

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.
The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 7.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

APRIL—1865.
Friday, 7—Our Lady of Pity.
Saturday, 8—Of the Feria.
Sunday, 9—PALM SUNDAY.
Monday, 10—Of the Feria.
Tuesday, 11—Of the Feria.
Wednesday, 12—Of the Feria.
Thursday, 13—Holy Thursday.
The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—
Saturday, 8—General Hospital, Montreal.
Monday, 10—Masson College.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

There has been a very important debate in the House of Commons on the subject of Canadian Defences, the general tenor of which is encouraging, and gives us grounds for hoping that in case we be attacked, the Imperial Government will put forth its strength for our protection, provided only that we show ourselves prepared to do our part, and in proportion to our means.

Mr. Newdegate would have done well had he left the Convents alone, as he would have escaped a very cruel letter from a Catholic Prelate, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Ullathorne. He would have done better still had he left that letter unanswered, as thereby he would have escaped a most damaging exposure of himself, and the bitter reproaches of his Protestant friends; who feel that their champion has not only made a fool of himself, but has not only convicted himself of discourtesy and dishonesty, but has brought ridicule, and obloquy on the cause of which he proposes himself as the champion. Briefly the case stand thus.

Dr. Ullathorne, in rejoinder to the many charges brought against the Conventual Establishments under his special ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by Mr. Newdegate in the House of Commons, addressed to the last named gentleman a letter, in which he (Dr. Ullathorne) courteously pointed out the errors of fact into which Mr. Newdegate had fallen; and challenged him to visit when he pleased, any one of the Convents which he had maligned, to satisfy himself by a personal inspection whether the interior arrangements of these institutions were indeed such as he in the House of Commons had represented them to be. The Bishop added that should Mr. Newdegate comply with this challenge the Convents should be opened to him: that he might bring with him as an additional precaution against deception any Protestant gentleman whom he might be pleased to name; and that on the other hand, he Dr. Ullathorne would be accompanied by one Catholic gentleman, Lord E. Howard. Under these conditions the Bishop challenged Mr. Newdegate to visit the Convents of which he had spoken in the House; which he had represented as fitted up with underground cells for the incarceration of refractory Nuns; and which he had denounced as prisons, and places where cruel tortures were practised on the inmates. This was a fair offer, and if accepted would of course have brought the matter to an issue.

But like an Evangelical slanderer Mr. Newdegate would not accept it; as he knew that thereby—since he would be compelled to publish to the world the results of his personal investigations—he would be reduced to the disagreeable necessity of retracting his accusations, of eating his own words, and of proclaiming himself to be either a simpleton or a knave, the dupe of the malicious slanders of others, or a malicious slanderer himself.

So Mr. Newdegate wrote a rambling and discourteous reply to Dr. Ullathorne's straightforward, and most gentlemanly proposal; declining to visit the Convents, declining to be disabused of his prejudices, or rather declaiming the necessity of retracting his unfounded calumnies against the Catholic ladies, the inmates of the maligned Convents. Mr. Newdegate refused the challenge, and the press of course commented upon his conduct. What the Catholic press said thereupon may easily be guessed, and is in one sense, and in so far as the character of Mr. Newdegate is concerned, of little consequence. It is important however to note in what light the man and his slanders are viewed by leading Protestant organs of opinion. The *Guardian* puts that opinion on record in the following terms:—

"Mr. Newdegate is a gentleman, but he has not behaved like a gentleman in the correspondence with

Bishop Ullathorne, in which his late speech has involved him. It is not the practice of gentlemen to tell, openly or circuitously, a clergyman of Dr. Ullathorne's position, age, and unspotted character that he is a liar or equivocator, without giving the least ground for so vile an imputation; it is not usual with them to bring public accusations against defenceless ladies, or indeed, against anybody else, without the least proof of their truth; to refuse, upon the shabbiest pretexts, the offer of a fair inquiry; and to reiterate the charges in the same breath. This however is the position in which the correspondence leaves Mr. Newdegate."—*Guardian*.

The *Times*, against whose impartiality no Protestant will urge an objection, is quite as severe, and expresses precisely the same views of the controversy as those put forth by the Anglican *Guardian*. The London *Times* thus delivers itself:—

"This polite and candid person [Dr. Ullathorne] will not trouble Mr. Newdegate with any more verbal explanations, but will make him a proposal which may settle the matter at once. Let him come and see for himself and examine with his own eyes the real nature of these formidable institutions. Let him bring one of his friends with him, and he shall be introduced by the Bishop, attended also by one of his friends, and he shall be allowed to go over every part of either of these dreaded establishments, to explore all the lock, bolts, bars, and cells, and to converse freely with any of their inmates. The whole place, in short, and all its arrangements, shall be thrown absolutely open to his inspection. The only condition which he shall be required to fulfill in return for this permitted invasion of the premises of innocent ladies is, that if he finds he is mistaken he shall own his mistake as publicly as he made his charge. This simple practical proposal completely disconcerts Mr. Newdegate, and he commences his reply with a sort of hesitation whether he had better reply at all, and proceeds by explaining more fully what it was at which he was charging. It is but small matter to him what the assertions of his antagonist may be; the question is what were his own assertions. But, at lengths, as he gets warmed with the subject he recovers his old enthusiastic attitude. What! trust himself inside a convent in his private capacity, even attended by a Protestant nobleman! He will never be a party to 'any such partial or local inquiry' as is proposed. His opponent is evidently endeavoring to throw his magical net over him. His letter is 'artistically written.' What devices might not be practised upon him if he once got within those mysterious walls! The grass is no doubt grown over the graves within them; the inscriptions are probably effaced, alterations would no doubt have been made since the occurrences alleged, and, in short, he could not take upon himself so tremendous a responsibility. As he concludes, he shuts his eyes, and charges again exactly as before, completely forgetful of his opponent's explanations. It had been explained to him that the nun who escaped and was brought back again was now entirely free from all engagements, and might be anywhere; but, oblivious of this simple reality, he threatens his opponent with one tremendous question—'Where is that lady now?' But the question is too solemn to be asked by himself. It cannot properly be put except under the authority of a Committee of the House of Commons; and no answer to it will be accepted except under such conditions. Dr. Ullathorne's business after this is simple. He has offered him the opportunity of satisfying himself and others in the matter, and as he prefers to go on charging imaginary giants without inquiring whether or no they are windmills, the knight, and not the windmills, must suffer.

It must be confessed, in short, that the Bishop has the best of it. Mr. Newdegate clearly puts himself in the wrong by declining to verify his own statements. If he will not trust his own eyes under every advantage, what right has he publicly to allege statements which have no better foundation than the eyes of others acting without such advantages? If he is so delicate about intruding his inquiries, even under the protection and with the consent of the official superior of these convents, with what delicacy or consistency can he make use of inquiries avowedly prosecuted without the consent or knowledge of these ladies? We confess we are sorry Mr. Newdegate comes off no better in the encounter."

It is in short the old, old story over again, and of which we in Canada have had so many instances before our eyes in the columns of the *Toronto Globe* and the *Montreal Witness*.—The only marvel is that Englishmen, who in all matters where their anti-Catholic prejudices are not excited, are fond of fair play and honorable dealing, fail to perceive that he who brings forward charges against Catholics, which he will neither retract nor prove when called upon to do one or the other of these things, and when every opportunity to establish their truth or falsity is afforded to him by the accused, is not to put too fine a point on it, a blackguard, a liar, and a coward. Henceforward Catholics can well afford to treat with silent contempt the slanders of such fellows as a George Brown, a Newdegate or the editor of the *Witness*.

The long-expected news of the evacuation of Richmond by the Confederates has arrived at last. After several days of hard fighting, in which, in spite of their inferiority of numbers the Confederates under General Lee contrived to inflict severe punishment upon the enemy, the former were compelled to evacuate the place which was taken possession of by the Northerners on Monday last. In a military point of view this is not of so much importance; but the moral loss to the Confederate cause is incalculable, and we fear irreparable. The intentions of General Lee are still uncertain; but the righteous cause which he has so long and so ably defended is for the present lost.

ORDINATIONS AT THE GRAND SEMINARY.—On Saturday morning last, the Right Rev. Dr. Farquhar, Bishop of the Mackenzie River District, conferred the Holy Order of Priesthood on the Rev. M. J. Sipple, of the Diocese of Boston. At the same time and place, the Rev. D. J. Lavin, of Ottawa, was ordained Deacon.

We understand that the Rev. Mr. Supple left yesterday for the scene of his labors.

The Peterborough *Review*, commenting upon the decision of Judge Smith in the case of the St. Alban's raiders, says:—"The hearts of the loyal and independent people of Canada will rejoice that by this firm and fearless decision our honor as a people has been maintained, and that the base spirit of subserviency to American views and truckling to American dictation which prevailed to our shame in some high places has for the present been effectually checked."

THAT DELEGATION.—What is the object of the Ministerial delegation to England? We hear often asked. This is a question that it is not very easy to answer.

To press the Union of all the British North American Provinces upon the Imperial Government can hardly be the object of the delegation, for we now know that the Lower Provinces are by no means desirous of contracting any such Union; and Mr. George Brown, one of the delegates, tells us through his paper, the *Globe*, that the "Confederation scheme" has entirely broken down, and that we must now adopt a perfectly different policy, to settle the "sectional differences," as they are called, betwixt Upper and Lower Canada. From this it follows, either that the policy of Mr. George Brown is entirely different from that of his colleagues; or that the latter have also renounced all idea of consummating a Union or Confederation of all the B. N. A. Provinces.

That projected Union may be considered in two lights. As a means for establishing on the shores of the Lakes, along the banks of the St. Lawrence, and on the Gulf a counterpoise to the neighboring Republic; or as a means for settling the sectional difficulties arising out of the incongruous Legislative Union of Upper and Lower Canada, and which difficulties, owing to the nearly evenly balanced state of parties, have for years rendered the political existence of any Ministry extremely precarious. As viewed in the first light, it is a measure in which the Imperial Government is interested, one therefore in which, without consulting the wishes of the Lower Provinces, it may deem itself authorized and bound to interfere, so as to impose, if necessary, the Union to which our Legislature has given its assent, upon the reluctant Legislatures of the Lower Provinces. This would be a high handed act, not at all in union with the principles by which the Colonial Office of the present day is governed; but in view of the gravity of the crisis, it is one which perhaps the Ministerial Delegates may have it in view to urge upon the Imperial authorities.

As a means for settling the "sectional difficulties" betwixt Upper and Lower Canada it cannot be expected that the Quebec scheme of Union will excite any interest amongst the Imperial authorities. It is as silly, as it is false, to pretend that the latter are actuated by any ill will towards French Canadians, or entertain any designs hostile to the nationality of the Lower Province. On the contrary, all well informed men in England know that the most loyal subjects of Queen Victoria on this Continent are to be found amongst the French and Catholic portion of the people of Canada; and so far from seeking to destroy or diminish, they would seek to perpetuate and extend, the political influence of that section of the population, as a counterpoise to the democratic and Yankee tendencies of the other section. Catholics and French Canadians have nothing to fear, for their religion or their nationality, from Great Britain, and Imperial statesmen; and if the latter look favorably upon the Union scheme which it is pretended that our Delegates are about to lay before them, it will be because they will be led to believe that therein are to be found the means of thwarting the hostile designs of the Federal Government upon the British Provinces.

The existing Legislative Union between the two Canadas was, as we all know, framed with the express design of subjugating the Lower to the Upper Province, and of securing Anglo-Saxon and Protestant Ascendency. As in its issue of the 10th ult., the *Montreal Herald*, a steady advocate of Representation by Population, candidly admits, the "practical men," who framed the present Union between the two Canadas "wanted only to swamp the French"—and it is simply because their policy has hitherto failed in its object that they are now crying out for "constitutional changes."

What form these "constitutional changes" will assume, now that by the *Globe's* avowal the Quebec scheme is knocked on the head, it is hard to say. That our "practical men," our George Browns and others will again start some plan "to swamp the French" cannot be doubted; but will the French be themselves parties and assenting thereunto? That is the question.

If they intend to resist further aggression they have, as we have often pointed out, but one course to pursue, but one line of policy to adopt—Upper Canada complains that "Equality of Representation" is unjust towards it, with its larger population, and demands an increase in the number of its representatives proportionate to its greater numbers. The only answer that Lower Canada should vouchsafe to such a demand is this—"Just, or unjust, the principle of Equality of Representation was adopted, not by us, but by you; imposed on us when our population was far in excess of your population; imposed on us for your interest, and, as your organs of the press, admit, with the express design of 'swamping the French.' Do the terms of that Union which you determined, which you imposed on us, displease you? Then break the Union if you will; but do not expect that we will admit that you have any legitimate cause of complaint against

us, or that we will lend you our aid to forge new and heavier fetters for our limbs." If the principle of Equality of Population be unjust, then are we the aggrieved party, since you in the day of your power imposed it on us. If it be just, then have you no cause to complain." From this dilemma no escape is possible.

On St. Patrick's Day last a silly boy of the name of M'Dermott, connected with some Yankee Fenian Society, came over to Toronto, and vented a lot of silly trash, which he no doubt mistook for the very quintessence of eloquence and patriotism. He then went back to New York, and boasted of his exploit as if he had done some great thing; as if he had bearded the British Lion in its den, and were henceforth entitled to the honors of Confessorship for his heroic daring.

Now in all this there would of itself be nothing worth taking notice of; for Canada, as a British Province, is a free country, and we here care but little for the fustian oratory of sucking Jefferson Bricks like this silly boy M'Dermott. The *Toronto Globe* however takes advantage of the youngster's subsequent boasting at New York, to indulge in an angry and insolent tirade against His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto.—It is for this reason only that we condescend to notice such a paltry affair.

It seems then that M'Dermott, when he got back to New York with a sound skin, was quite proud of his exploit of spouting fustian treason in Toronto; forgetting that his impunity, that the utter indifference of the Toronto authorities, are the best proofs possible of his mendacity when he taxed the British Government with tyranny. We should like to know how a British subject would fare at New York were he to deliver in that city such a tirade against the Federal Government, as he boasts that he delivered against the British Government with impunity in Toronto. But let this pass.

Had he done no more than this he would merely have made a goose of himself; but he had the impertinence to drag in the name of the Bishop of Toronto, with whom he pretends to have had an interview in his capacity of Fenian, and treason spouter; and who, so he asserted—expressed himself highly favorable to the Fenian cause." It is of this passage in this lad M'Dermott's speech that the *Globe* takes advantage, and of which he asks an explanation from His Lordship; for, remarks the *Globe*, "the accusation which Mr. M'Dermott brings against Bishop Lynch is a very grave one."

"Grave" perhaps it might be were it brought by one whom the accused was bound to notice, or whom indeed he could notice at all without too great condescension on his part. Who is this M'Dermott, that a gentleman like Dr. Lynch should be obliged to notice what he says? What party is there betwixt the position of a Bishop of the Catholic Church, and that of an obscure brat of a boy from the groggeries of New York, that the former should be held bound to clear himself of the charges brought by the latter? A gentleman is indeed in honor bound to notice an accusation against him, made by his equal, by another gentleman, by one of equal standing in society; but that a Bishop of Toronto should be called upon by the *Globe* to explain away the impertinences of a M'Dermott, is too preposterous.

Besides the Bishop of Toronto has once for all put on record his opinion of Fenians, and of all treasonable societies whatsoever. As a Pastor, addressing his flock, in the name of God, he has told them that all secret societies and their members, no matter upon what pretence organized, are accursed of God and of His Church; and his admirable lectures on the Papal Encyclical, in which the proposition that it is lawful to withhold obedience from, and to rebel against, legitimate princes is especially condemned, clearly show what are the views which the same eloquent and learned Prelate entertains as to the reciprocal rights and duties of rulers and subjects. The Bishop has condemned *Fenianism* because it is a Secret Society; and he has always taught his people that they cannot without sin rebel or conspire against the legitimate Government under which they live, under which they have placed themselves of their own free choice, and to which therefore they owe, for conscience sake, true and hearty allegiance. These, the public utterances of the Bishop of Toronto, are a full and satisfactory answer to the unfounded boastings of the lad M'Dermott at New York.

But of course the *Globe*, as the organ of Mr. George Brown, with its usual canor, gives judgment against Dr. Lynch; and more than insinuates that he and his brethren of the Catholic Episcopate in Canada, are sordid hypocrites, lying knaves, and rank traitors at heart. Otherwise what is the meaning of the following tirade which the *Globe* exhibits its rancor against the Bishops?—

"He and his brother Bishops have even been willing that their Church should be State-paid."

* 63. "Legitima principibus obedientiam detestare, immo rebellare licet."

(What authority has the *Globe* to offer for this assertion?)—"Can it now be true that he is an active enemy of Great Britain, who does not hesitate to give words of encouragement to the most extravagant of Fenian orators?"

The *Globe* then alludes to a letter published last November by the Bishop:—

"When Fenianism in Toronto betrayed itself in November last, Bishop Lynch wrote us a letter, wherein he gave a rather different account of himself. So far from expressing himself highly favorable to Fenianism, as understood in the United States, he gave the public to understand that he was rather against the whole thing, and against all similar combinations—only that he could not very well attempt to repress Fenianism here so long as Orangeism existed."—*Globe*.

In the Bishop's letter referred to, there was not from first to last one word about Fenianism, and His Lordship never alluded to his inability to repress it, because of Orangeism. His Lordship's letter treated not of Fenians *ver.* Orangemen, but of Catholics *ver.* Orangemen; and he simply said that "as long as the Orange association is permitted by law to continue its insulting processions, and to be a constant menace against the rights of Catholics, as exhibited on frequent occasions, so long shall we be powerless to prevent counter-organizations." The *Globe* has no right to misquote Dr. Lynch, or to confound two things so essentially distinct and opposed to one another as are "Catholicity" and "Fenianism." No Catholic can be a Fenian. The bitterest enemies of the Catholic Church in Ireland and the United States; who in the one burn priests in effigy, in the other proclaim their independence of all ecclesiastical or spiritual authority, and who in both, take pleasure in maligning the Pope, and trampling the laws of the Church under foot, are Fenians. Fenianism is essentially an anti-Catholic, or Protestant association, as much so as is Orangeism to which in many respects it bears a close family resemblance; only the former is a trifle the uglier and the viler of the two—the more loathsome in the eyes of every true son of the Church. We can indeed conceive nothing more contemptible—not even the "Swaddler"—than the fellow who pretends to be at one and the same time a Catholic, and a Fenian.

The *Globe's* object in falsifying the language of the Bishop, in trying to make it appear that, in his letter of November last, it was of Fenianism that he was treating, is apparent; for in another part of the article from whence we have already quoted, the *Globe* speaks of the Bishop's letter as "an apology for Fenianism;" thus insinuating that it is highly probable that he did express himself highly favorable to the Fenian cause" in the conversation that M'Dermott pretends that he had with him. The answer to this is, that in his letter of November last the Bishop never so much as alluded, however remotely, to Fenianism; that Fenianism is not a counter-organization to Orangeism, for its ranks are largely recruited from the most ultra of Protestants, or in other words are composed of infidels, and apostates from Catholicity who, like all renegades, are the most ruthless of our enemies. Now no Bishop of the Catholic Church, no layman, can entertain any feelings but those of scorn and abhorrence for Fenianism and all its abettors; and therefore we at once and without hesitation pronounce the accusation of M'Dermott against Dr. Lynch to be an unmitigated lie, a cowardly slander well worthy of the *Toronto Globe*.

THE ST. ALBAN RAIDERS.—The judgment in this case was not finished when we put to press last week, so that we were then unable to announce the result of the long pending investigation.

Judge Smith decided that the claims of the Federal Government for the extradition of the prisoners could not be conceded, as their case was not one provided for by the Ashburton Treaty. In a long but lucid and masterly speech he explained the grounds of this decision. The crime with which the prisoners were charged was really an act of war; the prisoners themselves were the duly commissioned officers of a Government whose belligerent capacity had been recognised by both the Federal and the British Governments; and, argued the Judge, a neutral Power had no authority or power to adjudicate between belligerents, as to the measures which they might severally see fit to adopt in the prosecution of hostilities.

The discharge of the prisoners having been ordered, they were again arrested upon another count; and also upon a charge of violation of British neutrality laws, for which latter offence they will probably have to stand their trial.—This is however purely a municipal affair with which foreigners have nothing to do.

The ice in front of the City began to give way on Saturday last. On Sunday afternoon it shoved again, and the river rose above the wharves, inundating Griffintown and all the lower part of the City causing thereby much suffering amongst the dwellers in these quarters.

The officers and committee of St. Patrick's Society, were indefatigable in their exertions to alleviate the distress occasioned by the flood in Griffintown. They distributed some sixteen hundred loaves of bread, and in doing so, no distinction was made; all classes requiring assistance were relieved, indiscriminately, without regard to creed and nationality. The committee propose continuing their praiseworthy efforts daily during the continuance of the flood.—*Gazette*.