

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 3.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Conference meets, adjourns and does nothing. It would be premature to assert that it is a failure, but the general opinion is that the chances of an amicable arrangement of the Danish question are small indeed. The other Continental news is of little political importance; but there are two items which our readers will note with pleasure. The first refers to the Sovereign Pontiff, whose health, in spite of *Reuter's telegrams*, and the speculations of Italian revolutionists, was so far re-established that he was able to take part in the solemnities of the Feast of *Corpus Christi* on the 26th ult. The second concerns the finances of the Italian Kingdom, which it seems are on the verge of bankruptcy; the budget for last year showing a deficit of Two hundred and thirty-five millions of livres. — "*Male paria, male dilabuntur*," says the proverb.

It is not for mortal man to decipher the strange telegrams which, three or four times in the course of every twenty-four hours, reach us from the seat of war on this Continent. There is a striking uniformity in all these precious despatches. They begin, invariably, with announcing a splendid Federal victory, and finish with an admission of a Federal defeat. One is a specimen of all, and here is one which reached us on Monday last:—

"After some fighting, Hancock's corps turned the Confederate left, capturing men, guns, and colors; but were unable to hold their ground, or bring off the guns."

In other words, Hancock's corps evidently "caught a Tartar," who would neither go along with his captor, nor allow the latter to retire in peace. Heartily do we wish the Yankees many more such victories.

As far as may be gathered, it would seem as if Grant had been compelled, by the firm front of Lee, to edge off to his own left and to the north-east of Richmond, so that he now occupies very nearly the same position as that in which some two years ago, General McClellan met with his defeat. Richmond, it is said, can only be attacked with any chance of success from the north-west; and the site of Grant's army, amongst the swamps of the Chickahominy, is notoriously unhealthy. The best index to the real state of matters is to be found in the high price of gold at New York, which rose to 95 on Monday last under the exhilarating influence of one of Grant's bogus victories. We have also the good news of a serious defeat to the Federals under Sherman, at Dallas. The difficulty arising out of Mr. Laird's Rams has been settled, the British Government having become the purchaser of the suspected vessels.

Of the treatment which British subjects receive from the Yankee Government, when so unfortunate or so imprudent as to place themselves within its grasp, the following short paragraph from the *Witness* of Monday last affords a striking example. The *Witness* is, as we suppose our readers well know, rabidly Yankee:

Mr. S. Y. Levey, merchant of Montreal, and who was lately arrested at Boston by the Federal Government on his arrival in that City of the *Asia*, has been released, there being no charge against him."

Certainly it is a wonderful thing that British subjects, generally, evince such little sympathy for the Yankee Government which thus deals with them. Mr. Levey, without offence, without cause assigned, there being in fact "no charge against him," was treated as a felon for ten days, and then released without apology, or compensation for the wrong done to him. And this is but one out of a thousand instances of similar violence. British subjects have even been foully murdered on the high seas by Yankee officers, and no redress can be obtained, so abject is our Liberal Government. In the words of *Blackwood* for last month,—

"The succession of humiliating rebuffs which it has received and has tamely submitted to, has at length taught every foreign Government that England under the present Administration, is a bully who talks big, but won't fight."

Let us fancy, if we can, the indignation of the Great Briton had the outrage to Mr. Levey been perpetrated by some of the weaker Powers, by the Pope, or in the Brazils; how Lord Palmerston would have trotted out his time-honoured "*civis Romanus*;" and how the British lion would have made the welkin ring again with his roaring!

We are happy to learn that our Catholic fellow-citizens of Williamstown, Gleggarry, under the auspices of their zealous pastor, appropriately celebrated the festival of *Corpus Christi* by a solemn public procession on the Sunday within the Octave. Everything was well arranged, and passed off in the most admirable manner.

We understand that Mgr. de Charbonnel, late Bishop of Toronto, has been appointed Co-adjutor to the Cardinal de Bonald, the Archbishop of Lyons.

Such is the interdependence, or mutual connection of all the dogmas of the Catholic Church that the heretic cannot attack one of them, without attacking all others, and, of course, the very doctrines or dogmas which he piques himself upon retaining; and upon the possession of which he bases his claims to the title of Christian.—The arguments which the heretic of the evangelical stripe employs against Catholicity, and its unreasonableness, are, word for word, the arguments used by the Deist and the Infidel to demonstrate the unreasonableness of Christianity; and, as with all arguments that prove too much, so those of our evangelical opponents prove nothing: because if logically applied they are as fatal to those parts of the Christian system he professes to have retained, in spite of his defection from the Church, as to those Romish dogmas against which he protests.

In theory, evangelical Protestants profess to hold the doctrine of the "Incarnation," or in other words to believe in the hypostatic union of the divine and the human in the Person of Our Lord Jesus Christ; in practice, of course, no Protestants do, or consistently with their system can, maintain this doctrine of the Incarnation.—They may assert it with their lips, but in their hearts they repudiate it, and in their controversies with Catholics they ignore it altogether. To illustrate our meaning, and to show how completely the doctrine of the Incarnation has ceased to have any place in the hearts of evangelical Protestants; how completely this doctrine, the great and fundamental fact of the Christian system, has been lost sight of by them, we will cite the terms in which the Montreal *Witness* of the 31st ult., denounces, and as he thinks, triumphantly exposes, the wickedness and the absurdity of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, and the worship of *Latria* which we pay to Our Lord present in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. The God Whom Catholics thus worship, says the *Witness*, is—

"not however the spiritual God whom both Catholic and Protestant may revere in common, nor the invisible God of the Patriarchs, nor the God of the Gospel dwelling in the heart, but the Divinity special to Catholics, and identified with a wafer; in a word, not the almighty God of hosts whom 'neither earth nor heaven can contain,' but the God of the host shut up in a pyx of gilded brass, and carried about as an idol in the hands of the priest that made it."

How thoroughly, though unwittingly, does the *Witness* in the above silly tirade, manifest his utter disbelief in, his total incapacity to form any idea even of, the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. To all this verbiage of our evangelical critic, it is sufficient for us to reply—that the God Whom we worship in the Eucharist, is a "*God-man*;" a God Who is even now perfect man as well as perfect God, "of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting," in the words of the Symbol of St. Athanasius. 'This is the Divinity whom we worship: a Divinity of Whom, from his language, it is evident that the writer in the *Witness* cannot form any conception. True, no doubt, God is a Spirit, and in spirit is He to be worshipped. But the God of Christians, at all events the "*Divinity special to Catholics*," is a God Who for our sakes and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was made man—"et homo factus est." It is in the practical recognition of this great central fact in history that Christianity consists. The Mahometan, the Deists of all ages and of all climes have recognised "*the spiritual God*," and "*the invisible God*" of the *Witness*; but they have denied altogether the "*God made-man*," the visible and incarnate God Who dwelt amongst us; and whose glory, as of the only begotten of the Father, our fathers in the faith beheld with their eyes.

The *Witness* may not see it, for his eyes are not keen: he may not perceive it for his logical sense is not acute. But in basing his objection to the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist—upon the argument that God is a Spirit, and invisible, he does by implication deny that God has been made man, and was and will again be visible to human eyes—and sensible to human touch. The *Witness* denies, by implication that He, Who said to His Apostles, after His Resurrection, "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have"—is God: and thus we say, unwittingly, whilst designing only an attack upon a Romish superstition, he actually repudiates the fundamentals of Christianity—so closely and inseparably are all the dogmas of Catholicity interwoven, so mutually dependent are they upon one another.

The *Witness* cannot for his part conceive a God that can be "shut up in a pyx of gilded brass and carried about;" such a God he cannot worship. We reply that the God Whom we worship was "*shut up*" in the womb of the ever blessed Virgin Mary, was "*carried about*" in her maternal arms; and that this God, so "*shut up*" and so "*carried about*" was, and is worthy of supreme worship, and was so adored by men and angels, even as we poor Papists adore Him to-day. Not "*special to Catholics*" is their

"Ut dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, per hoc in invisibilium amorem rapiamur."

† We quote from the Ag. Icon version

Divinity, as the *Witness* pretends; for they worship in company with the shepherds, and with the Magi, and with the multitude of the heavenly host; who worshipped Jesus carried about in the arms of His Blessed Mother. Again we say the *Witness* in striking at Popery strikes equally hard at Christianity, and the foundation of that faith which he still professes to retain.

So in like manner when the *Witness* argues against the "Real Presence" because of the indignities to which God might thereby be rendered subject, he does but repeat the arguments of the carnal Jews of old, who in the man Jesus refused to behold their God. Can this be God, argues the *Witness* "that can be consumed by fire, carried away by a rat, or eaten by vermin?" Can this man be God—exclaimed the unbelieving Jews, "who is subject to all human infirmities—to heat and to cold, to hunger and to thirst: who can be consumed by fever, or carried off by a bear?" The logic of the *Witness* is the logic of the infidel: and as it therefore proves too much for his cause, it proves nothing. It is the logic of the Jews who stood round the cross of Our Lord, looking on and mocking at the God "shut up" in a host: A God that can be "carried about!" quoth the *Witness*. A God that is nailed to a cross! exclaimed the Jews. "*Vah: si filius Dei es, descende de cruce!*"

We acquit the *Witness* of any formal design to impugn the doctrine of the Incarnation, or of the Divinity of Our Lord, but his arguments against Popery strike at the root of both these doctrines. That is to say, if they are conclusive against the Real Presence in the Eucharist because God is spiritual, they are conclusive against the Incarnation or the doctrine of a "*God-made-man*;" if they convince Catholics of idolatry, because they worship a God Who can be "shut up" and "carried about," they in like manner convince of idolatry the shepherds, and the angelic host who worshipped Him Who actually was "shut up" in the womb of Mary, and who was "carried about" in her arms. But this is absurd: therefore we conclude that the argument of the *Witness* is worthless, and that he who has resort to it must be very ignorant indeed.

Of deliberate design to shake the faith of his readers in an incarnate God, Who is perfect man as well as perfect God, we say that we acquit the *Witness*: but we tax him with ignorance, and an amount of presumption which if possible surpasses even his ignorance. Remember that this *Witness* sets himself up as a guide and teacher to his co-religionists; as one intimately acquainted with the workings of the "mystery of iniquity," and therefore eminently qualified to put his readers on their guard against the seductions of Romanism: and then take into account that this impertinent and presumptuous creature is so profoundly ignorant of the doctrines and discipline of that Church, whose discipline and whose doctrine he criticises, as to publish, seriously such trash as this:—

"It—the Romish Church—teaches that the priest by uttering certain words, provided however it (*sic*) be in the Latin language can transform a common wafer into the very body of Christ."

What plummet line can sound the depths of ignorance implied in the above passage: such ignorance of doctrine, such ignorance of history, such ignorance of facts—who can fathom it? We stand aghast as we look into the black abyss, and shrink from the task—as surpassing mortal strength. This is the stronghold of the *Witness*; his ignorance is the fortress in which he entrenches himself, and from whence he cannot be dislodged. To every animal nature has given some means of defence against its enemies; to one strength, to another courage, to another cunning, to another speed: to the Sepia is given the power of emitting when pursued a black liquid, which conceals it from its foes and in which it finds its safety. So with the *Witness*; he has been gifted, neither with wit nor humor: he is incapable of logical argument, and his intellectual faculties are but feebly developed. But in his very stupidity lies his safety; and the thick darkness which, when close pursued he, like the Sepia or cuttle fish, is able to conjure up all around him, stands him in stead of all nobler qualifications, and oft enables him to escape with impunity from the chastisement which his impertinence had provoked.

Strange advertisements sometimes appear in the columns of the religious papers of the United States—strange at least in the eyes of Catholics. Here for instance is one which we find in one of our United States exchanges, and which is eulogistic of a new invention, yclept,—"Brown's Patent Baby-Tender, or Magic Spring Cradle." This invaluable invention is recommended to the public by the Rev. James R. Dunn, "Pastor Central Presbyterian Church New York," as "a necessary adjunct to every house where there is a baby." We doubt not that the reverend gentleman is far more conversant with "Patent Baby-Tenders" than he is with the mysteries of the Gospel, and more competent to pronounce an opinion upon the merits of a "*Spring-Cradle*" than to sit in judgment upon the errors of Romanism; but the spectacle of our Apostolic man recommending such domestic articles to the public, is, if not an anomaly, at all events a little singular.

We cannot but suspect that our newspaper reporters have done a gross injustice to Sir E. P. Tache in their report of his speech in the Legislative Council, upon the motion that a Bill for granting a Divorce to certain persons therein named, be read a second time. In this report of Sir E. P. Tache's speech, which appears in very similar terms in all the journals, and which we copy in particular from the *Quebec Daily News* of the 3rd instant—the honorable gentleman is represented as having delivered himself as follows:—

Hon. Sir E. P. Tache.—In the case of Napoleon, the Pope granted a divorce because his marriage with Josephine had not been legally solemnized, according to the rites of the Church, and therefore was no marriage at all.

Hon. Mr. Christie would like to ask the Hon. Premier if the granting of the divorce was not a recognition of the existence of the marriage tie.

Hon. Sir E. P. Tache said the hon. member should bear in mind that there were such things as constitutional priests in France, at the time of the Revolution, who pretended to have the right to administer the sacrament in the same way as recognized priests of the Church. Napoleon was married to Josephine by one of these priests, who had no authority to do so, and that was the reason why the divorce had been granted?

Hon. Mr. Currie—Why?

Hon. Sir E. P. Tache—Because the priest had no authority from the Church of Rome.

We do not believe that Sir E. P. Tache, who is a man of education, and a Catholic, and therefore conversant with history and the doctrines of the Catholic Church, could have uttered such arrant nonsense as is here put into his mouth. In the remarks attributed to him there are almost as many errors—errors of fact, and errors of doctrine—as there are words. And as upon such an important topic it is desirable that there should be no such errors given to the world as truths upon the authority of Catholic gentlemen holding a prominent position in the political community, we deem it our duty to point out some of these errors, and to contradict them.

1. It is an "error of fact" that "the Pope granted a divorce" in the case of Napoleon.—He did nothing of the kind. The Pope never granted a divorce betwixt Napoleon and Josephine, and indeed his assent to their separation was not so much as asked for. The Pope was not so much as consulted in the matter by the French Emperor; who, setting himself above all laws, human and divine, and availing himself of a servile Senate, and a few courtier priests, who cared more for the favor of the head of the State than for the sacred cause of religion—obtained a decree declaring his marriage with Josephine invalid.

2. It is an "error of fact" to pretend that the marriage of Josephine with Napoleon was held to be invalid because it was celebrated before one of the "constitutional priests." That marriage was celebrated by Cardinal Fesch, in the presence of Portalis and Duroc, on the eve of the Coronation of Napoleon: and this celebration was insisted upon by the Pope himself as a condition *sine qua non*, of his presence at that political ceremony of the following day. The marriage of Napoleon and Josephine was then a valid marriage in the eyes of the Catholic Church; and was set aside by a few servile Gallicans, on the pretence that the Pope had no right to authorise Cardinal Fesch to assist at, or celebrate such a marriage.

It is an "error of doctrine" to pretend, that the priest is the Minister of, or administers the Sacrament of marriage; for it would thence follow that persons not married in the presence of a priest were not sacramentally united. And yet into this strange error of doctrine Sir E. P. Tache is represented as having fallen, in that he is reported as making the sacramental validity of Napoleon's marriage depend upon the status of the priest before whom it was celebrated. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that in marriage, the contracting parties being Christians—that is to say baptised—are themselves, to themselves, the Ministers of the Sacrament; and the functions of the priest are those of a witness, and according to the discipline established by the Council of Trent, the indispensable witness, of the contract, who also gives it his benediction. Were it otherwise, were no unions valid marriages unless celebrated before a Catholic priest, the unions of Protestants would not be marriages at all, in the eyes of the Catholic Church; and the opposition offered by Catholics to the pretended dissolution of such marriages by Act of Parliament, would be senseless. They oppose that dissolution because they believe, with their Church, that the unions of Protestants are valid, therefore Sacramental and indissoluble unions; they cannot therefore believe that the Catholic priest is the Minister of the Sacrament, seeing that in their unions, or marriage ceremonies, Protestants dispense altogether with the services of the priest.

We know not if what we write shall have the honor of being perused by Sir E. P. Tache; but should such be the case, we would implore him as a Catholic, as one to whom the honor of his Church, and the memory of one of her Supreme Pontiffs should be dear, to take the earliest opportunity of repudiating the language attributed to him by the press. He owes it to the memory of a Pope to deny that that Pope granted a divorce to Napoleon from Josephine; and thus

debt of justice he will surely pay. It is bad enough that Catholicity should be misrepresented, the Church reviled, and the honor of her Pontiffs assailed, by our enemies; but it is tenfold worse, and it becomes really serious, when Catholics of high standing appear to indorse these slanders, to misstate the facts of history, and misrepresent the doctrines of their own Church.

In reply to the strictures of other members—Protestants—upon the action of the Popes in matrimonial causes, we say, and we say it advisedly, that not only no Pope ever granted a divorce *a vinculo*; but that no Pope ever so much as took the case of such divorce into deliberation. When as heads of the Church, appealed to, to adjudicate and apply the law in matrimonial causes, Popes have paused to deliberate, and to examine witnesses, the subject matter of their deliberations has always been—not whether a valid marriage could be dissolved, but, whether a valid marriage had actually occurred in the case of the parties pleading at their tribunal. This, and this alone, was what the Popes had to determine; and this was a question of fact, involving also often some very intricate questions of canon law, upon which they were called to pronounce judgment. But never, we repeat it, did any Pope ever pretend even to have the power to dissolve a validly contracted, and therefore sacramental marriage, or in other words to grant a divorce.

Certainly, as a general rule, we of Montreal have no cause to complain of the behaviour of our Protestant fellow-citizens towards our Processions of any kind; certainly it will be admitted by every candid person that, with some very rare exceptions, these celebrations are always treated with marked courtesy by our separated brethren: and indeed we have every reason to congratulate ourselves upon the gentlemanly reception that we have met with from the great majority of the Protestant population, when engaged in celebrating the rites of our religion.

But there are occasional exceptions, and of these one has been brought before the public by the *Witness*, whose intent it is to make out a case of violence against Romanists. To this affair we alluded last week, abstaining from any comments thereupon, as it was then believed that the affair would be brought before the Courts. In this expectation we have been deceived, and disappointed. The persons against whom it was pretended that Catholics had been guilty of outrage, have wisely come to the conclusion not to provoke investigation, lest the tables should be turned against them, and it should appear that they, and not the Catholics, were the aggressors. Knowing what we know now, we certainly applaud the prudence of this proceeding.

But we no longer feel ourselves under any obligation to withhold our version of the facts of the case of which the *Witness* has already published a false account; and we have therefore no hesitation in making public the subjoined statements, made to us by persons eye-witnesses of the facts to which they depose; who on Wednesday the 1st instant, were prepared to swear to the truth of their statements had the case been proceeded with; and who, if the truth of their allegations be impugned, are prepared to give their names to the public, and to make good their every word.

From the independent statements of these witnesses it will be evident that, so far from any outrage having been perpetrated upon Protestants by members of the Procession on Sunday the 29th ult., a deliberate and wanton attack upon that part of the Procession which was composed of little girls, and where the stalwart arms of the males of the congregation were consequently least to be apprehended, was made by the driver and occupants of a carriage belonging we suppose, to Protestants; that by this unexpected and cowardly attack, the limbs and lives of the little girls were seriously endangered; and that, if the driver were interfered with, and his progress arrested, the act under the circumstances was not only strictly legal but highly laudable—one—we hesitate not to say it—one which nine out of every ten Protestants would have imitated. Where, in short, is the man, whether Catholic or Protestant, who would not interfere to save the lives of children, in imminent danger of being crushed to death?

With these prefatory remarks, we commend the following communications to the attention of our readers; reminding them that, to every word therein the writers were and are prepared to swear, should an opportunity for an investigation be afforded them:—

MONTREAL, June 2nd, 1864.

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

Sir,—As an eye-witness of the disturbance which occurred to the Procession on Sunday last, and of which mention has been made in the city press, allow me to relate through your columns what I myself saw and heard.

I was standing at the corner of St. Denis and St. Louis Streets, watching the Procession pass, when my attention was attracted by loud cries from some people standing near me, calling upon and making signs to the driver of a carriage, passing rapidly along St. Louis Street, to pull up. I looked, and I saw a private carriage drawn by two horses advancing fast upon the line of the Procession—at this point composed of little girls. Instead of pulling up, or moderating his speed, the driver of the carriage in question pushed his horses the faster and more furiously; as it appeared to me, with the intention of driving over the little children, who were