

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES FOR GEORGE B. CLERK, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

Terms: Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum. Country do, 24 " Payable Half-Yearly in Advance. Single Copies, 3d.

The True Witness. MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 6, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. As we were going to press, news arrived that the Atlantic Telegraph Squadron had succeeded in laying the Cable.

By the Persia we have European dates to the 24th inst. The news is of little importance. From India, we have a confirmation of the recapture of Gwalior, by Sir Hugh Rose on the 19th June. Gwalior was deemed almost impregnable, and the moral effect of Sir Hugh Rose's victory will doubtless be great.

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS.—The Macdonald-Cartier Ministry having been defeated by a majority of 14 in the Legislative Assembly, on the question of the propriety of accepting the decision of the Imperial authorities in favor of Ottawa as the Seat of Government, deemed it their duty to tender their resignation on Thursday of last week; which was accepted by the Governor-General, who at once sent for Mr. George Brown, and committed to him the task of forming a new administration.

Friday, Saturday, and Sunday were employed in negotiations; and at last on Monday evening, an extra of the Government Gazette appeared, containing the following appointments: Inspector-General, Mr. George Brown. Speaker of Legislative Council, Mr. James Morris.

From the first it was evident that the new Ministry would be exposed to the fiercest attacks of their predecessors in office; and accordingly, hardly had the announcement of the new appointments been made, than a vote of "Want of Confidence" was proposed and carried, in the Upper House by a majority of 16 to 8; and in the Legislative Assembly by 71 to 30; thus showing that with the Parliament as at present constituted, it was impossible for the Brown-Dorion administration to carry on the government of the country.

It seems, however, that Mr. Brown with a faculty inconceivable on the part of an old stager, had neglected before undertaking the task imposed upon him, to exact a pledge from the Governor General that a dissolution should be granted, in case he—Mr. Brown—should find himself unable to command a majority in the present Parliament. On Wednesday, therefore, the Governor having refused to accede to the request of his new Ministry for a dissolution, the latter found themselves obliged to tender their resignation; and it is now reported that Mr. Galt has been sent for, charged with the duty of forming a new administration, which it is expected will be a mere repletage of the Macdonald-Cartier Cabinet.

In the mean time, public business is at a stand still, great and unnecessary expence is inflicted upon the country, whilst the battle between the "Ins" and the "Outs" rages fiercer than ever. In it we confess we take but little interest. Between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, betwixt George Brown, and an Orangeman like J. A. Macdonald, there is, in so far as Catholics are concerned, but little to choose. From neither have we any reason to expect justice, and we may, therefore, look upon their struggles for place and salary with perfect indifference.

THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL AND THE "MONTREAL WITNESS."—We cannot but feel highly flattered and gratified at the pertinacity with which our cotemporary returns, week after week; to the subject of the Pastoral lately issued by His Lordship Mgr. Bourget; as it is a convincing proof; both of the importance attached by Protestants to documents of which they, on other occasions, affect to speak lightly; and of the severe blow which has been dealt by our

Chief Pastor, to the "Swaddlers," and their allies, the infidels of Lower Canada. The devil never sings out unless he is hurt.

Not that the Montreal Witness intends in his strictures to be complimentary to His Lordship. On the contrary, he would fain persuade his readers that the Bishop is one of the most terrible monsters in existence; and for this purpose brings forward no end of charges against him. Very formidable is the indictment presented by our saintly friend against the Popish Prelate; of which the substance is, that Mgr. Bourget governs the Diocese entrusted to him by Almighty God, without the slightest regard either to the views, or rather prejudices, of the Montreal Witness, or to the interests of Protestantism.—Nay! to such lengths has this tyrannical Prelate proceeded, that he has presumed to condemn, as unworthy of the perusal of Catholics, all immoral and heretical works; and instead of calling upon the Legislature for aid to check the prevalent vice of drunkenness, has actually—such is the man's temerity!—had the audacity to recommend his flock to address themselves to God, and to invoke the prayers of the Blessed Virgin Mother of His Divine Son. What is this but another Romish aggression, and an indirect attack upon the supremacy of the State? The Bishop, if he had been a man after the Montreal Witness' own heart, would have made application for a "Maine Law," instead of having recourse to purely spiritual weapons against one of the greatest moral evils of the day. Alas! our poor Bishop is neither a Protestant philanthropist, nor a "World Reformer."

Now we are not going to attempt even, a defence of our Bishop against all, or any of, the charges brought against him by the Montreal Witness. We fear that it is but too true that in addressing his flock, he speaks as one conscious of having authority from God; and that he eschews altogether the style and language of a Protestant Bishop, who, when he opens his mouth, speaks as one conscious that his authority is derived from a First Lord of the Treasury, or one of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. It must be conceded too, that, in his Pastoral letters, the Bishop is evidently far more anxious to say what is true, than what is likely to prove acceptable to the depraved appetites of the multitude; and that he neither attempts to flatter the vanity nor to pander to the passions, of his readers; thus showing himself to be altogether different from the occupiers of Protestant pulpits, and the ministers of evangelical congregations. Such an assumption of authority cannot but be offensive to our cotemporary, as altogether opposed to the great Protestant Tradition of which he is the exponent.

But worst of all, it seems that Mgr. Bourget has actually denounced all immoral and heretical books, as unworthy of a place in a Catholic library; and has enjoined his flock, upon pain of excommunication, to abstain from the perusal of all such works, not to purchase them, and to refuse them if thrust upon them by the Colporteurs, or other peddlars of immoralities and obscenities. Here again we will not attempt to vindicate the action of the Bishop, nor will we offer any apology for such a stretch of ecclesiastical despotism as the exclusion of immoral and irreligious books from the library of a Catholic Institute; yet we do think that we have the right to question the propriety of our cotemporary's strictures thereupon. Of all men, the editor of the Montreal Witness should be the last to reproach Mgr. Bourget with illiberality for his efforts to exclude books of an irreligious or immoral tendency from the reading-room of the Institute. Has then our cotemporary lost all recollection of an effort made by a certain party—amongst whom the editor of the Montreal Witness held a somewhat prominent position—to exclude from the Reading Room of a Literary Society in this City, some of the leading, and certainly some of the ablest Protestant periodicals of the day—the Westminster Review and the Christian Inquirer—upon the grounds that they carried their Protestantism somewhat beyond the limits which the editor of the Montreal Witness and his immediate friends desired to assign to their Protest? Was not the alleged heterodoxy of the Westminster Review and the Christian Inquirer urged by the editor of the Montreal Witness as a valid reason for their exclusion? and did not our cotemporary insist upon the duty of Christians to abstain from the perusal, and from encouraging the circulation of books which he deemed to be of an irreligious tendency? We are not now contesting the truth of the principles then laid down by our cotemporary with reference to the duty of Christians towards publications of an anti-Christian or immoral tendency; nor are we the apologists of the Westminster Review—a periodical whose ultra-Protestant tendencies we readily admit—nor of the very clever Christian Inquirer. Our object is merely to point out to the Montreal Witness the inconsistency of which it is guilty, when in one breath it advocates the exclusion from the Reading Room of a Montreal Literary Society, of works which attack what it holds to be a portion of revealed truth; and in another, denounces the Catholic Bishop of Montreal for pursuing the same policy towards works

which attack, either openly or covertly, by argument or ridicule, those dogmas which Catholics on at least as good grounds, hold as proceeding from God. If the sneers of the Westminster Review against the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, against the authority and the Inspiration of the Bible, and the divine origin of Christianity—and if its assertion of the right of "private judgment" against the Scriptures, afforded valid reasons for its exclusion from the Reading Room of a Non-Catholic Literary Society—surely it is equally reasonable that all works impugning the truth of any other Catholic dogmas, and questioning the authority and divine origin of the Church, should be excluded from the Libraries and Reading Rooms of Catholic Societies. The writer in the Westminster Review has his "private judgment," and the editor of the Montreal Witness can boast of nothing more. If in the exercise of their respective private judgments, they arrive at very opposite conclusions, surely neither has the right to condemn the other, unless it can be shown that one has been influenced by unworthy motives;—and the Montreal Witness by presuming to sit in judgment upon the Westminster Review and condemn it, was guilty of a gross violation of the fundamental principle of Protestantism—that is the right of "private judgment" in all matters connected with religion. In inviting criticism upon the historical truth of the Incarnation, and provoking to free enquiry into the evidence for the Inspiration of the short treatise known as the "Gospel according to St. Luke"—and consequently for the credibility of that writer's narrative of the supernatural events connected with the birth of Jesus—the Westminster Review does but fulfil the duty of a liberal inquirer after truth, a course which the Montreal Witness warmly and incessantly urges upon Catholics. In condemning the Westminster Review for so doing, and advocating its exclusion from the Reading Room, the Montreal Witness was—and avowedly without authority—pursuing the identical line of conduct which he attributes to, and condemns in the Bishop of Montreal.

But the latter claims to have authority, and from God, to speak in the matter in dispute; authority to judge betwixt the true and the false, and to condemn the latter. He claims, as a member of the Catholic Episcopate, to speak in the name of the Catholic Church—and that Church recognises the claim. Again that Church claims, in virtue of the Lord's promise, to speak in His name, with His authority, and as enlightened by His ever present, ever assisting Spirit, as the sole medium by Him appointed for promulgating, and perpetuating to the consummation of all things, the knowledge of revealed truth.—Before the Montreal Witness, then, can make out a case against the Bishop of Montreal for condemning certain books as immoral and irreligious, he is bound to show one of two things—Either that it is wrong to prohibit the perusal and circulation of books of an immoral and irreligious tendency, and therefore that it was wrong on his part to attempt to suppress the Christian Inquirer and Westminster Review, or else that the works condemned by the Bishop of Montreal are not of an immoral or irreligious tendency; that is that they contain nothing contrary to faith or morals, and that the Bishop is not a competent judge in matters spiritual.

But before he can do this, the Montreal Witness must prove that the Catholic Church is fallible, and that he himself is infallible, in all such matters. For, if not infallible, therefore liable to error, and therefore incompetent to determine whether any particular proposition with reference to faith or morals, be true or false. If he has nothing but his "private judgment" to appeal to, we reject him altogether as umpire in the matter in dispute; and will in the mean time be well content to abide by the decisions of one who has not only his "private judgment," but the testimony of the Catholic Church in his behalf.

In conclusion we would ask of the Montreal Witness to tell us frankly how he would deal with one whom he should find circulating amongst his children, or those over whom he had any influence—or endeavouring to force into the Library of a Literary Society of which he was Patron, President, or Member,—works such as Strauss' Life of Jesus, or the writings of the Rev. Theodore Parker, the most celebrated Protestant divine of the United States? We would remind him too, that in the opinion of Catholics, the tracts and pamphlets hawked about by his friends the Colporteurs amongst our French Canadians, and which have been condemned by the Bishop of Montreal, are at least as irreligious, immoral and dangerous, as any of the writings of the authors above enumerated. We pause for a reply.

A NEW "SWADDLER."—The Kingston Commercial Advertiser of the 30th ult., announces the advent of an emissary from the noble army of Saupers in Ireland, to collect funds for the "Support of the Irish Church Missions for the conversion of the Roman Catholics." The funds of the aforesaid Society are at the present moment at a very low ebb; and the admirers of

cant and humbug will be delighted to learn that the Rev. Mr. Fleury, for so the reverend "Swaddler" entitles himself, managed to collect "a very considerable sum" from the simpletons of Kingston for the conversion of Irish Catholics.

As this Mr. Fleury is apparently a very zealous servant of the Lord, we would suggest to him that the attention of the "Irish Church Missions" of which he is the advocate, might very properly and profitably be turned from the Papists of Ireland, to the sound Protestants of the sister Isle. We would direct his notice to certain extracts which will be found in our other columns, from Protestant journals of the British Empire, upon the morals of Protestantism, and the fearfully rapid increase of illegitimate births amongst the rural Protestant populations of England and Scotland. Would it not, we suggest it in all charity, would it not be better, more in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel, to endeavour to effect the reformation of the brutalised Protestant masses of England and Scotland—to try and convert the men to sobriety, and to give the women some faint idea of the meaning of the words purity and chastity—than to seek to disturb the faith of the Catholics of Ireland, whose Popish daughters are as justly celebrated throughout the world for their marvellous purity, as the great mass of the rural populations of Protestant England, Scotland, and Sweden, are infamous for their licentiousness, and bestial depravity. If the Rev. Mr. Fleury has any doubts on this head, we commend to his notice an article from the Scotsman, an Edinburgh Protestant paper, which he will find in our issue of the 23d ult. From this most unexceptionable witness—unexceptionable because a Scotchman and a Protestant—he will learn that the women of the rural population of Protestant Scotland, are—if we except the Protestants of Sweden, and perhaps the Sandwich Islanders—the most impure, the most unchaste, immodest, and licentious people on the face of the earth; and that in point of morality, Protestant Scotland contrasts unfavorably with the most depraved nations of heathen antiquity. From an article in the present issue, which we extract from the Protestant Union, he will also see that the rural populations of Protestant England are scarce a whit better; and that precisely there, where dissent, or evangelical Protestantism, does most obtain, there is debauchery most rampant, there, illegitimate births the most rife. These facts, voluntarily attested to by Protestants, merit surely the serious attention of the Protestant world. If, we say, with such hideous facts staring them in the face, the Protestants of Kingston will still persist in their fortunately impotent efforts to degrade the Catholics of Ireland to a level with themselves—if they will still allow themselves to be gulled out of their cash by itinerant "Swaddlers" from the French Canadian Missionary Society or the "Irish Church Missions"—we shall set them down as a set of incurable simpletons.

That the Rev. Mr. Fleury—whom the Kingston Commercial Advertiser recommends for a government appointment as Protestant Bishop of Kingston—entertains a very low opinion of the intelligence of his Protestant auditors, and that he himself is not much troubled with conscientious scruples against evil speaking, lying, and slandering, is evident from the style of his discourse, some extracts from which we find reported in the Kingston British Whig of the 31st ult. We cull the following for the delectation of our readers, and as a specimen of the stuff that Protestant fools are fed upon:—

"The Rev. Dr. Fleury"—says the British Whig (Protestant)—"a night or two ago at the Irish Church Missions Meeting in the City Hall, was pitching into the poor Papists as usual, and among other polite things told the following story:— 'An Irish priest found out that one of his parishioners had a Protestant Bible, so going to the man he taxed him with the enormity, which Pat did not deny. 'Give me the book instantly,' cried his Reverence. 'Not till I have read it,' replied Pat. 'If you dare to read it,' said the Priest, 'I'll turn you into a rat,' and left him. When the Priest was gone, Pat repented his temerity, and went after his father-confessor with tears in his eyes. 'Take the book,' says he, 'and take away your curse.' 'Have you read it?' asked the Priest, 'for if you have, into a rat you'll be turned, and no prayers can save you.' So the poor fellow went home despondingly, and when alone with his wife, said, 'Nolly, have I been a good husband to you?' 'You have Pat,' said she. 'Have I always taken care of the childer, Molly?' 'You have, Pat,' cried she again. 'Then,' sobbed he, 'when you see my nose grow long, my ears get longer, my face and body covered with hair, and a long tail between my legs, if you love me, Molly, keep the cat out of the room!'"

Now considering that the above is an old "Joe Miller" story, we can have no possible objection to its repetition by the Rev. Mr. Fleury; though we do think that the City Hall, the common property of Protestants and Catholics, was not the fitting place for lectures such as those delivered by the Reverend "Swaddler," and that if his sacred vocation does impose on him the necessity of telling silly lies, to a pack of gaping fools, against his Catholic fellow-citizens, a more appropriate theatre for the disgusting exhibition might have been selected. This, however, is a point which we leave the Catholics of Kingston to settle with their own Municipal authorities. But what shall we say of the man, calling himself a Minister of the Gospel, who could give utterance to such palpable falsehoods? To reason with such a one would be a hopeless task, and to

attempt to convict him of being a liar and slanderer, but a work of supererogation. That he is a worthy exponent of the Holy Evangelical Faith, we have no doubt, and well entitled to a niche in the Protestant Valhalla, alongside the Rev. Titus Oates, the saintly Achilli, and the chaste Maria Monk; but we think that after the specimen of his pulpit oratory given above, the great majority of respectable Protestants, especially amongst the members of the Anglican body, will more than doubt his fitness for the situation of Protestant Bishop of Kingston. Indeed we were sorry to learn from the Kingston Commercial Advertiser that this Mr. Fleury calls himself a minister of the Church of England. We have always been prompt to recognise the wide difference betwixt the clergymen of that denomination, and the tag-rag and bobtail of the conventicle, the spawn of Exeter Hall, who usually distinguish themselves by "pitching into the poor Papists" as the British Whig has it. We may doubt the validity of Anglican Orders, and call in question Anglican claims to the "Apostolic Succession;" but that the holders of these Orders are, as a general rule, gentlemen by birth and education, and as such, entitled to respect, no one will think venture to deny. We regret, therefore, when we find an ill-bred, coarse-minded and mendacious charlatan like this fellow Fleury—who ought by rights to be a Jumper or Methodist, or something of that sort—claiming fellowship with the ministers of the Church of England.

"ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION."—Two men once went up into the Temple to pray: the one a Pharisee, the other a Publican; the one made public profession of his "entire sanctification;" the other, smiting upon his breast, cried—"O God be merciful to me a sinner." In the Pharisee and publican of old, we have the exact counterparts of the evangelical Protestant, and the Catholic of the present day.

This fact has been forcibly impressed upon us by the perusal of an article in the Christian Guardian of the 28th ult.; being a critical notice of "The Life and Diary" of an eminent Methodist, lately deceased—a Mrs. Pickford, of Salisbury. This exemplary and extremely modest personage, as we are informed in the columns of our cotemporary, "did not profess to be either perfect in knowledge, or exempt from mistakes and errors, or independent of the atoning blood of Jesus and the sanctifying power of the Spirit, or incapable of falling from her steadfastness." She did not indeed look upon herself as a fully fledged angel, though she had no manner of doubt that the feathers were fast sprouting; but contented herself with the comfortable conviction that she possessed the witness of the Holy Spirit to her "entire sanctification."—For this, like the Pharisee of old, she constantly gave God thanks, that she was not as others were, and that He had filled "the temple of her soul with peace and purity;" she enjoyed also the high privilege of holding "distinct and separate communion" with the Persons of the ever Blessed Trinity: "with the Father at one season, and with the Son, or Spirit, at other seasons." This boast of the sainted Methodist is felt even by the Christian Guardian, to be a little too close an approach to the confines of blasphemy, and he shrinks from altogether "committing himself to it;" our cotemporary is conscious that this is "a coming of it rather too strong," as Mr. Samirel Weller remarked under somewhat analogous circumstances, in the case of his revered mother-in-law; though he still qualifies his doubts by the assertion that "it is our undoubted privilege to obtain joyous inward evidence of its truth"—that is the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity.

This then is the Spirit that evangelical Protestantism engenders and fosters amongst its deluded votaries; a spirit of pride the most dangerous, because a spiritual pride; the spirit which spake by the mouth of the Pharisee in the Temple, when he returned God thanks that he was not as other men were, nor such as those Papists. What further testimony do we need of the origin of such a spirit? For our parts, we look upon the fact, that persons are still to be found, making open profession of their "entire sanctification," as a convincing proof of the reality of demoniacal possession in the XIX. century.

REVIEW OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.—The annexed passage from an editorial article in the Toronto Colonist of the 2d inst., is pregnant with meaning, and should certainly arouse the Catholic laity of Upper Canada to the necessity of immediate action on the long agitated School Question:—

"If any government concern is to last a week; if its members are not to proclaim themselves traders in vile prejudice, and demagogues of the worst species, a large, broad, comprehensive policy must be agreed on. After the last general election cry, it is sheer folly to think that a few sham reforms will satisfy the people. The late Government might be sustained again, as they have been before, by a considerable parliamentary majority in keeping the school law as it is. But for the new men, a new educational policy is absolutely a necessity of existence. We take it, no special pleading can get over this sober fact.

Any policy which shall open up the entire educational question, will be of service to the cause