

The following letter has been addressed to the *Daily Witness*:

## ORANGEISM.

TRUE WITNESS OFFICE,  
MONTREAL, May 8th, 1878.

To the Editor of the *Witness*.

SIR,—It appears to me that your paper was on a spree lately, for I cannot account for its eccentricities in any other way. A few days ago the *Witness* said that I had much improved in the tone of my writing towards Orangemen, and on Friday you came out with a flaming and libellous tirade against the "fire-eater," and openly accuse me of having sympathy with "midnight assassination." This is a serious charge and one which I must ask you to retract. Whoever wrote that article wrote in ignorance of the policy the TRUE WITNESS is pursuing, and in blind idolatry to that genius of Orangeism which has, and will do so much harm to Canada. I cannot believe that whoever penned that serious charge reads the TRUE WITNESS at all, but he must be one of those unthinking fanatics who gets his news second-hand, and always exaggerated. He says that I am in sympathy with "midnight assassination." How does he know it? What are his proofs? What have I said or done that a public journal should thus attempt to slander my character in the eyes of my fellow citizens? I shall make the issue clear.—Prove that I am guilty of sympathy with "midnight assassination"—prove that I have by act or deed expressed such sympathy or else stand convicted of publishing a calumny and a lie. This is the issue and upon the issue I shall hold you responsible before public opinion. You purport to take your authority from the TRUE WITNESS—come then and examine the files and make good your charge. You will find that in last week's number alone, I discountenanced assassination and all illegal acts; that I could not agree "with any acts of lawlessness." I fight *Orangeism* and not *Orangemen*, and the frothing enmity of Orangemen on the one hand, or the blandishments of my friends on the other, cannot induce me to alter that position. But I repeat that it is evident whoever wrote that vulgar article in the *Witness*, knows the TRUE WITNESS by hear-say, and not by experience. So far as Orangeism is concerned, I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of every word I ever penned about the order, but when I am denounced, all I ask is, that my words shall be quoted, and I ask you, now sir, to quote the article or articles, which prove me to be in sympathy with "midnight assassination." You speak too of my "abominable and gratuitous attack upon Protestant Missionaries." This is another calumny. I never attacked "a Protestant Missionary." I attacked the *Colporteurs*, and if you mean by them "Protestant Missionaries" then you give Protestant clergymen an insult which they do not deserve. Towards *Protestants* I have never yet used a discourteous word. I would as soon insult the Pope for being a Catholic, as I would insult a Protestant, clergyman, or layman, for being a Protestant. Nay, more, I have avoided publishing scandals in which Protestant clergymen were concerned. Lately, when a scandalous affair took place in Ottawa, I treated the subject with more mildness than you did yourself, and when the McCloskey scandal was believed in by every paper in the States, I said that every Christian, no matter what his religion, "will hope that Bishop McCloskey has been calumniated" or words to that effect. Later still when the Rine scandal was the talk of everybody the TRUE WITNESS was less severe than any paper in the city—and yet I am to hear of "abominable and gratuitous attacks upon Protestant missionaries." While only last week I declined to insert a scandalous affair about a young Protestant clergyman at Hamilton, named Bell, who admitted his guilt and left the city. Have you exercised as much forbearance towards Catholics. Let the columns of your paper answer. I glory in no one's shame, but you seek the occasion of parading men's misfortunes before the world. Nay I have denounced bigotry in Catholics more than once, for I hate bigotry wherever I find it, in friend or foe. But perhaps you think that the article I wrote on the death of Colligan was sufficient to brand me as an assassin. But why? You may think that Colligan met his death while in the pursuit of an illegal object. Of this there is not the shadow of evidence to sustain. On the contrary the evidence goes to prove that he was killed by one of the four who went over the bridge, and one of whom refused to say whether he fired or not, and two of whom have since left the city. I cannot see anything in the evidence so far given to associate Colligan with criminal intent, and until I do, I shall refuse to believe that he was guilty of intended violence, merely because the Orangemen say so. It is easy, sir, to make a charge of being in sympathy with "midnight assassinations," and

I cannot easily believe that you reflected upon the consequences of that charge when it was made. I have indeed grown somewhat accustomed to abuse, and all because I do my best to expose the history of the Orange order. The many calumnies that have been heaped upon me have but proved how rabid is the opposition of my antagonists, who do not fight me upon the issues before us, but who assail me with personal abuse. Calumny and falsehood have run riot with the tongues and brains of my enemies. At one time I was a fanatic; then I was a Fenian; and now I am a veritable "fire-eater," and all because I oppose Orangeism. I have indeed paid no attention to the many falsehoods that have been uttered about me. I know well I must fight my career for some time before I am understood, for Protestants in any numbers do not read my opinions, and so they get them second-hand, falsified and contorted. There is just one rumour that I wonder has not been circulated about me. Hitherto all the silly things said of me have failed in their intended effect, but why cannot some of my antagonists start a rumour that it would be difficult to prove not true—say provide me with half-a-dozen mothers in law. And now sir while I am upon the subject of Orangeism, may I ask space in your columns to give my reasons, and the reasons which all Catholics assign for their opposition to the order.

The difficulty we Catholics experience in reaching Protestant public opinion, induces me to ask this favour, for I am certain that many of our Protestant friends do not understand the causes of our antagonism to Orangeism, and they may be inclined to attribute to us motives which we repudiate and condemn. Above all things a frank understanding is desirable, and it is to endeavour to bring about that understanding that I venture to submit this letter to the consideration of those who differ from me in matters of faith. In the first place I would remind you that all Catholics, irrespective of position or attainments, oppose Orangeism. We are unanimous, and when such an effect can be produced upon the minds of educated and uneducated, rich and poor, there must be a cause. We are not all fanatics, nor can we all be charged with narrow-mindedness or bigotry. Many of us have travelled the world, met Jew and Gentile, Buddhist and free-thinker and yet from not one do you ever find the antagonism to Orangeism removed. In some that antagonism may be dormant, and may take shape only in the memory; while in others it is active, and arouses a passion which finds expression in acts of violence and lawlessness. It matters not what his station, whether he graduated at Oxford or McGill, or if he was "in a garret born and in a kitchen bred" yet wherever an Irish Catholic is found there stands a man who hates Orangeism, as we Catholics say "the devil hates holy-water." And now why is this? Is it because Orangemen are Protestants. Certainly not, for many of my own dearest friends, and the nearest of my kith and kin, are of the same creed. For my own part I have as much, or perhaps more, Protestant than Catholic blood in my veins and the man who could fall out with a Protestant, simply because of his religion, is only fit for a lunatic asylum. The question of Protestantism never enters our heads, nay we would, at least I certainly would, risk my life if necessary to vindicate Civil and Religious Liberty for any Protestant neighbour. We want no more persecution for the love of God, on any side, but we want instead a frank and manly tolerance of opinion, and freedom from insult for all. I am not aware that Catholics are ever charged with insulting Protestants. I have not heard of a single authenticated instance in which Catholics countenance any fanatic who might be mad enough to offend his Protestant neighbour. Nay I say more—Let the Protestants unanimously say that our demonstration on the 17th of March is insulting, and I, for my part would advocate the abandonment of our procession on that day. Or let Protestants unanimously say that any act of ours, which is not an act of principle, offends them and I shall advocate—surrender. To Protestant public opinion I would make any concession by which no article of faith or practice of Catholic dogma or national honour was violated. We who are to live shoulder to shoulder in Montreal should give and take, and I am sure that so far as Protestants and Catholics are concerned, there is a disposition to do.

The quarrel then is not between Protestants and Catholics; religion has, on our part, nothing to do with it. What then is the cause of the quarrel? Is it because William won a victory over James at the battle of the Boyne in 1690. Certainly not! We Catholics do not care a straw for all the 12th's of July that passed from 1690 up to the present hour. We are neither fanatics nor fools to trouble ourselves about a fight that took place one hundred and eighty years ago, and which, according to the English historian Smiles, was as much a victory,

so far as the courage displayed went, for one as it was for the other. We care neither for James nor William; unless indeed of the two we think King William was the better fellow, the more chivalrous, and broad-minded, and he was certainly the better soldier. King William was by no means as bad a fellow as his so-called followers wish to make him appear, and the many Catholics who fought in his army, testified to his generous spirit on many an occasion. He was not a good living man indeed, but he was, to my opinion, superior to "James the coward," as his antagonist is to this day called in Ireland. It may be hard to convince Orangemen that we Catholics feel thus, but ask the first Catholic you meet by accident, and if he does not answer you as I have surmised, then he will be an exception to every Catholic I have ever spoken to on the subject. The truth is we deprecate religious feuds, and we do not care the snap of a finger for the memory of either of the combatants of 12th of July, 1690.

Not being religious, nor because of the defeat of King James, what other reason can we have to determine object to Orange displays. I will tell you sir: It is because the history of Orangeism is choked with deeds of violence, and because to this day, they rejoice in flinging coarse and ribald insults into our teeth. If we are Catholics we cannot forget that we are men, and all the world over individuals and nations, resent insult when they can. But it may be considered that I write wildly—well I will prove what I say. In the first place the Orange organization is linked with tyranny, the most foul that ever disgraced a Christian community. If this is too strong, then Protestant gentlemen and Protestant noblemen are to blame, for from them alone I take my authority. Lord Gosford, the Governor of the County Armagh, a Protestant nobleman who was not marked by no kindly feeling towards the Catholics, writing of Orangemen called them "a band of thieves who commenced and carried on a persecution of atrocious cruelty; that neither ancient nor modern history could supply an example of the ruin and misery inflicted by Orangemen" and he added—"let this be marked well—that the only crime of the wretched objects of this ruthless persecution was, a profession of the Roman Catholic faith, or an intimate connection with a person of that faith." Let anyone read the report of the Parliamentary enquiry which took place in 1836. That document contains accounts of atrocious cruelties, which could fill columns. This document is now rare, but fortunately I have one in my possession, but I can only quote a passage or two. Here they are. The report of the Committee called the Orangemen, "A band of thieves who constituted themselves judges of this species of delinquencies, and the sentence they pronounced is equally concise and terrible; it is nothing less than a confiscation of all property, and immediate banishment." The report of the committee is a chapter of horrors, which would cause any evenly minded mind to despise the order—well let us for the present say—as it was in Ireland. Then we have the testimony of Sir John Barrington, who gives a catalogue of insults so gross as scarcely to be fit for publication.

Aye and the same, or similar, phrases are in use in Canada at this very hour. They insult and annoy us here as their fathers insulted, outraged and annoyed, the Catholics in Ireland. Here they would commit outrage if they dared; but they insult and annoy whenever and wherever they can. Surely we have a right to expect peace in this new country. The spirit of the age is in favour of allowing people to go their way in peace. But even that blessing is not to be allowed us in Canada. Our thoroughfares are disgraced with Party Tunes, one of which is:—

Holy water, sleet and slaughter,  
We'll trample the Papishes every one,  
Cut them asunder, we'll make them lie under,  
The Protestant boys will carry their own?

This is only one of hundreds of foul and insulting songs that are played, and one which the rabid portion of the Orange organization glory. This is the reason of our hostility, and I ask any fair minded man if any organization of Catholics behaved in such manner towards Protestants would not the manhood of Protestants be up in arms to resent the affront as best they could. All we ask is to be left FREE FROM INSULT; we insult no one, and no one should with impunity insult us. We do not sing "Protestants lie under" and the Orangemen sing "Croppies lie down." We do not strive for undue Catholic power as Orangemen strive for Protestant Ascendancy. They out-fag decency by bleating about "Civil and Religious Liberty," when their history belie their words. I challenge anyone to point to a single measure that was ever calculated to give "Civil and Religious Liberty" to Catholics that Orangemen did not oppose. Here is a plain issue. Let any reader of history point to a single measure that was likely to place Catholics on an equal footing with Protestants, and which Orangemen did not vehemently denounce and persistently oppose, and I will

confess myself defeated. No, the reading of history is all the other way. As early as 1792 when the Protestant patriot Henry Grattan was labouring to remove the disabilities under which the Catholics of Ireland then suffered; at a time when no Catholic could hold office, nor exercise the franchise, the Dublin Corporation, animated by the spirit which afterwards impelled Orangeism, protested against the proposed act in favour of the Catholics and declared that Protestant Ascendancy should be maintained even at the hazard of "the lives and fortunes" of the bigots of the day.

"And," said the document containing this declaration, in order that no doubt may remain of what we understand by the words Protestant Ascendancy, we have further resolved, that we consider Protestant Ascendancy to consist in—  
"A Protestant King of Ireland."  
"A Protestant Parliament."  
"A Protestant hierarchy."  
"Protestant electors and Government."  
"The benefits of justice."  
"The army and navy."  
"Through all their branches and details, Protestants and their system connected with the Protestant realm of Ireland."

Later still the Orangemen threatened to rebel when Catholic Emancipation became law.—The Order passed the following resolution immediately preceding Catholic Emancipation:—

Resolved—"That any Orangeman who ever has, or may hereafter sign any petition in favour of the Roman Catholics, and for their emancipation, be expelled from all Orange Lodges, and his name posted."

Later still Parson Flanagan declared that 100,000 Orangemen would "Kick the Queen's Crown into the Boyne" if the so called "Irish Church" was disestablished and disendowed. "Civil and Religious Liberty" is in the minds eye of an Orangeman simply Protestant Ascendancy. Perhaps you doubt it, if so then their oath belies them, for if her Majesty was—say owing to conscientious scruples whether right or wrong—if she was to become a Catholic the Orangemen according to their oath would be released from their allegiance at once. Thus we Catholics give our loyalty under circumstances which the Orangemen would rebel. With us it is God and Country first, with them it is the order above all. They are loyal only so long as it answers their purpose. Look back to 1823 when they mendaciously petitioned Parliament to have their ascendancy accorded official aid, and in 1828 when these "loyal" men conspired against the succession of Princess Victoria, in favour of Duke Earnest, a man who was in sympathy with the graft. These facts came to light by the Parliamentary enquiry to which I before alluded. This led to their suppression for a time. I could fill your paper over and over again with catalogues of their bigoted fury. In England the order is laughed at and despised by every respectable Protestant. It was only three or four weeks since the *Times* of London called them "the Bashi Bazouks of Ulster." I have never heard a respectable man defend them, except indeed the few who use them for political purposes.

In Ireland, as Richard Lalor Sheil said, "Orangeism has marked its progress in blood, in murder and in massacre," and it looks as if the same thing was to happen here. You ask that they should be protected and say that they have the right to flaunt all the insigni which conjures up their infamous history in our faces here in Canada. We come here to make a new home, and I am of opinion that no man who brings to this new country the feuds which disgraced Ireland, should be protected in his blackguardism. If Ribbonmen undertook to walk through our streets, calling to mind their broils and turmoil with the Orangemen of Ulster I would say the same. If St. Bartholemew's day was celebrated with honour, and the memory of Charles X. made the occasion of a jubilee; or if Catholics walked through our thoroughfares singing "Protestants lie down," &c., &c., I, and all my Catholic friends, would be among the first to resist such infamous work. Wherein then do we offend the Protestants of this Dominion? Some say the Catholic Union is a kind of Catholic Orangeism. But I fail to see it. The Catholic Union do not play insulting airs and it has no vicious history to rake up decades of injustice to those who differ from its members in matters of belief. But if the Protestants of Montreal—no Orangemen, mark you, for to them I would make no concession—but if respectable Protestants said "abolish both Catholic Union and Orange processions," I, for my part, would say, Yes. I cannot speak for the Catholic Union, for I am not a member of it; but I know the temper of my co-religionists sufficiently well to warrant me in saying that here in Canada they should be free from the insults of Orangemen, and until that time comes, peace is, I fear, not possible. All we ask is that if we are going to hell, let us go quietly without insulting us on the way. It is bad enough to have hell in prospective, but the Orangemen, and the *Witness*, wish to give us a touch of it here.

I am obediently yours,

M. W. KIRWAN.

## PERSONAL.

CRAWFORD—Mr. Sherman Crawford M. P. for county Down, Ireland is dead.

CHAMBERS—Alderman Chambers has been elected Mayor of Quebec, by a majority of votes.

HANLAN—PLAISTED—The rowing match between Hanlon and Plaisted takes place to-day.

COLLIGAN—The inquest on Colligan is still going on.

McNAMARA—It is thought that Mr. McNamara the ex-priest of New York will shortly deliver a lecture at Toronto.

LEO—The secular press is beginning to learn that Pope Leo is not the "Liberal" they took him to be.

McMAHON—Marshal McMahon has congratulated the Emperor William on his escapes from assassination.

BATTLE—Mr. Martin Battle, of Ottawa, has returned to Montreal, to accept a position on the *Evening Post*.

O'DONNELL—PARNELL—Messrs. O'Donnell and Parnell, kept the House of Commons sitting from four o'clock on Monday until 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, over the Irish Sunday Closing Bill.

LYNCH—On Thursday, the Minister of Education visited the chief Catholic schools in Toronto, in company with Archbishop Lynch and the mayor, besides the members of the separate school board.

GRENIER—According to Alderman Grenier, there are it appears, 150 Catholics, 57 of whom are Irishmen, and 52 Protestants in the Police Force of Montreal.

ROHLER—Rev. Father Rohler left Toronto on Thursday, for a tour through Europe. Previous to his departure he was waited upon by a number of his parishioners, and presented with a complimentary address and a purse of money.

THIBAUULT—Alderman Thibault, said that 6,000 stand of rifles have been imported into Montreal since last July. The inference is that they have been imported by the Catholic Union to resist the Orangemen. This is an alarming statement.

McMAHON—The "Shamrock," so named in compliment to Marshal McMahon, is the largest vessel ever built in a private shipyard in France, being more than 300 feet long. She had just been launched, and will be used to carry troops to and from Cochin China.

CONROY—Le *Courrier du Canada* says: "A rumor states that His Holiness Leo XIII. has chosen a successor for Mgr. Conroy in the Episcopal See of Argh, and has confirmed the latter in his position of Apostolic Delegate to America. Mgr. Conroy is at present in Omaha, but will return to Montreal in about a fortnight."

WALKER—Major Walker is to be the Reform candidate for London, Ont., at the general election. The *Montreal Gazette* says of him that his claim for the support of the constituency is because he is able to keep up "a running fire of corruption." This is hard on the "Major" as the *Gazette* calls him.

TICHBORNE—The admirers of the Tichborne claimant in England occasionally publish bulletins about him, as if he were a prince of the blood. The latest of these interesting productions declares that his hair is gray and longer than usual, that his face is getting fatter, and that his hands are sometimes warm. This is extremely gratifying. He still sticks to his old story, of course.

CUDDIHY—Father Cuddihy, of Milford, Mass., recently denounced the Ancient Order of Hibernians from his pulpit, and gave notice that his parishioners must choose between that Society and the Church, as all who cling to the former would be excommunicated after a given period. The time expires on Sunday, and great excitement prevails in the parish, both the priest and the Hibernians having, at latest accounts, announced their intention to stand firm.

JOHNSON—While two lawyers were discussing a point rather warmly before His Honor Mr. Justice Johnson yesterday morning in the Superior Court a wrangle ensued which was thus interrupted by His Honor:—Judge Johnson—Now, gentlemen, I must put a stop to this. I am not going to have the Superior Court room converted into a Graphic meeting or a House of Commons. And the smile provoked by the belligerent lawyers' word battle deepened and expanded into a laugh, joined in by all present, until it was repressed by the crier.—*Gazette*.

MEVY.—New York, Edmund Mevy, the recognized leader of the Commune in New York, and who is said to be the individual who caused the death of Archbishop D'Arby, of Paris, and the Chief of Police, was arraigned to-day, charged with threatening the life of Harry Marks an *attache* of the *World*. Marks had written several articles on the Commune, in which Mevy figured prominently. The latter has since threatened the life of the journalist who caused his arrest. Justice Smith soundly lectured Mevy, telling him the commune was not an institution of this country, and its principles would not be tolerated here. He held him in \$500 bail to keep the peace.

LAVELLE—The Rev. Patrick Lavelle, the well-known pastor of Cong. Galway, has written a letter in which he gives it to Dr. Ward for defending Lord Leitrim, and says: "I do not, indeed envy Dr. Ward in his new role of apologist of the late Lord Leitrim—for apologist he is, let him wriggle as he will. The old maxim, *Nihil de mortuis nisi bonum* is still young, and it were well that the infamous memory of the murdered Earl and of his ruthless career were set for ever at rest, but it ill-behooves an Irish Home Ruler (?) to grasp the cudgel in his defence, and that in vilifying attacking two of the most singleminded, straightforward and honorable members from Ireland. I myself could tell truths about the late Lord Leitrim's landlordism—about rent raising 500 per cent.—but I forbear. Meanwhile I advise Dr. Ward to fire his superfluous ammunition in other quarters than in the National ranks."

O'DONOVAN ROSSA—O'Donovan Rossa, in reply to the question, put to him by a New York reporter, "Is there any unusual activity in the Fenian Brotherhood just now? and, if so, is that activity prompted by the anticipation of England and Russia going to war?" replied: "To the first, I should answer yes; and to the second only measurably so. Of course it will be a good chance for us to attack England when she has her hands full with Russia. Even should peace be maintained between those rival powers, we would still deal the English lion our blow. The day has gone, by far, for the saying that 'England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity.' We have men now who propose to make the opportunity by creating the difficulty. There are intense hearts as there ever were, and could England and Russia open recruiting offices in this country, you would see Irishmen flocking to the Russian standard from a feeling of antagonism to England. Here, for one who would enlist under the Union Jack. It is probable, however, that they will have a chance at their old enemy without waiting to be recruited by Russia. We are nearly ready, and when the hour strikes the world will be surprised at our strength and what we will do.—*New York Paper*."