

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 696, Craig Street, by

J. GILLIES.

G. E. OLIER, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE: To all country subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a 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 Correspondent that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription from THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 17.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1867.

Friday, 17—St. John Nepomucene, M.
Saturday, 18—St. Venantius, M.
Sunday, 19—Fourth after Easter. St. Peter Celestin, P. O.
Monday, 20—St. Bernardin de Sienna, O.
Tuesday, 21—St. Paschal Bayl, O.
Wednesday, 22—St. Soter and Gaus, M. M.
Thursday, 23—St. George, M.

APRIL DIVIDEND OF THE ROMAN LOAN.

Office of the Roman Loan, at the Banking House of Duncan, Sherman & Co.,
11 Nassau street, corner of Pine, N.Y.
March 15, 1867.

The coupon of interest of this loan due on the 1st of April, 1867, will be paid as follows:—
New York, at the banking house of Duncan, Sherman & Co.
Philadelphia, at the banking house of Drexel & Co.
Baltimore, at the banking house of L. J. Torrey & Co.
New Orleans, at the Southern Bank.
St. Louis, at the banking house of Tesson, Son & Co.
Louisville, at the banking house of Tucker & Co.
Cincinnati, at the banking house of Gilmore, Donlay & Co. and Hermann Garaghty & Co.
Boston, by Patrick Donahoe.
Providence, R. I., by George A. Leete, Esq.
MONTREAL, Canada, Bank of Montreal.
QUEBEC, Canada, Branch of the Bank of Montreal.
Havana, Cuba, J. C. Burnham & Co.
Lima, Peru, Alsop & Co.

ROBERT MURPHY, Agent.

AGENT FOR CANADA:

ALFRED LAROCQUE, Montreal.

The interest on the Bonds of this loan will hereafter be paid \$2.50 and 62 cents.

ALFRED LAROCQUE.

Montreal, 16th April, 1867.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Already the Peace Conference in London has held several Sessions, at which the following basis for future negotiations has been agreed to: The Territory of Luxembourg is to remain attached to the King of Holland as Grand Duke of Luxembourg; the fortress is to be razed, and the neutrality of the Territory is to be guaranteed by all the European Powers, parties to the Conference. On this basis it is hoped that a superstructure of peace may be erected, but it will not do to be very sanguine on this matter. Behind Kings and Emperors, behind diplomatists there are the peoples; and these, if their mutual jealousies and belligerent proclivities have been aroused, will not be kept from fighting, sooner or later, by all the protocols and red-tape in Christendom. Such seems to be the case with the Germanic and Gallic peoples, respectively; they look as if they wanted to go in and fight for the belt, and the championship of Europe; and if it be so, there is no power on earth that can prevent them from having their own way.

The French Government at all events does not seem as if it were confident of a peaceful solution of the question. It is pushing on its warlike preparations day and night without relaxation; and telegrams from Paris state that the scenes witnessed in that Capital, the rapid movements of guns and munitions of war, recall to mind the scenes that heralded the outbreak of the war with Austria. On her side, too, Prussia is continuing to get ready for a fight, and is putting her army on a footing for immediate active service. Her soldiers remember that they are the sons of the men of Rosbach and of Leipsic, whilst the fiery Gaul thinks only of Jena; but, with these memories, with these heart-burnings between two brave and powerful peoples, diplomatists will have hard work of it to keep the peace.

The Fenian trials are progressing in Ireland. Massey, the Fenian General, appears to have given most valuable information in his capacity of Crown witness, to the British Government. He has made known to it all the secrets of the society, its force, its intentions, and the names even of those connected with it, and who have hitherto remained unsuspected. Great dismay prevails in consequence.

It seems that in Dublin the insurgents reckoned upon the assistance of 14,000; in Cork, of 20,000; in all, 34,000, who were to have concentrated at the Limerick Junction, had not their designs been counteracted by the Police, and the

troops. In short, General Massey has made a clean breast of it.

So far the results of the Peace Conference are said to be gratifying. France and Prussia are ready to accept the terms proposed for arranging the Luxembourg dispute, and his bone of contention may therefore be looked upon as removed. Another however will probably soon be found.

The Ministry have won another victory in the House of Commons, having obtained a majority of 66 in a crowded House on one of the final divisions on their Reform Bill. This it is thought assures the success of the measure. It is positively asserted that the death sentence on the Fenian prisoners will be commuted to imprisonment.

On Sunday afternoon last took place the Benediction of the Bell for the Chapel of the Asyle St. Joseph. His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal officiated, and the Ceremony was attended by a large number of our most distinguished citizens.

A singular story is going the rounds of the papers, both in Europe and on this Continent, which again raises the long and much vexed question—"Was the child who died in the Temple on the 8th June, 1795, really Louis Charles, second son of Louis XVI, known as the Dauphin; or was it a dumb child, substituted for that unfortunate little one, doomed together with his father, to expiate the vices of his ancestors?" Here is the story which is now being told in the journals:—

A mysterious personage died last March at St. Petersburg called Count Louis Carlowitch de Ligny Luxembourg, 85 years of age, and holding the rank of Major in the Russian army. It is pretended that he was brought to Russia in the latter part of the last century, by his reputed father, Count Charles de Ligny Luxembourg, a Colonel of the *ancien regime*; who again had received him from Made. Tallien in Paris during the reign of terror, with a request to take charge of him; and a promise that, at a future period, full explanations should be given. The Colonel complied with the request; carried the child safely to Russia, where it grew up and lived until within a few weeks ago. This child, so it is pretended, was the Dauphin, Charles Louis, or Louis XVII of France.

There have been many pretenders to this rank, which shows that there always have been grave doubts as to the fate of the unhappy child of Louis XVI, and Marie Antoinette; and that the opinion that he was delivered from the Temple, has always more or less prevailed. Even so long ago as 1795, in the month of July, a child of ten years old was arrested by the local authorities of the village of Thiers, on the suspicion of being the Dauphin; he was, however, quickly released. At the beginning of the present century, the Dauphin was personated with great success by a young man, the son of a tailor at Lo. This pretender, whose real name was Jean Marie Hervagault, found numbers, even of high rank, to credit his pretensions, but he was at last arrested by Fouche, and sent to prison. One pretender, however, exposed, a dozen more started up; and even after the Restoration, Bruneau, Naundorff, Richemont, and even a Methodist preacher on this Continent named Eleazar Williams, have successively pretended to be descendants of the elder branch of the Bourbons. The number of these pretenders the momentary success of their plots, show how generally spread from the first, was the belief that Louis XVII did not die in prison. His real fate will perhaps ever remain a mystery.

On the one hand, it seems improbable, incredible, that the child was smuggled out of the Temple, and that a fictitious Dauphin was put in his place, in spite of the jealous vigilance with which he was guarded. Who had any interest to run such a risk? The pure royalists, then nobly fighting in La Vendee? But had they concocted such a scheme, and carried it into execution, they would naturally, and by way of gathering all the crypto-royalism of France around their standard, have loudly proclaimed the fact, and produced to the world the rescued Dauphin, the hope of royal and loyal France. This they did not do; therefore we cannot conceive that the evasion of the Dauphin, if such an event ever occurred, was the result of a plot concocted and executed by the pure Royalists.

The Comte de Provence moreover had no interest in saving the life of a child who stood between him and the long coveted throne. It is not to be supposed that he, as selfish, as unprincipled and as ambitious a man as ever breathed, would have interposed to save the life of his nephew, and thus destroy his own claims to the succession.

Still less can we conceive what interest the Convention, the men of the terror, could have had in conniving at the escape of their prisoner around whom, if free, all the enemies of the republic would have naturally rallied; and if the Dauphin was smuggled out of the Temple at all, it must have been before the 8th Thermidor, and whilst the Terrorists were still supreme; neither is it easy to see how the escape of a prisoner of such

importance, and so closely watched, could have been effected in those days of suspicion and dread without the connivance of the rulers of the State. For these reasons, and many others which naturally suggest themselves, there would seem to be no reason for doubting the generally received version of the fate of Louis XVII.

On the other hand, it is certain that by many acts after the Restoration, both Louis XVIII, and the Duchesse d'Angouleme, displayed their disbelief in that story, and betrayed a half-consciousness that the nephew of the one, and the brother of the other, was still living. They would not allow any monument to be erected to his memory: they refused to accept the heart of the child who died in the Temple, and that had been preserved, and was presented to them by Dr. Pelletan; in like manner they refused the offer of the Rev. M. Lemerrier to the Duchesse d'Angouleme, to search for the coffin in which the same child was buried, in the cemetery of Ste. Marguerite, though it had been purposely marked, and put in a place by itself. These, and many other things, trifles in themselves, tended to confirm belief in the story of the mysterious abduction of the Temple.

All the world knows that, after the death of his father, mother, and aunt, the unfortunate child, separated from his sister, was made over to the tender mercies of the cobbler Simon (fitting agent and representative of a democracy) by whom the innocent victim of Republican brutality was kicked, flogged, taught to drink, to swear, to blaspheme God, and to calumniate his parents. Now Simon being appointed to the office of Municipal, left the Temple on the 19th of January, 1794; and it is pretended by some that he, with the aid of his wife, smuggled the Dauphin out of the Temple in his luggage, having previously put a scrofulous and dumb child in his place. Certain it is that, when, after the Revolution of 8th Thermidor, there was a slight return to human sentiments, and a desire to mitigate the sufferings of the child-prisoner was entertained, a Commission of three members of the Convention was appointed by the Committee of Public Safety to visit the Temple, and report. None of these three Commissioners knew the Dauphin by sight, and in their report they declare that they found a child about 9 years of age, from whom, neither by threats nor by menaces, could they extract a word. That, in explanation of this silence, they were told by the guardians that, since he had been forced by cruel tortures to sign an infamous charge against his mother, the child had obstinately refused to speak; but as these guardians were not in charge of the prisoner when Marie-Antoinette was tried, their testimony is worth nothing. Besides, it seems scarce credible that a child so young, and who could scarce have known the meaning of his acts, could have formed and adhered so long to such a terrible, almost heroic, resolution. It certainly seems from this, as if a dumb child had been substituted for the Dauphin. But here are more mysteries.

A surgeon, the celebrated Dr. Desault, who had attended the royal family in better days, and who knew the Dauphin by sight, was sent to take care of the sick child, on the 6th of May, 1794. It is said that he imprudently let drop some expression of his doubt as to the identity of the child with his former royal patient: and at all events, on the evening of the 29-30 May, he was taken suddenly ill, and died not without strong symptoms of having been poisoned. The same fate befell the apothecary, Choppart, who had been also called in, and who also died suddenly and mysteriously, and with symptoms of poison, within six days of the death of Dr. Desault. It was said in Paris at the time, and has often been repeated since, that they were both poisoned, because they knew too much. They were succeeded by Dr. Pelletan, who did not know the Dauphin by sight.

Any how, the child died on the 9th of June, 1795, of scrofula, and general debility. No pains were taken to identify the corpse. The *post mortem* was hurried over in a most slovenly manner; the requirements of the existing law were not complied with; and no one was permitted to see the corpse, who had known the Dauphin when alive, and at liberty. The body was buried on the 10th, in the burying ground of the parish of Ste. Marguerite.

These are the main facts of the case, in so far as they have been hitherto brought to light; and though there may be in them a basis for romance, some grounds even for doubts, it can hardly be said that they are of themselves sufficient to furnish any assurance of the abduction of the real Dauphin from the Temple, or any valid motives for giving credence to the extraordinary tale of which we have endeavored to give the outline. One man, Cambaceres, might, had he so pleased, have thrown light on the mystery; but Cambaceres went to his own place, and made no sign.

* He had attended the elder brother of Louis Charles, who died at Meudon in 1790, and he knew all the members of the royal family.

FINWOOD.—This necessary article of fuel is at present very scarce in the city. There is a quantity of inferior wood on the wharves, perfectly green, and at very high prices, but the yards are quite empty.

BRITANNIA SELLING OFF.—The British Government is selling off its old wooden navy, cheap for cash, having no further need for it, or rather for its wooden ships, these being now pretty nearly useless for purposes of naval warfare. Amongst the names of the magnificent vessels thus, and for this cause, disposed of, we find these of the screw line of battle ships, *Colossus*, the screw frigates, *Imperieuse*, *Euryalus*, *Ter-magant* and *Arrogant*; the *Collingwood*, the *Cressy*, and *Orion* screw line of battle ships, with the *Leander* and *Chesapeake* screw frigates. No finer wooden men of war than these ever floated, and but a few years ago the possession of such a fleet of such ships rendered Great Britain mistress of the seas; to-day they are worth no more than the value of their timber, and of their iron and copper bolts. Great Britain's noble navy is lost, utterly lost, as much so as if all her ships had been consumed by fire.

Addressing a large audience on this topic at Glasgow the other day, Sir Archibald Alison thus described the consequences to Great Britain of the marvellous revolution effected by the introduction of the system of iron-plating, so as to make ships' sides impervious to any except the heaviest shot. He said:—

"The application of iron to the plating of vessels, and casing all ships of war in armour, which is impervious save to 200 or 300 pounders, has not only made a change in the art of naval war, but has, at one blow, deprived us, so far as available ships go, of our naval superiority. Three Trafalgars, won by the French or Russians, the Germans or Americans, could not do this as effectually as the use of iron vessels has done. Our great wooden fleet, so long the pride of Britain, the terror of the world, lies stored up in Portsmouth Harbor, of no earthly use in maintaining any maritime contest. Those noble three deckers, such as the Duke of Wellington, would be sent to the bottom by a single gun carrying a 300 pound ball. We have, at one blow, virtually lost the fleet which had been growing up for two hundred years."

Nor does the above statement include all the change that this new system of heavy artillery, and iron-plated ships has effected in naval warfare. It has, in the present state of physical science, made an aggressive naval war, or attack on distant countries by means of a fleet, almost impossible. For, as against the artillery now in use, and which could be employed for the defence, the attacking ships must be almost invulnerable, their sides must be made impervious to any except the very heaviest shot. But a ship made thus invulnerable will cease to be a sea-boat; she will no longer be fit to keep the sea in all weathers, to brave the storms of the Atlantic at all seasons; and though invaluable as a defence to her own coasts, she will be pretty nigh useless for an attack upon those of a foreign and distant nation. What science may accomplish in coming years it would be presumptuous to attempt even to predict; but certainly the problem of combining in one and the same vessel the qualities of invulnerability, and of sea-worthiness—the latter term, in the case of a man-of-war, implying not merely the power of making a long voyage, but of keeping at sea in all weathers, and for long periods, and of fighting her guns under all circumstances—has not been solved, has made no approach even to a solution. The perfect iron-clad resembles somewhat the old man-at-arms, who, clad from head to foot in armour, on which battle-axe, and sword, and shaft sped from English bow could make no impression, was almost unable from the weight of his defensive accoutrements to move; unable to advance or to retreat, incapable even of raising himself from the ground should he happen to stumble and fall. Besides, the ventilation of the best iron-clads is very defective; and the consequences on the health of the crew, and therefore on their power of standing a long cruise, is most deleterious.—We can therefore at once see that no nation can in the present condition of physical science, carry on a distant aggressive naval warfare. The revolution that has taken place in artillery and naval architecture has, whilst maximising the power of defence, reduced the power of attack to a minimum; but the secret of Great Britain's power lies in her capacity of making, and maintaining aggressive naval war.

The question of the legality of the Ritualistic practices of certain members of the Anglican Establishment, is about to be submitted to the decision of the Courts of Law; the Bishop of London having instituted legal proceedings against the Rev. Mr. Machonochie, minister of St. Alban's church in London, in which the latter is charged with four particular offences against the laws of the Established Church.—These charges are:—1st. That, after consecration, he elevates and exposes to the adoration of the congregation the bread and wine; 2nd. That he has lighted candles on his Communion table, or altar as the Ritualists delight to call it; 3rd. That he employs incense in the services of his church; and in the last place, that he mixes water with the wine used for Communion.

The case will be tried before the Court of Arches, from which, however, an appeal lies to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; so that the party defeated in the first tribunal, will probably carry their cause before the second. Long protracted litigation may therefore be anticipated.

* And yet, at first sight, it would seem as if the

case were a very simple one; as if, to use a vulgar phrase, the defendant had not a leg to stand on. If we test his mode of conducting the celebration of the Communion service, by the 39 articles, by the rubrics of the Prayer Book, or by the *sensus communis* of the Church of England, it does not seem capable of sustaining the ordeal for one moment. That Church is, it is its boast that it is so, essentially Protestant: it protests, not merely against the Papal supremacy, but against the doctrine of the Real Presence, and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Communion service, which, it teaches, is nothing but a commemoration, or bringing to mind of Our Lord's last supper; but towards which, even considered merely as a commemorative rite, as was the Jewish Passover, it entertains so strong a feeling of jealousy, not to say antipathy, that it discourages, rather than encourages, its frequent celebration. Once a month, not oftener, does it care to see its ministers engaged therein; in this indeed showing that, it is soundly Protestant. Yet, if Protestant, it is less so than are many other sects, amongst which this, the one great central act of Christian worship, is celebrated, not weekly, not monthly even, but only once a year. This aversion of all the sects to the frequent celebration, even of those maimed and mutilated rites which they have put in lieu of the daily Eucharistic celebrations of the Catholic Church, is strongly characteristic of Protestantism: and it is by the frequency of their celebrations, quite as much as by the forms and ceremonies with which those celebrations are accompanied, that the High Church, or Ritualistic party in the Establishment betray their Romish proclivities, and their estrangement from the spirit of their own sect.

There should therefore, we think, have been a fifth head of accusation brought against the Rev. Mr. Machonochie—to wit, that of too frequent Eucharistic celebrations, and of assigning to the celebration of the Lord's Supper a place too prominent for Protestant worship, and altogether alien to the genius of Protestantism. Indeed herein lies the material difference between the Catholic and the Protestant idea of worship, or the supreme act of the Christian *cultus*. A Catholic speaks of going to Mass,—and by that one word he implies that, having done so, he has fulfilled his religious obligations, and tendered to his Lord, his Master, and his God, that one supreme act of homage which is His due. The Protestant, by way of implying precisely the same thing, will say that he has been to "hear to hear the Rev. Mr. . . . preach," as if listening to sermons were the one act of highest worship, adoration, or fealty that creature can tender to Creator. There is therefore an essential difference between Catholic and Protestant worship: and no matter what the mere ceremonies, or outward rites with which the latter is conducted—any religious system which gives especial prominence to the celebration of the Lord's Supper; or which makes its celebration the prime object of the hebdomadal gathering together, tends towards Romish or Catholic worship, and is, in so far repugnant to the spirit of Protestantism, and therefore of the Church of England as By Law Established.

Just as a high idea of the dignity of the Lord Jesus, and a vivid realisation of His Divine Personality, underlies that *cultus* which Protestants denounce as "Mariolatry," so in like manner does an excessive regard for the Lord's Supper—does a tendency to make its celebration the most prominent act of public Christian worship, indicate the existence of a Romish *diathesis*, which if not vigorously dealt with, and quickly counteracted, may lead to all the horrors of Catholicity itself.

We read in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 9th inst.:—

"And now the word has gone forth from the *Globe* office. There shall be no more Coalition Governments."

Which is simply the equivalent of the "word" that there shall be, in the executive government, or Cabinet for the "Dominion of Canada," no single representative of the Conservative and Catholic element in Lower Canada. The Province of Ontario will of course be represented in that Cabinet by men holding, and bent upon carrying into effect, the views of, the Clear-Grit, or Protestant democratic party dominant in that section of the Dominion: and unless there is to be a Coalition, which Mr. Brown will not so much as hear of, it is evident that the members of the Cabinet representing the Province of Quebec or Lower Canada, will have to be of the same political stripe, or way of thinking, as will be the representatives in the Cabinet of the Province of Ontario—that is to say *Rouges*, or Yankee Annexationists.

The Paris correspondent of the *Minerve* gives some very interesting details of the Exhibition; and of the position that is occupied therein by the products of British N. America. Canada is well and worthily represented by Sir William Logan, and Dr. Sterry Hunt, both eminent in the scientific world, and who do honor to the country which they represent. The geological and mineralogical specimens from this Continent are the objects of much attention.