

## THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

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

## TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.  
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. Subscribers not receiving their papers regularly, are requested to make their complaints known to the Editor of the Journal.

The Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—

Alexandria.—Mr. D. McGillis.  
Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. Jas. Doyle.  
Brantford, C. W.—Mr. John Comerford.  
Bytown.—Mr. Ewd. Burke.  
Carillon.—A. E. Montmarquet, Esq.  
Chambly.—Mr. John Hackett.  
Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. Stuart McDonald.  
Counties of Kanourasku and L'Islet.—Rev. L. A. Bourrel.  
Dundas County.—Mr. Alex. McDonald, (Ich).  
Eastern Townships.—Mr. Patrick Hackett.  
Lochiel.—Mr. Owen Quigley, P. M.  
Mosa, C. W.—Mr. Thomas Fitzpatrick.  
Norwood.—Rev. Bernard J. Higgins.  
Oshawa.—Rev. J. B. Proulx.  
Pembroke, C. W.—Mr. Thomas Lee.  
Perth, C. W.—Mr. John Doran.  
Pislon, C. W.—Rev. Mr. Lalor.  
Quebec.—Mr. Mathew Enright, 24, Mountain St.  
Sorel.—Mr. Robert McAndrew.  
St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. Patrick Flynn.  
St. Thomas, C. W.—Mr. Patrick Bobier.  
Shipton, Danville, and Melbourne.—Mr. A. Donnelly.  
Terrebonne.—M. Prevost, Esq., N. P.  
Three-Rivers.—Mr. John Keenan.  
Toronto.—Mr. Thomas Hayes.

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 28, 1851.

It will be seen, from the extracts of the proceedings in the Imperial Parliament, that the passage in the Queen's speech, which alluded to the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England, was extremely guarded. On Tuesday, 4th February, Mr. Hayter gave notice that, on Friday, the 7th, Lord John Russell would introduce a bill "to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in the United Kingdom," thus pledging himself that Ireland shall have her full measure of the iniquities in preparation for England. We rather suspect that the title of the bill will turn out to be a misnomer. All the acts of Parliament that ever were, or will be passed, cannot prevent the evil so much dreaded. So long as our beloved father Pius IX., in virtue of the authority committed to him by God, thinks fit to appoint bishops to English Sees, so long will the titles of such Sees be rightfully assumed, and rightfully used. No power on earth can prevent Catholics from recognising and respecting in the person of Cardinal Wiseman, the true and lawful Archbishop of Westminster, to whom their spiritual allegiance is due. If the measure introduced be stringent, no government will dare enforce it, and if it be not, it will be easy to drive Dan O'Connell's old coach-and-four through it.

At the same time, we must confess that, as Catholics, we hail this contemplated return of Protestantism to its ancient system of penal enactments, as the highest compliment, and the greatest blessing, which it can render to our holy religion. It is a compliment to the mighty power of Catholicity, as showing how deeply Protestantism hates, and therefore, fears it; for hatred is never perfect unless based upon fear. No Catholic could possibly imagine a more complete refutation of the silly falsehood, that "Popery is declining," than the re-enactment of penal laws. Men do not erect barriers to check the advance of a discomfited and retreating foe, nor legislate against the aggression of a declining cause. It is because Catholicity is advancing with giant strides, that the powers of darkness tremble, and, sneaking from the encounter in which they are sure to be worsted, seek shelter behind Acts of Parliament, as the only effectual bulwark of the Protestant religion, against the "insolent aggression" of Christ's Church. Penal enactments are complimentary to Catholicity, as demonstrating the truth of the proposition, that by brute force alone was Protestantism established, and that by force alone has it been, or can it for the future, be upheld.

Penal enactments will prove also to be the greatest blessing which Protestantism can render to the cause of truth. The Church ever thrives best when most assailed. Persecution, whilst it strengthens the courage of her friends, will rid the Church of her most dangerous enemies. As, according to the Prophet, "a man's enemies are they of his own household," so the most deadly enemies of the Church are to be found amongst those who profess themselves her children. We fear, not the foes who are without, but those who are within, the Church. "God defend us from our friends, we can defend ourselves from our enemies." The really dangerous enemies of the Church, are those who call themselves

"liberal Catholics,"—men, who would fain reconcile the service of God with the service of mammon, or, failing in the attempt, are ever ready to sell themselves to the highest bidder; exchanging the precious heritage of the faith, for a paltry mess of place and preferment. Many such are there, and ever will be, in the Church, in days of peace; but, one good effect of the penal laws, will be, to make these men known, and when known, they cease to be dangerous.

Next mail will bring us a full account of the proceedings in Parliament. It will be a grand and imposing sight. Little Lord John will arise in his place in Parliament, to curse the Church, saying unto her, "Thus far shalt thou come, but no farther;" but, at the bidding of the God of Jacob, the curse will be turned into a blessing. The Church, which has seen the throne of the Cæsars crumble into dust, which has witnessed the birth of all the existing nations of Europe, and which is destined to outlive them all, will not quail beneath the frown of Johnny Russell, or tremble at the violence of any tempest which he may raise against her. We know that in the world the Church will be distressed, that she can never cease to be the Church militant, battling with error under all its forms,—now, as Heathenism or Mahomedanism, anon, as Infidelity, Protestantism, or Socialism,—but we know also that, though often sore beset, she shall never be overcome, for we have confidence in the promise of our Redeemer—"I have overcome the world."

"There are cases, I know, in which the law must be appealed to for protection. If, for instance, a vile charge is brought against a man of known probity and pure conduct—a man beloved by all around him—such a charge, as, if substantiated, would inflict irreparable injury, and, by detracting from or destroying his reputation, would effect his ruin—he is bound to vindicate himself before the country. Should his accuser refuse to retract and apologise, (and no respectable journal, having given currency to the charge, will damage itself by refusing to insert such retraction and apology,) he brings the whole case into open Court; he invites the fullest investigation, and gives the accuser the opportunity of proving all that he has alleged. His object is then accomplished; his character is cleared from the foul imputation; slander slinks away abashed, and the good man rises higher than ever in public esteem."

We copy the above from the very eloquent lecture upon the "Freedom of the Press," lately delivered by the Rev. Mr. Cramp, as peculiarly applicable to a controversy between this paper and the *Montreal Witness*, respecting certain charges made by the latter journal against the gentlemen of the Seminary in Montreal. We flatly contradicted these charges, upon their first appearance, calling upon the editor of the *Montreal Witness* to substantiate, or else to retract, and apologize for them. The editor of the *Montreal Witness* has not thought fit to do either the one, or the other. Such conduct must, in the opinion of any person of common sense or common honesty, absolve us from the necessity of being very delicate in the choice of terms we may think fit to use towards him. The English language can afford no terms of contempt which the detected slanderer does not richly deserve; and if we refrain from their application, it is not because the editor of the *Montreal Witness* does not merit, but because we will not sully our sheet by employing them.

We will now advert to this business for the last time. In the *Montreal Witness* of the 5th instant, we read as follows: "That the French Government granted to each tribe" (of Indians) "then within the limits of Canada, a Seignior, or free estate, consisting of three square leagues of land . . . After the conquest, these Seigniorial grants were confirmed by the British Government. In course of time, however, the Seignior of the Lake of the Two Mountains fell into the possession of the Priests, no one can tell how." We read, moreover, that the Indians frequently discuss "the mysterious manner in which their deeds had been spirited away, and the most suitable course to be pursued to recover them." If the above extracts do not imply, that the Seignior of the Lake of the Two Mountains was originally granted to the Indians by the French, and confirmed by the British Government—that the title-deeds of the Indians had been fraudulently abstracted, and that the St. Sulpicians had, by dishonest means, acquired possession of their lands, we must plead guilty to a total ignorance of the English language. On the 17th instant, the *Montreal Witness*, in reply to our denial of this atrocious calumny, shifted his position, stating that "There can be no doubt, we think, that the Seignior of Two Mountains was given for the Indians; but, as it would not be safe for them to hold the land in their own name, subject to the danger of being alienated by themselves, whenever they were over-reached or intoxicated, it was put in the hands of the St. Sulpicians;" and, again on the 24th, reiterating the charge that the property "was given for their" (the Indians) "benefit, and therefore might, with all propriety, be said to be given to them." So much for the statement of the *Montreal Witness*, which we declare to be a malicious and deliberate falsehood, and we intend to make good our assertion. We challenge investigation into the facts which we are about to bring forward, not from a corrupt and malicious imagination, but from the existing title-deeds, held by the St. Sulpicians, as their title to the Seignior of the Lake of the Two Mountains. If any one desires to contradict us, or to obtain additional information, we will point out where the deeds may be found. The original grant will be found in the Registry Office, having been registered at Quebec, 2nd October, 1719, and again, soon after the British took formal possession of Canada—Friday, 14th June, 1765, letter A, page 135.—An authenticated copy of the deed in question, is also preserved at the Seminary;

and will, we have no doubt, be readily submitted to the inspection of any gentleman who will give himself the trouble to inquire.

It is well known that the St. Sulpicians were originally charged with the duty of missionaries to the native tribes in the vicinity of Montreal. In the execution of this duty, and for the purpose of removing the Indians as much as possible from the contaminating influence of the white traders, the St. Sulpicians, at their own cost, and *proprio motu*, removed their missionary establishment to the *Sault au Recollets*. In consideration of their services, by a grant of the governor, Philippe de Rigaud, 17th October, 1717, and confirmed by His Most Christian Majesty, 27th April, 1718, a certain piece of unconceded land at the Lake of the Two Mountains, three-and-a-half leagues in front, and three in depth, was given to the St. Sulpicians for ever ("à perpétuité"), and for their sole use and behoof—"en pleine propriété, quand même la Mission sera ôtée," even though the Mission itself were to be removed,—a "titre de fief et Seigneurie," subject to the usual conditions of the Seigniorial tenure, "foi et hommage," and also that the St. Sulpicians should, at their own expense, remove the missionary establishment to their newly acquired seignior, and build thereupon a Church, and a stone redoubt, or fortification, for the defence of the young colony. As if this were not sufficient to remove any doubts as to whether the Seignior was given to the St. Sulpicians for the use of the Indians, the same original grant declares, that whilst the St. Sulpicians, like other Seigneurs, are held to concede, from the *uncleared* lands of their Seigneurie, upon the usual demand, and on terms of "cens et rentes," yet that they are fully authorized to dispose of ("vendre, ou donner a redevances plus fortes") such portions of their property as shall have been one quarter cleared. The ordinance of 1840 was modelled upon the original grant, and expressly declares that the Seigneurie is to be held by the St. Sulpicians, "as the true and lawful owners, and proprietors of the same, and to the only use, benefit, and behoof of the said Seminary."

As we have noticed the expulsion of the widow Thomas, or Thompson, from the English hospital, justice requires that we should insert the following account of the circumstance, as given by the Committee of Management of that hospital, through the columns of the *Transcript*:—

{ MONTREAL GENERAL HOSPITAL,  
21st February, 1851.

(To the Editor of the *Montreal Transcript*.)

SIR,—The complaint was, that an elderly female called Thomas, (but whose real name is Ellen Thompson,) was sent away from the hospital at a late hour on the 5th instant, and set down at the door of a house in Alexander Street, while in a dying state. That she was in a dying state is, however, disproved by the fact, that she was that very day discharged by the medical attendant.

In order to understand the case, it must be premised that the hospital is, in its very nature and constitution, intended exclusively for the sick, and is not in any sense an asylum for the poor, helpless or destitute, except whilst suffering under disease. Were persons discharged by the medical officer as convalescent or incurable permitted to remain, and supported out of the funds of the Hospital, it would soon become a poor-house, and have no vacant space or funds left for the diseased for whose relief it was solely intended. It may be readily understood, however, that it is oftentimes very difficult to get those who have no means of support away—and hence the most positive rule has been necessarily adopted for the guidance of the Institution in this respect, that all and every patient who is discharged must leave the Hospital immediately.

Now the evidence in this case shows that so far from this rule having been applied with unwonted severity with regard to Ellen Thompson, there had actually been an exception made in her favor. She would have been sent out on the 15th January by the medical attendant, but on account of her want of clothing was allowed to remain till the 5th February, when she was discharged. The same want of clothing prevented her from being sent out immediately on the day she was discharged, as the Institution does not furnish, and has no funds from which to furnish clothing; but at length the matron herself from her own clothing prepared what was absolutely requisite. The poor woman was sent to the house of the clergyman of her own faith attending the Hospital, and if not his house it is the house where the porter is generally sent to for the priest to visit the sick.

It is but just to the officers of the Hospital to state that the Clergymen who were in daily attendance upon the sick in that Institution, had been informed a considerable time previous that this woman was ready to be discharged, and would be sent out but for her want of clothing to cover her; and three days before she was sent out the matron distinctly informed one of these gentlemen that Ellen Thompson could remain no longer in the Hospital, and enquired of him where she was to be sent; and on the same day on which she was sent out the Clergyman in attendance was again notified.

The Committee do not say that in the extreme case of the Clergyman refusing to have anything to do with her remarking that it was an unseasonable hour, between five and six o'clock in the afternoon, she should have been, as was the case, left within the porch. It would have been better in their opinion to have brought her back to the Hospital until some way of disposing of her had been devised; but such a case not being contemplated in the rules, and the Porters having before taken discharged patients to the Clergyman attending the Hospital, must have believed that he was only doing his duty, especially as it is generally understood each Church should take care of their own poor, when discharged from the Hospital, and, that discharged patients had formerly been sent to the Clergyman in question, and been cared for by some of the numerous and well endowed charitable agencies of their Church.

We will offer a few remarks upon the above. We

contend that the fact of the woman's discharge proves, not her convalescence, but the desire on the part of the hospital authorities to get rid of her. A better index to the real state of her health, may be found in the following particulars, which we give upon the authority of the Catholic clergyman especially charged with the duty of visiting the hospital.

The widow Thompson was admitted (to the best of his recollection) about the beginning of last December, and up to the 28th of last month, did not seem to be so ill as to require any special spiritual assistance. On the morning of the 28th, upon his visiting the sick, the attention of the reverend gentleman was called by one of the nurses (all of whom are Protestants) to the state of old *Granny*, as she was called. Upon examination, the clergyman found her condition such, that he deemed it his duty to lose no time in giving her the last rites of the Church. For this purpose, he hurried off to the Church of St. Patrick's; but, being unable to return himself, he dispatched another Priest to the hospital, who administered to the widow Thompson the Sacraments of Extreme Unction, and of the Blessed Eucharist as her *Vinticum*. From this time to Tuesday the 4th, her condition remained unaltered. On that day, the day immediately preceding her expulsion from the hospital, the Priest again administered to the sick woman the Holy Communion in the expectation of her immediate dissolution, and on the following day, Wednesday, the 5th instant, she was turned out of the hospital after night-fall, in the depth of a Canadian winter, and left lying on the snow before the door of the Jesuits. When it is remembered that the subject of this treatment was an old woman 73 years of age, and unable, from disease, to move without assistance, it is surely needless for us to comment upon the propriety, or impropriety of the whole proceeding.

The clergyman who is our authority, admits that the matron applied to him before the discharge of the old woman, but he positively asserts that he never authorized her being sent to him; that, on the contrary, he warned the matron that he was unable to make any provision for her, as his instructions confined him to attendance upon the patients, inmates of the hospital. As to the officers of the hospital having sent other sick persons to him, our informant assures us, that since he took charge of the hospital, about fifteen months ago, he has no recollection of but one person having been sent to him; although he is aware that before then, another invalid (a Catholic) was sent from the hospital to St. Patrick's Church, and that, although the best care was taken of him, he died within eighteen days after having been so discharged.

The assertion that the widow Thompson "was sent to the house of the clergyman of her own faith attending the hospital, and if not his house, it is the house where the porter is generally sent to for the Priest to visit the sick," is incorrect. The authorities of the hospital know, or ought to know, that it is not to the house of the Jesuits that the porter is usually sent when the services of a Catholic Priest are required, and that neither of the Catholic clergymen who daily visit the sick, belong to the order of the Jesuits.

We have no desire to create any prejudice against the English hospital. We have confined ourselves to the bare statement of facts, and our object in so doing, is to prevent a repetition of the very impertinent conduct on the part of the hospital authorities, in leaving patients, of whom they may wish to be delivered, at the door of private gentlemen. It should be remembered, that in the eye of the law the Jesuits are nothing more than private citizens; that in becoming Priests they have not ceased to be gentlemen, and are therefore entitled to be treated like private citizens, and as gentlemen. We do not ask of our Protestant brethren any respect for their sacred character; but as the equals, to say the least, of their insulters, in education, good breeding, birth, and everything which goes to make up the character of gentlemen, the Jesuits have the right to insist that, for the future, the authorities of the English hospital shall refrain from a repetition of the very impertinent conduct of which we have had occasion to complain.

A writer in the *Transcript* assures us, that "the statement made that Protestants are admitted to the hospital of the Hotel Dieu, is so entirely at variance with the general belief, that he is disposed to think it will be found to be a mistake of the typographer, or, perhaps, of the editor, in the course of rapid writing." We beg leave to assure the writer of the above, that our statement is perfectly correct, and that the "general belief" is merely a proof of the "general ignorance" respecting everything connected with Catholicity and Catholic institutions, which prevails amongst Protestants. The authority for our statement, is a report lying before us, signed by Dr. P. Munro, Professor of Clinical Surgery, and L. Boyer, both medical attendants at the Hotel Dieu. If men, who never cease from talking about subjects of which they are profoundly ignorant, would but give themselves the trouble of making a few preliminary inquiries, they would spare us some trouble and themselves much ridicule; they would discover that patients are admitted into the Hotel Dieu, not according to the nature of their religion, but of their disease; and that, strange though it may seem to "many who do not believe the statement," these Protestant patients can always be attended by ministers of their own persuasion, when they choose to send for them. We appeal to the personal experience of the Rev. J. Irwin, if this be not the case.