

The True Witness. AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 663 Craig Street, by J. GILLIES. G. E. OLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE: To all country Subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 10, 1869.

ECOLESIASTICAL CALENDAR. DECEMBER—1869. Friday, 10—Fast. Of the Octave. Saturday 11—St. Damasus P. C. Sunday, 12—Third of Advent. Monday 13—St. Lucy, V. Tuesday, 14—Of the Octave. Wednesday, 15—Ember Day. Of the Immaculate Conception. Thursday, 16—St. Rose, B. M.

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.—With reference to a paragraph in Monday's Herald, and reproduced by the Star, reflecting upon the conduct of the Rev. M. Rousselot, cure of Notre Dame, in the Guibord affair, we are in a position to say that the allegations therein contained are FALSE; and we invite the public to suspend their judgment till the real facts are laid before them. There are two sides to every story.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. The speech of the French Emperor pronounced before the Chambers, promising reform, and concessions to popular opinion, does not seem to have given general satisfaction in France. The opposition is as bitter as ever, and if its members could convince the people that they had anything to substitute for the Government which they propose to overthrow, they might have some chance of success.

The health of Victor Emmanuel is re-established. The public papers discuss the question whether during his sickness he received absolution, and was reconciled to the Church. He certainly made no public confession of his guilt or reparation for his many acts of robbery; and under such circumstances any absolution pronounced by a servile priest would be void and of no effect.

The affairs of Ireland are such that, so it is said, the Government is becoming alarmed, and is making preparations to meet another armed outbreak, which every true friend of Ireland will pray God to avert.

If the approaching General Council were to have no other effect than that of provoking the hostile criticisms of the enemies of the Catholic Church, it would still have done much good service: it would have shown us how feeble, how silly, may we not add, how dishonest in many cases, are our adversaries, how ignorant they are of the teachings of the Catholic Church: or if not ignorant, how unscrupulous they are in their misrepresentations of these things.

Every scribbler, learned or unlearned, improves the occasion by having a fling at the Papacy, and the constitution of the Catholic Church. Cumming, Tribulation Cumming, brays and lashes out with his hind feet with more than ordinary asinine ferocity: the London Times hurls its thunderbolts at the head of the successor of St. Peter: and even the staid Edinburgh Review joins in the outcry. The little dogs, the big dogs and all, bark, each according to its gift, at the enemy whom they bate, whom they fear, and whose stately majesty and dignified attitude rebuke them, and their slanders.

Foremost of course amongst the "little dogs" stands our old acquaintance Cumming. He seems to cherish the hope that by his loud and incessant barking he may at last attract some notice from dignitaries of the Church, even though that notice may assume the contemptuous form of a kick, or a cut of the whip. But again his vanity will doom him to disappointment, for we may be very sure that not again will a courteous gentleman, like His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster, condescend to take heed of him or his yelpings. Any moderately well informed

boy of 10 years of age who has studied his catechism, is more than sufficient to silence such a silly though noisy babbler. Take as a sample of the nonsense the man writes, and which learned Protestants editors reproduce, a string of questions, which, laboring under the idea that he is thereby impugning Popes and Councils on the horns of a dilemma, he publishes in the form of a letter to the Pope, in the columns of the London Times. We have not room for all these questions; but we lay before our readers a few of the more important, as specimens of the silliness that pervades the whole lot:—

1. "Will the Council"—so Dr. Cumming wrote—"be good enough to explain why Peter, the alleged first Pope, was married, and why no succeeding Pope prelate or priest dare marry? Why does Paul require a Bishop to be the 'husband of one wife'? Does he refer to Protestant Bishops only? If so in what epistle or address does he or Peter give the information that a Roman Catholic Bishop must not be the husband of any wife?"

The schoolboy of 10 years of age to whom such questions might be addressed would, with a smile at the ignorance of the questioner, reply—1. That St. Peter was married before being chosen by Christ to the office of Apostle, but that after that office had been conferred upon him, there is no reason for believing that he led the life of a married man. 2nd. That St. Paul does not "require" a Bishop to be the husband of one wife: that the precept referred to, Timothy iii., 2, is restrictive, not permissive, and prohibits the raising to the office of bishop as unworthy of that dignity, any man who has been married twice. That there can be no doubt as to the Apostle's meaning is plain from this, that he was himself unmarried; and that in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, c. vii. v. 7, he expressly says that in this respect he would to God that all men were even like himself. It would not be easy to express in more forcible language the superiority of the celibate over the married state, though the latter is honorable.

Mr. Cumming also desires the Council to enlighten him as to why it is that St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans makes no allusion to St. Peter, when he sends his greetings to numbers of Christians in that City? We do not need a Council to explain so simple a matter, as our ten year old schoolboy will suffice for such an easy job. St. Paul writing to the Christians of Rome, which city he had not then visited, though the faith of its Christian population the converts of St. Peter was celebrated throughout the world, naturally enough sent his salutations to those of the said converts with whose names he was familiar: but as we also know that St. Peter did not always reside in the Imperial City betwixt the period of his first visit to the commencement of the reign of Claudius—and the time when the Epistle to the Romans—A.D. 58 was written, the silence of St. Paul is easily accounted for on the hypothesis that, at the date indicated, St. Peter was not in Rome: especially since by a decree published in the ninth year of Claudius, all Jews, and St. Peter was a Jew, were banished from the City.—Acts. c. 18 v. 2.

If the above illustrate the silliness of the objections raised by men like this Great Tribulation Cumming, the following criticism on the closing scenes of the Council of Trent illustrate their dishonesty, and wilful misrepresentation of historical facts.

The passage begins in this wise:—"The final vote related to the confirmation of the Council by the Pope. The members then present felt it was expiating the whole fabric to grave disaster if they called in one infallible to authenticate and give force to another infallible. If the decrees were as they alleged, infallible, the Pope could not make them more so."

The dogmatic decrees of a Council have no more binding force on the consciences of Catholics until they have been confirmed by the Pope, than an Act of our Colonial Parliament has the force of law until it has been sanctioned or allowed by the Queen, or Her representative. There is no Council, there can be no Council without the Pope: and there are not therefore two infallibles, but only one infallible authority: to wit, the Bishops united with their head, the Pope.

Secondly as to the matter of fact:—The Council of Trent did in its 25th and last Session 4th December, 1563, vote publicly and unanimously that the confirmation of its decrees by the Pope be asked for by the Legates of the Holy See. Whereupon on Wednesday, 26th January, 1564, on the motion in consistory of Cardinals Moronus and Simoneta, the reigning Pope Pius IV. did confirm them in the following words,—

"Confirmamus, atque ab omnibus Christi fidelibus recipi, inviolabiliter observari, mandamus, in nomine Patris et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen."

Then, and not before, and in virtue of this confirmation, did the decrees of the Council of Trent become binding on the consciences of Christians. So much for the assertion—That the Council of Trent did not invoke the confirmation by the Pope of its decrees. Dr. Cumming, with his usual disregard for facts, then pretends that the following compromise was agreed upon by the two infallibles—the Pope and the Council.

"Confirm the decrees but ordain that no one shall have the right, or ought ever to entertain the thought of interpreting them (the decrees). Pius IV. was delighted with this resolution."

The only reply that this statement requires is this: That whilst by his Bull Benedictus Deus,

Pius IV. makes known that he has confirmed the decrees of the Council; and whilst in order to prevent the confusion which would inevitably result were every one to deem himself at liberty to interpret these decrees according to his caprice, he forbids any such interpretations to be put forth, without his sanction or authority, reserving to himself and the Holy See the right of interpreting them, should any disputes as to their true meaning arise—the Pope did order that a full and authoritative interpretation of the said Tridentine Decrees be prepared by competent theologians: which work, when completed, and approved of by the Holy See, was given to the world under the title of the "Catechism of the Council of Trent," a work that has been translated into all the languages of the world, in accordance with a decree of the Council itself Sess. 24, c. 7, which had itself provided beforehand for the interpretation and explanation of its teachings. So thoroughly was the work accomplished that, though men may dispute as to the truth of what the Council of Trent teaches, there have never been any doubts either amongst Catholics or Protestants as to what it teaches, so plain is its language, so lucid are the commentaries thereupon of the Catechism which contains the authorized interpretation of its teachings.

We should but weary our readers were we to take up one by one all the absurdities and untruths of the critic of the Council of Trent: we have done enough to show how false in fact, how weak in argument are his criticisms.

In the Montreal Witness of the 3rd inst., we find the following paragraph which we must confess somewhat startled us:—

"We do not see that any of the speakers at the recent right meetings in Ireland are half so truculent as our own True Witness. That veracious journal has over and over again informed us that the Irish people will be satisfied with nothing less than the land of Ireland for the people of Ireland, the present proprietors being merely robbers, or the representatives of robbers, whose title no length of possession can render good."

We challenge the Witness to cite any one passage wherein the TRUE WITNESS, speaking of the Irish Land Question, has used "truculent" language: wherein it has ever called in question the legal validity of the titles on which the present landlords of Ireland hold their property: or wherein directly or indirectly it has ever employed language that, taken in connection with its context, can be so interpreted to bear the construction that the Witness puts upon it.—And we pledge ourselves, should the Witness be able to produce any such passage, publicly and formally to retract it, and to express our abhorrence of its sentiments, since it would be in direct opposition to our views. It is indeed strange that whilst the TRUE WITNESS has been in some quarters and only the other day, denounced as a Scotch advocate of Irish Landlordism, it should by the Witness be accused of advocating extreme opinions which it has always, to the best of the editor's ability openly condemned, as revolutionary, and savouring of rank communism.

It is true that we have always insisted that Mr. Gladstone's Church Bill would not satisfy the people of Ireland, since the principal cause of Irish disaffection was to be found in the Land question. We have in this simply stated a fact thus recognised in the Evening Telegraph, a thoroughly Conservative journal:—

"From the telegraphic news as to the state of Ireland, it now appears more than ever clear, that the church robbery act of last session has had no effect in bribing about the pacification of Ireland."—Evening Telegraph, 3rd inst.

As a matter of history we may have asserted—and if we have not, we assert so now—that much of the property now held by the actual landlords of Ireland was obtained originally by force of arms, by iniquitous confiscations, by the wholesale banishment of the native and lawful proprietors, and by means of the operation of the old Penal Laws, now repealed; but whose disastrous effects survive in the unhealthy social conditions of Ireland generated by impolitic and immoral legislation. But that the validity of titles, though in their inception bad, should be after centuries of prescription called in question, we have never so much as insinuated. We do not believe that a wrong done in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be set right by a wrong done in the nineteenth century to the legal holders of property which has fallen into their hands by inheritance or purchase; and who are neither morally nor legally responsible for the wicked acts of Cromwell, of James the first, or of Elizabeth.

We have given the views of the several parties in Ireland on the Land question, to the best of our abilities, fairly and impartially: quoting for that purpose the language of the Dublin Irishman on one side, of the London Times, and of English conservative papers on the other side. We have never ventured to hazard an opinion of our own as to how the question should be dealt with, seeing that it is a question so difficult—the most difficult with which a British Legislature has ever had to grapple: but we have expressed an ardent hope that, whilst in all cases the rights of property are religiously respected, the grievances of the Irish tenants—and they are many and great, as the Times, as Mr Gladstone admit—may be removed; and the cultivator of the soil may be secured against rack renting, capricious evictions, and the risk of having the labor

of years, seized upon and appropriated by an unscrupulous landlord. We have also asserted that "property has its duties as well as its rights": and that it would be well if the State could enforce the performance of the former, as well as guarantee the enjoyment of the latter. This, under the old feudal tenure, was to a considerable degree accomplished: but under the modern commercial system which has supplanted the old feudal system of tenure, the rights of property are alone considered, or dealt with by the legislator, and its duties are neglected. We have therefore contended that Free Trade principles—that is "Buy in the cheapest, sell in the dearest, market" with unlimited competition, as applied to the sale or letting of land in Ireland, would not redress the grievances of which Irish tenants complain, but would rather aggravate them.

To those who at any time may have honored the TRUE WITNESS with a perusal, this explanation, this disclaimer of the abominable views attributed to us by the Witness—views which we repudiate, which we abhor—is, we know, unnecessary. But as there are many who form their estimate of the TRUE WITNESS from what the other Witness says of it, and as we should be loth to have it believed that a journal calling itself Catholic, and professing to speak in subjection to the teachings of the Church, should hold, or advocate liberal, democratic, revolutionary, or communistic opinions—all of which we hate as we do the devil himself—we demand as a right that the Witness do one of two things.—Either that he quote our very words, together with their context, which are justly obnoxious to the reproach of "truculent," and susceptible of the revolutionary interpretation that our contemporary puts upon them; in which case we promise to retract them, as unworthy of a journal which piques itself upon being Catholic, Loyal, Conservative, Tory if you will—for God forbid that we should be ashamed of being called a Tory. Or that failing in this, the Witness retract its mendacious and utterly groundless charge against us. We wait for a reply.

ADULTERY, MURDER, AND BLASPHEMY.—In no country in the world, at the present day, at no period of the world's history, if we except the epoch of the French Revolution, when hell itself seemed to have broken loose upon earth,—have these three flourished so luxuriantly as in the United States. In all ages have there been crimes, adulteries, murders, and blasphemies; but it is the peculiar manner in which these—the last products or bright flowers of modern non-Catholic civilization—are entwined or wreathed together in one pestiferous bouquet, that specially distinguishes New York and the nineteenth century, from all other climes, and other epochs. We will tell the story as shortly and as inoffensively as possible.

A man and wife in New York lived, as is too often the case, unhappily together. A third party, now deceased, made love to, and seduced the wife, with the promise of obtaining for her a legal divorce, which promise it seems he fulfilled. The indignant and drunken husband—for it seems he was drunk at the time—shot his unfaithful wife's paramour, who lingered for about a week, and expired a day or two ago. So much for the Adultery and the Murder part of the business: and here then the Blasphemy is most appropriately brought in.

Shortly before the wounded man expired, being in articulo mortis, there was enacted at his bedside the blasphemous farce of a marriage between him and the unhappy woman whom he had seduced, whom he had detached from her real and living husband, and with whom his connexion had been simply mortal sin. The chief dramatic personæ in this hideous comedy were the notorious Protestant minister Mr. Henry W. Beecher, assisted by another minister of the name of Frothingham; the other parts were well and appropriately filled by the Hon. Horace Greeley, and other friends of the dying man, and the relations of the unhappy woman. God Himself was, in the course of the piece, deliberately invoked, and outraged by prayer. Yes, by prayer; that He the Holy One would bless His creatures then deliberately violating His law by contracting an adulterous union. Nay, the aforementioned reverend ministers of God, as they style themselves, still more blasphemously ventured to thank God for the adulterous intercourse that had previously existed betwixt the guilty pair. Scarce would we believe it, but that we find it related editorially by the Globe, whose editor, though not very thin-skinned, and not extreme to mark what is done amiss by such eminent Yankee non-Catholics as Henry Ward Beecher, and the Hon. Horace Greeley, cannot in this case conceal his disgust at the whole proceedings. We copy from the Globe then, as a valuable commentary upon the Christianity and morality of the American non-Catholic community:—

"Perhaps the most extraordinary expression is one used by the clergyman who assisted Mr Henry Ward Beecher to marry the divorced wife of Mr. Richardson as the latter was dying. He returned thanks to Heaven for 'what these two have been to a jobber, for what they may be yet.' * * * Bless those who * * * Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors wife."—Old Book.

may depend on her. Bless the little ones who are left in the world without their father. Considering that Mr. Richardson and the lady were then being married, the reference to past relationship is rather puzzling when coming from a clergyman. On the one hand, it is denied that the two have been anything to one another, and on the other, the officiating clergyman returns thanks for their past alliance. The reference, also, to the father whom the children are about to lose makes the matter more perplexing.

The tone of everything that has been said or written upon the subject of the Richardson-McFarland affair betokens an extremely lax idea on the part of Americans of the obligations undertaken by those who marry. Marriage in the United States seems to be looked upon as a conventional arrangement which can be set aside at the pleasure of either party by merely undergoing certain formalities: and the act of marrying her, instead of being viewed with disapprobation is received with laudatory comments. When the husband shoots the person whom he deems to have injured him, there is a cry for his death: that is if the man who has been killed belongs to a portion of the community powerful enough to press their views; in other cases the murderer becomes the hero: in the room of him he has displaced. This may be all very suitable to a go ahead people despising the conventionalities of *effete* Europe, but it isn't law, justice, or morality.

To the Globe we would say, let us take heed lest in a few years the same may not be said of Canada. We are on the verge of the precipice, and no man can leap off, and say "thus far will I fall, and no farther." Let us take heed how we take the first step over the perilous brink, by legalising the immoral, anti-Christian principle of divorce *a vinculo*, on any pretence whatsoever; for if we do, we shall not be able to stop ourselves till we reach the bottom of the foul abyss wherein decency and morality in the United States now lie crushed and mangled. There is but one way of avoiding the catastrophe; and that is by holding fast to the Christian rule, "One with one, and forever."

THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, AND THE PROTESTANT ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.—The latter, as representing the Protestant Church of England, has been negotiating with the Greek Patriarch as representative of the Oriental schismatics, in expectation of obtaining from the Patriarch a recognition of the Catholic status of the Anglican Protestant Establishment. For this purpose it seems that a copy of the Anglican Prayer Book, and a report of the Pan-Anglican Synod at Lambeth, were forwarded to the Patriarch, whose rejoinder is now published.

We doubt if that reply will please the Anglicans, since, in plain, even if in polite terms, it taxes them with heresy, with novelties, and abandonment of the old Catholic Faith—with regard especially to the Eucharist, to the number of Sacraments, Tradition, the infallible authority of the Councils of the Church, and the invocation and *cultus* of the Saints. These things throw the poor Patriarch into suspense, and make him doubt as to the propriety of recognising in the Anglican Establishment, a branch in any sense of the Catholic Church. It is, as he sees, essentially a Protestant institution. Here is that portion of the Patriarch's letter wherein these his views are respectfully communicated to the Anglican official:—

"But on descending to the particulars of the contents of the Prayer book, and of the distinguished Confession of the Thirty-nine Articles contained in it,—since in the perusal of them, both the statements concerning the eternal existence of the Holy Spirit, and those concerning the Divine Eucharist, and, further, those concerning the number of the Sacraments, concerning Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Tradition, the authority of the truly genuine Ecumenical Councils, the position and mutual relations of the Church on earth and that in Heaven; and, moreover, the honour and reverence due from us to those who are, in theory and practice, the heroes of the faith—the adamantine martyrs and athletes—since, we say, these statements appeared to us to savour too much of novelty; and that which is said (p. 592, Art. 12) 'As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith,' deprives the Eastern Churches of the orthodox and perfection of the faith—(let us be permitted to say that accusations of our neighbours are out of place in a distinguished Confession of Faith)—these statements throw us into suspense, so that we doubt what we are to judge of the rule of Anglican orthodoxy."

We do not wonder at the reluctance of the Greek Patriarch to admit Anglican orthodoxy, when he sees that the liturgy of the Church of England expressly repudiates the infallibility, and in consequence the existence, of an *ecclesia docens*; since if there be on earth a body with authority from God to teach, in its teachings that body must be infallible. The "rule of Anglican orthodoxy" is simply the Protestant rule of private judgment; and it is the adoption of this rule of faith, no matter what its results, that determines its essentially Protestant, or anti-Catholic character.

This Protestant principle is clearly and broadly laid down in the Times, commenting upon the cautious reply of the Patriarch to Anglican overtures, and the letter from the Pope to the Archbishop of Westminster. There is no infallible authority on earth, says the Times; in matters of faith every man must follow the dictates of his own conscience, for God has given him no better guide than this natural faculty:—"What we do say is that * * * in fact no such infallible living authority exists on earth, and that in consequence individuals and communities can recognise no ultimate authority on earth but their own consciences." In other words the idea of a revelation is a humbug: for if God had supernaturally made a revelation of His will to man, the latter would surely recognise as the ultimate authority on earth that