

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1852.

We most earnestly request of our Subscribers to remit to us, without delay, the amounts due to this Office.

A meeting of the St. Patrick's Hospital Society will be held on Monday next, at 7 p. m., in the Rooms of the St. Patrick's House. Members are requested to attend.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On Tuesday, the 18th ult., the motion for the committee of investigation into the mode of education pursued at Maynooth, came again under the consideration of the House of Commons. Mr. Newdegate, on the part of Mr. Spooner, who was suffering from the effects of an accident, having, it is reported, been run over by an Irish cab, drawn by a horse of Romanist principles, requested that the debate might be adjourned until the 16th inst., as that was the earliest day on which the question stood a chance of coming before the House. Mr. Cardwell, who said that he intended to have voted for the enquiry, remarked that it looked very like mockery of the House to have the debate adjourned to the 16th of June—a period when it would be impossible to enter on any enquiry. Lord John Russell followed in the same strain; he seemed to think that ministers were humbugging the House, and apparently lending their sanction to the respectable Spooner's motion, for the sake of a little popularity at the hustings; if the government were in favor of a withdrawal of the grant, they should say so at once; and if they were not, they should not encourage and feed the excitement which was being got up on the subject. Lord John might—though he did not do so—have cited himself, and his Durham letter, as a case in point, to show the evil results flowing from getting up a fictitious religious excitement—an excitement which it is far easier to get up, than to allay, and which, sooner or later, must prove fatal to the politician who has recourse to such dishonest and dangerous practices; Lord John must have thought all this, but kept it to himself. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply, spoke as the Chancellor of Exchequer alone can speak—enigmatically, and like a great Oriental mystery—"he was not prepared to abrogate; but he was prepared to vote with the pious Spooner; though he was not prepared to say that a committee of the House was the best tribunal to investigate the matter in dispute. The House had a great deal of work to do; there was the Militia Bill, and the Corrupt Practices Bill, having got through which they might be able to see their way clearly." Mr. Osborne moved that the great day of the Derby should be named for the adjourned debate, in which he was seconded by Mr. Anstey; but the respectable, and highly prosy Mr. Newdegate threatening the House with an oration, the members hurriedly dispersed, and so the affair dropped.

The opinions of the press seem to be much divided on the subject of this Maynooth grant. The *Times* argues that its abolition would "save *em* right;" that it would be but a just punishment for the enormities of which the Church has been guilty towards the Protestant government of Great Britain. Amongst these enormities, the *Times* enumerates the following as the most serious, and the most meriting of chastisement:—She has "put under ban the lay Colleges," and "has insisted, and does still insist, on the right of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, to dictate the whole education of their subject laity, to nominate their tutors and professors, to select all their books, and to defend them from all heretical contact;" "therefore," argues the *Times*, "the Maynooth grant should be recalled." On the other hand, the *Weekly News*, also a Protestant paper, thinks that the revocation of the £28,000 to Maynooth should be accompanied by the revocation, of the grant of £36,000 to the Irish Presbyterians, and of something else:—

"The general feeling of sincere Church Reformers, in and out of Parliament, concerning the Maynooth grant, is, that it should be comprehended in a general inquisition of our entire system of religious grants and endowments. Come that inquisition when it may, and we fervently hope it may come soon, we cannot disturb the grant for the education of the hierarchy of the Irish majority, whilst we allow the princely endowment of the Church of the Irish minority to stand unmolested. We cannot slaughter the small deer of ecclesiastical corruption, and suffer the lions to escape. The *butte* must be general, and by no means confined to the Irish hunting-grounds."

In the Lords, the Duke of Argyll called the attention of the House to the case of a British subject of the name of Murray, who has been sentenced to death by the tribunals at Rome, as an associate of the felons and banditti who have so long troubled the peace of that country. On another page will be found a petition, to his Holiness the Pope, from the English residents at Rome, in which they implore the clemency of the Sovereign Pontiff for the unhappy convict, without attempting to deny the reality of his guilt, or to impugn the justice of the sentence which has been pronounced upon him. This motion of the Duke of Argyll called up the Earl of Mal-

mesbury, who forcibly pointed out the evils resulting from the refusal of the British government to establish diplomatic relations with Rome.

The *bona fide* investigation into the affair of Mr. Bennett, has been brought to a conclusion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced its result as follows:—

The crown officers had advised the government, that her Majesty had no means of instituting an effective enquiry into the case, by means of a commission, as such commission could not compel the attendance of witnesses, or of the parties implicated; the parishioners of Frome, if they felt themselves aggrieved by the conduct of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, might appeal to the Bishop of Bath and Wells; upon the whole, government did not wish to mix itself up with the question, having got itself into hot water already, through meddling with religious disputes.

The *Tablet* mentions the following ecclesiastical arrangements, for the better ordering of the English Catholic Hierarchy, as in contemplation. John Bull's no-Popery bellowing don't seem to have had much effect at Rome:—

"For each of the Sees in England, except one, the Holy See has decreed the erection of a Chapter, consisting of twelve Canons and a Superior. In the expected diocese, we understand, that it is supposed there are not sufficient materials for a Chapter, and, therefore, none has been established. In case of an Episcopal vacancy in any diocese, an absolute majority of the Chapter—that is—at least seven votes, and along with them the Bishops of the province—are to have the privilege of recommending, as in Ireland, three names of Priests to fill up the vacancy. Of course, it is not to be understood that in England, any more than in Ireland, the Holy See parts with its absolute power of nomination and appointment; but in both countries the same method, substantially, has been adopted, of learning the local wishes and opinions which, wherever higher considerations do not intervene, the Holy See, in its prudence, is always most desirous to consult and conciliate. In addition to this movement towards a perfect Hierarchy, the Supreme Pontiff has given "fixity of tenure" in England to a certain number of Clergymen, who are to be in the nature of Parish Priests, but who are to be distinguished by another name—that of 'Missionary Rectors.' There are some peculiarities in the circumscription of the parishes, and other details, upon which we have not such full and accurate information as would enable us to speak more completely; but we believe the correctness of the outline we have now given may be relied on."

The Steamer America arrived at Halifax on the 8th inst. The following is the most important item of European news transmitted by telegraph:—

"The papers are occupied with the coalition formed against Louis Napoleon by the Northern powers, during the visit of the Emperor of Russia to Vienna and Venice. It appears they would not object to Louis Napoleon becoming an elevated Emperor of France, but that any attempt to forward or perpetrate an imperial dynasty, would be resisted by Austria, Russia, and Prussia.

M. de Keren's mission to the Emperor of Russia and Austria proved a complete failure. He could not obtain an audience from either of these potentates. They look upon Louis Napoleon as a provisional and temporary power, and recognize the house of Bourbon as the sole and legitimate dynasty of France. This decision has caused great chagrin to the Bonapartists."

DESTRUCTIVE FIRE AND LOSS OF LIFE.

On Sunday morning, between the hours of five and six o'clock, one of the most serious fires with which this city has ever been visited, broke out in the premises of Mr. Martin, carpenter, corner of St. Peter and Lemoine Streets, and raged with unabated fury until nearly noon, when it was at last got under, not however before it had destroyed an immense amount of valuable property, leaving us also to lament over the more serious loss of several lives. We abridge the following from the detailed account of the catastrophe, as it appeared on Monday morning, in the columns of the *Montreal Herald*, and other city papers:—

This sad calamity originated in St. Peter Street, at the corner of Lemoine Street, in a carpenter's shop occupied by Mr. Martin as his dwelling house. The family were in bed when the alarm was given, and were aroused from their slumbers by a loud knocking at the door: the flames gained so rapidly that two of the children, one about 13 years of age, and the other 9, were surprised in bed; the elder of the two was dragged out of a window, her clothes all on fire, but so scorched that she died within a few hours; the younger must have been suffocated by the smoke, and perished in the flames. The fire, carried by the wind which was blowing a fresh breeze from North, and North-West, was communicated to the old St. Andrew's Church, and the dwelling house of Mr. Mahony, and crossing St. Peter Street seized upon the immense block of buildings erected by the late Mr. Cuvillier, and which was occupied by merchants' warehouses. Here the fury of the conflagration was at first checked; but the violence of the wind carried some of the burning shingles to St. Francis Xavier Street, and set fire to the roofs of two houses belonging to Mr. DeWitt. From thence the flames were carried across to St. Paul Street, near the Custom House; the old Commercial Hotel, recently occupied, in part by Messrs. Workman, in part by the Imperial Customs Department, and in part used as offices by several business men, was speedily in ruins. Then the fire spread across the street, embracing in its red folds the whole of the Northern and Southern fronts of St. Paul Street, both sides of the little lane known as Capitol Street, and the handsome row of commercial buildings in Commissioners Street, which front the port and the river. The danger now appeared to be extreme. The Parish Church, the hospital of the Hotel Dieu, and the vessels in port, were all menaced. Some twenty, or five and twenty first class stone buildings, standing on three parallel streets, were in flames together, whilst in the streets, and on the wharves, a

scene of wild confusion presented itself, every one within the line of fire being busied in removing his merchandize and household goods. The garrison had been turned out, and aided by the police under the direction of Capt. McGrath, exerted themselves to their utmost, to prevent pillage and to protect the heaps of valuable property with which the streets were encumbered. The fire at last got round to St. Joseph Street, having made almost a clean sweep between the foot of the seminary garden and the river; the hospital was now in great danger; the sick were removed, some to the Parish Church, others to the Grey Nunnery and other places of refuge, whilst the greatest exertions were made by all classes of the community to prevent the flames extending to the vast pile of buildings known as the Hotel Dieu: the young students from the seminary were employed passing buckets of water to throw upon the adjacent roofs, and the whole efforts of the Fire Brigade were directed upon this spot, and the opposite corner of St. Paul Street. Here at last, thanks to the mercy of God, the fury of the destroyer was stayed, having ravaged St. Paul Street from the Custom House Eastward, to the wall of the Hotel Dieu on the North, and the house of Mr. Gettes on the South. The *Herald* estimates the rental of the buildings destroyed at about £6,000, which represents a capital of £60,000; to this must be added the value of the merchandize destroyed within the buildings, which must be much in excess of the value of the houses destroyed, for this calamity has fallen upon the city at a time when the merchants had just completed their spring importations. The total is variously estimated from £200,000 to £500,000, a great part of which will fall upon the Insurance Companies. It is a singular coincidence, that upon the same day, June 6th, Trinity Sunday, 1803, forty-nine years ago, a great part of the city of Montreal was destroyed by fire. In 1765 also, the same portion of the city which has just fallen a prey to the flames, was the scene of a still more disastrous conflagration; upon that occasion 108 houses containing 215 families were destroyed, and the loss of property was estimated at £116,773 cy., no part of which was insured.

Great complaints were made of the want of water during the fire on Sunday, and our city cotemporaries are earnest in their exhortations to the city fathers to remedy this defect without delay. The greatest credit is given to the Mayor, the Civic authorities, and the Fire companies, for their arduous and long continued exertions: we regret to say that the Mayor is himself a considerable sufferer, his large hardware establishment in St. Paul Street having been totally destroyed.

THE JESUITS AND THE MONTREAL WITNESS.

We called some days ago upon the *Montreal Witness*, as the propagator of a most serious charge against the Jesuit Fathers established in this city—a charge accusing them of violence, false imprisonment, and attempted murder, against the person of one of their body, who, having ran away from the college, had still further excited the ire of his former colleagues, by threatening to reveal certain secrets respecting their iniquitous life and conversation—either to substantiate his charges, by bringing forth his evidence, or giving up his authority, or else to retract, and apologise for the wrong he had done. We understand, thank God, little of the morality, or conventional rules, of the men who style themselves evangelical; but we do know what are the rules and customs that obtain amongst gentlemen, and honest men; and we know also, that, to the latter, our request must have appeared most reasonable, and one with which no one could refuse to comply, without forfeiting every claim to be treated otherwise than as a dirty, contemptible scoundrel. How far the editor of the *Montreal Witness* has replied to our challenge will be seen from his rejoinder on the 31st ult., which we subjoin:—

"Now, that the poor man in question has been obliged, for fear of his quondam friends and their tools, to flee to a safer country, the *True Witness* most valiantly dares us to prove the persecutions which the man affirmed he suffered, and concerning which he was the only witness. This, of course, from the nature of the case, we cannot do, and even though we could adduce his testimony, which it would not be safe for him to give, we admit that without concurrent testimony it would be inconclusive."

The Italics are our own. Upon this reply, if reply it may be called, we have a few remarks to offer.

It will be seen that, by implication at least, the *Montreal Witness* re-iterates the charge,—that a poor man "has been obliged, for fear of his quondam friends (the Jesuits) and their tools, to flee to a safer country." Now, either this statement is true, or it is false; either the Jesuits are the most infamous, or the most foully calumniated of men; if they are not a set of murderous villains, then must their accuser, the editor of the *Montreal Witness*, be a mendacious and malignant slanderer. There is no *via media*; there is no way of acquitting the one, without condemning the other. Really, it is of some consequence to the community to know on which side lies the truth—on that of the Jesuits, who deny the charge in *toto*, from beginning to end; who deny that any member of their order, or inmate of their college, has *run away* from them, or that they have ever, directly or indirectly, by themselves or others, held out any threats to any person whatsoever, and who challenge investigation, and court the most rigid scrutiny—or on the part of the *Montreal Witness*, who, when called upon to substantiate his charges, sneaks pitifully away, and whines out, "that from the nature of the case this we cannot do." We could confidently rest our case here, and appeal to the different conduct of the men—of the accused, and their accuser—the one, straightforward, bold, and manly; the other, shuffling, cowardly, evasive, and very like the

conduct of a snuffing and psalm-singing deacon of the Little Bethel.

But we have not finished yet. We contend that in a populous city like Montreal, with a numerous and influential Protestant population, it is impossible, that the events, related by our cotemporary, could have occurred, and that there should be no concurrent testimony. We put it to any man of common sense—is it possible, that, in the heart of a community like ours—a community, certainly, not uncivilised, or lawless, any one should twice make his escape from illegal imprisonment, should for days be compelled to live in hiding, his liberty menaced, his life in danger from a band of blood-thirsty cut-throats, and that not only the police should know nothing about it, and should take no steps whatever to repress the menaced outrage, but that no one person in the city should know anything about it; that no one should be able to testify to the abduction of the fugitive, to the time and manner of his escape; in fine, that there should be no concurrent testimony whatever? Was every body asleep in Montreal—were the police all slumbering on their posts—were there no passers by when the outrage occurred, when the unhappy run-away Jesuit was entrapped, and dragged back to the dungeons of the Holy Office? The man who is fool enough to believe such a tissue of absurdities, is fool enough to believe the editor of the *Montreal Witness* an honest man. The force of credulity can no farther go.

But we will go further; we will say that our cotemporary did not believe the story himself, when he gave it forth to the world. We do not say that he originated it; of that we have no proof, and though we know him well enough, to be assured, that he has malice enough to circulate any report prejudicial to the character of Catholic priests or religious, no matter how false, we do not think that he has wit enough to invent even so silly a lie, or pluck enough to be the first to set it agoing; for these reasons, we do not think that the lie originated with him, but rather opine, that he was made use of as a tool, or convenience for the propagation of falsehood, by others.—Again, we do not think that he believed the tale, for, in that case, his well known hostility to priests, and Jesuits, would have prompted him to do, what a sense of duty as a Christian, and a citizen, would have prompted another to do immediately upon hearing of the circumstance—viz., to give information to the police, of the meditated outrage, and thus secure the safety of the menaced, and bring about the condign punishment of his persecutors. We have also the unconscious testimony of the editor of the *Montreal Witness* himself to the fact, that he did not believe the story. No man can believe a statement upon inconclusive testimony; but he himself admits that, even with the pretended run-away's evidence, the testimony would be "inconclusive;" therefore, unless a man can be convinced by testimony that is not convincing, and which he feels, and admits, to be inconclusive, the editor of the *Montreal Witness* did not believe the story when he published it, and, therefore, we do not think that any epithets, which we have applied to him, are a bit too harsh.

For the editor of a journal enjoys no immunity from the obligation, "not to bear false witness against his neighbor;" he possesses no privilege which the humblest individual in the community does not equally possess; and, just as it would be infamous on the part of the latter, so is it infamous on the part of the former, to repeat tales prejudicial to the character, or injurious to the prospects of his neighbor, without being positively convinced of their truth. Our cotemporary knows this—he knows that he dares not publish a report injurious to the solvency of any members of our mercantile community, upon inconclusive testimony; he knows that if he did so, that if he were to publish—that Messrs. — & Co. were unable to meet their pecuniary liabilities, or had absconded from their creditors, he would be amenable to the law; and yet, because he knows that it is contrary to the customs of our religious communities, to take any notice of newspaper paragraphs, or to have recourse to the civil power when aggrieved, he hesitates not to lay to the charge of a body of gentlemen—who, leaving out of the question the respect due to them as clergymen, are at least his equals, if not immeasurably his superiors, in every relation of life—crimes, which, if true, not only unfit them for the performance of their spiritual functions, and of their duties, as instructors of youth, but render them unworthy to be tolerated for one instant, as members of any Christian, or civilised community; and he does this upon testimony which he himself admits to be "inconclusive;" and when called upon to give up his authority, or else to retract and apologise, refuses to do either the one, or the other: there is no expression too harsh to characterise such conduct. Yet we should not be angry with the man, for it is by calumniating, that he best can serve the cause of our holy Church; had he other weapons, he would employ them; had he truth on his side, he would disdain the use of those he now employs; Protestants themselves are ashamed of such vile champions of their cause, and like Dr. Nevin of the *Mercersburg Review*, disclaim any sympathy with them and their slanders. Speaking of your genuine No-Popery brawler, Dr. Nevin, himself a Protestant, thus describes him—commending the description to the attention of our cotemporary, we leave him to his own gentlemanly and honorable meditations:—

In his battles with Romanism, he spoils his own cause continually by extravagance and excess. He persecutes and spits venom, while affecting to play the bully for toleration and peace. He calls names, and spouts out intemperate blackguardism, while pleading himself with the idea that he is the pink of evangelical courtesy and good manners. He is himself irreverent and profane in the treatment of sacred things, while heaping accusations of profanity on Rome. He sets up himself, as the personification of private judgment, in order to pull down the Pope; holding, with great show and zeal, that all men have the right of thinking as they choose, provided only they think with *him*, and not some other way. He is great for free enquiry and light, and yet takes good care never