

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES FOR GEORGE B. OLSER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, At the Office, No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance; but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, three pence; can be had at this Office; at Fygn's, McGill Street; and at Pickups News Depot.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

"PEACE!" such is the substance of the last tidings from Europe. Hardly can it be credited, so unexpected, so improbable, are its terms.—Louis Napoleon is evidently either the most disinterested of princes, or the most astute of politicians; but one thing only is certain, that, even more than his great uncle in his most palmy days, the present Emperor is the arbiter of the destinies of Europe. Peace, however, is said to be concluded; and men now ask anxiously—"What next?"

Austria abandons Lombardy to France, who hands it over to Sardinia. Austria retains Venice, which will, however, form part of the Italian Confederation, under the honorary presidency of the Pope; and France withdraws her armies from Italy, content with the glories she has won for herself, and the benefits she has conferred on others.

Will this arrangement last? We think not. Soon the people of Lombardy will tire of their new rulers; and find to their cost that the rule of Sardinia is the most iniquitous and oppressive in Europe. The revolutionary party too—how will they relish the terms of this peace? what will Garibaldi do? what will Kossuth and the followers of Mazzini say to it? the people of Italy are some twenty six millions, and will perhaps claim a right to be heard in the matter.

And Austria is not driven out of Italy; and the Papal government is not secularised; and the French Emperor's boast to make Italy free, in the revolutionary sense, from the Alps to the Adriatic is not yet fulfilled. Here then are the seeds of another war, the germs of another outbreak of "oppressed nationalities." We do not, therefore, believe that the peace will be of long duration.

Louis Napoleon has returned to Paris, not—so it is hinted—on the best of terms with Victor Emmanuel. Count Cavour has resigned, being averse to the peace just concluded; and the French Press do not seem to view in a very favorable light.

A FEW PARTING WORDS TO THE TORONTO FREEMAN.—It has been urged against the TRUE WITNESS, that it looks at every question "through a pair of Catholic spectacles." To this reproach we need only reply, that we trust that we may have merited it, and that it shall be our constant study to deserve it.

Somewhat similar in substance is the objection raised against us by our Toronto cotemporary the Freeman; who complains that the editor of the TRUE WITNESS is not "amenable to public opinion," that he is deficient in respect for "Irish opinion;" that he does not derive his intelligence from "among the same class from which he derives his patronage;" and that he takes "his advisers from one class, and his supporters from another." Elsewhere the Freeman insinuates that the course of the TRUE WITNESS is instigated "by certain parties in Montreal and Quebec, whose national zeal or prejudices, or both, seem to have overridden their sense of justice;" and the entire gist of the Freeman's complaint against us amounts to this—that on politico-religious questions we do not look to the public or laity generally, for instruction; or, in other words, that we view those questions rather from a Catholic than from an Irish stand point. There is much truth in the Freeman's allegations against us; and we do confess to a feeling of satisfaction in reading them.

Of course it is not difficult to guess who are the "certain parties" therein alluded to; but respect for them, that respect which every true Catholic journalist should scrupulously maintain, must be accepted by our readers as a valid excuse for not pursuing this subject any further.

For it is sufficient to repeat what we have before stated; that the TRUE WITNESS has never professed submission to "public opinion;" or to any opinion save that of the Catholic Church, speaking by and through the mouth of her Pastors. It is the boast of the TRUE WITNESS—as it should be to every Catholic journalist—that he is "amenable" to no lay or secular influences whatever; that he recognises no authority upon the questions with which he exclusively deals—(politico-religious questions, i.e., questions into which the religious element enters)—except the authority of the same Church; and that in all

things unreservedly submissive to that authority, and guided by her teachings, it is his highest ambition to be a humble instrument in the hands of the Church, to direct, not to follow—to enlighten, not to reflect or repeat—"public opinion." The Freeman's allusions, therefore, to the "certain parties" at Quebec and Montreal are uncalled for, and impertinent.

And so when the Freeman threatens to "draw aside the veil (sic), and expose to public view what had better remain concealed," we frankly reply that—as there is, or has been, in our editorial career, nothing of which we have cause to be ashamed, nothing that we are desirous to conceal, nothing which if published to the whole world would cause us to blush—so, in so far as we are concerned, we not only permit, but invite him to carry his threat into immediate execution. We court scrutiny the most rigid; and for that purpose release, as far as lies in our power, the Freeman from any and every pledge of secrecy that he may have at any time, or in any circumstances given. This we think will be admitted to be a full and straightforward challenge; and, therefore, as unlike as possible those miserable shuffles which of late have appeared in the columns of our cotemporary. If, we say to him, you have a word to say against the perfect honesty, consistency, and disinterestedness of our editorial career, speak out like a man, if you are one; or else by your silence acknowledge the injustice of your insinuations against the TRUE WITNESS.

For the cause of our opposition to Mr. McGee's present policy, we refer the Freeman to an article on that subject in another column, and addressed to the Montreal Herald. We have instanced as amongst those causes, Mr. McGee's violation of the pledge in his Address to the electors of Montreal to uphold the "Constitution of Canada as it is;" his abandonment of the policy of "Independent Opposition" which he was especially sent to Parliament to maintain; his advocacy of the "Voluntary Principle" as held by the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada; and which in their mouths, and as by them expounded, means "no sectarian schools or colleges—no sectarian grants—no ecclesiastical corporations;" and which, if carried into practice, would deprive all our Separate Schools, all our distinctively Catholic institutions, of that State aid which, in common with non-Catholic schools, colleges and hospitals, they now receive. These facts, however, the Freeman finds it convenient to ignore; and has the impudence to assert that the TRUE WITNESS does not venture to point out in Mr. McGee's "Parliamentary career a single flaw or false step;" adding the untimely boast that—"he"—Mr. McGee,

"has never been known—like the fair and easy nominal Catholics who cling to the Treasury benches, to give an assenting smile, or an approving shrug to the ribald jest, or insulting remark indulged in at the expense of our nuns and clergy."

And yet, we tell the Freeman, that Mr. McGee sat tamely in his place, and, without a word of remonstrance, allowed the Bill for the Incorporation of the Academy of St. Cesaire to pass with the same infamous insulting restrictive clause, which, but the other day, a Society of which he is President denounced as an insult to their religion. Yes; he kept silence whilst this gross insult to our Religious Communities was being offered; from the same motives, no doubt, that prompted him to publicly address M. Dorion, who voted for that same insulting restrictive clause, as "his honored and honorable friend;" and because the infamous alliance which he was even then meditating with the "Protestant Reformers" required of him to sacrifice the interests and honor of his Church, to their malignant hatred of Popery.

Here then are more than sufficient reasons to justify our opposition to the man whose cause the Freeman, with more zeal than judgment, advocates. For ourselves, and in vindication of our motives, we need say nothing; for there are insinuations which the man of honor cannot stoop to notice. Our readers will not credit the Freeman's silly balderdash about the TRUE WITNESS' hostility to Irishmen; nor will his "high-falutin'" appeals to their national prejudices against us as a foreigner, have much weight with them. True, we have never professed to "represent Irish Catholic feelings, rights, and privileges;" for we know of no "rights," for we know of no "privileges;" that Irish Catholics, as distinguished from other Catholics in Canada, can lay any claim to. We have always contended on the contrary, that he is the worst enemy of Irishmen who makes such claims on their behalf; that, as "duties" and "obligations" are co-relative to special "rights" and "privileges;" so if Irish Catholics have the latter, there must be incumbent on them "duties" also, and "obligations;" not incumbent on Catholics of other origins. This we deny; and we can assure the Freeman that by the bunkum claims he puts forward for the Irish Catholics, as entitled to any special "rights" and "privileges," he does but make himself, and, in so far as lies in his power, his fellow-countrymen, ridiculous in the eyes of all sensible men, of all origins and all denominations. In virtue neither of their origin, nor of their religion, can Englishmen, or French Canadians, Irishmen, or Scotchmen, claim any particular "rights" or "privileges." All are alike en-

titled to the privileges of British subjects, and to no more; and as Catholics, Irishmen have no "duties," and therefore no "rights" and no "privileges" from which Catholics of other origins are exempt. As Irishmen they stand in Canada on precisely the same footing as do all her Majesty's other subjects; as Catholics, their interests are inseparably bound up with, and are indistinguishable from, the interests of other portions of the Catholic body; and the worst service that any man can do them is to represent them as a distinct element in our Canadian political organisation. Perfect equality, social and political, with men of all other origins is all that Irish Catholics can, with propriety, demand; in this demand the TRUE WITNESS will ever be, as loud and earnest as the Toronto Freeman; and as this demand for perfect equality is incompatible with the silly claims for "rights" and "privileges" which the latter now puts forward in their behalf, we contend that we, rather than the Freeman, are the true friends of the Irish Catholics in Canada.

The honor, the interests of the Catholic body, demand that all the members of that body, without any party distinctions of national origin, should be inseparably united; and that thus united, the Catholic body should present a bold front to its common enemies. This is the beginning and end of the policy of the TRUE WITNESS—"Union amongst all Catholics;" even should the consequence of that union be war with all Protestants. Yet this hostility would by no means follow as the necessary consequence of that union; for as our policy is essentially defensive, and not aggressive; as we seek not to impose any burdens on our Protestant fellow-citizens, to deprive them of their rights, or to interfere in any manner with their religious, educational, or charitable institutions; so also we have good reasons to believe that amongst them there are numbers equally well-disposed towards us. But—and upon this point we insist—union amongst all Catholics is essentially necessary to our common prosperity, and the integrity of our Church. The rancorous hostility of our foes, the calumnies of George Brown and the Witness, we can afford to despise; but internal strife, but the arraying within the Catholic camp, of nationality against nationality—of Irish Catholic against French Canadian Catholic—must inevitably and speedily prove fatal to us all. Here again is a reason for the opposition which we, Catholics, and intent only upon Catholic interests, offer to the policy advocated and represented by the Toronto Freeman.

With reference to the Freeman's appeals to the national prejudices of some of his readers we will be brief. Show us, we say, that our policy is inconsistent with Catholic interests, and the teachings of the Catholic Church, and we shall at once abandon, and condemn it. But as the TRUE WITNESS is essentially a Catholic paper, and recognises no difference betwixt the religious interests of one portion of the Catholic body, and those of another, it is superfluous for the Freeman to prate to us about Irish Catholic interests in particular; for we maintain that there are, and can be, in Canada no Irish Catholic interests distinguishable from the interests of French, English, Scotch or German Catholics. We have endeavored honestly and to the best of our ability to promote the interests of the Catholic community without distinction of persons; without fear or favor of any man, or set of men, we have spoken on all occasions what we believed to be truth; and have ever kept before our eyes our pledge of making the TRUE WITNESS an independent journal; independent of all Ministerial influences on the one hand, and of all popular or secular influences on the other.

And so when menaced with loss of popularity because we will not fall down, and worship the idol of the hour; because as gentlemen and as Catholics we will not sacrifice one iota of our convictions to popular clamor, we can listen to the threat unmoved. We never have, and never will, court popularity by artifices unbecoming the Christian gentleman. We do not affect to despise popularity, for every one likes the approbation of his fellow-men; but to obtain that approbation, never will we shrink from speaking our minds fully and frankly on all occasions when the interests of the Church require that the truth should be spoken. By so doing we have offended some, we may offend others, but we shall be simply discharging a duty which as a Catholic journalist we owe to ourselves, to our readers, and to the Church. If by adhering to this course we can win or retain popularity, it is welcome—"laudo manentem;" but if we must make sacrifice, either of that popularity, or of our own self-respect and the testimony of a good conscience, without a moment's hesitation we renounce the former, and cling to the latter.—"Mea virtute me involvo."

Only this, in conclusion, would we hint to the Freeman; that neither it, nor yet the TRUE WITNESS, is, or can be, competent to decide as to whether any particular person is the fitting representative, and champion of our Church and religion. This is a question which belongs exclusively to the ecclesiastical tribunals, for they alone are competent to adjudicate thereupon.—To that tribunal do we refer ourselves; by its decisions, are we content to abide; and it it shall recognise Mr. McGee to be what the columns of the Freeman proclaim him to be, the representative and champion of Catholicity in Canada—then, but not before, will we adopt his policy, and range ourselves beneath his standard. Is the Freeman content to abide by this issue?

APPROVAL OF THE "TRUE WITNESS."

To the Editor of the "True Witness."

Kingston, 25th July, 1859.

DEAR SIR—In the last issue of the Toronto Freeman, I regret to see a document signed by a number of your subscribers in this city, which deserves some explanation. Lest the public should imagine the same views were entertained by a majority of your readers, I think it right to make you acquainted with the manner in which that "precious document" was concocted, and the means resorted to, to procure signatures. Some five or six of the individuals, whose names are appended thereto, met one evening last week in a private caucus, and appointed three of their number to go round the city and canvass against the TRUE WITNESS. To achieve this object, these individuals left no means untried, in the shape of misrepresentation and mis-statements; representing the document as a private remonstrance only, intended for the eye of the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS alone, and not for publication. Many were induced to sign it under this impression, and now deeply regret the manner in which they have been duped. Out of the whole number, not one-half, I would venture to say, really understood the object in view, or the purpose for which the document was intended. The parties most active in the matter are men of no political or social influence in the Catholic community, and were afraid to call a public meeting, lest their petty manoeuvring should be exposed.

On last Sunday His Lordship the Bishop of Kingston took occasion to read these gentlemen a lesson they will not soon forget. In the course of his remarks, after alluding to the underhand, contemptible way in which the movement was got up, and the means resorted to, he said the Catholics of Canada had a right to be proud of the TRUE WITNESS, and of Mr. Clerk, its able and talented Editor. It was the only really English Catholic journal in the Province, and as such was entitled to their warmest support. In the past eight or ten years, it had been their unflinching and heroic advocate, and the zealous defender of the Church. After paying a merited compliment to Mr. Clerk, who, he said, was the ablest writer on the Continent of America, he said the TRUE WITNESS had nobly and faithfully fulfilled the mission for which it was established, and was the true and fearless exponent of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. In no instance, and under no circumstances, was Mr. Clerk false to the trust reposed in him. The Irish Catholics of Upper Canada, he said, owed him a deep debt of gratitude for his able and unflinching advocacy of their rights.—When the purity of their countrywomen, the chastity of their wives and daughters, was called in question, who so ably and so eloquently cast back the false slander in the teeth of those who uttered it?—Was it because he did this; because he never became the sycophant or parasite of any party in power; because he eloquently fought and contended for Catholic rights, that the present movement was made in Kingston, where he had always received a warm and generous support? He hoped not, he trusted not. We had known Mr. Clerk too long to condemn him for one, of whom we had little experience. His Lordship most eloquently and warmly upheld the cause of the TRUE WITNESS.

I remain, Dear Sir, your obedient servant,
A KINGSTON SUBSCRIBER.

A LARGE AND INFLUENTIAL MEETING IN FAVOUR OF THE "TRUE WITNESS."

A public meeting of the Catholics of the City of Kingston was convened in the large School Room of the Christian Brothers, on Tuesday evening, the 26th instant, to express their confidence in the TRUE WITNESS newspaper, and in its Editor, George E. Clerk, Esq.; and also to discountenance the attempt of a few of the subscribers to that truly Catholic journal, to weaken its influence in this city. The meeting was both large and influential; nearly the whole of the leading Catholics of the city were in attendance. The greatest enthusiasm and unanimity were evinced by the gentlemen present. Daniel Macarow, Esq., President of the St. Patrick's Society, was called to the chair, and Mr. John Patterson was requested to act as Secretary.—The Chairman explained the objects of the meeting, and in warm terms denounced those who sought by unfair means to induce the well-meaning, but misguided Catholics, to withdraw their support from a newspaper established under the patronage of the Bishops of Canada; a journal that upon all occasions proved itself the able and unflinching advocate of Catholic rights and principles. The learned Chairman concluded an able and eloquent address by calling upon those present to extend a generous support to that journal.

The following Resolutions were submitted to the meeting, and adopted by acclamation:—

Moved by Mr. Alderman Bowes, and seconded by Patrick Browne, Esq.:—

"That this meeting has heard with deep regret of a movement having lately taken place in this city with the avowed object of putting down the TRUE WITNESS, the English organ of the Catholic Church in this Province—that the large majority of the Catholics of Kingston discountenance such proceedings, and believe the action taken by the parties connected with it as both rash and ill-advised."

Moved by Thomas M'Keever, Esq., seconded by P. J. Buckley, Esq.:—

"That this meeting have every confidence in the TRUE WITNESS and in its Editor, George E. Clerk, Esq.—they repose confidence in the judgment and integrity of that gentleman, as being an able, zealous, and unflinching defender of Catholic rights and principles."

Moved by James O'Reilly, Esq., seconded by Wm. Hartly, Esq.:—

"That the Catholics of this city have no sympathy with those parties who are endeavoring to create dissension between us and our French Canadian brethren of Lower Canada—our interests are inseparable. It therefore becomes the duty of every true Catholic to assist in drawing more closely together the bonds that unite us to our Lower Canadian friends."

Moved by James Delaney, Esq., seconded by Daniel Lynch, Esq.:—

"That it is both expedient and necessary that this meeting take immediate steps to increase the subscription list of the TRUE WITNESS in this city; and that the following gentlemen be requested to act as a Committee, viz:—

Messrs. P. O'Reilly, John Bowes, John Patterson, P. M'Acnamia, Matthew Rourke, Thomas M'Koon, P. M. King, Thomas Pidgeon, Robert Condy, M. Flanagan, J. O'Reilly, William Hartly, Patrick Browne, Peter Delaney, James Hartly, D. Lynch, P. M'Grogan, Thomas Erly, Roland Kain, Thomas Lovitt, Patrick M'Cumiskey, Hugh M'Cluskey, Christopher Farrell, Michael Binch, Capt. M'Neil, James M'Bride, Michael Garrett, P. Purcell, Daniel Rourke, P. Hyland, James Brennan, Henry Bowman, Daniel Donoghue, Jeremiah Meagher, Maurice Roach, Daniel Sullivan, T. Mulhall, Joseph Norris, Thomas M'Dermott, Archibald J. Macdonell, B. Somers, M. Sutton, James King, P. J. Buckley, Jr., James M'Guire, John Ryan, Martin Dolan, Peter M'Donald, Thomas Baker, John L'Hoist, D. Sullivan, and the Chairman."

Upon the motion of Mr. O'Reilly, a Subscription List was then opened with the following result:—

His Lordship the Bishop of Kingston, \$40.00, the Very Rev. Angus M'Donnell, V.G., \$20.00, the Very Rev. Patrick Dollard, V.G., \$10.00, and a year's subscription in advance, A. J. M'Donnell, Esq., \$10.00 D. Macarow, Esq., \$10.00, James Delaney, Esq., \$5.00, William Hartly, Esq., \$10.00, Patrick Brown, Esq., \$10.00, James Hartly, Esq., \$10.00, James O'Reilly, Esq., \$10.00, John Bowes, Esq., \$5.00, Denis Delaney, Esq., 5.00, Michael Flanagan, Esq., \$5.00, Jeremiah Meagher, Esq., \$5.00.

The following gentlemen also paid in their subscriptions:—

Messrs. Patrick M'Neil, P. J. Buckley, Thos. Baker, Peter M'Donald, Thomas Erly, Thomas M'Keever, Henry Bowman, F. Trudell, James M'Bride, John Hamkins, Daniel Hallinan, John M'Carthy, Martin Dolan, Patrick M'Grogan, Peter O'Reilly, Patrick Smith, James Fitzsimmons, Edward Gallivan.

It was then agreed by the Committee that the city should be canvassed immediately, and a new and complete list of subscribers to be transmitted during the week to the TRUE WITNESS office.

Upon the motion of M. Flanagan, Esq., D. Macarow, Esq., left the chair, and Wm. Hartly, Esq., was called thereto. A vote of thanks was then given to the Chairman, and the Secretary, when the meeting separated.

JOHN PATTERSON, Secretary.

Kingston, 26th July, 1859.

If, in essaying to express our thanks to the gentlemen, of the Clergy and laity, who have been pleased so generously to give us so handsome and flattering a mark of their approbation of our general conduct, and of our humble efforts to promote the interests of our common religion, we say but little, our friends will not conclude that we do not feel much, or that we are not sensibly affected by their kindness. We have we think been misjudged, and indeed harshly judged by some; but we trust that time—the great avenger—will yet justify us in their eyes. To those who have at once done us that justice—which confidant in the integrity of our motives, we feel convinced will ultimately be done us by all—we can only offer our sincere and hearty thanks; accompanied by the fervent hope, that our future shall be such as to justify their approbation of our past; and that we may approve ourselves not unworthy of the good wishes and kind offices of our Kingston friends.

Under the caption "Stunning Abduction," the Canadian Protestant press has, during the past week, been regaling its readers with a garbled account of the conversion, and reception into the Catholic Church of a young lady, lately resident in Montreal, and the daughter of a gentleman whose name is already well known to the public, as connected with a distinguished "Insurance Company." We owe it to our readers to lay before them a plain and unvarnished statement of the facts, in so far as they have come to our knowledge; and to unravel the mingled web of truth and falsehood in which those facts have hitherto been presented to the world. For this purpose we shall first lay before our readers the Protestant version thereof, as we find it in the Protestant journals.

These tell us that the young lady in question—a Miss Starr—who had received her education in Paris, there "fell under the influence of Roman Catholics;" that there she was urged to leave the world and join a convent; that upon her removal from Paris to Montreal she was "traced from place to place by the wonderful secret police system of the Romish Church;" and that "the ecclesiastical officials" were by these agencies, kept "informed of her history, position, and tendencies." By the Protestant version—and in this consists the entire gravamen of the charge against the Romish ecclesiastics of Montreal—the young lady was the pursued, and not the pursuer; was decoyed into the Church, and did not spontaneously offer herself a willing victim.

Next we are told that the young lady, thus watched, influenced, and worked upon, was persuaded, nay, almost compelled, to abandon the paternal roof; and at the instigation of the clergy—by whom it is more than insinuated that she was kept in durance—was induced to conceal herself from her parents' anxious search, within a nunnery; that the Bishop of Montreal was cognisant of the facts of the case; that when applied to for information, he denied all knowledge of them; and expressing great sympathy for the father, gave him full permission to prosecute his search after his daughter in the different Convents of the city; that hereupon the father went to the Grey Nunnery, where his daughter—according to the same excellent Protestant authority—was actually concealed, with the knowledge of the Bishop of Montreal, and the inmates of that institution; that from the Grey Nunnery the young lady was spirited away to Toronto, and subsequently to Toledo, in the U. States, where much against her will she was forcibly detained; and where at last, after a series of romantic adventures, the distracted father found his long lost child, and rescued her from the hands of her inhuman jailors. This, in substance, is the Protestant version of the events, the true and Catholic version of which we are about to lay before our readers.

Some time ago, one morning very early, a young lady presented herself at the Seminary of Montreal, and in great anxiety demanded an interview with one of the Priests of that establishment. Her request being granted, the young lady proceeded to introduce herself to the Priest, as the victim of a cruel, systematic, unrelenting