

## The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

GEORGE E. OLERK.

At 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, price 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickups News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1861.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

By the arrival of the *North American*, we have nothing particular to report. In Italy matters remain unchanged.

The civil war in the U. States assumes a more war-like aspect. The first great battle has been fought, in which 35,000 Northern and 80,000 Southern troops were engaged; according to the reports from the field of hostilities, the latter gained the victory.

THE MONTREAL "WITNESS" AND THE SEURS GRISSES.—Our saintly cotemporary does not like Sisters of Charity, whether Grey Nuns, or Nuns of any other hue; and to do the poor creature justice, he lets slip no opportunity of asserting, or insinuating, anything that may present itself to his prurient imagination against the good morals or good management of our Popish institutions. If Catholics were but half as zealous in supporting these establishments, as the Protestant press is in decrying them, their condition would indeed be most flourishing, and creditable to the charity of our coreligionists. A Jesuit is, of course, the special object of evangelical hatred, for hereby we know that he is indeed the true servant of Jesus, in that the anti-Catholic world hates, and calumniates him, even as it hated and calumniated his Great Master, and crucified Him betwixt two thieves; but next to a Jesuit, the Protestant evangelical does dearly hate a Sister of Charity. Of this hatred, of this truly diabolical passion the *Montreal Witness* is an admirable exponent.

But as with some men's loves, so with the *Montreal Witness's* hatreds. It hates, not wisely, but too well, or rather, too bitterly; and in its excessive passion it commits itself sometimes by its palpable falsehoods, at other times by its ludicrous exaggerations, and false reasoning. Hatred, as well as love, is oftentimes blind, and leads its votaries astray. This is especially, indeed frequently, the case with our poor dear cotemporary, who to use the exquisite trope of the Oriental bard, is "always putting his foot in it." We had an instance the other day in the case of the interesting "Young Frenchman," for whom a Dr. Helmuth at Quebec was lying in wait, but whom the Jesuits of Montreal mysteriously kidnapped and confined in gloomy dungeons fathoms under ground; we have another amusing instance in its still later onslaught on the Foundling Hospital of the Grey Nuns, with reference to the very large amount of mortality, especially amongst infants, in Montreal.

This mortality the *Witness* indirectly attributes to the above-named institution; and though it prudently abstains from making any definite charge, either against the design, or the management of the said Foundling Hospital, it insinuates a good deal, and invokes the interference of the Legislature. The *Gazette*, having given some statistics of our City mortality, and having rightly attributed the formidable proportions of these statistics, to the abominable uncleanness, and defective drainage of Montreal—the *Witness* eagerly avails itself of the opportunity to vent a little of its superfluous bile, or spite, against the Sisters of Charity. It says:—

There is another reason. The chief mortality is set down to Infantile Debility, and a large portion of all the cases of this kind come from the Foundling Hospital of the Seurs Grisses. This Hospital enables mothers to throw off the responsibilities of maternity without actually committing child-murder, but with a similar result as far as the children are concerned. From facts that have come to our knowledge at different times, we doubt if more than one in twenty or thirty of the infants received at the Grey Nunnery grows up to maturity. If our calculations are wrong, we will be happy to publish a correct return, which we think the Legislature should require annually. It would thus be seen what public money is granted for.

What we chiefly object to in the above is its want of precision. The animus of the writer is plain enough; but we are puzzled to find out the exact nature of the charge he wishes to bring against the obnoxious institution—whether it is against its system, or mode of management merely; or whether it is to the institution, *per se*, without reference to the manner in which its affairs are conducted, that our evangelical cotemporary objects.

If the former be the intention of the *Witness*,

then, in common justice, he is bound to show that the actual loss of life amongst the inmates of the Grey Nunnery Foundling Hospital is greater than that which occurs in similar institutions; and amongst children exposed to similar external physical conditions; and that there is reason to suspect that some sound, universally recognised principle of hygiene has, in the case of the said Hospital, been violated either through ignorance or carelessness, through culpable neglect of ordinary sanitary precautions, or deliberate malice. The *Witness* is bound to compare the infantile mortality of the Foundling Hospital, not with the average infantile mortality of the community, but with that of the mortality amongst the offspring of the most unhealthy, because the most vicious, the most impure, and the most intemperate section of society. The children abandoned to the mercies of a Foundling Hospital, are generally the offspring of vice, the issue of criminal intercourse, whose parents have but too often done their best to prevent the witnesses of their crimes from seeing the light of day. Children born under such circumstances, abandoned by their natural, or rather unnatural parents, and reared by strangers, are at best but fragile plants. They bring into the world with them the seeds of early decay; their sole inheritance is a diseased constitution, and a rickety frame; and under such circumstances the marvel to one who carefully, and without prejudice, studies the statistics of the Foundling Hospital of the Grey Nuns is, not the great mortality amongst its inmates, but the immense success which has hitherto attended the pious and charitable efforts of its managers.

But it is, perhaps, against the Foundling Hospital itself that the spite of the *Witness* is directed; it is to the institution, *per se*, and to its objects, not to its method, or system of management, that our cotemporary objects. If so a new issue is opened up; and we must quit the domain of hygiene for that of morals. On this ground too, we are perfectly prepared to meet our opponent.

It is, we will begin by admitting it, a great evil that a mother should under any circumstances abandon her infant, to the care of others. If compelled to do so by poverty, ill health, or other material conditions, it is a physical evil; if by merely a desire to devolve the care of maternity upon another, or from dread of the world's censure, it is a moral evil. But evil though it be, there is a still greater evil—an evil common, fearfully common, and rapidly increasing amongst all classes of Protestant society—and that evil is "child-murder." So common, so almost universal, has this hideous crime become, that amongst a large section of the Protestant world it is scarce looked upon as a crime at all; so common is it that there is scarce a Protestant paper published either in Canada or in the United States which does not publicly advertise the means of committing this crime, scarce a Protestant editor who, morally, is not as foul a murderer as the wretch now lying under a well deserved sentence of death in our City Jail. Betwixt the filthy medical adviser who actually administers the fatal drug intended to produce abortion, or him who actually handles the deadly instrument wherewith the foul crime is consummated, and the mercenary journalist or editor who for a pecuniary consideration knowingly makes his paper the medium for circulating the information where these drugs may be purchased, or the infamous services of the "abortion doctor" may be procured, there is no appreciable moral difference whatsoever; and yet, we say it advisedly, there is scarce a Protestant journal published on this Continent, either in Canada or in the United States, which does not contain advertisements wherein the best, safest, and cheapest methods of committing "child-murder" are not daily announced to an anxious public, thirsting after the guilty knowledge.

Now it is sound morality to accept the less of two evils, of which one is unavoidable; and inasmuch as the Foundling Hospital diminishes to a very considerable extent the temptations to "child-murder," and since it is a moral certainty that of the children who are therein received, the immense majority would, but for its existence, have been murdered, either *in utero*, or immediately after they had seen the light,—(take for an instance of this, the moral condition of the Eastern Townships)—we gladly hail its establishment amongst us, as an institution which secures the ineffable blessing of Baptism to the child, and which at the same time to a very considerable extent keeps down the crime of "child-murder," so fearfully prevalent wherever the Foundling Hospital does not exist. Of all murders, that of the unbaptised child is infinitely the most fearful to contemplate; for it involves, not the loss of the life of the body alone, but the loss, or death, of an eternal soul; and therefore the great object of the Foundling Hospital, under Catholic management, is to procure for the child the unspeakable benefit of Baptism, that is of Regeneration and of spiritual life. That of the children therein received numbers do daily die, we have no doubt, for the reasons by us above-indicated; but if they die, they do but exchange a wretched for a most glorious exist-

ence; a heritage of sin, shame and sorrow for one of life, and joy and glory, everlasting; and whilst no one, however bigotted, will pretend that their days on earth have been cut short by the Foundling Hospital, every one acquainted with the rudiments of Christianity knows that for the Sacrament of Baptism, by which the abandoned child is regenerated and made a child of God, and heir of the Kingdom of Heaven, it is indebted to the institution which the *Witness* reviles upon earth; and upon which, from beneath the earth, Satan looks no doubt with an evil eye—as upon an institution through whose instrumentality he has been defrauded of many an expected subject, and the limits of his Kingdom have been very considerably reduced.

Sir Archibald Alison, in a letter to C. M. Clay, contends that the American Constitution is a failure, and recommends a National Church and a Monarchy. (News by the Great Eastern.)

That Sir Archibald Alison should have arrived at the above conclusion, so far as the fact of the American Constitution being a failure is concerned, is not at all remarkable for aught but its tardiness, though as to the remedies prescribed we should be little inclined to follow his advice. That the American Constitution from its very nature, could never be aught else but a miserable failure, was always evident; and Sir Archibald need only have studied the workings of the Protestant Reformation (that other religious republic), to have arrived earlier at this conclusion. When the pseudo Liberals of the Reformation founded the religious republic of Protestantism, it was plain to all men, that it contained within itself the very principles of dissolution; and that therefore from its very nature it could never stand. A religious or civil institution like a material edifice must have some bond of union, if it is to exist in a permanent form, else it will be destroyed and turned into a heap of ruins by the first deluge or storm. But if instead of this bond of union, it have within it, the very principles of repulsion, it were folly to expect it ever to present aught but a mishapen mass. Now that this was the case with Protestantism as a system, any one can see at a glance. "Everyone his own Bible interpreter," makes at once as many religions as there can be possible—and (and for the matter of that impossible too)—interpretations, and hence at once an end to all religious unity. The will of man can never be a bond of union either in religion or politics, for it is as various as there are possible combinations of his intellectual and physical passions. The Algebraist can work out the resultant of these possible combinations, when the metaphysician has determined the sum total of the innumerable springs of action in the passions. Hence then the utter want of unity in the Republic of Protestantism, and hence also the utter want of unity in that other Republic—the American Constitution. If we read that Constitution aright, we can reduce it to nothing else but a "Community of States dependent upon the will of each individual State;" and hence, as we have already said, the will of States, as of individuals, can never form a bond of union, but must ever be a principle of repulsion and division. It is true that in the case of both republics, they have held together longer than their nature would warrant us to expect; but if we examine the cause closely we shall find that this arose from external causes that bound them together as long as they existed. Anglicanism, for instance, has been kept together—(if its innumerable changes can be called *keeping together*)—by its being interwoven with the State, the bond of union being the temporal power, not any intrinsic bond. And the American nation held together just so long as there was a sufficiently balanced community of interests, and the moment that balance was destroyed, it broke up—or, as Sir Archibald terms it, became a failure. It is in view probably of this fact of the Anglican Church Establishment having existed so long by being interwoven with the State, that Sir Archibald would recommend the adoption of a State-Church in America.

And not only was this failure of the American Constitution evident from its very nature—but the existing state of things showed that it must prove so. The Southern States are a distinct nationality—with boundaries, perhaps, not very distinctly defined; nevertheless, they are no less distinct a nationality, and in these days of superstitious reverence for "nationalities," that one fact ought of itself to be a sufficient argument. 2ndly, there was a diversity of institutions—free labour, and coloured labour. 3rdly, a diversity of climate, the political institutions of the temperate zone being unfit for the torrid. 4thly, there was a want of external pressure from surrounding nations to consolidate them. A war with some powerful neighboring nation—had one existed—would have warded off, perhaps for centuries to come, this present dissolution. Amidst much discordant elements, it required no great Prophet to foretell this dissolution, whenever the slender ties that held the unbound mass together, should be worn away.

SACERDOS.

SYDNEYHAM.—Mr. Michael Hayden has kindly consented to act as agent for this place and its neighborhood.

POOR DEAR BROTHER JOHN!—Who has been poking fun at the editor of the *Montreal Witness*?—who has had the heartless audacity to render that innocent and interesting creature the "victim"—as Sam Weller would style it—"of gammon?" Very cruel, very wicked is the hoax which our evangelical cotemporary has had played upon him by some mad wag.

On Thursday night, the 11th instant, there was a very perceptible shock of an earthquake, which startled many an old woman; and "gave every one a sort of uneasy sensation," to use the words of the *Witness*. But what was the earthquake of Thursday to the moral convulsion which on the Friday afternoon following, stirred to their inmost depths the passions of our Protestant fellow-citizens! We beg of our readers not to laugh, if they can help themselves—whilst they peruse the following "Wonderful Tale of a Cock and of a Bull," which most appropriately was presented to the world on the afternoon of Friday the 12th instant, by the *Montreal Witness*:—

"A STRANGE STORY.—Three or four weeks ago, a gentleman of this city came into our office accompanied by a young Frenchman of prepossessing appearance, who appeared very much excited, and from whom we learned the following particulars:—He said he was a French Roman Catholic, who had become Protestant, and that he had come out in the Steamship "Jura," with letters to Dr. Helmuth, Quebec, from whom he expected employment in some missionary capacity. On the voyage, however, he made a confidant of one of the passengers, without suspecting that he was a Jesuit, and this person had persuaded him not to stop at Quebec to see Dr. Helmuth, but to come direct to Montreal, where he introduced him to a College, at which he was told: 'That God had directed his steps to that house, in order that he might be reclaimed and his soul saved.' There, he said, he had been kept ever since without being allowed to go out, till at last he had got away, and sought advice in the first Protestant Church he saw open;—which happened to be the Wesleyan Church, Great St. James Street.—And now, added the young Frenchman, 'I wish to know how I can get my baggage away!' Seeing that he was in a state of terror, we sought to calm him by assuring him that Canada was a free country—that he and his property were perfectly safe here—that he could go, accompanied by a witness, and demand his baggage, and none could withhold it from him without incurring serious consequences; and, that his person was equally safe, as no one could legally restrain him of his liberty; only, we added, it might be as well to take a witness with him lest he might possibly be confined in a dungeon without any one knowing it. 'I have been there,' exclaimed he, with great excitement 'five days already!' He said he had promised to return at a certain hour, at which he would go and get his baggage. He professed the greatest thankfulness for the information given him—appeared delighted to think that he was safe in Canada; and left hurriedly, walking towards the Place d'Armes. We expected that he would return and state how he had got on about his baggage but saw him no more.

"About a fortnight after this strange interview, Dr. Helmuth, being in town, mentioned to us the mysterious disappearance of a young Frenchman who had come passenger by the 'Jura,' consigned to him with good recommendations, of whom he was in search, but of whose fate, after landing, he could learn nothing. We then mentioned the interview we had had with the youth in question which was the first information Doctor Helmuth had received concerning him. On farther inquiry, it was ascertained at the Steamboat Office that the person he described as having persuaded him to go to the College, had actually come by the 'Jura,' and the young man, having pointed in the direction of the Jesuits' College, Bleury Street, as the place of his confinement, a deputation went there to inquire after him, who were informed by the parties they saw that they knew nothing whatever of such a person.

We do not vouch for the young man's veracity, or accuse any one on his vague and excited evidence; but there are some points in this story about which there can be no doubt:—

1st. The young man actually came by the *Jura*, with two letters recommending him to Dr. Helmuth, as a young French Medical gentleman, and convert from Romanism.

2nd. The person who, he says, persuaded him to go to a College, came by the same vessel.

3rd. This young man came in a state of excitement to Protestants, stating that he had been confined in the said College for five days,—that his baggage was detained, and that he was going back to claim it that day.

4th. He has not since been seen or heard of, so far as is known.

We will gladly publish any farther information that may be sent to us concerning this case, which is exciting a good deal of interest, as it gives every one a sort of uneasy sensation to think of the possibility of mysterious disappearances in this land of law and mystery.

If the above "Story" be intrinsically "strange"—from the manner in which our cotemporary recounts it, and the reckless manner in which he employs his pronouns, it is perfectly unintelligible. All that we can detect in it certainly is, that some one has been making a fool of the editor of the *Montreal Witness*, and that our cotemporary has given himself the trouble of proclaiming the fact to the world.

Let us analyse this "strange story," and we shall see what a mass of absurdities, incongruities, and inconsistencies, of false reasoning, reckless assumptions, not to say downright lying and slander it presents.

"Three or four weeks ago a gentleman of this city came into our office accompanied by a young Frenchman of prepossessing appearance."—*Montreal Witness*, 12th inst.

Why not give the name of the "gentleman of this city"?—why not tell us how, and where, he picked up the "young gentleman of prepossessing appearance"?—why not explain how it happened that the "gentleman of this city," if he believed the strange story told by the "young Frenchman," &c., did not accompany the latter to the College where he had been confined in a dungeon, and had left his baggage? and at all events why if he said "gentleman" doubted the truth of the story, some short, simple but decisive test as to its truth was not at once applied—such as calling in the "young Frenchman" to show the College into which he had been inveigled, and in which he had been imprisoned? Why were not the Police at once informed of the circumstance?

Again, all this happened some three or four weeks ago; and in the interim the editor of the *Witness* must either have suspected that a poor friendless "young Frenchman of prepossessing appearance" was the victim of Jesuitical cruelty; or he must have disbelieved the "strange story" told. If he suspected an illegal detention, why did he not sound the alarm?—why allow weeks to elapse? and even after the confirmation of his worst suspicions by Dr. Helmuth, why allow near a fortnight to pass over, without making the matter public, and calling for an investigation?

We do not tax the editor of the *Witness* with being the author of the silly story given above; yet we cannot but wonder with exceeding wonderment, at the simplicity, not to say gullibility, of our cotemporary. It was moreover so easy for him to have tested the truth of the "young Frenchman's" story, so easy to have at once applied a simple but conclusive test as to its truth or falsity, that we cannot but blame him for the readiness with which he entertains every malicious idle story hostile to Catholics, and reflecting upon the fair fame of Romish institutions.—We cannot, therefore, acquit the *Witness* of all moral guilt. He who too eagerly receives false witness against his neighbor, or who, without due, patient and thorough examination helps to circulate the false testimony, is little, if aught, better than the original slanderer. "The receiver," says the proverb, "is as bad as the thief;" the retailer of calumny is as bad as the originator of the lie.

Besides, the "Young Frenchman's" story carried falsehood on the face of it. There was about it an inherent mass of improbability, not to say absurdity, which should have sufficed to put the editor of the *Witness* on his guard against it; and even if respect for truth and Christian charity could not inspire him with caution, yet the fear of making himself ridiculous should, so at least one would expect, have sufficed to prevent the man from making such a ridiculous exhibition of himself before the world, as to give the "strange story" publicity, without a moral certainty of its truth.

We have waited patiently for the denouement of the mystery, but have waited in vain. The only light that our honest and intelligent cotemporary has been pleased to throw upon the subject is contained in the following paragraph, addressed in reply to a communication, dated 17th instant, from a "Subscriber" greatly interested in the fate of "THAT YOUNG FRENCHMAN." To him our dear cotemporary thus makes answer:—

"[In reply to the above, we have to say that the young man called upon us on Monday last, stating that he had been in the Noviciate since his previous visit, and that hearing that there had been something about him in the papers, he had got out, accompanied by a friar, to buy one. He said he had to return again to the Noviciate, and was going to New York in two days with two Brothers. He appeared much less excited; and though he avowed he was still a Protestant, and wanted to see Dr. Helmuth, he did not appear to be at all afraid of his present keepers. Upon the whole, therefore, we came to the conclusion that we did not know what to think or believe about the matter.—Ed. *Wit.*]

The public will know however what to think of the intelligence of the editor of the *Montreal Witness*, and of the honesty of the man who, to excite, or keep alive, prejudice against the inmates, or "Brothers," of some of Catholic institutions—(name not given of course)—can apply the term "keepers" to the companions of the "young Frenchman" who called at his office.—A "Keeper" implies one who imposes restraint upon him who is kept. If then the editor of the *Witness* really believed that the "young Frenchman's" attendants were the latter's "keepers," it was his duty, as a citizen—a duty which his hostility to Popery would have encouraged him to perform—to have invoked the aid of the legal authorities to deliver one whom he believed to be under restraint, from the hands of his "keepers;" if, on the other hand, the editor of the *Witness* did not believe his visitor to be under restraint, his application of the term "keepers" to the companions of the "young Frenchman" is grossly dishonest; and, not to put a fine point on it, a cowardly insinuation of a falsehood, which he dares not utter openly. This is what all honest and intelligent persons will think and believe about the matter.

STATISTICS OF ILLEGITIMACY.—The Protestant journalist has a great advantage over the Catholic, in that he—the Protestant—makes his own statistics as he goes along, whilst the latter is obliged to dig for them, and has generally to rely on Protestant sources of information.—These of course represent Protestantism in its most favorable, and Catholicity in its most unfavorable, aspect; and yet, in spite of these circumstances and of the constant efforts of a Protestant press to keep back all that tells against the morality of Protestantism, and to exaggerate everything that may seem to be prejudicial to Popery, the facts cannot be altogether concealed; nor can the conclusion be avoided that the most Protestant, are also the most immoral, the most thoroughly depraved, communities on the face of the earth.

We turn to the statistics of Protestant Scotland for the first quarter of the present year, published by the *London Times*, from the official