

# The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY,  
AT  
662½ CRAIG STREET.  
M. W. KIRWAN—EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.  
Terms—\$2.00 per annum—in Advance  
MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 5.

## CALENDAR—SEPTEMBER, 1877.

WEDNESDAY, 5th.—St. Lawrence Justinian, Bishop and Confessor.  
First Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia, 1774.  
THURSDAY, 6th.—Office of the Blessed Sacrament.  
O'Connell and Repeal Prisoners liberated, 1844.  
Fergus O'Connor died, 1855.  
FRIDAY, 7th.—Feria.  
SATURDAY, 8th.—NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. St. Adrian, Martyr.  
Malakoff and Sebastopol taken 1855.  
Surrender of Humbert at Ballinacuck, 1798.  
John Martin born at Loughorne, Co. Down, 1812.  
SUNDAY, 9th.—SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST.  
HOLY NAME OF MARY. St. Gorgonius, Martyr.  
Murrough O'Brien, Earl of Inchiquin ("Murrough an tOshane") died, 1674.  
MONDAY, 10th.—St. Nicholas of Tolentino, Confessor.  
TUESDAY, 11th.—Of the Octave. SS. Protus and Hyacinthus, Martyrs.  
Massacre at Drogheda by Cromwell, 1649.

## NOTICE.

St. Jean Baptiste Village Infantry Company.  
The members of the above Company will assemble at 662½ Craig St., on SATURDAY EVENING, the EIGHT inst., at HALF PAST SEVEN, for the purpose of being measured for uniform.

(By Order,)

M. W. KIRWAN,  
Capt. Commanding.

## TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We must request our subscribers to see to their accounts. This is the first time since the paper has changed hands that our subscribers have been reminded of their obligations, and such of them as are in arrears will oblige by forwarding their subscriptions. We do not care about dunning our readers, but it is necessary to remind them from time to time that we must all pay our way as we go along.

## "AN IRISH CATHOLIC."

We beg to call the attention of our readers to the splendid letter from "An Irish Catholic," which we publish in another column. All we ask our friends is to ponder well upon the words of this spirited and elevating letter. The writer's name we cannot give, but let his words speak to us, and let us thank God that we have such men in our midst.

## THE PROPOSED PILGRIMAGE TO ST. ANN'S.

The Catholic Young Men's Society of Montreal are organizing a pilgrimage to St. Ann's. The advertisement will be found in another column. This pilgrimage is organized with the sanction of the clergy, and a priest from St. Patrick's will accompany it. It will partake of a purely religious character, and will, we are sure, be largely patronized by the Catholics of the city. The tickets are only \$2.00 each. The nature of pilgrimages of this kind is well calculated to quicken the religious fervour of our people, and we hope that many hundreds of our Catholic youth will avail themselves of the opportunity.

## "FATHER DOWD."

An anonymous scribe in the *Witness* attacks Father Dowd. Something signing itself "Matter of fact," writes of the revered and beloved pastor of St. Patrick's as making a "hypocritical appeal" to his people "to heal the wounds inflicted on the peace of our fair city." This nobody, unknown and unmasked, writes thus:—"Can any man of moral precepts read his (Father Dowd's) speech on that occasion and pronounce it other than a reiteration of Mr. Kirwan's inflammatory challenge." Of course—"inflammatory," "moral precepts," &c., &c.!! This is charming! Just fancy—"moral precepts," "Holy Water, &c.," "Gods of Bread," "To Hell with the Pope," "Croppies lie down," "Protestant Boys," &c., &c., and "moral precepts!"

## PERSONALITIES.

The *Witness* fights men and not principles. It invariably attacks the "editor" of the *True Witness* and seldom the cause we advocate. It attributes "motives." We have now tried for eight months to elevate the tone of the *Witness* and to conduct our warfare upon the recognized rules of journalistic combat. We have never yet used a personality. Yet we have failed to secure the boon we laboured for. Well when we cannot obtain fair play by honourable warfare we must try some other means. If our opponents will insist in taking advantage of us, while we refuse to take advantage of them, we must see if there are no other means of bringing them to their senses. If personal-

ties be the rule in Canada, then we suppose we must use personalities too. So now we give fair warning that the next time we are assailed personally, we shall do our best to defend ourselves by descending to personalities in return. We daresay we can stand that kind of tearing just as well as our neighbours. The *Witness*, and its surroundings, can no more afford to be torn to pieces than any other paper, and perhaps not quite as much.

## "CHINIQUEY"

Chiniquey is again in arms, with soul eager for the fray. He denies that he asked for "readmission to the Church of Rome" and heroically shakes his fist in defiance at "his old accusers." He is, it appears, not upon his last legs yet. There is still a kick left in his immortal carcass, for virtue and Chiniquey have long been estranged. He is of the breed of outcasts. Angels pity, men despise, the groveling porpoise. He is the duped of many, the laughing stock of all. Like dead sea fruit his words fall like ashes from his mouth. Poor man, the victims of the Mamartine were never more oppressed than he. He is of the world, and yet the world knows him not. Who knows but he may be a prophet in disguise? Is he not called a "father" a veritable "father" and may he not be a heaven sent friend as well? So think his admirers, the men who hound him on, and who, behind his back, treat him with scorn. But let him rave away. He injures no one but himself. He is a victim to fanaticism and we can allow the unfortunate man talk and talk. He has touched the pitch and he has been defiled therewith.

## THE VOLUNTEERS.

We take the following notice from the *Official Gazette*—

"St. Jean Baptiste Village Infantry Company.—To be captain, provisionally: Martin Waters Kirwan, Esquire, vice Alexander Simpson, left limits. Ensign E. Gaudry having left limits his name is hereby removed from the list of officers of the Active Militia."

We hope that this example will be followed over the Dominion at large. It is our right that we should have a fair representation in the volunteer force of the country. Our people have been too indifferent upon this question, and it is time that they should bestir themselves. If one-half of the Volunteers in Montreal were Catholics, there would be no such violations of military law—as a private calling from the ranks for "Three cheers for King Billy." We do not think that the "St. Jean Baptiste Village Infantry Company" are likely to cheer for the "immortal" William. We hope the men who are to compose it will know their duty better. But about that "Three cheers for King Billy," if the authorities do not take the matter up, then we must only have it brought into Parliament, for we are determined not to allow the charge to go by default.

## THE "TRIBUNE"

The *Tribune* of Toronto has been called a government "hack." That is to say, it is a paper that is prepared to defend the government at any hazard. It is supposed to receive government assistance, and in return it gives the benefit of its circulation to prop up the powers that be, no matter who or what may assail them. It sells itself body and soul for a mess of government potage. Now, as a political organ, the *Tribune* has a right to do as it pleases. From a mere political "hack" nothing better could be expected. But this *Tribune* should take the cross it has abandoned from off its pages. It is not a Catholic paper. It may have Catholic news, and like the devil himself may be able to quote Scripture by the yard, and yet it is no more Catholic than he. It was not Catholic when it defended orange b.r. Foy on the Immigration question, and it has not been Catholic on the orange question either. It is in fact a paper worked by men who care nothing for our faith, and the mission of the *Tribune* is to make everything subservient to the interests of the party that sustains it. It is fulfilling its mission to the letter. We regret that we are forced to say this, but as the recognized organ of the Catholics of this Dominion, we find it necessary to once more caution our people against the dangerous and subtle teachings of the *Tribune*.

## THE SENATORSHIP.

MONTREAL, 3rd Sept., 1877.  
To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

DEAR SIR—In your last issue you announce that B. Devlin, Esq. M.P. was likely to be appointed Senator for the Rigaud Division, as it now turns out that such an appointment has not taken place, would it be pertinent to enquire if an Irish Catholic is entitled to the position, as the district is essentially French-Canadian, and the late representative was, although having an English name, purely of French nationality?

Again, the shrillness of Montreal if claimed by the English-speaking people, would be an equal injustice to the French people. If French-Canadians are entitled to no appointments in their own country, give them fair notice and let them emigrate.

AN IRISH CATHOLIC.

We do not object to the appointment of a French-Canadian, and we rejoice that an "Irish

Catholic" has thought proper to open the question. It is not to French-Canadians, as such, that we object, but it is to men who are neither French nor Irish, nor have done anything to promote the interests of either one or the other. By all means let the French-Canadians have the lions' share of patronage in this province, as they are entitled to it, but let us, both French-Canadians and Irish, put a stop to bogus candidates, who try to use all parties and who belong to none. We are anxious to work harmoniously with our French-Canadian fellow-citizens, at the same time we are sure that they will give us fair play, when they have it in their power.—E. T. W.

## THE "TRUE WITNESS."

For some time past the *TRUE WITNESS* has taken an exceptional stand with relation to the Catholic people in this Province and the orange organization. If there are a few of our friends outside this Province who think that that stand was too pronounced we beg of them to set their minds at rest. Our position is sustained by the wide spread silence of the clergy, a silence which we are bold enough to accept as *not* being a denunciation of our views. From one end of the Province of Quebec to the other the clergy have given no evidence of hostility to the views we have expressed. Archbishop Bishops, Clergy and all, have been complacently silent. Whether they have openly endorsed our views or not we shall not say, but we can assure our readers that there has been neither public nor private condemnation of our words. Our circulation has doubled and everywhere there are evidences that the whole of the Catholic public opinion is with us. Not only in the province, but outside as well, we have been sustained. With one solitary exception there has not been in any part of the Dominion a censure flung at us by a Catholic priest. We have good reason for knowing, that the good fathers at Ottawa, at Kingston, and at Belleville, have not opposed the *TRUE WITNESS*. When there is anything bad said of us we publish it, when there is any good said of us, we reserve to ourselves the satisfaction of knowing that we are supported by our friends. Out of piles of complimentary notices, we have scarcely ever published one. We allow the paper to speak for itself. But we think it necessary now to assure our friends that our policy is the policy of the Catholic people, and that no clergymen in the Province of Quebec, and perhaps not two in the Dominion, will condemn us for continuing to pursue the action which has hitherto guided our steps.

## QUINN'S VINDICATION.

Our readers are already in possession of the facts connected with the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Michael Quinn, on a charge of the murder of the late Thomas Lett Hackett, on the 12th of July last. The accusation was formulated by a woman calling herself Maria Walsh, but whose real name, according to the testimony of her husband, is Mary Bradley. This wretched woman, whose character is of the very worst description, made the most positive statement in connection with the shooting of Hackett, and swore to Quinn as the man who had fired the fatal shot, in her presence in Victoria Square, at three o'clock in the afternoon of the day in question. Not satisfied with this she went farther and swore that Quinn had acknowledged his guilt not only in her presence, but in the hearing of several persons in his boarding-house, amongst whom was a young woman called Mary Leonard. Her evidence was complete from the beginning to the end, she had traced him from the moment when, as she alleged, he had torn an Orange Lily from the breast of a lady who works at a Mr. McCruden's, until he fired the shot that caused Hackett's death. Quinn was arrested, he was then put into prison, and during several weeks the dreadful charge of murder was hanging over his head. The greatest possible secrecy was maintained by the authorities during the early progress of the investigation, and no doubt, as in the case of young Sheehan, there were those who had already pronounced the verdict of guilty upon him. Fortunately, however, the witness for the prosecution was a little too willing—she swore too much, and when her cross-examination was closed, in which, by the way, she forgot her lesson several times, and contradicted herself in a most glaring manner, the other persons whom she had mentioned in her testimony were called forward. One creature, who has since disappeared, was found willing to state she had seen this woman Bradley on the Victoria Square at the time of the shooting affray, but Mary Leonard contradicted her in the most positive manner. Three witnesses, her own husband included, proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that she was not present on the occasion at all. That she was in her boarding-house from half-past eleven in the morning, until six o'clock of the same day. Still, fortunately for Quinn, several gentlemen came

forward and testified that he was not in the vicinity of the fatal occurrence, and that he had actually exerted himself to preserve the peace at another point where some trouble was threatened. In view of the overwhelming testimony laid before the Magistrate, the counsel charged, with the private prosecutions felt obliged to come forward and state that he had the fullest belief in the innocence of the prisoner, and Mr. Desnoyers, P. M., discharged him on Friday last, giving expression at the same time to his deep regret that an innocent man should have been made the victim of a woman, "who must have been grossly mistaken, if she was not actually guilty of a most heinous crime."

Mr. Quinn has been discharged, he has suffered great mental agony, he has suffered the loss of his liberty, and, being a poor man, he still has to pay another penalty, for he has lost his employment through the nefarious charge that has been laid against him. We hope something will be done to compensate him for the great injuries that have been inflicted on him. In the meantime, it is a subject of regret that this matter cannot be probed to the bottom, and that they, if any, who induced this wretched woman to prefer such a charge, are not brought to justice, it is at all events satisfactory to know that the proper steps have been taken to deal with Mary Bradley, alias Maria Walsh, as she so richly deserves. Quinn, her intended victim, is now a free man, and she is a prisoner in the common gaol, awaiting her trial at the next Court of Queen's Bench, on a charge of perjury.

## OKA.

There is a society in London, England, called the "Aborigines Protection Society." It is composed of what the *Gazette* calls "old ladies in pantaloons." The members are of the "fogie" class, decrepit in form and bald in intelligence. In London their name is synonymous with "intermeddlers" and "imbeciles." No one minds what the "Aborigines Protection Society" say. But the members themselves hold quite a different view of the functions they are fulfilling. As the Sythian Ambassador said to Alexander, "The world is not large enough to contain," the ambition of this mighty power. Their intermeddling extends wherever the "Aborigines" are found. In Africa the negroes, Bosjesmen, Hottentots, &c., come under this special case, and are made unhappy thereby. In Asia, the Aborigines, everything in fact from an Orang-Outang in Borneo, to a full-fledged Turcoman, are sheltered beneath the world-wide canopy of the "Aborigines Protection Society." In Oceania, the Maories of New Zealand, the "jins" of Australia, and the amiable "Jam-Jams" of the Fiji Islands, all, are sheltered by the paternal wing of this society of "old ladies in petticoats." In America, too, their jurisdiction is limitless. Here, the "poor Indian, whose untutored mind, &c., &c." is their charge. It is a very happy family, this "Aborigines Protection Society." The world is its cage, and it enfolds all the "aborigines" of the earth. Well, this "Aborigines Protection Society" has, of course, taken the Oka Indians under its protection. They have written to Lord Carnarvon upon the subject. The fun of the thing is that they deny that the burning of the Church at Oka was the work of incendiaries. Here is what they say:—

"Not unnaturally this catastrophe was supposed to be the work of Indian incendiaries, but the committee are glad to learn that thus far rumor is unsupported by a tittle of evidence."

The "old ladies" were not well posted when they committed themselves to such an opinion. It is now placed beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Church was wilfully burned by a band of Indians, who threatened to take life, and then heroically flew to arms and defied the civil power. A grosser outrage was never committed upon law and order, and the sixteen braves who are now awaiting trial, will we hope receive such a punishment as will give us a guarantee that their is some protection even for Catholic property in this country. Of their guilt no one in this country has the shadow of a doubt, but it is from the "Aborigines Protection Society" that we are to obtain accurate information, and not from Judge Coursol or the men who know all the circumstances surrounding the case. Again this "Aborigines Protection Society" hold that the burning of the Catholic Church was a set-off against the destruction of the Protestant Church. This is odd. The one was wilfully burned to the ground by a lawless mob with arms in their hands, and who fled from, and afterwards defied, the law, in consequence of their act. The other was destroyed by order of the Court, and in a legal manner. But the *Gazette* thinks that the Catholic clergy made a mistake because of their "reticence" at the time the fire occurred, and that it was because of their reticence that the "old ladies" on the other side have had the first, and the false story of the burning. It says:

"Reporters of the daily press were sent up, their instructions being to obtain from all parties for

publication any statement they might desire to make. The Indians and their friends were naturally anxious to forestall public opinion, and gave the fullest information. The clergy, on the other hand, declined to make any statement, and as a consequence only one version obtained currency." (The italics are our own.)

This is not quite accurate. The clergy did make a statement which was obtained from them in the usual way, and which was published in the *TRUE WITNESS*. This statement is now proved to be true, as every Catholic was sure it was from the commencement. If the Catholic clergy were more "reticent" to others than to ourselves they had good reason. The *Gazette* says the reporters were sent to Oka with instructions "to obtain from all parties for publication, statements they might desire to make." Well we do not doubt that such were the instructions, but how were they carried out? Does the *Gazette* think that the Catholic clergy could be otherwise than "reticent" towards gentlemen who when they arrived at Oka, at once threw themselves into the enemies arms? They went straight to the house of the Rev. Mr. Parent. They were his guests. They heard his story first, and it was his story that went abroad to the world. The Catholic clergy could not be otherwise than somewhat reticent towards those gentlemen, and much as we think of most of the reporters on the press in Montreal, yet they committed a serious mistake, when going to Oka they at once threw themselves into the arms of Mr. Parent, and thus left themselves open to the charge of taking sides. It is not always that a man likes to denounce or to expose his host, and the reporters who went to Oka did not violate the laws of hospitality by even telling the truth about the doings of the Rev. Mr. Parent and his Oka braves.

## "INTOLERANCE IN MONTREAL."

Many of the Protestant papers in Canada have pronounced against what they have called "Intolerance in Montreal." In euphetic and indignant tones they have emphasised the phrase, and from one end of the Dominion to the other, the tocsin has been sounded and its echoing note has been "Intolerance in Montreal." It is an astounding discovery! In this free land, wherever the genius of orangeism prevails, there, of course, Civil and Religious Liberty are secure. Was it not so in Ireland, and is it not so here? Do not the memories of the procession in Toronto, the butchering of nearly a dozen in Thorold in 1847—for which not one orangeman was imprisoned—the maimed at Brockville, the attacked at Belleville, and the ashes of Oka attest it. It is we alone, we poor "Papists," the "idolatrous" followers of the "scarlet w..."—we mere "ignorant" and "benighted" fools who believe in the "gods of bread" and whose "superstitious" "cant" only befits us to be made "croppies lie down"—it is we who are "Intolerant in Montreal." No matter if in this Catholic Province, Civil and Religious Liberty have full swing—yet we have "Intolerance in Montreal." No matter if we can challenge the Protestant minority to point out a single grievance that they labour under, yet no matter—we are "Intolerant in Montreal." What odds if we can prove that the Protestant minority has more than its share of the representation, still are we not "Intolerant in Montreal?" Our facts go for nothing, the opposition assertion carries the day, and the orangemen the world over look with anger upon the "intolerant" and "bigoted" Catholics of Montreal. It is a pitiable exhibition of mis-directed zeal. With nearly a quarter of a million of Irish Catholics unrepresented in Ontario, we think that we can turn the tables upon the frothy utterances of the orange braves. For true "intolerance" you must seek the brethren of the mystic tie. Their oath, even its modified form, proves it: "I swear" say these saffron gentry, "that I am not, nor ever will be a Roman Catholic or Papist, nor am I now married to, nor will I ever marry a Roman Catholic or Papist, nor educate my children, nor suffer them to be educated in the Roman Catholic faith." They hate us as their friend hates holy-water. We are "intolerant" because we resent insult, we are "bigoted" because we will not allow ourselves to be trailed at the coat-tail of orangeism, and we are "priest ridden," because we respect the men who are, to us, God's anointed. "Intolerant" indeed! Who was "intolerant" when that obscene and immoral outcast, Chiniquey—made hell rejoice when his blasphemous and sacrilegious hands outraged that "wafer" which we believe to be the Living God himself. Who were the "intolerants" who applauded the unhappy man in his madness and hounded him on to create here a bitter feud between men of different beliefs? Answer ye fanatics of Montreal who gloried in these assaults upon the "Papists," and who patting the insane apostate on to his doom. Yes, and there he is now left despised and neglected by his orange friends, and despised by every right minded man in the community. And who were the "intolerants" when, before that, a miserable