

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 228, Notre Dame Street, by

J. GILLIES.

G. E. OLBERG, 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.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1865.

Friday, 24—St. Matthew, Ap.
Saturday, 25—Of Immaculate Conception.
Sunday, 26—QUINQUAGESIMA.
Monday, 27—Of the Feria.
Tuesday, 28—Of the Feria.

MARCH.

Wednesday, 1—ASH WEDNESDAY.
Thursday, 2—Of the Feria.

The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—

FEBRUARY.

Saturday, 25—Notre Dame, Montreal.
Monday, 27—Noviciat, at LaSalle.

MARCH.

Wednesday, 1—The Holy Family, Boucherville.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

The latest reports from England are unfavorable as to the health of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. His strength was failing, and serious apprehensions were entertained.

The European Continental news is of little interest. The health of the Sovereign Pontiff is said to be excellent, and whenever the Holy Father appears in public he is received with the respectful, and affectionate acclamations of his people, in spite of all that the revolutionary party can do or say. It is equally pleasant to know that the robber King of Sardinia is daily becoming more unpopular, and that the financial difficulties of the bogus Italian Kingdom are on the increase.

The Imperial Parliament of Great Britain was opened by Commission on Tuesday the 7th inst. In the speech from the Throne allusion was made to the meeting of delegates from the several British North American Provinces at Quebec, and the result was spoken of approvingly. In the proposed Union, farcically called "Confederation," the people of Great Britain see the promise of a speedy and honorable rupture of the ties which connect them with these Provinces, and which consequently threaten at any moment to involve them in a costly and difficult war with the United States. As Confederation, so called, is the first step towards separation, it is of course looked upon with a favorable eye in England; as, for the same reason, it is earnestly promoted on this side of the Atlantic by those who cast longing, wistful looks towards Washington, since they know that separation must be shortly followed by annexation.

The talk of building up, out of the scattered fragments of the British possessions in North America, an independent State is, if we look at the chart, a palpable absurdity, the veriest *duncombe* that ever was uttered. Our peculiar physical and geographical conditions forbid it, and make of it in the present condition of science a physical impossibility. The Canadas, which are to form one part of this new North American Empire, are separated from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which form another most important part, by the United States, the only enemy whom we have to encounter, and against whom we have to guard. Montreal is the heart of Canada, the objective point of attack; and a straight line drawn from Montreal to St. John's, N.B., or to Halifax must pass through that enemy's territory. Geographically, we stand towards the Lower Provinces, much in the same position as Poland stands towards France; and if the latter has hitherto been unable successfully to interfere for the protection of Poland, it is not because since the days of Louis XV, France has been indifferent to Poland, but because all Germany intervenes between France and Poland, just as the hostile territory of the United States intervenes between Canada and the British American Provinces on the Atlantic.

Nor is there any way of surmounting this physical obstacle to a union of Provinces so separated or isolated from one another by nature, except by means of aerial navigation, or a long, circuitous water navigation which for many months of the year is blocked up by ice. For to talk of a railroad, on the enemy's side of the St. Lawrence, running throughout almost its entire course parallel, and contiguous to that enemy's line, as a means of military commu-

nication in time of war between Montreal and the Lower Provinces, would be simply to raise well-founded suspicions of the speaker's sanity. All lines of communication between the different parts of British North America, to be of any the slightest use for military purposes, must be constructed entirely on the left bank of the St. Lawrence. This is a condition essential, not only to any conceivable military co-operation of the several Provinces with one another, but to the defence of Canada; and by that singular fatuity which so eminently characterises our Canadian policy, we have been careful to construct the only railroad which connects Montreal and Quebec on the enemy's side of the river; whilst the Beauharnois canal, which is essential to keeping up water communication between Montreal and the Lakes, has also with like singular contempt for the most obvious dictates of prudence, been constructed on the enemy's side of the river, and within his easy and tempting reach, should he feel inclined to interrupt our water communication with the Lakes, on the naval command of which depends, as the Duke of Wellington always insisted, the fortunes of Canada. We therefore, when we hear of the military advantages of a Union assigned as a reason for supporting the Ministerial scheme of Confederation, feel assured that false pretences are being urged in favor of that measure; for were there on the part of our rulers any serious intention of putting Canada in a state to maintain its independence by force of arms, they would begin by constructing a railroad between Montreal and Quebec on the left bank of the St. Lawrence, as essential in case of war with the United States, to military communication between the two cities; and for the same reason, they would at once, and no matter at what cost, open a canal on the Canadian side of the river, and beyond the reach of a *coup de main*, in order to keep open water communication between the Lakes and the sea; without which neither the naval armaments of Great Britain nor those of the Lower Provinces could take any part in the defence of the Canadian frontier.—Money so expended would be usefully expended; but for all military purposes it would be just as rational to cast it into the sea as to expend it on an intercolonial railroad which would always be at the complete mercy of the enemy in time of war.

This is no party question, or matter of opinion. Any body who will take the trouble to open a chart, and with a ruler and pair of compasses will set himself to the task of measuring and comparing distances, will see that the British North American Provinces once separated from Great Britain, and physically separated from one another, cannot be politically united for effective military purposes against the United States, should the North and South unfortunately for us again be united, and should our neighbors feel tempted to make themselves masters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This, if they intend to maintain their tariff, in other words, if they intend to meet their pecuniary obligations contracted during the war, it will be a fiscal necessity for them to accomplish; for it would be as easy to fill a bucket with its bottom knocked out, as it would be for the United States to maintain their enormous tariff upon all foreign goods, if the St. Lawrence were open to the importation of these goods at our rate of tariff. It is therefore a moral certainty that the U. States, will ere long attempt to annex those Provinces which command the navigation of the St. Lawrence: again it is equally certain that, separated from Great Britain and abandoned to our own resources we, destitute of all the requisites for a successful defensive war, would offer less resistance to the enemy than did Denmark to the combined forces of Austria and Prussia: whilst in the third place, that the proposed Union scheme will lead to the separation from Great Britain of its N. American Provinces, is a fact which the *Times* clearly sees, and hails in the following terms:—

"It is true we are not actually giving up the American Colonies—may the despatch we are quoting does not contain the slightest hint that such a possibility ever crossed the mind of the writer; but yet it is perfectly evident—and there is no use in concealing the fact—that the Confederation movement considerably diminishes the difficulty which would be felt by the Colonies in separating from the Mother Country."—*Times*.

From the seat of war we hear of the capture of Columbia by Sherman, and of the evacuation of Charleston. The policy of General Lee, now commander in Chief of the Confederate Army, seem to be the concentration of all the troops at his disposal for the purpose of a grand attack upon Grant and Sherman. That he may be successful the friends of liberty everywhere must hope; but so where should more fervent prayers for his success be offered up than in this country, for his subjugation of the South means the subjugation of Canada.

On Sunday last was read in all the churches and chapels of the Diocese a Pastoral from His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, under date Rome, Jan. 1st, in which the late Encyclical of the Holy Father was pronounced to the Faithful and another Pastoral, appointing the time for the Jubilee, was promised.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.—The debates on the Union Resolutions still continue, but on neither side has anything very striking or very original been said upon the matter. The proceedings in some respects resemble those of a *lit de justice* under the *ancien regime*, rather than those of a free British Legislature. The Edict of the Ministry is to be registered in its integrity, upon pain of, Lord knows what! fearful consequences; but no amendments will be allowed. So of old a *Grand Monarque* appeared, booted and spurred, whip in hand, before the Parliament of Paris, and holding his "*Bed of Justice*" ordered, under pain of exile or imprisonment, the members of the Court to register his decrees. Sometimes they obeyed; sometimes they proved refractory, and were sent packing off to prison there to consider themselves. The penalty hanging over the heads of our Parliamentary gentry is dissolution, and the expences of a new election; and thus, with the exception that the privilege of talk is still allowed to an unlimited extent in our Provincial Parliament, the student of French history cannot fail to be struck with the analogy between its present position, and that of the old French Parliaments during the holding of a "*Lit de Justice*."

There has been a *quasi* comic debate on the docking of member's pay, which they generously vote to themselves under the facetious title of indemnity. Indemnity for what? We should like to know. We can well understand how an innocent man, pounced upon and sentenced to five or more years penal servitude with hard talking in the Provincial Parliament, would, under such circumstances, have a right to claim "indemnity" for the wrong done him. But our members of the Provincial Parliament are so of their own free choice. Legislative honors have not been thrust upon them, but have by them been earnestly solicited from intelligent, free, and independent constituencies, and with much expenditure of fervid eloquence and rot-gut whiskey. With eyes devoutly upturned to heaven, and hands on that region of the human frame where by a pleasant fiction the legislative heart is supposed to be located, honorable candidates have offered themselves to the service of their country, much puffing their own good qualities; and blathering much also of their zeal in behalf of "*liberal principles*" or of "*notre sainte religion*"—according as Liberalism or Catholicity were the more in vogue amongst the constituencies whom they severally addressed, and whose most sweet voices they craved. To vote for them was not only to ensure the moral and material well-being of the country, but to confer upon them an honor and a favor for which they should feel ever grateful. Why then in the name of common sense should these men claim an "indemnity" for the much coveted honor, and laboriously earned favor?

This practice of paying members of Parliament, or rather, of allowing M. P. S. to dip their fingers into the public purse, and remunerate themselves for their services, according to their own estimate of those services, is a nasty democratic custom, alien to the spirit of the British representative system, and should be reformed by totally abolishing it altogether. If a man is too poor to give his Parliamentary services gratuitously, he is not fit to be a member of Parliament, and to be entrusted with the pecuniary interests of the country.—There is certainly no sin, no shame in poverty; no honor, no virtue in wealth. But the honest man, but the gentleman with a keen sense of honor, conscious of poverty, will never aspire after a seat in Parliament; and on the other hand, it is only you unprincipled political adventurers, intent upon making a profit of their votes, and on selling themselves, and their constituencies to the highest bidder, who, having no independent fortunes of their own, present themselves before the public as candidates for legislative honors. To purge the Legislature of these men, to deliver the country from these obscene blood-suckers, no means more certain and efficacious than the total abolition of the low democratic custom of paying members of Parliament.

The Union Resolutions have been carried in the Legislative Council by a majority of 30; the numbers being as 45 to 15.

At the last meeting of Institut Medical, the Rev. Mr. Bilton gave a very brilliant and instructive lecture on "Chemistry applied to Physiology." The President, Mr. E. Darce, followed by Drs. Meilleur and Peltier then addressed the meeting contributing much to render it one of the most agreeable and interesting. In the gift of Dr. Boyer, the *Dictionnaire Medicale* in 30 vols., was acknowledged and thanks given.

NEW CUSTOM HOUSE, QUEBEC.—We are glad to learn that the contract of heating by steam the new Custom house, Quebec, has been awarded to Thomas McKenna, Esq., of this city; and from his great experience in this particular branch of business, we are confident that the Department of Public Works will have no cause to regret the choice.

Mr. George Brown, through the *Toronto Globe*, indicates, with much candor, the precise value to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada of that clause in the Union Resolutions which "guarantees" to minorities their right to Separate Schools. The guarantee is, according to Mr. George Brown, worth simply nothing, and should not shock the anti-Catholic fanaticism of Upper Canada.

The *Globe* argues that, so long as a majority in the General Parliament and the General Government are in favor of the Separate School system, it will be out of the power of the local, or municipal government of Upper Canada to repeal the separate school law, since every act of the latter is subject to the "veto power" of the former; and that "veto power" would be exercised upon every act of the local legislature repealing the separate school law, so long as, but no longer than, a majority in the General Government were in favor of the separate system.—On the other hand, should the day ever arrive when a majority of the said General Government should become so hostile to what the *Globe* calls "*sectarian*" schools, as to withhold its veto from a Bill passed by the local legislature for the entire repeal of the separate school system, there would be no difficulty in repealing, by means of that hostile General Government, the clause itself which pretends to guarantee the educational rights of the Catholic minority of Upper Canada. The reasoning of the *Globe* is unanswerable, and shows conclusively that the said guarantee will be about as valuable a protection to the Catholics of Upper Canada against Protestant aggression, as would be a pasteboard parapet against a battery of Armstrong guns.—The only guarantee upon which our friends can rely is: that a Government and a Legislature in which Protestants and enemies of separate schools will be always in an overwhelming majority, will never be hostile to the principle of separate schools. That there may be no misunderstanding on this point, we copy the very words of the *Globe*, replying to Mr. Currie's objection that the "*guarantee*" may prove an obstacle to the ultimate repeal of all separate school laws in Upper Canada. Guarantee or no guarantee, argues the *Globe*, it matters not; for the concession of the "*guarantee*" amounts to nothing. The Italics are our own.

"This is much better than would have been an arrangement leaving the educational question in the hands of the Federal Parliament, and quite as good as would have been an arrangement giving it unreservedly to the local Parliament, for then the veto power of the General Government would have served to prevent us from repealing the separate school laws now in force, just as well as the '*guarantee*' to which Mr. Currie objects. If it be answered that the general Government and Parliament may some day become so hostile to sectarian schools that it would withhold the veto in such a case, and allow us to repeal the sectarian school laws, we can reply that when that occurs there will be no great difficulty in repealing the constitutional guarantee—so that either plan would come to the same thing. Mr. Currie forgets, too, that by this concession, which practically amounts to nothing, and by giving up the right of abolishing about one hundred schools in Upper Canada, which we are, under the present system, altogether powerless to abolish, we secure to the minority in Lower Canada the continuance and the extension of their school privileges—privileges which are rendered of the utmost importance by the sectarian character of the schools maintained by the majority. All in all, we do not see how we could have a better bargain."

No, certainly not; if the overthrow of the separate school system in Upper Canada be the object in view.

We continue the communication of our esteemed correspondent D. N. P. on the opinion expressed in a late issue of the Journal, to the effect that it might, and indeed must, be said that not all that is contained in Scripture is revealed—using the word "*revelation*" in the strictest sense of the term; and as applying the "*supernatural*" communication of the knowledge of the facts by them recorded, to the sacred penmen. The proposition as laid down by our correspondent is couched in the following terms:—

"We cannot say that all that is contained in Scripture is revealed."

And as the truth or falsity of this proposition depends entirely upon the meaning of the word "*revealed*," a strict and exhaustive definition of that term is the one thing needful, without which all controversy on the subject must degenerate into a mere logomachy. Here is what our correspondent says on the subject:—

"With regard to the second proposition, 'We cannot say that all that is contained in Scripture is revealed,' I think it is necessary to make a distinction. When theologians define and explain the mode in which the Holy Ghost influenced and guided the sacred writers, they use the word *revelation* strictly in distinction from mere inspiration, to signify the manifestation to the writers of things unknown to them; but in its common acceptation, the word *revelation* has a more extensive meaning. It is taken—and in my opinion very appropriately—as a synonyme of the word *God*, to signify the deposit of all the truths, precepts, and facts, known and believed, upon the authority of the Holy Ghost.—'*Animadvertitur dum iamen est communis loquendi usu receptum esse, ut revelationis nomen universe significetur quicquid in sacris litteris continetur, ut etiam quod Spiritu S. dicitur viva voce per traditionem transmissum esse.*'—Perrone, *Tract. de S. Theo.*, part. II., cap. de divio can. lib. inspirat. That theologians themselves, when they use the word *revelation* without defining or restricting its meaning, generally understand it in *latter* sense as just explained, see manifest. Vgr. Bouvier, *de Fide*, t. 2, p. 5 says: '*Sicut res reeveleat, sunt objectum facti agniti de Fide*, p. 23. '*ex dicit autem patet actum facti dicitur quicquid importare aut supponere, videlicet, objectum reeveleatum.*'—Murray, Theo-

logical Essays, v. iii, p. 208: 'according to Catholic theology, two conditions are required for a true act of divine faith. The first is that the doctrine be revealed: the second is that the person believing be certain that it is revealed.' Perrone, v. ii., p. ii, p. 107: '*quicquid in sacris litteris continetur profecto ad nostrum objectum est, hoc ipso quod divinitus sit inspiratum.*' now these theologians cannot be supposed to disagree as to the real object of divine faith; therefore, what Perrone he calls inspiration, the others call revelation, and the argument may be thus succinctly resumed: revealed truths only are the object of divine truths—Bouvier, Murray; but all that is contained in Scripture is the object of divine faith—Perrone. Therefore, all that is contained in Scripture is revealed, in the sense in which it is true to say that revealed truths only are the object of divine faith.

I said that the word *revelation* was very appropriately used to signify the deposit of all the truths, precepts, and facts known and believed upon the authority of the Holy Ghost. Although many things recorded in the canonical books may have been naturally known to the sacred penmen, and a supernatural manifestation of those things was not made to them, it does not follow that they cannot be said to be revealed to the world; for God being the author of the inspired books, the Holy Ghost is truly the historian of the facts therein contained; those facts are related, made known (why not say revealed?) by the Holy Ghost; and that by a supernatural means, that is by divinely inspiring the sacred writers to record them for our information. Therefore, we can say it a true and appropriate sense, that all that is contained in Scripture is revealed, and the proposition which denies it absolutely and without any distinction, is false, to say the least.

As to the danger of falling into a vicious circle, if we say that all that is contained in Scripture is revealed, I must confess that I cannot see it; but it seems to me that while we labor to avoid an imaginary vicious circle, we are exposed to fall into a real one. The vicious circle which we ought to avoid, consists in asserting that supernatural revelation (or rather the possibility of supernatural revelation) can only be proved by supernatural evidence, and we fall into that vicious circle when, from the fact that many things recorded in Scripture may be proved by human testimony, we infer that they are not supernaturally revealed. The true, I think, and only safe position is in holding that those two elements (the human or natural, and the divine or supernatural) are distinct, but exclude not each other; that we require human evidence as a motive of *credibility*, and divine authority as the motive of our assent of faith.

But although many things recorded in Scripture are not revealed in the sense you attach to the word, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is manifestly not one of them, for it was revealed in the strictest sense. Jesus Christ himself had foretold it several times during his life—Matt. xii, 40: xx 19. "Cum ergo resurrexisset a mortuis, recordatus sunt discipulis ejus, quia hoc dicebat, et crediderunt Scripturæ; et sermo quem dixit"—St. John cap. ii, 22. "O stulti et tardi corde ad credendum in omnibus que locuti sunt prophetæ."—Luce, xxiv., 25. Therefore, "the apostles preached a risen Christ whom they had seen, heard, and whose body they had handled," and "whose resurrection had been revealed to them." Indeed, had not His resurrection been revealed, what the Apostles saw or heard might have proven anything or nothing, but would not have proved what faith teaches on that fundamental point. But was not His very apparition to His disciples a new and most certain revelation of His resurrection? a miraculous and supernatural means by which He made known to them that He had truly risen as He had foretold?—"Resurrexit sicut dixit." We are not to confound two things altogether distinct—the resurrection of Jesus Christ and His apparition after His death; the one is the thing revealed, the other the revelation of it. For an evidence of the latter, the Apostles had only the testimony of their own senses (I hold that we have another and superior motive); for an evidence of the former they had the authority of Christ's words, who had proved Himself to be God.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ therefore is not a mere fact or event, but it is a mystery, and a dogma, which never could have been known to man, except by revelation. "The mystery of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the necessary consequence of the mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption."—MARTINUS, Faith and Reason.

There remains a far more conclusive argument. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is an article of Catholic faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed; therefore it is a dogma the truth of which rests not only on the human testimony of the Apostles as trustworthy historians, but on the authority of the revealed Word of God, and the infallibility of the Holy Catholic Church.

Yours, &c., D. M. P.

From the above it will be seen that our correspondent distinguishes between the "*strict*" sense of the term "*revelation*," and the loose or popular sense in which it is received "*communis usu loquenda*." We of course used it only in its strictest or most rigid sense, to denote the "*rei prout ignota per affectionem*;" and we were careful to note also the distinction which Perrone so sharply draws between "*inspiration*" and "*revelation*."

It seems to us that without temerity it is possible also to distinguish between,

"Facts of revealed religion;"

And,

"The revealed facts of religion;"

and therefore to say that not all the facts of revealed religion were themselves "*revealed*"—*e. e.*, made known by supernatural means to the sacred penmen.

Thus, for instance:—That the person known in history as Jesus Christ was crucified and died on the cross is,

"A fact of revealed religion."

But that the person Jesus Christ was crucified as an atonement for the sins of the whole world: that His death was an acceptable sacrifice, an atonement for our transgressions, and that by His blood we are cleansed from our iniquities—is a good deal more. It is,—

"A revealed fact of religion."

Of the former, the witnesses and historians had conclusive evidence through a natural channel: their senses and their reason. The second they knew to be true, not by their senses, not by any dialectic process, but by "*revelation*;" that is to say the knowledge of it was supernaturally communicated to them. To establish "*the fact*" that "Christ died on the cross," an intelligent, honest witness, competent in the natural order only, suffices; but "*the revealed fact*," that "Christ died on the cross for our sins," can be established only by a supernatural witness, to whom the fact has been