Vandals of the North, carried Chaos wherever they went. Attila and Alaric destroyed all before them. The temples were ruined, the libraries were burned, and the magnificent collections of painting and sculpture were trampled upon and broken. The Catholic Church stood upon the ruins of the civilized world, and out of Chaos built up the structure to which mankind owes nearly all, yes, nearly all, the civilization it possesses to-day. Yes, as Samuel Laing, the Scotch Presbyterian, said:

“The Catholic Church and her establishments were then the only asylum for the spirit of freedom and independence of mind were lodged, kept alive, and nursed to their present maturity, and that all that men have, of social, political, and religious freedom, may be clearly traced, in the history of every country, to the working and efforts of the independent power of the Church of Rome.” Yes, “Rome did much for civilization” but Christian Rome did far more than Pagan Rome to advance thought and consolidate freedom. Lecky too, who was a non-Catholic, substantiates Laing, for he says that the beneficial works of the early Church of Rome:

“Constituted to gather a movement of philosophy which has never been paralleled or approached in the pagan world.” Yes, it was the Catholic Church that saved civilization to the world; or, as Guizot says:

“Powerfully assisted in forming the character and in furthering the development of modern civilization, whose innumerable monasteries, with active monks and clergy, acted as centres in the diffusion of intellect and in that of reality, and whose glory is that the human mind, broken down by storms took refuge in the asylum of Churches and Monasteries.”

Who was it then that in the dark ages of ruin and dismay, when the light of learning was put out, the fire of literature and inquiry quenched, barbarism triumphant, and civilization destroyed; who was it but the Catholic Church that rescued the world from anarchy and decay? Let a Protestant again reply:

“If the Catholic Church had done nothing more than to preserve for us, its painful solitude and unwarded toil, the precepts and intellectual treasures of Greece and Rome, she would have been entitled to our everlasting gratitude. But her hierarchy did not merely preserve these treasures. They taught the modern world how to use them. We can never forget that at least nine out of every ten of all the great colleges and universities in Christendom were founded by monks or priests, bishops or archbishops. This is true of the most famous institutions in Protestant as well as in Catholic countries. And equally undeniable is the fact, that the greatest discoveries in the sciences and in the arts (with the sole exception of Sir Isaac Newton) have been made either by Catholics or by those who were educated by them. Our readers know that Copernicus, the author of our present system of astronomy, lived and died a poor priest, in an obscure village; and Galileo lived and died a Catholic. The great Kepler, although a Protestant himself, always acknowledged that he received the most valuable part of his education from the monks of the abbey of Weissenau. In other departments of science, as well as literature and the arts, including those of statesmen, orators, historians, poets and artists.”

O yes, the Catholic Church was the saviour of civilization the emancipator of the world. She was so during the first four hundred years of her existence and she was so during what is called the “dark ages.” The Rev. Mr. Bray says the Catholic Church was a “colossus of crime”—that for long ages her Popes “were guilty of almost every crime under heaven,” and that “the immorality of her priesthood was largely instrumental in her ruin.” He said too “the alliance of Church and State was brought about for the aggrandisement of the Church and for the suppression of liberty.” I challenge one and all of those issues. The Church was never so free, the people never so happy, as when the Popes exercised the temporal power. Italy does not now, nor never did, enjoy so much liberty as she did during the days of the Republics of Genoa, Pisa, Lucca, and Florence. How is it possible that a Church that has civilized the countries which embraced it, can be opposed to liberty, for civilization and liberty must of necessity go hand in hand. Let us look at St. Augustine coming to England to convert the people. Let us see him baptizing King Ethelbert who in the favour of his zeal was anxious to coerce his subjects and force them to adopt the Christian religion? Who prevented the King from using extreme measures—who but Augustine, the delegate of Pope Gregory I. Was not Michael, King of the Bulgarians warned not to force idolaters to become Christians by Pope Nicholas I? Did not the Council of Toledo, the fourth great reforming council, enact that “no one should be compelled against their will to become a Christian?” Yes, and this too at a time when the Church had unlimited sway, and when its power in Europe was unquestionable and unquestioned. Who stopped the crusade which was being preached against the Jews—who but St. Bernard. Can we forget the touching letter written by Penelon, Archbishop of Cambray, to the son of King James II. of England, in which the illustrious prelate said:—

“Above all never force your subjects to change their religion. No human power can reach the impenetrable recess of the free will of the heart. Violence can never persuade men; it seems only to make hypocrites. Grant civil liberty to all, and in proportion as you are indulgent, but in tolerating with patience whatever Almighty God tolerates, and endeavouring to convert men by mild persuasions.”

Do we not remember what Dr. Brownson, who was at that time a Protestant,—do we not remember his thanking God that there was a power on earth—meaning thereby the Temporal Power of the Church of Rome—that could stand like a wall of iron against the tyranny of earthly sovereigns. No the Catholic Church has been the friend of civil liberty all over the earth. Who told the Emperor Theodosius not to enter the sacred portals of the Cathedral at Milan because the blood of his subjects was on his hands, who but the intrepid St. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan. Who wrung from King John the Magna Charta of British liberty, and upon the plains of Runnymede, made a reluctant monarch grant

civil liberty and Habeas Corpus to his subjects—who but Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury. Was not European liberty developed when Catholicism was triumphant? I grant that since the Lutheran secession liberty in Europe has advanced. I freely grant that before that secession the progress of liberty may have been somewhat sluggish. But what was the cause? Was not feudalism already being destroyed by the Church? Was not the administration of justice moral, national, and equitable. Were not States becoming larger and the grievances of municipalities being ameliorated. I grant that the organization of society, and civil liberty was not the same in the sixteenth century as it is now, but it is absurd to compare the liberty of the subject three hundred years ago with the liberty of the subject to-day, as it would be to compare the liberty and security enjoyed in the sixteenth with that enjoyed in the thirteenth century. The temporal power of the Popes was never universal, therefore, they cannot be charged with the slowness of civilization and liberty, outside their own domain. When Mr. Bray says that that power was usurped, he uses not merely an inaccuracy, but he uses an anachronism. The temporal power of the Popes was the salvation of society. In Rome alone was the Inquisition never used to put a human being to death, while the rest of Europe was reeking with blood. In Rome alone did the people enjoy more civil and religious liberty than they did in any part of the world, as the spirit of the Catholic Church opposed to servitude and injustice, brought comfort to the afflicted and threw the mantle of its protection over the persecuted of the earth. Thither flew the Jews when there was a price upon their heads, and there, ay, under the shadow of the temporal power, under the guardianship of that religion, which they had attempted to destroy; therein Rome I rejoice to know—yes, I glory in knowing—that there alone was civil liberty secure, and men—Jew and Gentile possessed more freedom than they did in any part of the civilized globe. “Ah, yes,” says the Rev. Mr. Bray, “all very well, I grant there was a time when the Church was good, but it afterwards becomes a colossus of crime.” The clergy were for the most part profligate and the entire record of the “Romish” Church for whole centuries was but the record of “social and political crime.” Sweeping charges and liberally applied. At one time, he said, “a million swords would have been taken from the scabbard at its call: now only a few hundred French, and Belgians and Irish would respond to her appeal for martial help.” Not so sir, not so! Now as then a million of swords would spring out of the scabbard at her call for martial help, if the Faith was assailed. Yes, millions of Catholics would joyously take their places in line, and at a moment's call if the Church or the Faith required it. We might not all battle for the restoration of the temporal power, but God forbid that the Pontiff—the aged and venerable Pontiff, God bless him—or his successor should find it necessary to call the Catholics of the world to his standard in defence of the Faith. If that day ever comes and if the Rev. Mr. Bray lives to see it, I promise him that he will see history repeat itself and will witness millions of bayonets flashing from the scabbards, millions of bayonets glittering in the sunshine, and millions of men ready to march to death with military glee. He glories in the fall of the Papacy as a temporal power, yes, so did its enemies since the days of Corellius to Pius IX. but it stands still as powerful as ever. The succession never failed, and 200,000,000 of faithful subjects give allegiance to its decrees. But I must go on. The Rev. Mr. Bray describes the trial of skill between Hildebrand and the King of Germany. But he gave a different account of the cause of that contest to what I have been in the habit of reading. Protestant historians too give a different version of the story. I read that Hildebrand was defending the liberty of the people, and opposing the heresy of the King. We know on the authority of Voltaire, Wheaton, and Kent, that the Popes were recognised as a power in Europe, and had a spiritual right to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. Henry appointed a clerk Pope, ordered Hildebrand, the elected of the Cardinals and the choice of the people, to abdicate, sent his soldiers into the Churches and acted the tyrant over the defenceless Hildebrand. But with the spirit of a true pastor, the Pope still held out for the people until at last the King and Pope met at Canosa, and the Pope challenged the King by the body and blood of Christ, to swear as he swore, that he had never acted save for the good of the Church and the benefit of the people. The conscience-stricken King recoiled from the terrible ordeal, he could not take the oath, and the Pope, as champion of the people and defender of the Church, triumphed over the tyranny and the despotism of the King. Voltaire, De Maistre, Dellarmine, and many Protestant writers, support the Pope, and rejoice that despotism received so severe a shock as it did at Canosa in the year of our Lord, 1075. Yes sir, the Popes whom you have so much abused have ever been the champions of liberty in Europe. They rescued it when the Saracens brought ruin in their wake and upon the plain of Poitiers the crescent went down before the emblem of man's redemption. Was that not the doing of Gregory III. and Charles Martel? You say the Church broke marriage vows. Was it not the much abused Popes who preserved the sanctity of marriage and in spite of threats and denunciations from Philip Augustus of France or from Henry VIII. of England held on through all those dark ages to the precept that man shall not separate what God has joined. Inflexibly the Popes have resisted all through history, as they resist now—the immoral teachings of the divorce court. But says the Rev. Mr. Bray when the Court left Rome and went to Avignon, it became the most “voluptuous” Court in Europe. Harsh words Sir, very harsh words,—and let us see how true. The Papal Court left Rome for Avignon in 1309. Of the Popes at Avignon Platina tells us that one of them Benedict XII. was a good man, “that he loved and sought out the good, but repelled the wicked.” Again St. Peter Thomas of Aquitaine celebrates the merits of another of the Popes who lived at Avignon—Clement VI.—while Fellet exposes the calumnies of Fleury about the same Pontiff. Again we find Narvoesay of another of the Avignon, Popes—John XXII. that “he carried great constancy into his enterprise. His mind was sound and sagacious, his heart magnanimous, and his prudence consummate. He was known to be eloquent, sober, frugal, humble and just.” Another of the Avignon Popes—Innocent VI. is said to have “loved uprightness and justice. His own life was upright and his zeal for religion unalterable.” Of another, and the last but one of the Avignon Popes—Urban V.—that he was “adorned by the finest virtues, and that his memory was so much respected that the King of France for a long time exempted from taxation the place where he was born.” And this is all. Here are all the Popes who were at the “voluptuous” court at Avignon. Ah but this is not all. Why did not the Rev. Mr. Bray tell the condition of Rome in 1309 and its condition when the Popes returned in 1371? Why did he not tell that in 1309—the marts were full of merchandise, the libraries full of books, and Rome looked as if she was about to equal the splendour of the age of Augustus. Where were the 150,000 souls which the Popes left in Rome in 1309, where were they when they returned in 1371. Gone, gone nearly all gone! Of the 150,000 only 17,000 remained. Grass, says De Maistre, was growing in the streets, the cattle were browsing in the thoroughfares, commerce had fled the marts, while literature was almost destroyed, and science was no more. Gone, gone, all gone. The people were half starved, and yet the Pope left the “voluptuous” court at Avignon,

and gave up its seductive pleasures for the misery of Rome; they abandoned the limpid waters of the Rhone, for the muddy freshet of the Tiber. I am not prepared to say that the Court at Avignon was all it might be, but take it all in all I deny that history sustains the charge that it was “the most voluptuous in Europe.” I grant that some of the Popes were not the best of men, but what had that to do with the purity of the many. Was the sanctity of Christ in any way sullied by the presence of Judas in the apostolic college? Of the 250 Pontiffs who have been head of the Church how many were bad? What line of Kings in the world can show so clear a record, Can England or France, Germany or Spain, Russia, or Sultan point to so pure and virtuous a succession,—a succession which has supplied the world with testimonies of virtue and piety, and has left a record, take it all in all, a history to which civilized non-Pagan history furnishes a parallel. O if I chose to dwell upon the monarchs of merry England and compare them with the Popes, but I am here to-night simply to defend and I shall not be betrayed into a single word that would hurt the feelings of the most susceptible Protestant in Montreal. But I allow Voltaire, who cannot be accused of kindly feeling towards the “Romish” Church to give his testimony of the Popes of Rome he says:—

“The wealth which the Popes acquired was spent not in satisfying their own avarice and ambition, but in the most laudable works of charity and religion. They expended their treasure in giving hospitals to excited Bishops at Rome, and in feeding the poor. And I may here add that the same Popes have generously imitated the munificence of the early Pontiffs.”

Yes the glory of our Pontiffs has been attested to in a thousand ways. All the world has been forced to witness their piety and their zeal. The infidel Gibbon says of them that—

“The Pope's temporal authority, is now confirmed by the reverence of a thousand years, and their nobility is the free choice of a people whom they have redeemed from slavery.”

Yes, whatever abuses found, for a brief while, refuge in your ranks, they were quickly reformed, and the history of the Pontificate stands the proud monument of your virtue. You sent reformers over Europe—you sent missionaries to civilize mankind, and to-day you find a grateful and obedient people the testimony to your virtue and to your zeal. You sent forth your missionaries to preach God's truth in every corner of the earth, and the Gospel was carried wherever mankind found a refuge or made a home.

But I must go on. I come to the Lutheran secession, and I find the Rev. Mr. Bray saying that Luther bared the iniquities of the Church of Rome to the world. Now I shall say nothing of Luther to-night. I shall let him pass. I shall not tonight rake up counter charges against the Protestant Church, nor shall I revert to the persecutions which Catholics suffered in every country in the world, where the Lutheran secession became triumphant. My position to-night is purely defensive, and I have no desire to leave behind me any painful record of this lecture. There is now, at this moment, abundant chances of striking home at the reformers of the time. But I shall allow it to pass, and I sincerely hope that I shall not be compelled, in self-defence, to bared the doings to which the Catholic Church was subjected at the hands of Luther and his followers. But I may however speak of the Lutheran secession generally, and I am prepared to argue that the Lutheran secession may have impeded instead of having advanced the progress of civilization by introducing discord. If Europe had remained Catholic, most of the world would now be Christians. The Church of Rome civilized nations when the difficulties of travel and research were almost insuperable. Her missionaries penetrated every corner of the known world, when it took years to cross the deserts of Africa, and sea voyages were long and perilous and almost unknown. The sound of the missionary bell was heard on the shores of China when St. Francis Xavier had to tramp wildernesses to reach his goal. Yes, the world was fast becoming Christian when the Lutheran secession may have retarded its progress. If Europe had been Catholic, her Majesty's possessions in India would to-day scarcely be worshippers of Vishnu, or followers of Mahomed. The Catholic Church triumphed over Islamism in Europe, and if Europe had remained Catholic, it would in all probability have triumphed over Islamism in Asia. Yes, the Lutheran secession probably retarded the progress of civilization. About that time Catholic Europe was putting forth gigantic efforts to civilize the world. De Gama had doubled the Cape, Columbus had discovered America, Cortez penetrated a new world and took possession of its Capital, Magellan found a new passage to the Pacific—the spirit enterprise was everywhere abroad—Catholic Europe laid her right hand on the East and her left on the West.—the land of Tasso was joyous—and a Catholic Navigator, Sebastian D'Elcano, had made a tour of the Globe. But the Lutheran secession brought religious war, the nations were divided, civilization became paralyzed, and from that day to this it has been a social war between two different schisms which have sprung up all over the world. I do not say that civilization has been permanently retarded by the Lutheran secession, but I say it was for a time paralyzed, and that the progress made by the Catholic Church in the past warrants us in saying that the world might have been more advanced if that secession had never taken place. I now come to another theme which the Rev. Mr. Bray calls the course of the “Romish” Church—the plotting Jesuits. The poor Jesuits—terrible men—they always come in for their full share of denunciation. They have often been persecuted, and even for a time suppressed. In the last century Pombal of Portugal, the Bismarck of his time, was their bitter foe, just as the Bismarck of to-day is their unrelenting enemy. They were expelled Portugal, as they have been expelled Germany, and like the Popes, when they were expelled from Rome, they have always had an unhappy knack of coming back again. The “wicked, plotting” Jesuits have afforded our opponents a wondrous fund or small talk, and I was not at all surprised that the Rev. Mr. Bray should have taken them into his keeping. Whether the Jesuit is in Pekin, directing the observatory, or within the Arctic Circle, living on blubber and tallow candles, collecting manuscripts at the Vatican, or furnishing a meal for the frolicsome natives of New Zealand—whether he is kidnapping Indians on the prairies or savages on the pampas, it is all the same, there he is the plotting, terrible Jesuit. But let us look into what they have done. In no country in the world had the order of Jesuits, so much power as it had in Paraguay. There they were found in all their terrible authority—and what do we find as the result. Listen to what D'Alembert, who certainly was no friend to the order; but listen to what he says of those “plotting Jesuits” in Paraguay:—

“The Jesuits have acquired a monarchical authority in Paraguay, founded solely on opinion and on the mildness of their government. They make the people who obey them happy. What we know of their administration is a best eulogium, and perhaps makes it desirable, if what is said is true, that other barbarous countries where the people are oppressed and unhappy, should have the Jesuits for apostles and masters.”

Royal, a non-Catholic, writes in his “Histoire Philosophique”

“Nothing equals the purity of morals, the mild and tender zeal, the paternal care of the Jesuits of Paraguay. Each Jesuit is at once the real father and guide of his parishes. This authority is not felt, because he neither commands, forbids, nor punishes anything save what is commanded, forbidden, or punished by the religion that they all adore and cherish as he does himself.”

Buffon, the infidel, writes:—

“The missions have made more Christians among these barbarous nations than the victorious armies of the princes