

and the name under which it is purchased. It is also stated that gambling is to be another prominent feature of this immoral resort. We bring these charges under the notice of the Police Committee, at this early date, so that the proper authorities cannot plead ignorance of the facts, if we should deem it necessary to make an open exposure of one of the most seductive and dangerous houses in Montreal.

|| We beg of the members of the committee to bestir themselves before it becomes necessary to enter into the details of the question and give the names of the participators in this outrage upon the respectable citizens of that locality.

### TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

We have been asked by one of our numerous "Enquirers" to give "a firm Christian some reasonable argument in favor of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation." We are very anxious to answer in a satisfactory manner all the varied questions on every imaginable subject that are sent to us by subscribers and friends. Some times, however, these questions entail no end of labor and research, which we are only too glad to bestow upon them, as in the case of our series of articles on the "Act of the Union;" at other times they threaten to enter a domain—that of Theology—which is away beyond our humble reach and which we dread to approach with our inexperience or to explore with our lack of knowledge. However, without claiming any theological exactness for our reply, we will attempt to prove, from common sense—and nothing more—that either Transubstantiation exists, as taught by the Catholic Church, or else Christianity has no foundation, neither in Christ nor in the Scriptures; in other words, that if the New Testament is truly the word of God and if Christ is truly the Son of God, the dogma of Transubstantiation must necessarily be both reasonable and exact.

We take it for granted that our correspondent is a Christian, no matter what his denomination, and that he believes in the Bible. Firstly, if Christ is the Son of God, co-eval with the Father, equally Omnipotent, Omniscient and True, He must have always said exactly what He meant and meant what He said: "For every idle word that man shall speak, he shall render an account on the day of judgment." Christ never could have spoken an idle or useless word, if He was the Truth itself. Being possessed of all power and all knowledge He must have had full command of all language. This, then, is our major premise: that Christ as God, speaking in all the earnestness of one making a last will and testament, must have intended what He said to be understood as He said it; being Omnipotent He must have had the power to execute whatever He said; being Truth Eternal He must have willed what He said. Now, what did He say?

In describing the Last Supper, St. Mathew, in his gospel, (XXVI. 26.) tells us that Christ having taken bread broke it and giving it to His disciples told them to "take and eat," and added "for this is My Body." Did Christ say that? If not, St. Mathew wrote what was not exact, and if the first of the Evangelists deceived his readers, the whole Bible is a mere fiction. If we are to believe at all in Holy Writ, we must believe that St. Mathew recorded exactly and faithfully what Christ said on that occasion. St. Mathew tells us that Christ said "this is My Body," and we must believe that these were His words, otherwise there are no inspired Scriptures. If Christ used these words, being God, Truth itself and unable to deceive, He must

have intended them to convey exactly the meaning that they present, namely, that the bread in His hand became His body. If he wished it to be understood that the bread would be a figure of His Body, as God, He would have said so. But he did nothing of the kind, He merely said, "This is My Body." Our minor premise is, that Christ said what St. Mathew records. The only conclusion that can flow therefrom is that Christ having meant what He said, and having said that the bread was His Body, that it then and there became His Body. To deny the conclusion you must deny Christ's power to perform that miracle; if He were powerless to perform it, He was not God, for He was not Omnipotent. Take it as you please, either the transubstantiation then took place or else Christianity with its Founder and its Bible must perish.

\*When God drew the world from chaos the miracles was more wonderful than that of changing one substance into another. When God made man, He took a handful of earth—part of His own creation—and made man to His own image and likeness; when God—Christ—established the Eucharist, He took a handful of bread—part of His own creation—and made of it Himself. Nothing more or less wonderful in one act than in the other. Both were miracles; and once the boundary line between the natural and supernatural is passed there is no longer any limit to the possibilities of the power beyond. The same arguments hold good in the case of the perpetuation of that great mystery. If Christ could perform the first act He was equally able to transmit His power to others, that His other words might be fulfilled; "Do ye this in commemoration of Me," and "Behold, I am with you, all days, even to the consummation of the world." If the mystery of transubstantiation took place at the Last Supper, it takes place on our altars daily; if it does not take place on our altars, then it never took place at the Last Supper. Christ spoke useless words and deceived His disciples, and therefore could not have been the Son of God; or else St. Mathew placed words in His mouth which He did not use and consequently the first of the Gospels is false. In a word you must either accept the dogma of transubstantiation or else reject the Scriptures and the Divinity of Christ.

We however, perceive the great objection you make, but which you do not express. You say that even though all things are possible to God, still how can the body be there under the appearance of bread? We are possessed of human, physical senses, and we are not capable of understanding or feeling that which our senses cannot perceive. We are commanded to "eat the flesh of the Son of Man;" our physical taste, our sense of touch, our sight and all would be shocked, or even paralyzed, were they to perceive the reality of the Divine presence outside the Eucharistic form. But while the accidents of the bread—the shape, color, weight, taste, and so forth,—remain the same, still the substance is no longer the same—it has become the Body of Christ, which always brings us back to the same reasoning, based on His power as God.

You tell us that you cannot understand that reasoning; neither can we; nor can any other human being. We cannot understand it any more than we can the creation, or any other mystery of our Christian religion. It is here that Faith comes into play. If you have no faith you are no Christian, and if you cannot believe without seeing and understanding, you Christianity is *nil*. However, we will attempt, by an example, taken from common mortal life, to illustrate

the reasonableness of the Real Presence. But we must begin by the firm belief in Christ, and in the fact that Christ had the will and the power to do what He said. If he had not the will He was talking useless words and deceiving; if He had not the power, He was using still more meaningless language. In either case he could not have been God. So we must pre-suppose the will and power.

Let us take a powerful commander, or Emperor, (say Napoleon Bonaparte in the days of his power and glory) and illustrate our meaning through him. An officer has done some disgraceful act and he is brought before the Emperor. The angry monarch says: "You are an officer, and you are not ashamed?" Mark the words: "You are an officer." The Emperor merely stated a fact, but did not exercise his will or power and no change resulted from his words. Next day a private soldier is reported for an act of heroism and he comes before the Emperor. Looking proudly at the man in the worn and soiled uniform of a battle-torn private, the Emperor says: "You are a brave man; I say to you as a reward, you are an officer." The same words exactly, but this time coupled with the will to create him an officer and the power to so change his rank. Up to the moment that the Emperor said "you are," the man was still a private in the ranks; but the moment the Emperor added the words "an officer," the man became an officer. Why so? Because the Emperor said it, and the Emperor had the will and the power to change the private into an officer. There in the Emperor's presence he stood, an officer of the army; yet to all outward appearances a mere private soldier. He had neither sword, nor spurs, nor epaulets, nor sashes; but he was as much an officer as the one beside him in full uniform. The accidents were wanting, but the rank existed; the Emperor had the will and power to create that rank.

So was it, in a supernatural and more wonderful sense, when Christ took the bread into His Hand and breaking it said: "This is My Body." As long as Christ had only said "This is," the object in His Hand was bread; but the moment he added the words "My Body," it immediately became His Body. To all outward appearances it was still a piece of bread; to the on-looker there was no flesh to be seen, no form of a human frame; but by virtue of Christ's will that it should become His Body and by virtue of Christ's power to make it become His Body, the transubstantiation then and there took place. This, then, brings us back again. If you deny the Real Presence you must be prepared to either deny the truth of the Gospel, (in which case the Bible is false) or else the will and power of Christ, (in which case all Christianity is based upon a gigantic lie). We have not attempted any deep argument, nor do we feel competent to treat these theological questions adequately and satisfactorily. However, we know why we believe in the truths taught by the Church, and in our own rough and untutored way, we are prepared to give any Christian the benefit of our reasoning.

### TO THE SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS.

We desire to address a few plain words to the gentlemen who composed the Catholic School Board during the past couple of years—from January 1892 to May or June 1893. We have learned that you have been laboring for some time back under a very false impression which it is our duty to immediately efface. During the course of 1892, and also during the months of this year, that

have elapsed, quite a number of articles, upon school matters, appeared in the columns of the TRUE WITNESS. Some of those articles were critical, other laudatory, and all very clear and pointed. By some means or other members of the School Board became possessed of the idea that these articles were written, inspired or suggested by persons outside our office—members of communities, of the clergy, and laymen. What gave rise to such an impression is more than we are able to tell; but a more erroneous one never existed. We ask the members of the Board to kindly read and learned by heart what we are about to state; it may save them in future from harboring unjust and unfounded opinions and perchance prevent them from acting upon the same.

Every article that appeared in the editorial columns of the TRUE WITNESS, from the 25th January, 1892 down to this issue, was written by the present editor, and by him alone. No person else either directly nor indirectly suggested, inspired or penned one line that appeared in these columns. On the educational and school questions the ideas expressed, the plans laid, the arguments set forth and the opinions given were and are the sole property of the present editor. If any fault is to be found with them he alone is responsible. The articles were written—especially those of last year, to which reference is made—without consultation with any one, layman, priest or religious. They have been approved of by hundreds after they appeared; but were never dreamed of by any one, save the writer, before their publication. If the vivid imagination of any member of the Board suggested to him the idea that these articles emanated from any other source, then that man's imagination is to blame for having played him false: if any person ever stated to any member of the Board that a line of editorial on these matters was written, suggested or dictated by any human being, except the editor, then that person told a deliberate falsehood.

We trust that this statement is sufficiently plain to disabuse these gentlemen of any false impression under which they may have been laboring. It is a very bad thing to jump too readily at conclusions. Those to whom these words are addressed fully understand what we mean; they know exactly why we make these assertions; it is unnecessary for us to go into any further explanations. They must also know to whom we refer and why we refer at all to the matter. If an injustice of thought has been committed, we trust it will not be intensified by an injustice of action. If our language is not sufficiently clear and if our meaning is not understood, we are prepared to inform the public, as well as those to whom we address ourselves in particular, of the full details of the reason which called for this plain statement.

### HOME RULE SPEECHES.

The authentic and *verbatim* reports of all the important Home Rule speeches delivered in the British House of Commons during the recent debates, have been collected into pamphlet form by Mr. P. Mungovan, the well-known "Rambler," whose name is a household word in every Irish Catholic family in Canada. The pamphlet is in press and will be issued in a few weeks. Any orders sent to THE TRUE WITNESS office, or addressed to the author, in care of this office, will be promptly attended to. The volume will contain the speeches of Gladstone, Balfour, Salisbury, Justin McCarthy, Sexton, Blake, Sanderson, Russell, and, in fine, every important speech delivered on the Home Rule measure. Price will be made known later on.