

HEMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND.
 SHORT SIGHT BILLS from One Pound upwards, negotiable in any part of the United Kingdom, are drawn on the
 Union Bank of London, London.
 Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
 National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
 By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
 St. Sacramento Street,
 Montreal, February 9, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

We are still without decisive intelligence from the Seat of War. Silistria still holds out, though closely pressed by 70,000 Russians. In several sorties, especially on the 29th ult., the garrison have inflicted severe punishment upon their assailants. The place, it was expected, could hold out to the 15th inst.; by which time a considerable force of the Allies would be in the field; on the other hand, the Russians were pushing on reinforcements from Bucharest. Everything seemed to indicate that a bloody and decisive battle was at hand. We have nothing new from the Baltic.

The political news from England is important; several changes have occurred in the composition of the Cabinet, amongst which the following are reported:—

- Lord John Russell,—President of the Council.
- Duke of Newcastle—Secretary of War.
- Sir George Grey,—Secretary for the Colonies.

THE CANADIEN AND THE BISHOPS OF CANADA.

It must have been with feelings of shame and indignation that every good Catholic read the following startling announcement, which appeared in the columns of the *Canadien* on the 12th inst., and was subsequently copied by the *Montreal Freeman*:—

"Yesterday, the faithful at Notre-Dame had the pleasure of listening to the eloquent Bishop of Toronto, Mgr. de Charbonnel, who took advantage of the occasion—speaking not only in his own name, but in that of all the Catholic Bishops of Canada—to recommend strongly the present Ministry to the confidence of the Catholic population of the Province." The Italics are our own.

"It is false, false as hell"—was the indignant exclamation of every honest Catholic—of every one except some miserable lick-spittle—on reading the above. "Never would Mgr. Charbonnel, that eminently prudent and exemplary Prelate, so have debased himself, or so vilely prostituted his sacred office; never would he have ventured thus publicly to compromise his colleagues; never would he have condescended to appear in the pulpit as a mere 'stump-ordinator'—or, as the *Journal de Quebec* aptly terms it, as—"un claqueur ministeriel." Yes, we knew, every intelligent Catholic knew, the moment he read it, that the statement in the *Canadien* was an infamous falsehood; the miserable attempt of a reckless partisan, to get up a little political capital against the approaching general election, at the expense of the honor and good name of the Bishops of the Catholic Church; a desperate bid for Catholic votes in favor of the political programme of the present Ministry—including of course—"Secularisation of the Reserves—Seigniorial Tenure Question—Railroads and Debentures." Well indeed, and with good reason, might all sincere Catholics blush with shame and anger, at seeing their beloved Prelates thus vilified, thus foully misrepresented—and, worst of all, in a professedly Catholic journal! Had an open and avowed enemy done this, we might have borne it; but alas! when a pretended friend condescends to the dirty work! what shall we say then?—what answer can we make to the jeers and scoffs of our adversaries? Must we not bang our heads with shame, and admit the justice of their reproaches?

Nor have the Protestant papers been slow to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded to them by the *Canadien*. In severe, and—were the facts of the case, as related by our cotemporaries, true—in meritedly severe terms, have they commented upon the (imputed) conduct of the Bishop of Toronto;—justly have they denounced, the unworthy jumbling together of sacred and profane, religion and politics, the Kingdom of Heaven and the Grand Trunk Railway, the Lord of Hosts and Mr. Hincks. With perfect propriety have they condemned the employment of the language of the hustings in the Chair of Truth, characterising it as a profanation of sacred things, as a vile prostitution of the holiest of offices, to the meanest of purposes.

We blame not our Protestant cotemporaries for their language upon the occasion; we blame rather the *Canadien* and *Montreal Freeman* for giving them an opportunity, which they were not slow to avail themselves of, without pausing to enquire into the truth of the allegations of their informants. By their conduct, these journals have brought scandal upon the Church, and disgrace upon the religion which they profess. Not all that the *Globe*, not all that the *Montreal Gazette*, and the most rabid No-Popery journals of Canada have ever written, has ever done so much injury, or inflicted so much pain upon Catholics, as has this unprincipled attempt of these ministerial "backs," to exhibit the Bishops of Canada, as employing the influence with which their spiritual character invests them, in the service of their political patrons; who, we have reason to know, do not feel at all thankful to their champions for the manner in which they have attempted to serve them. There are good men, high-minded gentlemen, and sincere Catholics, amongst the members of the pre-

sent Ministry; to these the tactics of the *Canadien* and *Montreal Freeman* are as distasteful, as they are injurious to the Church.

Thank God, we have it in our power, to give a full and formal contradiction to the allegations of these papers. It is not indeed to be expected that the Bishop of Toronto should appear in print, to repudiate the expressions falsely attributed to him, or to justify before the public, the language which he, as a Pastor of Christ's Church, may have seen fit to hold in the pulpit. Were he so to condescend once, he might be called upon to refute some other vile calumny tomorrow, and again the next day. Ill would it become the dignity of our Prelates to allow themselves thus to be dragged before the public. It was, perhaps, the knowledge of the insuperable aversion of our Bishops to apologise for, or defend their conduct in, the newspapers, that encouraged the *Canadien* to take such unworthy liberties with the name of the Bishop of Toronto.

But though the Bishop of Toronto can not condescend to take any notice of newspaper paragraphs—though it would ill suit the dignity of our Prelates to contradict the statements of the *Canadien*—it is, we trust, permitted to us to do it for him, and them.—We say it then, with full knowledge of the facts, and from the highest authority, that the Bishop of Toronto never did, either in his own name, or in that of his colleagues, recommend the present Ministry to the confidence of the Catholics of the Province. "The Bishops of Canada"—so runs a communication with which we have been honored—"are never in the habit of passing votes, either of confidence, or of want of confidence, in the Ministry of the day.—Their functions are confined to praying Almighty God to guide and direct the deliberations of the Government, that all its measures may tend to the happiness and well being of the whole community." And if this be not enough, we may add that we know that the Bishop of Toronto repudiates the language imputed to him by the *Canadien*; we know—and we trust that that Prelate will not esteem us guilty of a breach of confidence for making it public—we know that he has spoken of the *Canadien* "as having invented what it said about him"—and we know also that the editor of the *Canadien* was not in the Church on the Sunday in question; and could not therefore have heard Mgr. de Charbonnel recommend the present Ministry to the confidence of the Catholic public. All that can be said in extenuation of the conduct of the *Canadien* amounts to this—that he may perhaps have picked up at second, or third hand, a garbled report of what the Bishop of Toronto really did say; and this plea—though it may go far to acquit the *Canadien* of deliberate falsehood—cannot absolve him from the imputation of culpable negligence, and gross disrespect towards his ecclesiastical superiors; with whom he should have consulted, ere presuming to attribute to them, upon mere rumor, language and conduct so unbecoming the Ministers of God's holy word. We trust that this will be a warning to the *Canadien* how he again attempts to implicate the Episcopate of Canada in his party squabbles; we trust too, now that his grievous error, and its injurious consequences, have been pointed out to him, that he will publicly acknowledge his fault, and thus make some amends for the scandal he has occasioned. These remarks apply as well to the *Montreal Freeman*, who, as having assisted in propagating the scandal, is bound also to give circulation to its refutation.

One word as to what really did take place on the Sunday in question. The Bishop of Toronto, bespeaking the sympathies of the Catholics of Lower Canada for their Upper Canadian brethren, naturally complained of the gross injustice to which the latter are subjected by the operation of the school laws.—But, fearing lest this might seem to convey a censure upon the Ministry—and as it was as little his object to cast odium on them, as to pass a vote of confidence in them—the preacher took care to explain that he did not attribute the hardships of which the Catholics of his diocese complained, to the dishonesty, or evil dispositions of the Government. "On the contrary"—added His Lordship, in his anxiety to avoid all semblance even of partisanship, either for, or against the Ministry—"they have manifested a readiness to listen to our complaints, and to redress our grievances, for which I bless them with all my heart." Finally, the Bishop commended the cause of "Freedom of Education" for the Catholic minority of Upper Canada, "to the prayers and votes of his auditory." Out of these simple circumstances, has the monstrous romance of the *Canadien* been concocted.

In bringing our notice of this painful affair to a conclusion, we would take the liberty of addressing ourselves to the *Montreal Herald*. We do not confound him with the general run of anti-Catholic journalists; and we believe that he is ready to repair a wrong done, even though the victim be a Catholic Bishop. Our cotemporary's remarks of Saturday last were severe; but as he wrote in good faith, and relying on the accuracy of the statements in the *Canadien* and *Montreal Freeman*, we do not blame him.—We would merely request of him to bear in mind that every story has two sides; and, in his next issue, to do Mgr. Charbonnel the justice to state that the assertion that "he, in his own name, and in that of the other Catholic Bishops of Canada, recommended the present Ministry to the confidence of the Catholics of the Province"—has been formally denied.

The *Christian Guardian* having called upon us to deal with the statements of one of his contributors, who writes against Popery over the signature of "Protestant," we complied with our cotemporary's request, by impugning the credibility of his correspondent—instancing his mendacious quotations from the writings of the Cardinal Bellarmine, as

amply sufficient to justify us in refusing to honor such a very unscrupulous, or very ignorant, scribbler with a more lengthy notice. At the same time, we challenged the *Christian Guardian* to verify the pretended quotations from the Cardinal; offering to refer the question at issue, to the arbitration of friends of the *Christian Guardian* at Montreal; pledging ourselves also to produce any of Cardinal Bellarmine's works that might be required for the purpose of verification.—TRUE WITNESS, May 26.

This challenge, to test the veracity of "Protestant," has been declined. "Protestant," like a coward, shrinks from the test, assigning in excuse the following cogent reasons:—

"Any friends I have in Montreal are too precious in my view, and I would not like therefore to be instrumental in endangering their lives and property, which has already been threatened by Ribandmen and Jesuits. Besides St. Tetzal, or St. Liguori, might steal the sentences I have quoted out of the Cardinal's Works, seeing that the interest of the Church needs it; or a winking Madonna, or even any of your priests might miraculously change the words, or stupify the examiners at the time.—*Christian Guardian*, 14th instant."

We have been so long accustomed to the shuffling and quibbling of our evangelical friends, that we scarcely expected that our proposal would be complied with. To lie, and—when challenged to subject their slanders against Popery to the light of enquiry—to shrink like curs from the field—have ever been the tactics of your orthodox No-Popery controversialists. But scarcely ever did we see such miserable reasons assigned for declining the encounter, as those given by the great gun of the *Christian Guardian*. He is afraid, forsooth, for the lives of his friends at Montreal; and has his misgivings, lest Popish priests should miraculously change the words of the passages in dispute, or stupify the examiners. "Protestant," however, still persists, in reiterating his calumnies against Cardinal Bellarmine.

He says, moreover, that, at Knox's College, Toronto, there is an edition of the Cardinal's works. Now, if this be true, we are willing to change the venue from Montreal to Toronto, where the lives of "Protestant's" friends are surely not in danger; and where no Popish priests, or apocryphal saints, can possibly break in, and steal away the words from the printed page. The question at issue is simple. Does Cardinal Bellarmine anywhere teach—that, "at the bidding of the Pope, the Church is bound to believe that vice is good, and virtue evil—and that the Sovereign Pontiff has power to make that sin, which is no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin?" If he does not, then is the writer in the *Christian Guardian* a liar and a slanderer; if he does, then do we promise to renounce all connection with the religion which Cardinal Bellarmine professed. This question can be easily settled. The authorities at Knox's College, will, we doubt not, give "Protestant" access to the Cardinal's works; and we are very certain that, of the gentlemen connected with that institution, there is not one, who, after the examination of the disputed passages, will presume to endorse "Protestant's" statements, or to impugn the correctness of those which we are now about to make. The edition from which we quote is the Paris folio, of 1608, known as the *Editio Tri-Adelphorum*, published in the Cardinal's lifetime; thus affording a guarantee for the integrity of the text. Will "Protestant" be so kind as to tell us what is the edition in use at Knox's College.

In January, 1852, writing upon this same subject, we so fully met this accusation now again brought forward by "Protestant" that all we need do here, is to repeat what we said then. In his 4th book, *De Romano Pont., c. 5*, Bellarmine—having laid down the propositions that, the decrees of the Pope, when addressing the Universal Church, are of binding obligation, and that he is infallible on questions of faith—concludes from these premises that the Sovereign Pontiff, when addressing the Universal Church on questions of morals, is also infallible. "It is impossible"—says Bellarmine—"that the Pontiff should err, by commanding the practice of any vice, or by prohibiting the practice of any virtue." For, were it otherwise, if not infallible, he might err: and, as the Church is bound to yield obedience to his decisions, in that case the Church might fall into grievous error, which is impossible, unless God Himself be a liar. Besides, continues the Cardinal, still applying the same style of argument—If the Church could err in questions of morals, then must she also be liable to err in questions of faith—which is impossible, unless Christ be an impostor.

"For," argues the Cardinal—and it is here the disputed passage occurs—"the Church teaches that all virtue is good, and all vice evil; if, however, the Pope could err, in commanding vice, or in prohibiting virtue"—then, as the Church is bound to hear and obey him—"the Church would be bound to believe vice good, and virtue evil, unless she would sin against her own consciousness"—the said consciousness consisting in her unalterable faith "that all virtue is good, and all vice evil." The argument of the Cardinal, throughout, consists in the "reductio ad absurdum"; and is employed for the purpose of establishing his thesis, that—if the Pope's decisions, on questions of faith and morals, be of universal obligation—and if the Pope be infallible when addressing the Universal Church on matters of faith—then, under similar circumstances he must also be infallible on questions of morals; or else—and he proceeds to show the absurdities which would result from admitting his premises—but denying his conclusions. Thus in Euclid, 1st Book, IV Prop., we read—if the point A coincide with the point C, and the point B with the point D, then must the straight line AB coincide with the straight line CD; or else "two straight lines would enclose a space." What should we think of the honesty of the man who, citing Euclid,

should assert that it was therein taught that "two straight lines can enclose a space?" And yet this is what the whole of "Protestant's" accusation against the Cardinal amounts to.

Another deliberate falsehood of "Protestant," is contained in attributing the following passage to Cardinal Bellarmine:—

"Christ has given to St. Peter (and consequently to the Pope) the power of making that to be sin, which is no sin, and that which is no sin, to be sin."—*Christian Guardian*.

And this passage, we are further informed, is to be found in "Chapter 31." Now unfortunately for "Protestant," this book consists only of 25 chapters, and can have therefore no 31st. In the whole Treatise *De Romano Pont.*, there is but one book, the Second, which has 31 chapters: and in this, we affirm without fear of contradiction, that no such passage occurs: the whole chapter being taken up in discussing the various titles assigned to the Sovereign Pontiffs from the 1st century, to the seventeenth.

The third and last lie which we shall condescend to notice, is the following—still from the "Protestant" of the "Christian Guardian."

"Further, Bellarmine (*De Penit. lib. iv., c. xiii.*) says that 'Papal pardons discharge us from obedience to the commandments of God, which enjoins to do works worthy of repentance.'—*Christian Guardian*."

As there is no *lib. iv., c. xiii.* in which the Cardinal treats of "Indulgences" and their effects. But, so far from insinuating that they "discharge from obedience to the commandments of God," his words are—

"Indulgentia non solvunt nos divinis preceptis." "Indulgences do not discharge from divine commandments."

We suppose that "Protestant" must have contracted the habit of treating the Decalogue as he treats Bellarmine—reading "Thou shalt steal—Thou shalt bear false witness."

We hope that the *Christian Guardian* will now be satisfied with the manner in which we have dealt with the statements of the Methodist champion.

"We learn that the New York street-preacher, J. S. Orr, or, as he is often called, the 'Angel Gabriel,' has stated it as his intention to be in Montreal on the 12th July, and exercise that freedom of speech which was denied Gavazzi."—*Montreal Pilot*, 20th inst.

We fancy that our Protestant ministers, will have but little reason to feel proud of the promised accession to their numbers in the person of their reverend brother, the Rev. Mr. J. S. Orr; and still less do we imagine that this threatened visit is looked upon with feelings of satisfaction by the great mass of our Protestant fellow-citizens. With the exception of a few fire-brands, there is, we believe, a general desire amongst all denominations to forget the past, and to live on good terms with one another; and the arrival amongst us, at this particular juncture—when we are on the eve of a general election—of a notorious and infamous Jack-Pudding like this Protestant minister, the sole object of whose mission is to stir up bad blood betwixt his co-religionists and Catholics, is not likely to meet with the approbation of a single respectable Protestant in Montreal.

The report of the arrival of the Rev. Mr. Orr, for the 12th prox., has been in circulation for some time; but the *Pilot* is the first city paper that has taken notice of it. Perhaps it would have been better not to have alluded to it, and thereby created unnecessary excitement; it was therefore our intention to have kept silence on the subject, had not our cotemporary thus publicly called attention to it; under these circumstances, it may not be amiss to offer a word or two of advice to our friends and Catholic brethren.

In the first place then, if this fellow comes, remember that his object, and the object of those who import him, is, to excite Irish Catholics to some foolish display of violence; their intention is solely to insult and irritate Catholics, and thus to provoke them to a breach of the peace. The surest way then to defeat these objects, and to break the hearts of the Rev. Mr. Orr and his flock, is, for Irish Catholics to take no notice whatever of him, or them; not to go near them; and if, unfortunately, compelled to pass within hearing, not to stop and listen, but to hurry on about their ordinary avocations.

If he attempts to preach in the streets, or the public thoroughfares, we may rely upon the vigilance of our City authorities for a prompt and effectual repression of the nuisance. If, on the contrary, he and his hearers, confine themselves within the limits of some private property, no one has a right to interfere, so long as they do not, by their shouting, or clamor, obtrusively thrust themselves upon the notice of the public. But in no case would interference from a mob be permissible; if this Mr. Orr creates a nuisance, we must leave him to the Police, whose duty it is to abate nuisances, and who will no doubt have received their instructions beforehand.

Finally, we would say to all Irishmen—"Look upon him amongst you, who would incite you to acts of violence, or who would attempt to excite any display of popular feeling on the occasion, as your worst enemy; as the most dangerous foe to your religion, and your nationality. As you respect yourselves—as you honor your country,—and as you love your Church—let nothing provoke you to the slightest manifestation of hostility towards this miserable, half-witted Protestant swaddler, and the handful of designing knaves who encourage him. Keep the peace—and the laws will protect you from all aggression. Keep the peace—and you will gain, not only a complete triumph over those who would assail you, but the respect and sympathy of all the respectable portion of the Protestant community; you will deserve also the blessings of your Church; and approve yourselves worthy of the name of Irishmen and Catholics."