

To the Commissioners.—Your proposition comes to late, though no doubt the facts are as you state. Yet it must be remembered that the present overbearing influence of the Orangemen, and their paramount influence in the State, are but the direct result of our own apathy and venality. Had the Catholics, as a body, but displayed half the zeal to resist the deliberate insult offered to them last year by the Governor General in receiving the Orangemen in his official capacity, that too many of them do to ingratiate themselves with the "powers that be" in the hopes of obtaining some government appointment—were they as much in earnest for the honor of their religion as they are in advancing their own pecuniary interests—were they less addicted to "place-hunting," and not quite so ready to put up tamely with the insolence of "Jack-in-Office" and the dispensers of official patronage generally—something might yet be done; though we confess, that from our experience of the past, we have not any very sanguine hopes for the future. This however is certain—that, until Catholics show to the world, by their prompt but legal and constitutional resentment of insult, from whatever quarter it may proceed, that they respect themselves, it is in vain for them to expect respect from others. Last year, we tamely submitted to a gross and premeditated insult from the Governor General and his Ministry; and by so doing have invited, and justly merit this year to meet with, insult again.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 31, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Mayo Election Committee has terminated its proceedings by unseating Mr. Moore. The Lords have thrown out the "Oaths Bill," on the second reading by a majority of 173 to 139; thus, as they fondly flatter themselves, saving the "Christian" character of the British Empire. An effort will be made in the House of Commons to frustrate the illiberality of the Lords, by giving instructions to the Clerk, to omit, when administering the oaths, the formula—"on the true faith of a Christian"—which is the only part of the oath to which the Jews would object. The Catholic peers in the Upper House voted with the minority; Dr. Sumner, Government Archbishop of Canterbury, "would have felt it a great relief to his mind" to have been able to do the same; but, having the fear of Exeter Hall before his eyes, declared his resolution to maintain the "Christian character" of the British Legislature. The Polygamy Bill has not been proceeded with in the House of Commons.

The trial of Miss Smith, acquitted of the murder of her lover having terminated, public attention has been seriously directed to the events now menacing the British Empire in the East. The latest dates from Bombay are to the 11th ult.; and their contents are, if not altogether so bad as might have been anticipated, very far from encouraging. The entire North West of India was open to the insurgents; some twenty-six thousand men had already been lost to the Bengal Army; and though, in the other Presidencies, no open revolt had occurred, there were but too good reasons for fearing that the hatred of British rule was general and deep-seated.

On the other hand, the insurgents who had foolishly awaited at Delhi the approach of the troops sent against them, had been attacked in their cantonments, and driven back into the city with great slaughter and the loss of twenty-six guns. The heights in the vicinity were strongly occupied by the British forces, and a successful attack upon Delhi was expected immediately. The result will not be long doubtful. The mutineers will be routed, and a signal vengeance inflicted upon them for their unmentionable atrocities. But—it may well be asked—will military executions, no matter how justly deserved, or unsparingly inflicted, tend to restore confidence in British rule amongst the native population of India?

The immediate cause of the outbreak is still enveloped in considerable obscurity. It certainly is not likely that it was a mere burst of unpremeditated fury, or that the "greased cartridges" could alone have provoked it. The general opinion is, that the suspicions of the natives have been aroused by late acts of the Government, and the imprudent countenance given to the evangelical missionaries; and that, fearful that it was intended to make war upon their "caste" system, they were stimulated to a revolt which—considering the long years of insult, oppression, and robbery to which the native races of India have been exposed since the days of Warren Hastings—it is a wonder has been so long postponed. But outraged humanity will at last assert its rights; and it would seem as if the long delayed, but well merited chastisement, were about to fall upon the nation which turned a deaf ear to the indignant remonstrances, and prophetic warnings of Edmund Burke.

The news from the Continent of Europe is not reassuring; there are insurrections and rumors of insurrections—plots and rumors of plots. The Italian insurrection, just repressed, was but a branch of a great plot; whose centre is most probably in London, and whose branches spread throughout all Europe. In Paris, preparations had been made for assassinating Louis

Napoleon, and for another revolution. The great Protestant hero Mazzini, the well beloved of Exeter Hall—though like most other Liberals very careful not to expose himself to any personal risk—was to have inaugurated the era of civil and religious liberty in Italy. This was, according to the correspondent of the *Times*, to have been effected by the liberation of the convicts and galley slaves; and the "letting loose on society some hundreds of ruffians who have themselves only just escaped hanging was," according to the same authority, "but the commencement of the grand plan of the chiefs of this Jacquerie movement." Of the nature of the stimulants applied to these champions of "civil and religious liberty" some idea may be formed from the following circular, which was extensively hawked about by the brave Mazzini's agents:—

"Courage! The first house and family that should be sacked in — Street, will be the family of being the richest, the most wealthy, and being spies and cruel enemies of liberty. Pillage and fire! Courage!"

With such evidences of the progress of sound Protestant principles in the South of Europe, it would seem as if the long expected explosion could not much longer be averted; and certainly we should not be surprised at the efforts made by the existing governments to exclude the apostles of the new evangel from their dominions. It is of course superfluous to mention that English names figure amongst the lists of the Italian revolutionists—for when was there an insurrection in which British emissaries and the agents of Exeter Hall were not actively engaged? In this instance however, a Miss White, has been arrested; and since of her guilty complicity there can be no doubt she has been very properly committed to prison; we anticipate a dreadful explosion of bile amongst the saints in consequence. Amidst all these horrors, and incentives to blood and plunder, it is consolatory to read the accounts of the Holy Father's progress. Everywhere he is received with joy, and the honors due to his exalted position; and amidst the acclamations of the faithful, who in thousands crowd around his route to catch a sight of his features, and to receive his blessing, the calumnies of the enemies of the Lord's Anointed can no more be heard—and the truth is proclaimed, that, not upon the bayonets of his soldiers, but upon the affection of his people, is the throne of Pius IX firmly established.

As a proof of the truth of what we stated in our last, that "a Protestant lie is immortal," we may be permitted to quote the following from the *Toronto Colonist*:—

"A few years ago Mr. Bronson—a misprint evidently for Dr. Bronson—who, as our readers are doubtless aware, is a very learned and talented convert to the Church of Rome, lectured in Montreal on Church history; and among other things propagated the singularly offensive doctrine, 'that Protestants are all illegitimate—that their marriages are mere shams, and their ordinances but so many pious frauds.' We may not give his exact words; but we undertake to say, that they were stronger rather than milder than we have stated." The Italics are our own.

When, or where, this lie originated, or by whom it was first set agoing, we cannot say; but this is not the first time that we have seen it in print, and, not only contradicted it, but proved its absurdity. Yet, knowing it to be a lie, and a lie so ridiculous that it can be credited only by the most stupid, and the most ignorant, the *Colonist* hesitates not to reproduce it, at the present moment of excitement, as if it had never been refuted; and as if even in Montreal, where his lectures were delivered, and reported by the Protestant press, every intelligent Protestant did not know it to be a groundless lie.

Dr. Bronson never said, or insinuated, that "Protestants are all illegitimate;" that their "marriages are mere shams;" or that all "their ordinances are but so many pious frauds." We will show why it is impossible that he could have given utterance to such silly nonsense, so offensive to his hearers, and so repugnant to the express doctrines and practice of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Bronson's Lectures in Montreal were attended by Protestants, and were reported, when they were delivered, by the Protestant press of this city. If therefore the language imputed to him by the *Colonist* had been made use of by him, we should most certainly have found it reported, and complained of, in the columns of that press. It would also have appeared in our own columns—seeing that we reported the Doctor's lectures as they were delivered, and would not assuredly have softened down any of his expressions. Now, we challenge the *Colonist* to produce from the reports given at the time of Dr. Bronson's lectures in the Montreal press, any such language as that which he attributes to him.

In the next place, Dr. Bronson is, as the *Colonist* admits, "a learned and talented convert to the Church of Rome;" and therefore well acquainted with the doctrines and practice of that Church. He is also a scholar not unknown to the world, not without honor amongst his own community, and therefore not likely in a public lecture to have hazarded statements, which every one in the slightest degree conversant with the doctrines of the "Church of Rome," must have known to be false. He is also a married

man, and a father; married, and with children born unto him whilst yet a Protestant, and certainly not likely to cast doubts upon the honor of his own wife, or the legitimacy of his own children.

Now, every Catholic child knows that the "Church of Rome" does recognise the validity of Protestant marriages, in that she insists, and that most strongly, upon their indissolubility; and does consequently recognise the legitimacy of the issue of all such marriages. Were it otherwise, she would, of course, insist upon the separation of those Protestants whom she received into her communion, after marriage. But this she does not do, neither does she re-marry them, or make any difference betwixt the children, issue of such marriages—born after or before their parents' conversion; and therefore this, the invariable practice of the Church with married converts from Protestantism—and of which Dr. Bronson must therefore have had personal experience—must convince every one that he, a "learned and talented convert," would not have been such a fool as to make a public display of his ignorance, by attributing to the Church doctrines which not only she does not hold, but which she expressly repudiates.

There are indeed sexual unions common amongst Protestants which the law recognises as valid marriages; but which the Catholic Church, and a considerable portion of the Anglican sect, agree in denouncing as adulterous. We mean the unions of two persons, either of whom has been divorced, and whose former partner is still living. Of these unions, common in the United States, and which, it is to be feared, will be so soon in Great Britain, the Church, no doubt, looks upon the issue as illegitimate; because they are so—being the issue of an adulterous connection, which no legislation, which no Acts of Parliament can render lawful under any circumstances. Of these marriages therefore—i.e., the re-marriages of divorced persons during the lifetime of their former partners—the learned Doctor may have spoken in the manner attributed to him by the *Colonist*; but, and we repeat it, it is a self-evident lie—to say that Dr. Bronson—a gentleman well versed in Catholic theology, himself a convert, married as a Protestant, and whilst a Protestant, the father of a family—did openly and wilfully misrepresent the doctrines of his Church, for the sake of stigmatising his wife as a concubine, and his own children as illegitimate; and that this, though done publicly, escaped the notice of the reporters for the press actually present.

Neither would the Doctor have been such a fool as to say that all the "ordinances" of Protestants were "but so many pious frauds." Of the only two religious ordinances which the majority of Protestants admit—baptism and the Lord's Supper—the "Church of Rome" expressly asserts the validity of one—Protestant baptism; though she does not recognise the sacramental character of their other ordinance as by them administered. This the *Colonist* may condemn as illiberal; but he must conclude the Anglican sect under the same condemnation; for it not only refuses to recognise the sacramental character of the Lord's Supper, as administered by Dissenters, but, according to the natural interpretation of its 23rd article, must deny the validity of their baptisms; seeing that it declares it to be unlawful for any man to administer the sacraments "before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same." Now, the "Church of Rome" holds that baptism administered by any baptised person, is a valid baptism, and a real sacrament.

The *Colonist* further says:— "Gavazzi, as we need hardly repeat here, owed his life to his courage and to his strength in Quebec, for repeating really not half as irritating things as Mr. Bronson did when there; and his hearers and himself were subjected to the dangers of little less than a battle, because of his telling the same story in Montreal."

All we need reply to this is to quote the following expressions made use of by Gavazzi towards the Catholic clergy, as reported at the time in the *Toronto Globe*. If from any *contemporaneous* report, published by Catholic or Protestant, of Dr. Bronson's lectures, the *Colonist* can cite anything "half as irritating," we shall leave the Doctor in his hands to receive a well merited castigation. If he cannot, he must pardon us if we look upon him as a wilful and deliberate slanderer:—

"Tolerance with the Roman Church is a crime against your church and your society."
"The Roman clergy have no social affections; don't call yourselves priests, call yourselves murderers; the Romish clergy are the soul of Satan, the soul of the Devil himself."
"The Church of Rome belongs to anti-Christ and the Devil."

The *Montreal Herald* of Saturday last, in reply to an article of ours wherein we joined with the *Montreal Witness* in loudly condemning the infamous custom of certain unprincipled newspaper editors or proprietors, who outrage decency and morality by making their columns the medium for circulating the vile advertisements of the filthy quacks with whom society is infested, and our moral atmosphere polluted—meets us with the following retort:—

INDUCENT ADVERTISEMENTS.—The *True Witness* thinks that the Protestant press have a monopoly of the filthy medical advertisements of the class which disgrace the *Hamilton Banner*, and which the *Wit-*

ness has just been denouncing. If he will look at the head of the last column of the fourth page of the *Toronto Mirror*, he will find very near Dr. Cavalli's last epistle, a book advertisement of a certain Dr. Amos, exactly in the style of those he joins the *Witness* in denouncing. The *Mirror* was the first Catholic paper we took in hand after reading the article in the *True Witness*; but we are of opinion that we could readily show our contemporary some other instances. For the rest, we heartily join in his condemnation of such things; no matter where they appear.

With shame and regret—regret for the sake of the *Mirror*, with still more shame and regret for the Catholic press of this country—we are obliged to confess that the retort of the *Herald* is but too true; and that the columns of the *Mirror* are polluted with a filthy, blackguard advertisement from a dirty fellow of the name of Amos, such as no gentleman, no Christian should lend himself to circulate—such as no father of a family should allow for one moment to cross the threshold of his house—and which, now that his attention has been called to the subject, we hope that the editor of the *Mirror* will at once discard from his columns; giving at the same time a satisfactory explanation how it found admission in a journal which we, in common with our Catholic fellow-citizens in Canada, have hitherto been accustomed to hail as the bold and consistent champion of religion and morality.

It is barely possible—and we hope that it may turn out to have been the case—that this filthy advertisement with which the *Herald* has it in his power to tax a member of the Catholic press, may have crept into the columns of the *Mirror* inadvertently; that the editor and proprietor were ignorant of the nature of its contents; and that their carelessness, and not the love of unholty gain, has been the chief crime of which the *Mirror* has been guilty. If so, our cotemporary will at once, no matter at what pecuniary sacrifice, no matter what his arrangements or agreements with the advertiser, expunge it from his columns, and apologise for its appearance. Failing to do this, or failing to explain satisfactorily how it obtained admission in the first instance, we must, of course, treat the *Mirror* as we have treated the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Toronto Colonist*, the *Hamilton Banner*, and other notorious offenders against decency and good morals. Nay worse! For, for a Protestant, there is this excuse, that he walks at best by a dim and uncertain light; that the moral standard of heresy is necessarily low; and that perhaps after all, he does not fall much below that standard. But for the editor of a Catholic paper what can be said in extenuation? what plea can be urged for a mitigation of sentence? When the latter sins, he sins against knowledge, against grace, and with a perfect consciousness of the malice of his offence. To him are applicable the terrible words of Our Lord—St. LUKE, xii., 47, 48, in the parable of the two servants—both of whom committed things worthy of stripes—but of whom one knew his master's will, whilst the other did not. And so in the defective training of the Protestant, and in his consequent imperfect moral development, we can find many palliating circumstances, which are altogether wanting in the case of one who having been brought up within the bosom of the Catholic Church, is guilty of like sins.

And whilst calling upon the *Mirror* to retrace his steps, and make amends for the scandal he has brought upon the Catholic press, we would call upon the press throughout the Province—Catholic and Protestant, French and English, and of whatever shade of politics—to combine against the circulation of the moral poison contained in those advertisements which we condemn no matter where they may appear. In this we are all interested; interested as members of society, as parents, and as Christians. There is no man, we trust, calling himself a Christian, who will not join with us in this holy crusade against immoral books and obscene advertisements; there is no man, we are sure, being a father, but what will heartily wish us success in our efforts to save the rising generation from the inevitable and fatal pollution which awaits it from coming in contact with such publications. Ask the medical man, and he will tell you, what the nature, what the objects of these books, these advertisements, and what is the invariable result, what the physical and moral degradation, which invariably attend their perusal. Again then we would call upon every honest man to put these nuisances to society down; and that can be most effectually done, by prosecuting with the utmost rigor of the law, every scoundrel who lends his aid, either through the press, or any other means whatsoever, to the advertising, sale, or circulation of obscene books.

PROTESTANT INCONSISTENCY.—The *Commercial Advertiser*, a warm advocate of the right of "private judgment" for himself, is horrified at the claim of other protesting sectaries to exercise the same right; and has the impudence, and inconsistency to qualify as "disgusting," the proceedings at a late convention of the members of the "Spiritualist" denomination of Protestants; whereas a Mrs. Lewis of Cleveland is reported to have delivered herself as follows. The said Mrs. Lewis in the exercise of her right of "private judgment" declared:—

"That she was in favor of universal freedom, and that loving whomsoever she chose was a part of that freedom, and to confine her to love one man was an

abridgment of her rights." She said that "although she had one husband in Cleveland, she considered herself married to the whole human race. All men were her husbands; and she had an undying love for them." She said also, "what business is it to the world whether one man is the father of my children or ten men are? I have the right to say who shall be the father of my offspring."

How Mrs. Lewis can be refuted upon Protestant principles—how without denying to her the right of "private judgment," the *Commercial Advertiser* can contest her "right to say who shall be the father of her offspring" we cannot understand. Indeed, Mrs. Lewis in asserting the propriety of the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, does but assert a legitimate corollary from Protestant principles; does but carry out to its logical consequences the Protestant theory of marriage as exemplified in the legislation of all Protestant countries, Great Britain not excepted. Thank God, in England at least, the practice of the people has hitherto generally given the lie to the theories of its legislature.

For, unless marriage, i.e. the indissoluble union of one man with one woman, be not a divine institution, monogamy is merely a human institution, and not of moral obligation. But by taking upon itself to put asunder, or to divorce, man and wife, the Protestant State, practically denies that the union of the sexes is a divine institution; because whom God hath joined together, man cannot under any circumstances have the right to put asunder; and thus in every Protestant State the divine origin of marriage is, by the State, practically ignored. And again, since the State cannot legalise anything opposed to the moral law, and as it does profess to legalise the separation of man and wife, and the contracting of fresh sexual unions, there cannot be, in the general opinion of the Protestant world, anything immoral, or opposed either to the natural or revealed laws of God, in such chopping or changing of partners. Now if it be not contrary to the moral law to do so in one instance, there can be no moral impropriety in doing it in a thousand instances. If the State, or civil power, has the right under any circumstances, to dissolve a marriage and to authorise the persons so separated to contract fresh unions, it must be because God has not Himself ordained the indissoluble union of the sexes; has not Himself proclaimed the law unalterable—"one with one and for ever." But if God has proclaimed no such law, man has no right to do so; and no man has therefore the right to impugn the morality, or to effect disgust at the conduct of those of his fellow creatures, who, in the exercise of their "private judgment," and upon a matter upon which God has laid down no precise rules, deem themselves entitled to determine for themselves the conditions of their sexual unions.

In other words. Either the union of the sexes is the subject matter of a positive divine law, and therefore beyond all human control and legislation; or it is not. If it is—the action of those Protestant States which authorise divorce is a "disgusting" infraction of Divine Law; if it is not—every one is at liberty, in so far as the Law of God, or morality, is concerned, to contract such sexual unions, and for such times, and under such conditions, as he, or she, pleases; and the impertinence of these Protestants who presume to criticise the manner in which that right is exercised is, to say the least, very disgusting.

THE BISHOP OF ST. HYACINTHE.—A pastoral letter of His Lordship the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe, dated the 13th inst., announces to his Clergy, that his health having been restored, he resumes the administration of his Diocese, confided by him since the 15th November last to Mgr. LaRoque, Bishop of Cydonia. Our readers will be pleased to hear of the convalescence of Mgr. Le Prince, who is now on a visit to Kamouraska for the sake of sea bathing.

His Lordship the Bishop of Bytown, assisted by several of his Clergy, performed the ceremony of laying the corner stone of the new Catholic church at Plantagenet Mills, on Wednesday the 15th instant, on a beautiful site liberally given by P. M. Martin, Esq., for that purpose. The church will be a handsome edifice of cut stone, 98 feet in length, by 52 in breadth.

Saturday last, the 25th instant, Feast of St. James the Apostle, Patron of this Diocese, was a day memorable in the annals of Montreal, for the opening of the great work which, for the honor and glory of God, our saintly Bishop has undertaken. In the forenoon, High Mass was sung by His Lordship Mgr. Bourget; and after Vespers, a solemn procession, issuing from the chapel, proceeded to the site of the new Cathedral, where the Bishop performed the ceremony of planting a cross upon the spot where the High Altar will stand, and upon which the acceptable sacrifice, the pure offering, spoken of by the prophet Malachias, shall be daily offered up by our children, and our children's children through all generations.

The ceremony was most imposing. Preceded by the Clergy of the city chanting the *Vesilla Regis*, and surrounded by a large body of