

PSO
1888
C 75 F

This is an exact copy of one of the Campaign Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the General Election Campaign of 1883. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1.) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2.) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3.) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1883, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.

FACTS FOR THE IRISH ELECTORS!

A Faithful Record of How the REFORMERS AND CONSERVATIVES HAVE TREATED THE IRISH PEOPLE.

The Franchise.

In a few days the Catholic electors of Ontario will be called on to vote for one of the political parties in this Province. Questions of grave importance will be placed before the people. They will be asked to consider the Boundary Award, the Streams Bill, the Licensing System, the Finances, and other questions of provincial interest. All these issues will be discussed from public platforms. The Catholic electors, as well as their fellow citizens of other creeds, will have an abundant opportunity of arriving at just conclusions on the merits of the two platforms before the people. Instructors on these subjects will be everywhere. The people will hear all the points in dispute like a thrice-told tale. But beyond these Boundary Awards, and Streams Bills, and Licensing Systems, and questions of Finance, who is to speak to the Catholic people as to the relative worth of the two parties, from a Catholic point of view? Few, if any, platform speakers will be bold enough to tell the world which of the two parties has been the best friend of civil rights and religious liberty for all. Few men will care to raise what is wrongly called the "sectarian cry." And yet, in this crisis, it is desirable that that "cry" should be raised; it is necessary for our own good that we all should know the party that has been the faithful sentinel of our interests, that we Catholics may act on the good old maxim of one good turn deserving another. As electors we are entitled to view, and exercise, the franchise from every standpoint. We have a right to consider it as it affects our principles in a religious sense, as well as how it affects our interests in a commercial way. Our hopes and fears, as Catholics, are dear to us, and it is desirable that we should know the history of the men who claim our support. As citizens, and as Catholics, we are free to vote for whom we please. A great leader of public opinion in this Province one time told us that we were "the slaves of Rome." That great leader spoke in his anger. He knew not what he said.

His Grace, the Illustrious Archbishop of Toronto,

knows better than the Hon. George Brown. In a letter written to Sir Alexander Galt, the Archbishop said:

"His Holiness the Pope will never pronounce *ex cathedra* what political party in the British Dominion, whether Whig or Tory, Conservative or Reform, the Catholics should follow."

Speaking of the priesthood as citizens, he said:

"It is desirable that the clergy shall mix as little as possible in secular politics and mere party warfare," and, "to be brief, the priest, in purely temporal matters, as a priest, has no concern."

This is high authority. It is irrefutable. It should satisfy the most sceptical and irrational that we are not "slaves of Rome." It should convince them that we are at liberty to do as we please in temporal affairs. But if these utterances of the illustrious prelate are added to each other, he gives us more. In the same letter he added:

"In this country, where men belong to two parties with the same principles, that is to say, government for the greater good of the people, clergy-men ought not to prostitute their sacred character for merely party purposes, or use the church and the altar as the battle ground for contending factions."

True, this principle is an old one. We find it in such high authorities as Saurez, the Bull of Boniface III., Pope Innocent III., Pius IX., Cardinal Manning, the late beloved Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Dr. Conroy, and Pope, Leo XIII. In all temporal matters, or in *extra finem ecclesie*, outside the church, Catholics can do just as they please. They are no more the "slaves of Rome" than they are the slaves of the moon, and while tendering their dutiful obedience to the church, in spiritual affairs, Catholics have the highest authority, down to his Grace of Toronto, for saying that on such questions as the franchise they are free to vote for whom they please. On that point there can be no dispute, and we refer to it only to prove how much our position is, by some people, misunderstood. Possessing this liberty, in whose favour are we, as Catholics, to exercise it? Let us see. In 1842 the Catholic people of this Province commenced a feeble agitation for

Separate Schools.

The Reform party of that day assailed our people in the slang of the pot-house and with the ribaldry of a cowboy. Fanaticism and rancour had taken the place of religion and manliness. We were only good to "build jails and fill them." Our priests were "petticoated gentry," and ourselves "the blood-hounds of Rome." Our religion was a "mummery of superstition," and our churches "Mass houses." During the long struggle from 1842 to 1863 the leaders of the Reform party thundered their abuse into our ears. They advised "a long rope and a short shrift for the Irish." The Catholics, and particularly the Irish Catholics of this province, can never forget it. The language of those days has been seared into their brains. They cannot forget how the Reform leaders told them that "Murder by an Irish Catholic is regarded as a virtue." We asked for Separate Schools, and they replied, "The sincere Papist is a cruel and a bloody man." We agitated for the right of bringing up our children according to our conscience, and we were received with yells of "No Popery." For nineteen years we fought for the privilege of having the education of our children placed under the spiritual guidance of our priests, and the Reformers told us that those same priests were "mere warty insects crawling in the chinks and spider-boles of society." No wonder

D'Arcy McGee

said that "Clear Gritism in bigotry and blasphemy outbids Orangeism itself." For nineteen years the struggle went on. Step by step we made slow progress. In 1850 the right of having Separate Schools was conceded, and in 1863 the battle was fought and won. In spite of all the blustering intolerance of the Reform party the *Conservatives* carried the *Separate School Bill* through the House of Assembly, and foremost in the ranks of those who fought for it we find the name of Sir John A. Macdonald, now Premier of the Dominion; and foremost against it we find the name of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, now Premier of Ontario. Let the Catholics of Ontario ask themselves who were their best friends then. Let them remember, too, that it was this same Reform party that opposed the incorporation of the Loretto Convent in 1857. The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie said that the people of this Province do not want these institutions here; our climate does not agree with them. But the Conservative party forced the measures through the House, while the Reform leaders bellowed, "More Popish Institutions." But that is not all. Sir John A. Macdonald did not stop here. He took charge of another Bill, which authorized the Clergy, Christian Brothers, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of St. Joseph, and other religious communities to take charge of the education of the Catholic youth. The sluice-gates of abuse were opened anew. The Grits denounced Protestant Conservatives for their liberality, and taunted the Orangemen with being "recrants who granted all the demands of the Popish hierarchy." The leaders of the Reform party asked—here are their words—"When will the absurd farce of a professing Protestant Association giving its aid to the machinations of the Romish hierarchy come to an end? Nor should it be forgotten that only one supporter of Sir John A. Macdonald voted against the Separate Schools, and not one Orangeman voted against the incorporation of St. Michael's College. The Reformers said that

"The most despicable of panders to the Romish priesthood in the House of Assembly, without exception, were the members who were sent to Parliament and retained their seats by Orange influence."

The Conservative party were with us to a man; and again may be well to ask: Who were the best friends of the Catholic people then? But still the fight continued. In 1866 the Hon. Mr. Langevin, a member of the Government, introduced a Bill which had for its object more concessions for the

Protestants of Quebec and the Catholics of Ontario.

But in order to understand the reason for introducing this Bill, it may be necessary to state that at this time the Protestant minority of Lower Canada had Normal Schools already supported out of the educational funds, while the Catholic minority of Upper Canada had none. The Protestant minority of Lower Canada had Grammar Schools and Industrial Colleges similarly sustained; the Catholic minority of Upper Canada had none. The Protestant minority of Lower Canada were represented in the Council of Public Instruction by five members; the Catholic minority of Upper Canada were represented by only one. The Catholic minority of Upper Canada numbered, in 1861, 258,141 souls; the Protestant minority of Lower Canada 162,212 souls. The Catholic minority of Upper Canada received less than one-fifth of the amount granted to the Lower Canada minority out of the public funds. Ten Catholic bishops met in Montreal and petitioned the Government that in the event of the bill passing the Catholic minority of Upper Canada should be given the same rights and privileges as those extended by the bill to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. In that petition the Catholic bishops admitted the right of the Protestants to watch over the education of their children, and the petition asked that all should be treated alike. What was the result? Twenty-five years of fanaticism and rancour had not been at work in vain, and the bill had to be withdrawn. The men who decried the "bloodhounds of Rome" had this one triumph and that, too, in spite of the liberal and generous efforts of Sir John A. Macdonald.

"If introduced with reference to Quebec alone," he said, "the bill would have passed, but as it is, even all the members of the Government from Upper Canada except myself, would vote against the bill."

Sir John was faithful to his trust. It was during this debate that he used the words:

"Gentlemen, the principles of civil and religious liberty must be vindicated; the Catholics of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec."

How these words remind us of the touching language of Grattan when he said:

"We Must Tolerate One Another."

No wonder his Grace, the learned Archbishop of Toronto, in a letter dated St. Catharines, July 9th, 1867, and directed to Father Jamot, said

"It would be an error for us to alienate ourselves from the party who were willing to grant the Catholics of Upper Canada all the educational rights that the minority of Lower Canada sought for themselves, which fair and just measure was rejected by the very men who now seek our patronage."

True to its history of opposition to "Popish institutions," the Reform party would have even sacrificed their co-religionists in Quebec, if that were necessary, rather than accept the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, and

"vindicate the principles of civil and religious liberty in Ontario." No compromise with "Popery," that was the password; that was the "Open Sesame" of success to Reform politicians; men whose narrow minds remind us of what Rabelais said of the man who "lived all his life in a barrel, and only saw the world through the bung-hole." The Archbishop told his people to stand by those who stood by them. In his letter he wrote as a citizen, not as a priest. He was exercising his right as an elector. He was not "prostituting his sacred character for merely party purposes, or using the church and the altar as the battle-ground for contending factions." His Grace was an elector, and as an elector he spoke and wrote, and had the right to speak and write, off the altar, as well as any voter in the land. But the fight did not end there. The Reform party was thwarted but not beaten. In 1867 they made another attempt to extinguish the

"Popish Institutions of Ontario."

In that year they raised the cry of the "Complete Separation of Church and State." This was a subtle blow at the Catholics again. They expected a grand rally to their reconstructed platform, which meant: Away with the Separate Schools, away with the House of Providence, away with the Good Shepherds, and away with every "Popish institution" that obtained money from the Provincial Treasury. No matter whether they rescued the unfortunate, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, attended the sick—these good priests and pious nuns, who trod the road of dusty death to benefit the human race—all had to go, for "Church and State," or the Reform party demanded it. As Mackenzie said: "The attempt here on the part of the Government does not agree with them," and they should go. Nor did their hostility end there. In 1873 there was another complication. In that year the

Orange Charter

came before the Legislature. Mr. Mowat voted for, and carried the Charter, by a majority of seventeen. Mr. Mowat, however, had grown subtle in his career. He was now stooping to conquer. The Irish Catholics were no longer hewers of wood, and drawers of water. They were making their power felt in elections, and the man who canvassed South Ontario to the music of "Vote for Mowat and no Popery," in 1857, had grown a little—not much—but a little wiser in his generation. He passed the Orange Charter, but was afraid to recommend its becoming law. He sent it to Sir John, and, with a callousness which outdid Annanias, he begged that it be disallowed. The measure he voted for, the Charter he passed through the house, he tried to strangle in the dark. He thought he would please the Orangemen by publicly recommending the passage of the Bill; he thought he would please the Catholics by privately choking it out of existence. The trick was discovered, its unconstitutionality exposed, and Oliver Mowat convicted in the eyes of public opinion of an attempt at political fraud. He tried to deceive the Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants alike. He played fast and loose with the Orange and Green. And so the Bill fell to the ground. The Orangemen were furious. They should be conciliated, and twelve months after the Hon. Mr. Mowat returned to his first love, and passed an "Act" respecting Provident and other Societies." This Act conveyed to the Orangemen all the powers that had been granted by the House to the Charter of the year before. It was simply Orange Incorporation under another name. It was another subtle attempt to deceive Catholics and Protestants alike. Mr. Mowat thought he would please the Catholics by leaving out the words "Orange Incorporation," and he thought he would please the Orangemen by granting them all the power they asked for. He was playing the old game of divide and conquer. He kept the Irish at each other's throats, and stole the pass-key to power, during the squabble. Here are his own words referred to above. He said:

"The general bill gave the Orange Societies a better means of incorporating than their own leaders were willing they should have. If the Grand Lodges have chosen to be incorporated there was no difficulty about the subordinate Lodges, and in the next session the difficulty had been removed by an amendment expressly providing that any branch of an incorporated society of the character aforesaid may be incorporated. It would be found, on comparing the two methods, that of the general Act and that of the special bill, that the former was the simplest, safest, and least expensive."

And yet it was "not Orange Incorporation." The rose by that name would not smell so sweet. He had incorporated Orangemen in a "simpler, safer, and less expensive" way than Orangemen themselves demanded—that was for the Orange societies; he had not granted Orange Incorporation and was the enemy of Orange incorporation; that was for the Catholics; and as the devil always beats the world at a barter, so did the Hon. Mr. Mowat succeed in deluding both sides of the House. There are thousands of Grit Orangemen who are the friends of the Reformers, and there are thousands of Grit Catholics who to this hour are under the impression that Mr. Mowat refused to incorporate the Orangemen. But let us see what he says about it himself. Speaking on the 7th of February, 1877, he said:

"In 1858, in the old Parliament of Canada, I voted for Orange incorporation; and here, in the first session, when I have the honour to occupy my present position, I have voted the same way, and I still thought the Orange body was entitled to incorporation if it desired it."

And yet he did not "incorporate" the Orangemen; he only passed an "Act respecting Benevolent and other Societies." But later still in 1878, we find him speaking in the Amphitheatre, Toronto, where he said:

"I voted for Orange Incorporation once, and I will vote for it again under similar circumstances. I am of opinion that the Orangemen, if they want incorporation, should have it."

Yes, but it must not be called "Orange Incorporation." The "Popish institutions" must not be so far offended; dust must be thrown in their eyes. The old feud must be kept alive at all hazards. The Irish must not be allowed to know each other better, for they might then like each other more. The battle-ground of strife must be kept cleared for action. From the first day the Hon. Mr. Mowat entered public life to this hour he has been the frank opponent of the Irish people, Protestant and Catholic alike. He and his friend, the Hon. Wm. Mc-

Dougall, that Lone Fisherman of political life in this country, have acted on the principle, as Mr. McDougall once said, that there should be

"No Irishman in the Cabinet."

He entered public life as a *protege* of the *Globe*. That journal damned him with praise. On December 14th, 1857, it said that he "represents sound principles," which meant, in the language of the Reformers of that day:

"Satey and vicious, ignorant beast; Nothing remains but to make him a priest."

Of course the *Globe* applauded him. It is said that he could

"Satisfy the most unreasonable, that he was sound on all the great questions of the day."

which meant the "warty insects," the "mass houses," and the "holy dolls." He was *sound* because he opposed the Irish then as he does now. He was in accord with the "principles" of the Reform party, which were again in the words of the Reform leaders:

"The people of South Ontario will be called upon to decide whether the ideas which are to rule this great country are to be those of the Lower Canada priest-ridden party, or the Upper Canada Liberal party."

Those were the "principles" under which the Hon. Mr. Mowat made his bow in the House of Assembly. Has he changed?

The Hon. Mr. Fraser

says he has. But the Hon. Mr. Fraser is not an impartial witness. Let us see if the Hon. Oliver Mowat of 1883 is not the same Hon. Oliver Mowat of 1857. It is an accepted practice in this country that the Cabinets of the Dominion and the Provincial Governments shall be formed with a view to give each of the largest creeds and nationalities representatives in these bodies. It is a wise and statesmanlike custom. It is fair to all. In the Cabinet of the Dominion, the French-Canadians, the Irish Catholics, the Protestants and others are represented, and their representatives hold their position, because of the relation they bear toward certain sections of the community. In the Cabinet of Quebec it is the same. The Protestant minority and the Irish Catholics are represented in the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mousseau. But in the Cabinet of the Hon. Mr. Mowat this is not so. There the policy is, "No Irish need apply." Protestant and Catholic are treated alike. The Hon. Mr. Fraser tells us that he is a "Canadian." He repudiates the Irish. Here are his words. Speaking at Dunville in 1879, he said:

"I suggested that all this wrangling about Scotch and English and Irish should be an entire forgetfulness of those who called themselves Canadians. (Cheers.) I pointed out, moreover, that so long ago as 1857, more than one-half of the population of this Province was native Canadian born, and in 1871 three-fourths were native Canadians. I said if representation was to be regulated and directed, and governed by nationality, there should be some consideration given to those whose nationality was Canadian." (Applause.)

But the Hon. Mr. Fraser appears to forget that were it not for all this "wrangling" he would not now be where he is. It is this "wrangling" about what he decries—"Catholic representation"—that placed him in the position he occupies. He owes that position to the Irish Catholic people, and their reward is that he preaches a species of Know-nothingism in reply. Sir John A. Macdonald gives us representation, treats us liberally, gives our people some of the best positions in the Dominion; the Catholic Mr. Fraser decries all agitation for Catholic representation in the Dominion. It is time for the Catholic of Ontario to thoroughly understand the issue. According to Mr. Fraser's own account he does not represent the Catholics of Ontario, and it is better that they should know it. In another part of his speech he said:

"I trust that nothing more will be heard of Catholic representation or Scotch domination."

We hope the Hon. Mr. Fraser will be disappointed. The cry of "Catholic representation" should be continued. It has been on the whole, fairly successful; we should make it more so. He may hear it so long as the Reform party denies the Catholic their fair share of representation in the councils of the people and the emoluments of office. The Hon. Mr. Fraser owes a good deal to the Catholics of Ontario, and he should be willing to echo the words of Sir John A. Macdonald:

"Gentlemen, the principle of civil and religious liberty must be vindicated; the Catholic people of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec."

Does the Hon. Mr. Fraser forget that the Protestant minority of Quebec, with a population of 189,399, is guaranteed twelve representatives in the House of Commons by the British North America Act; while the Catholic minority of Ontario, with a population of 328,839, has no guarantee at all. We rejoice at the representation the Protestant minority of Quebec has in the affairs of the Dominion. We are glad to know that apart from the twelve constituencies that are guaranteed, there are others that return Protestants as well. Here are the facts as given by the census of 1881:

	Catholics.	All others.	Total.
Population of Quebec....	1,170,718	189,399	1,359,927
Population of Ontario....	328,839	1,603,389	1,932,228

Thus we see that the Catholics of Ontario are *one-sixth* the total population, and have no guarantees; while the Protestants of Quebec are only about *one-seventh* the total population, and they are guaranteed twelve M.P.'s in the House of Commons! And yet Mr. Fraser tells the Catholic people that he wants to hear no more of "Catholic Representation." We do not ask for an amendment to the Constitution. We do not want any remodelling of the British North America Act. All we want is that what is *law* in Quebec should be *custom* here—fair representation for the minority. Sir John A. Macdonald says that the Catholics of Ontario are entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec; but Mr. Fraser says, in effect, "No, they are not." He will not have any "wrangling" about the subject at all. Better, he implies, that we should accept the situation, than raise what our enemies call the "sectarian cry." We repeat that we rejoice at the liberty the Protestants of Quebec enjoy. We would not rob them of the smallest share of it. We would, if justice demanded it, give them more rights and privileges than they even

⚡ This is an exact copy of one of the Campaign Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the General Election Campaign of 1883. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1.) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2.) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3.) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1883, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.

now possess. There is no room in this Dominion for religious ascendancy. But as we are willing that that principle should be applied to others, so do we wish it to be applied to ourselves. The Catholics of Ontario are "entitled to the same rights and privileges as the Protestants of Quebec" equal rights for all—and until they are obtained the agitation to secure them will, we hope, be continued. Nor does Mr. Fraser's analysis of the population by nationality meet the situation. He says "that in 1871 three-fourths of the population were native Canadians. Perhaps so; but they were "French Canadians," "Irish Canadians," "Scotch Canadians," and other nationalities. Many of the men that he calls "Native Canadians" call themselves "Irish Canadians," and they ought to be the best judge. To call them "native Canadians" does away with the demand for Irish Catholic representation! It is the barrier in the way; that is the thing we must not "wangle" about. But that is just the thing we hope our people will "wangle" about until they obtain that measure of fair play to which their numbers, their wealth, and their intelligence justly entitle them to. These "Irish Canadians" are just as loyal to the country they live in as any "native" in the land, and no friend of theirs will tell them to cease "wangling" for representation in the Councils of the people. If the Catholics of Canada ever get their religious Runnymede it will only be by doing that which Mr. Fraser says they ought not to do—"wangle" for it.

But the Hon. Mr. Fraser goes further. At a banquet given to him at the Rossin House, Toronto, he said:

"I am free to say here, in the presence of my chief, that I would be willing to quit public life to-morrow, and confidently leave the interests of my co-religionists in the hands of Mr. Mowat, so certain am I that absolute fair play would be given my people, so long as the man who sits there leads the Legislature of Ontario."

And all this is said of the man "who sat there" and voted for Orange Incorporation in 1859; who "sat there" and voted against the Separate Schools in 1863; who backed up the "principle" the "sound principle" of "No Popery" and the "Mass houses," who deceived the Catholics by "incorporating" Orangism; and who deceived the Orangemen by advising the "disallowance" of the bill! Most men have three characters: that which they show, that which they think they have, and that which they really have. The "show" character of the Hon. Mr. Mowat is a pretence at liberty? what character he "thinks" he has we do not know; what character he "really" has, his record as a politician tells. Mr. Fraser may be "willing to trust the interests of his co-religionists" to such a man, but the Catholics, and particularly the Irish Catholics of Ontario, we believe, will not. The Catholics of this Province can never have confidence in Oliver Mowat. He has always been their enemy. How different the language of

W. R. Meredith,

the leader of the Local Opposition, the son of an Irish Protestant. This man comes of a liberal stock. His father bequeathed \$500 to the Sisters of Mount Hope Orphan Asylum, London. The son of such a man must have breathed an atmosphere of liberal opinions. W. R. Meredith in 1833 echoed similar words to those used by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1866. He said in his place in the Local Legislature in January of the present year:

"I recognize the right of the Catholics in this country to fair play. Any one who would adopt any other course was not a true Canadian. I recognize the right of the Catholic authorities to give their advice, and to make enquiry with respect to what books are used in our High Schools in which the children might be taught."

Compare this with the "Bloodhounds of Rome"—opposition to the Separate Schools, the fight against St. Michael's College, the vote and the no vote for Orange Incorporation, the Scotch exclusiveness of the Cabinet, and, as we shall prove further on, the denial of our people a fair share of the emoluments of office. Mr. Meredith would, if returned to power, take an Irish Catholic into his Cabinet; Mr. Mowat "wants no Irishman" in his Ministry. Yes, McGee was right. There can be no doubt about it. For

"Bigotry and intolerance Clear Gritism outbids Orangism itself."

Conservatism has taken the bigotry out of many Irish Orangemen; Reform "principles" only fixes it on the more strongly. The "Reformer" in Canada would be a "Tory" in Ireland. The Scotch Grit is, and has been, the open antagonist of everything Catholic; the Irish Orangemen often, very often, voted for Catholic measures one after the other. The Scotch Grit of to-day may not be as fanatical as his fathers were at the battle of Drumclog, immortalized in "Old Mortality," when the Covenanters charged, with the Bible in one hand and a sword in the other, to the cry of "Jesus and no quarter." They may not stand enthusiastically by the Covenant, that document that teaches that the

"Papists are now damned and confuted," "that our Sacraments are five bastard Sacraments," and that speak of the "Roman Anti-Christ."

But there may be too much of the old fire left. The world has out-grown intolerance such as this. Bigotry has seen its worst days. We are no lovers of Orangism. As Catholics we cannot be. But whatever we may think of the institution, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that Orangemen have often voted for Catholic measures with refreshing liberality. The feuds of past decades are dying out forever. A spirit of tolerance is abroad. "Hating each other for the love of God" is becoming a thing of the past, and were it not for the "principles" of the Reform party and their bitter opposition to Catholic rights the people in Canada would now be living under conditions which would remind us that the day was coming—

"When man to man the world o'er,
Will brothers be for all that."

But some people say that the Reform party is "friendly to Catholic interests now." They tell us that the Reformers of Ontario hold the same relation to the Catholic people of this Province as that held by the Conservatives to the Catholic people of the Dominion; but let us see:

In the Department of Education, Toronto, there are fifty-eight employes, who cost the country about \$48,000 a year, and there is only

One Catholic in the Department,

and he was appointed before Mr. Crooks took charge of his present office.

In the Registrar-General's office there never has been a Catholic permanently employed within its walls.

In the Treasurer's Department, Toronto, there are \$15,000 a year spent in salaries, two getting \$2,000 each, one \$1,800, one \$1,400, one \$1,200 two \$1,100, and so on, all of whom are Protestants! down to the Messenger, the solitary Catholic employed in the Department, and he gets just \$300 per annum.

Mr. Mowat's Department has not a Catholic appointed by him.

Mr. Hardy has not appointed a Catholic to his Department since he came into power.

Mr. Pardee has not appointed a Catholic since he became Minister of Crown Lands.

Mr. Fraser has appointed two Catholics—only two—to permanent inside positions in his Department since he became Minister of Public Works.

The Insane Asylum, London, costs in salaries, \$12,000 a year, out of which the Catholics get \$300.

The Agricultural College, Guelph, costs in salaries \$11,200 a year, of which the Catholics get \$600.

In the Department of Immigration there is not a Catholic permanently employed.

The Catholics are made "housekeepers," "messengers," and other hewers of wood and drawers of water by the "friendly Government," that is the sum and substance of it all.

Or let us take some of the recent appointments made by the Mowat Government, and we see the same story—the same antagonism to Irish Catholics; the same old hostility in another form.

Protestants.	Per Year.
A. H. Dymond	\$2,000
Mr. Lamont	2,000
Mr. Smith	2,000
Mr. Hunter	2,000
Mr. Kirkpatrick	1,800
(This gentleman succeeded a Catholic, Mr. Devine.)	
Mr. McKeenish	3,000
Captain Purdy	1,200
Mr. Symers	1,200
Mr. Laird and wife	1,200
Mr. Thomas	800
Mr. Laird	500
Mr. Mann	500
Mr. Baiselo	1,000
Mr. Strang	800

And what do the Catholic champions of the Mowat Government say to that? We may be told that we have forgotten Mr. McCrossen, of Penetanguishene. Not at all. Mr. McCrossen succeeds a Catholic, Mr. Kelly. It would hardly do to turn the Catholics out altogether. As for Mr. Merrick's appointment to the Shirievault of Prescott, it is more honorary than beneficial, more showy than remunerative. Now, we are not a race of office seekers. We do not wish to see our people "bend the supple hinges of the knee that thrift may follow fawning." We ask no favours because we are Catholics—or Irishmen, but we protest, and will continue to protest, when we are excluded from place or power because of the religion we profess or the country we come from. We do not advocate the rights of Catholicism "sectarian" grounds but on the principle for which men have fought in all ages—equality before the law—civil and religious liberty. When taxed to support the State, the Catholic is as much entitled to the good things that are going as anyone else. Nor will the Orange cry do duty again. That issue blinded us in 1879. It will do so no longer. There is something dearer and nearer to us now—equal rights for all. This is just what the Mowat Government denies us. It is the old record in a new form. It is crushing the "Papists" in another way. It is to the pockets of many Catholics what the "Separate Schools" were to their principles. The Catholics of Ontario should not be led away by false issues. We give the facts, from the parliamentary returns, and no one can honestly contradict them. But see how the

Conservatives have Treated the Catholics

all over the Dominion. Let us compare the two balance sheets and give an impartial answer. In 1871 the Catholic League was formed. It had for its object the winning of Catholic representation for the Catholic people. It brought the Globe to its marrow bones, the late Hon. George Brown promised everything. He promised the leaders of the league representation according to population. The Conservatives would not be bound by any promises at all. The result was that many Catholics became Reformers, only to be betrayed. It was mainly owing to the "Catholic vote" that the Reformers were returned to power in 1874. It was, in a large measure, because of the promises the Reformers made to the Catholics, that they sat on the Treasury Benches. Before that Reform triumph the Hon. John O'Donohue said that if the Reformer's were not true to their promises he would be one of the first men to throw them overboard. Well, the Reformers triumphed, and with what result? During the whole of Mr. Mackenzie's term of office not one Catholic was appointed to the Bench! He won the support of some Catholics by promises of fair play. He told them that he would take an Irish Catholic into the Cabinet; but like the Hon. Mr. Mowat, he took a Scotch Catholic, or a "Canadian" instead. He dares not face the howl of anger from his supporters, when it was hinted that the Catholics would like to see the Hon. Mr. Anglin in the Ministry. During his four years of power he shut the door in the face of the "Catholic place hunters." He almost caused a political free fight in Montreal when he appointed an Irish Catholic Chief of the Water Police at a salary of \$1,200 a year, and that, too, in place of another Catholic who had died. The late Mr. Devlin, M.P., was told by some irate Scotch Reformers in Montreal that that appointment might cost him his seat in the House of Commons. Like begets like, and it was "No Popery" working in secret both in Ontario and the Dominion. Scotch ascendancy was crowding us out, and the Catholics of the country saw it. In 1878 they resented this exclusiveness, and had their revenge. They taught the Reform party that the day for "using" the

☞ This is an exact copy of one of the Campaign Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the General Election Campaign of 1883. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1.) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2.) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3.) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1883, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.

"Catholic vote" was at an end. Four years of Reform Rule was enough for them. During these four years the Catholic people of the Dominion, like Milton, "had fallen on evil days." The

Hon. John O'Donohoe,

true to his promise, was one of the first men to abandon the Reformers. He resolved to resent the betrayal of Catholic interests. After a life-long devotion to Irish and Catholic principles, the Hon. John O'Donohoe could not see his co-religionists and countrymen betrayed without protesting against the betrayers. The worm had been trod upon; it turned to sting. Thousands of Catholics did the same, and in 1878 a change came, and with that change a new state of affairs. The Conservative party reversed the picture. Step by step they have shown that "the principles of civil and religious liberty" are as dear to them to-day as they were in '55, '57, '63, '65, or '66. Let the friends of the Reform party point to such appointments made on their side as Conservatives can on theirs. Did the Reformers ever make such appointments as Mr. Moore Kelly, Penetanguishene; Mr. T. J. O'Neill, Inspector of Prisons; succeeded by Moylan, Inspector of Prisons; French, Inspector of Post-Offices; McGee, Deputy-Administrator, about \$4,000 a year; Judges Power, McGuire, Que.; Walters, N.B.; Dogherty, Fitzgerald, Macarow, McKeagney (Manitoba); Macdonald, or, last of all, Judge B. L. Doyle, of Huron. Mr. Mackenzie threw the Catholics a few crumbs of office, while they might, for all he cared, starve for the big loaf. Look at the positions our people have been given under Sir John A. Macdonald: M. P. Ryan is made Collector of Customs in Montreal, one of the best positions in the Dominion, and said to be worth \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year. With two pronounced Irish Catholics in the Cabinet, with the recollections of the Costigan resolutions in favour of Home Rule, and the \$100,000 voted by the Conservative Government when Ireland was weeping under the affliction of a famine, the Irishman—Catholic or Protestant—must be dead to all generous impulse if he refuses to lend a helping hand to a friend, who, in the dark hours of our history, stood loyally by our side. *Sir John has always had an Irish Catholic in his Cabinet.* In 1847 he had Sir Dominick Daly, father of the present member for Halifax. In 1854 he had the late Judge Drummond, of Montreal. Then Charles Alleen, now Sheriff of Quebec. Then D'Arcy McGee. Then Sir Edmund Kenny, of Halifax. Then John O'Connor. And now John Costigan and Frank Smith. Besides these are Senators T. Ryan, Montreal; W. Miller, Nova Scotia; J. Dever, N.B.; Frank Smith, Toronto; G. Howlan, P.E.I.; John O'Donohoe, Toronto. Compare the records and answer, Which of the two parties has done the most for our people? Can we forget how the party that sent

Six Catholic Conservative M.P.'s

from this Province to Ottawa, and the party that sent none? Can we forget that there is not one Catholic Reformer from this Province in the Dominion House of Commons? Can we forget how that same Reform party treated Prof. O'Donoghue in 1876? The two "murderers, Riel and Lepine," were sent across the lines for five years; the "felon," O'Donoghue, who was not even charged with "murder," was banished for ever. Do we not remember how the Reformers did not budge an inch until Laurier, the leader of the French Liberals, had been beaten in his own county? Then, indeed, but not till then, did the Reformers begin to yield. Two days before Laurier stood for Quebec East a partial amnesty was given to O'Donoghue, and why? Because the Irish of Quebec called for "amnesty," and Mackenzie knew that there should be some compromise made, or Laurier would be defeated.

The Irish Catholics of Canada cannot easily forget the struggle the Hon. John Costigan made for O'Donoghue, supported by the "Orangemen" White, of Hastings, who, with generous candour, said that O'Donoghue was persecuted because of his nationality. As for the doings of Hon. John Costigan, they are familiar to the Irish people generally. He has won and retains their confidence and esteem. His name is synonymous with everything that is calculated to elevate his people socially, politically, and commercially. From such a man we all expected the ring of true steel, and were not disappointed. But Mr. White, of Hastings, is not so well known; and yet he ought to be. Kindness begets kindness all over the world. "Gentle when stroked, fierce when provoked," may be taken as the motto of more than a Geraldine. On the 23rd of March, 1876, Mr. White said:

"If O'Donoghue had nothing to do with the death of Scott, he was more entitled to amnesty than those who got it. Like many other poor Irishmen, O'Donoghue was caught in a trap, while those who investigated him into the position were allowed to go free."

But it was all unavailing. The Government of Mackenzie was hostile, and O'Donoghue died in exile, a beggar. Can the Irish Catholics of Canada forget these things?

And as it was in Manitoba and Ontario, so it was in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. From the Red River to the Atlantic is a long stride, and yet we find the same old story—opposition to "Popish Institutions" everywhere. The *Charlottetown Herald* (Catholic) said previous to the last elections in that Island:

"They (the Reformers) have swept the last vestige of Catholic office-holders from the official domain, and established a Protestant wherever they can."

And this, too, in a Province where the population is nearly half Catholic. But how is it now? The Grits have been defeated, the Conservatives are in power, and a

Catholic Conservative (Sullivan) is Premier of the Island!

After these elections the same paper said:

"For three years before that the Catholics were a proscribed race. Religious equality is now a recognized principle in the form of Government."

During the Reformers' regime "the last vestige of Catholic office-holders" was "swept away." During the Conservative regime "religious equality" was a "recognized principle in the form of Government."

But how do we find it now? Let the Catholic electors of this Province put the question to their own conscience and answer. Powerless to bite, the Reform party even

challenge any statement it contains, and to give them an

in these days occasionally shows its fangs in agony. It was only in the beginning of January in the present year that the *Montreal Herald*, that faithful sleuth-hound of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, said that

"The murderer Mann had the courage of his convictions; the coward Davitt had not. One was bold in his villainy; the other was a sneaking assassin, who feigned orders to commit murders he had not the courage to do himself."

How like the days of the rampant Protestant horse. How it reminds us of the Reform action against O'Donohoe "because he was an Irishman." We can smile at these attacks now. We have grown strong, and like the wise man of Horace we can remain unmoved.

Our history is a fight against calumny. The weakness among our own people often "learn to betray." They do it in Toronto. Take the two "manifestos"—one by Senators Smith and O'Donohoe, and the other by four *professing* Irishmen. See how the two Senators are misrepresented. Here is what the first manifesto said—the one written by Messrs. Smith and O'Donohoe:

"At the outset they desire to state their complete confidence in the wisdom of your Lordships as the guardians of Catholic faith and morals in this Province; and in regard to the recent controversy concerning the character of the text-books to be used in the matriculation examinations for the High Schools and University, they submit to any decision of the authorities of the Church."

And yet, in face of that "submission" in presence of that obedience to the authority of his Grace and the Catholic Bishops of the Province "as the guardians of Catholic faith and morals," this "counter manifesto" said that:

"Had Senators Smith and O'Donohoe ranged themselves on the side of your Grace in condemning the introduction of what you deemed objectionable literature in the High Schools and University, then, indeed, might they have claimed to be on the side of Catholic interests in the Senate."

Now, mark, the manifesto of Senators Smith and O'Donohoe was published on the 30TH OF OCTOBER. It was in nearly every paper in Canada on the 31st of October. They were the first to take up the cudgels for his Grace. They expressed confidence in his "wisdom"; they accepted him as the "guardian of Catholic faith and morals"; they said that he and the other bishops were the best judges of what "text-books" should "be used in the matriculation examinations for the High Schools and University," and that they would "submit to any decision of the authorities of the Church" on questions of faith and morals; and yet, on NOVEMBER 17TH, EIGHTEEN DAYS AFTER the manifesto of Senators Smith and O'Donohoe had appeared, these four irate politicians had the coarseness to say:

"Had Senators Smith and O'Donohoe ranged themselves on the side of your Grace in condemning the introduction of objectionable literature," &c.

Who first "condemned" the "objectionable" literature but Messrs. Smith and O'Donohoe? Where were Messrs. Ryan, O'Connor, Cassidy and Doherty for the EIGHTEEN DAYS after Messrs. Smith and O'Donohoe had "ranged themselves" on the Archbishop's side? As for some of the signers of the "counter manifesto," they do not believe in Catholic representation at all. Mr. Ryan openly condemns it. He expresses contempt for any man who seeks for "Catholic representation." We must all be "Canadians"—that is the platform of Peter Ryan. It will not do to be Irish Canadians or English Canadians—nothing but full-blooded "native" will answer this "Englishman with an Irish name."

Daniel O'Connell

told the Irish people, when they thirsted for political reform, to "agitate," "agitate." He told them that agitation was the shadow of those coming events, political and religious emancipation. He pointed out how it prepared the public mind for mental revolution; how it broke down the barriers of prejudice and caste; how it purified social and political existence. Agitation emancipated the Catholics, altered the system of collecting the tithes, disestablished and disendowed the "Irish Church," obtained two Land Bills, and is now in fair way of winning a peasant proprietary and Home Rule for Ireland. When Ireland slumbered there was no reform; when Ireland awoke she wrung redress—scant, perhaps, but still redress, from her rulers. And what is true of the old land, in this respect, is true of the new. As we were treated at home, so the Reform party in Canada thought we should be treated here. The world had not grown accustomed to treat us as freemen and equals. For years we accepted the situation. We were broken in spirit and irresolute in action. We neglected to "agitate," "agitate." But the Catholic League, and the spirited policy of the Irish Catholic press of Canada, have changed all this. They have almost put an end to the blustering intolerance of two past decades. They have scorched the men who called us "the bloodhounds of Rome"; we must now politically kill them. We do not now hear of "a long rope and a short shrive for the Irish." We "agitated" and stopped the abuse.

Until we agitated for redress in Canada we had none of the advantages of Catholic emancipation. We were taxed to support a State in the making of whose laws we had no voice. We lived in an atmosphere which the Reform party made as dark and hostile as the days of penal prosecution. The spirit of liberty travelled but slowly across the ocean. Then Irish Catholics in Ireland were emancipated in 1829; the Irish Catholics in Canada are not fully emancipated in custom yet. Until 1878 they had votes, but little or no representation. But they told both parties that representation was the price of their suffrage; they kept their word, and they won. What it has done in the past it can do in the present, bring our enemies to their bearings. Let us remember who those enemies are. The cry of "Orange incorporation" should deceive us no longer. We point to acts, living acts, and not sentimental grievances, for cause and effect. Scotch exclusiveness should be fought foot by foot. We want to see Irishmen take their proper place in this Province. We want to see an Irish Catholic and an Irish Protestant in the Local Cabinet. We want to see Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants, as tax-payers, receive their fair share of the emoluments of office. We want to see our people register their votes for those who have been their best friends, and keep in mind the stirring apothegm of Byron: "They who would be free, themselves must strike the blow."

A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT has been sent to each member of the Ontario Government, in order to opportunity of answering it—IF THEY CAN.

This is an exact copy of one of the Campaign Sheets issued by the Tories for distribution during the General Election Campaign of 1883. It is devoted to attacking and arraigning the Mowat Government for alleged gross injustice to the Irish Catholics. (1.) This sheet was prepared by a gentleman then in the employ of the Tory party. (2.) He received his salary through the Tory organizer, H. H. Smith, of Peterboro'. (3.) C. W. Bunting, of the "Mail," gave instructions as to the character and scope of the Document. (4.) Sir John Macdonald, W. R. Meredith, and C. W. Bunting were each handed proofs of the sheets. (5.) Each made suggestions as to the alterations necessary to make the appeal more complete, and (6.) Each gave special orders that it should be very largely circulated among the Irish Catholics.

Electors read it carefully, and then decide for yourselves whether the political leaders, who were the authors of such a document, can be regarded as the champions of Protestantism, or even worthy of the slightest degree of respect or confidence by the Electorate of Canada. In 1883, to try to serve a point, they allege the Government to be ultra Protestant. In 1886 they allege that the same Administration is ultra Catholic.