

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 195, Fortification Lane, by
J. GILLES.

G. E. CLERK, 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.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots.
Single copies, 5 cts.

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 figures after each Subscriber's Address
every week shows the date to which he has paid up.
Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid
up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from
SAID DATE.

S. M. PETERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo.
Bowling & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized
Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1874.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JULY.—1874.

Friday, 17.—St. Alexius, O.
Saturday, 18.—St. Camillus of Lellis, C.
Sunday, 19.—Eighth after Pentecost.
Monday, 20.—St. Jerome Emilian, C.
Tuesday, 21.—St. Praxede, V.
Wednesday, 22.—St. Mary Magdalen.
Thursday, 23.—St. Apollinaris, B. M.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Marshal MacMahon has sent the following
Message to the French Assembly: "When you,
by the law of November 20th last, delivered
executive power into my hands for seven years,
you intended to afford to the public interests
that stability which precarious institutions are
powerless to give; that vote conferred upon me
grave duties for the fulfilment of which I am
accountable to France; and from which I can
in no case be permitted to withdraw. It also
conferred rights which I shall never exercise
except for the good of the country. Your con-
fidence rendered my powers irrevocable for a
fixed term. In forestalling the votes on con-
stitutional bills, in according them yourselves,
you enchain your sovereignty. I shall em-
ploy the means with which I am armed by the
laws to defend my power. This course I am
convinced, is in accordance with the expecta-
tions and will of the Assembly which, when it
placed me at the head of the Government, in-
tended to create a strong, stable and respected
power. But the law of November 20th must
be completed. The Assembly cannot meditate
tearing up its engagements. Permit me to
press on your minds the claims of the fulfil-
ment of that engagement. The country de-
mands the organization of public powers, and
and the questions which were reserved, must
be settled. Further delay will depress trade,
and hamper the prosperity of the country. I
hope the Assembly will not fail to fulfil its
obligations. I adjure it in the name of the
highest interests of the country to deliberate
without delay upon the questions which must
no longer remain in suspense. The Assembly
and Government are directly responsible. I
am desirous of accomplishing all my duties,
and my most imperative duty is to afford to
the country defined institutions, security and
calm. I have instructed the Minister to in-
form the constitutional committee concerning
the points upon which I believe it to exist." M.
Raoul Duval argued that the Assembly was
powerless to constitute a definitive Government,
and moved that it dissolve after having voted
upon the financial bills, the bill on military or-
ganization, and one for a general election on
October 25th; he demanded that his motion
be declared urgent. The demand for urgency
was supported by the Left and the Bonapart-
ists, but was rejected by a large majority. The
Left Centre voted with the majority, thinking
that MacMahon's message increased the chances
of Cassimir Periers bill. The motion was af-
terwards referred to the Committee on Parliam-
entary Initiative, in which the Left predominated.
The French Government have signified their
acceptance of the Bill drawn up by the Com-
mittee of Thirty for the continuance of the
Personal Septennat, but urge that some of its
most important provisions should be embodied
in a separate measure so as to have them speed-
ily passed by the Assembly.

Revolts among the peasantry of northern
Prussia in consequence of changes in local gov-
ernment are reported. Blood has already been
shed in conflict with the troops, and fur-
ther serious trouble is apprehended. Germany
and France are to present indictments again
each other at the Brussels International Law
Congress for alleged acts committed by their
respective armies during the late war.

The Carlists have cannonaded Puyreda with-
out effect, and they are now waiting for rein-
forcements. General Saballes has arrived and
will take charge of operations. An attempt
was made to assassinate Prince Bismarck on
the 13th; the name of this aspirant for notori-
ety is Kullman. It is said the British dele-
gate to the Brussels Congress will not take

part in the proceedings until Lord Derby's re-
servations are considered. Menseigneur De Me-
rode, Archbishop of Mitylene and Private
Chaplain of the Pope, is dead. The Argentine
Republic proposes to the nations of the Pacific
to settle the question of the ownership of the
Straits of Magellan declaring them neutral.—
President Guzman Blanco, of Venezuela, de-
creed expulsion from the Republic for the Bis-
hop of Merida for opposing the Establishment
by law of civic marriages. The Bishop died
before he could embark. Dr. Baroit was na-
med his successor by the President, but he re-
fused to obey other orders than those of the
Holy See. He was arrested and sent out of
the country, followed by various other priests.
The flood in Massachusetts has done an im-
mensity of damage; among the chief sufferers is
the Boston and Albany Railway Company,
some of whose bridges are carried away, and
portions of the track were swept away.—
Doekray, the American, so long kept a
prisoner in Cuba, has at length been tried
by court-martial and sentenced to death.

The Toronto Nation of the 9th inst. has
made a mistake, which we are sure, when it is
pointed out, it will hasten to correct.

Mr. Attorney-General Clarke of Manitoba
has not, never had, any connection whatsoever
with the TRUE WITNESS of Montreal, whose
editor, Mr. Clerk, is a distinct person.

The Nation errs also in a matter of fact, in
pretending that the Roman Catholic Church
has by no means always acted upon the doc-
trine that marriage is indissoluble. Never
during the long period of her existence has she
ever sanctioned the contrary doctrine, neither
has she ever ceased to uphold the indissolubility
of marriage. No power on earth, temporal
or spiritual, not even the Pope, is able to grant
a divorce *a vinculo* on any pretext whatsoever.
Separation, or as it is called divorce *a mensa
et thoro*, the Church does indeed in some cases
sanction—but a *vinculo matrimonii*, never.—
Human laws allowing divorce, and permitting
divorced persons to contract new sexual unions
are in her eyes but laws legalising adultery;
but no human legislation can make that moral
which God has prohibited, or cancel the divine
law. "One with one and for ever, until death
do them part." The Pope cannot grant dis-
pensation from the moral law, or law of God.

As to the "legality and morality" of a
divorce obtained in the States—a question which,
according to the *Nation*, is exciting much dis-
cussion in Canada—our contemporary's views
are not very clear. We do not understand
him, but neither does he clearly understand
himself. In order to help him to a clearer
understanding on the matter, we would invite
him to sit down and after mature cogitation
try to define "marriage"—there is nothing like
sharp definitions—pointing out wherein mar-
riage differs morally—we do not say legally,
but morally—from concubinage, and pointing
wherein consists the moral difference betwixt
the two. He will perhaps discover that to
those sexual unions, only contracted in har-
mony with the revealed will of God, can the
term marriage be applied.

But who is to determine what the revealed
law of God on this matter is? According to
the grand principle of Protestantism, the right
of private judgment, every man, every woman
is at liberty to determine the revealed law of
God for himself and herself; and therefore—
as often it has been ably argued by the ablest
of all the Protestant periodicals of the day, the
Westminster Review—individuals, if marriage
be not sacramental and indissoluble, are mo-
rally at liberty to contract such sexual unions,
as they please; for life, for a term of years, or
during good behaviour, as may seem to them,
in the exercise of their private judgment, most
convenient, and conducive to their mutual
happiness. This is "Free Love;" a conclu-
sion from which no logical Protestant, who
boldly carries out his principles to their ulti-
mate consequences, can escape.

But if the individual be incompetent to de-
termine what is the revealed law of God, upon
the question of the intercourse of the sexes,
so also is the State, which is a human insti-
tution, and therefore fallible. The State by its
laws, may attach penalties to certain particular
acts, which it calls bigamy; it may refuse to
concede to the parties to, or the issue of, sexual
unions which it does not approve of, certain
advantages in the matter of property, and suc-
cession to property, which it concedes to those
who conform to its regulations. This it can
do, and has the right to do: but it cannot
make that moral which God has forbidden, or
that immoral which God himself allows. It
may legalise concubinage and call it marriage;
it may absolve from the legal pains and pen-
alties of bigamy; but any sexual unions which,
without its consent, would be immoral and
adulterous, are none the less immoral and ad-
ulterous because contracted in accordance with
its laws, and in conformity with Act of Parliam-
ent. This the *Nation* will not fail to per-
ceive when it shall have found its way to a
sharp and exhaustive definition of the term

marriage, and is able to point out wherein,
morally, marriage differs from concubinage.

Admit the right of the State to grant
divorce and pass divorce laws, and you can-
not deny to it the right to determine the
grounds or reasons for granting such di-
vores. Every particular independent State
in this matter must be sole judge and a law
unto itself. Canada might grant divorces
on such and such grounds with equal right—
for as a correct interpreter of the revealed law
of God, any one State is as competent as any
other State—Indiana, or Mexico, or Italy might
grant divorces on other grounds. What would
be the practical result? Just this—That in
course of time a man might, if he could afford
it, have half a dozen wives—one in every State,
one in Canada; one in the United States; an-
other in Mexico; another in Italy, should his
business carry him thither, with all of whom
he might morally cohabit if divorce laws mo-
rally affect the relation of the sexes. This
would be the logical consequence of attributing
to the State a moral right to grant divorces.
Hitherto the privilege of having a wife in every
port, has been restricted to sailors; but carry
out the divorce principle, deny in any case the
indissolubility of marriage, and Jack will no
longer enjoy a monopoly of this privilege.

Thus then, if you logically carry out the Pro-
testant principle of individual private judg-
ment, you arrive at "Free Love." If illegi-
ally, but for the sake of expediency you place
restrictions on that great Protestant privilege,
and give to the State what you take from the
individual, and as you cannot secure uniformity
of legislation amongst different, but contiguous
States, you must allow a man the moral right
to have one wife in one State, and another wife,
half a mile across the Lines, in another State.
From this dilemma there is no possibility of
escape, if you make the State competent to
determine the morality of sexual unions. In
the particular case alluded to by the *Nation*
the gentleman in question when in the United
States is divorced from his Canadian wife; and,
therefore, if the State has the moral right to
grant divorces—morally at liberty to contract
another sexual union with another woman. But a
few miles further North, another woman to whom
he has been married, and from whom by Cana-
dian law he has not been divorced, is his wife,
and so by taking the Grand Trunk cars from
one State to another he can enjoy all the ad-
vantages of polygamy as well as if he were a
dweller in Utah, and had set up his tabernacle
amongst the children of Joe Smith. To such
an absurdity, to such a moral abyss does the
admission of the right of divorce inevitably
lead us.

If St. Peter and his successors of the first
four centuries had or were thought to have
jurisdiction over the whole church, how does it
happen that they never exercised it? If Rome
was to decide on all questions of faith, why had
not the other churches recourse to her in all
doubts and disputes?

It is precisely because St. Peter and the Popes
of the first four centuries did exercise universal
jurisdiction—it is precisely because the churches
had recourse to Rome in all disputed questions
of faith and morals, that we grant her this
right. As far as St. Peter is concerned, it
was not to be expected, that there would be
the same necessity for the exercise of this
power in his time, as at any subsequent pe-
riod. His fellow apostles were for the most
part all alive, and as having received their in-
structions from our Divine Master himself,
would, in the eyes of their flocks, have such
authority, as almost to decide on the instant
all disputes. Hence there could be little or no
necessity for appeal. And as a point of fact,
we find that in the sole case where there was
necessity for an appeal (the council of Jeru-
salem) St. Peter's voice decided the matter.—
Those who deny this power to Peter remember
must not only overthrow this fact of the deci-
sion at Jerusalem, but must also show, that
there were times and places, where it ought to
have been exercised and was not.

As far as the other popes are concerned, we
have a striking example of this appeal, (and that
within a quarter of a century after St. Peter's
death,) when the Corinthians sent Fortunatus
to Rome, to inform that church of their un-
happy division. St. Clement then held the
papal throne. He had been a fellow-labourer
with St. Paul (Phil. iv., 3) whom he followed
to Rome, where as St. Irenaeus and Pope Zo-
rimus tell us, he heard St. Peter preach, and
was instructed in his school. He was ordained
bishop by St. Peter, and if we follow the ex-
planation of Epiphanius (Hær. 27, c. 6) was
vicar of Rome with an episcopal character,
until on the death of St. Cletus, he was placed
(A.D. 91) in the apostolic chair. To him
some five years later came Fortunatus, bearing
with him the unhappy tidings of the troubles of
the Church of Corinth. A party in that
church had rebelled against the spiritual au-
thority and had presumed to depose some holy
and irreproachable priests. There was a ques-
tion of faith also, as well as of obedience in

these troubles for certain Corinthians would
fain deny the resurrection of the flesh. Against
these disunion's Clement wrote that epistle,
which in the ancient church ranked next to
the canonical books of Sacred Scripture and
was read with them in the churches. This
epistle is a magnificent declaration of the pri-
macy of the See of Rome; and a worthy ini-
tiative of those innumerable Papal Bulls, which
from that day unto this have spoken with the
voice of Peter reproving the waters whenever
they have lashed in fury against the Rock.
But why was this cry directed by an ancient
church to Rome? If all apostolic churches
were equal, why did Fortunatus brave the sea
and the hardships of a journey to lay his sor-
rows and the sorrows of the Corinthian Church
at the feet of a distant pontiff? Were there
not flourishing churches at Philippi, Thessalo-
nica and Berea pertaining to the same race as
Corinth? There was the Church of Ephesus
too and Smyrna, older churches and to be
reached without the dangers of the sea. And
if they wanted an Apostle was not St. John
yet alive, and near at hand, nearer far than
Rome? This grand old man, this living Mar-
tyr, this Exile Prophet had he not braved the
boiling oil before the Latin Gate, and foretold
the sufferings and future glory of God's holy
Church? What more meet then than that
Corinth should turn to him in her anguish and
distress? His sacred body when cast into the
seething oil, had immediately soothed its angry
bubblings, and dispersed its heats. What more
natural then than that Corinth should ask, that
he would stay the angry ebullitions and the
heats of party pride? Why then went Fortu-
natus to Rome? Why turned he his back on
Ephesus and the aged John, and braved the
seas to Rome? Because the primacy of Peter
and of Rome, was as well known, and as piously
acknowledged by Corinth and the early church,
as by the bishops of the whole world assembled
in the Council of the Vatican in the year of
grace 1873.

But do not Dodwell, Cave, Archbishop
Wake and Grabe in Spicilegio think that this
epistle was written by St. Clement while the
See of Rome was vacant after the martyrdom
of SS. Peter and Paul? and do they not thus
account for his writing in the name of the Ro-
man Church?

They do; but that does not affect the argu-
ment. The fact of the appeal to Rome being
established, it matters not when the appeal was
made; and the very admission that Clement
wrote in the name of the Roman Church is all
we need.

But why do these writers think that this
epistle was written whilst the See of Rome was
vacant?

From certain internal evidence, which
though of a certain weight, can hardly be con-
sidered conclusive. 1st. He speaks (c. 1) of
internal troubles which seem to represent Nero's
persecution. 2nd. He speaks (c. 5) of the
Martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul as recent.
(So great an event would long be recent.) 3rd.
He mentions the services of the Jewish temple
as subsisting (c. 41) and these were abolished
in the year 71. And lastly Fortunatus who
came from Corinth to Rome with information
of the schism (c. 59) was an old disciple in
St. Paul's time. All which is very deserving
of consideration, but can hardly be deemed
conclusive.

But be it as it may, an appeal to Rome was
made; it was evidently made to Rome in prefer-
ence to nearer and older churches; and if it
was made, as these men assert, during an in-
terregnum, the more the proof that it was made
to Rome on account of the primacy.—SACER-
DOS.

FATHER HYACINTH'S BABY-BOY.—The
"only religious daily" gives us an engraving
of Pere Hyacinth and his baby-boy, dedicated
to the Rev. Clergy of Canada! The Montreal
Witness is not an illustrated paper, and we are
therefore at a loss to understand why it has
gone out of its usual routine to present its
readers with this engraving. The portraits are
doubtless good ones—(we never saw the fallen
monk or his baby-boy,)—they are certainly
striking. The Rev. Father is remarkably good
looking, though we think we see on the fore-
head the curl of the traditional little girl:—
who when she was good, she was very, very good,
But when she was bad, she was horrid.
The baby-boy is the very picture of his father,
even to the curl. If likeness be any criterion,
there can be no doubt of his paternity. Should
the man-boy prove in after years to have as
little regard for solemn vows as his father, he
will certainly be a *brave boy*. The Rev.
Clergy of Canada must feel highly complimented
by this dedication. It is so delicate, so in-
structing, and it says so plainly, "Go thou and
do likewise," that they cannot but appreciate
it. We shall expect next to see the portraits
of the most prominent of Montreal's demi-
monde with the numbers of their residences
appended, published in the "only religious
daily!" One thing is certain, if the children
of our Dominion clergy are born in no more
honorable wedlock than *Father Hyacinth's*

baby-boy, the holy State of matrimony is little
prized amongst the teachers of the people. On
every ground of morality, and especially on
Protestant grounds, *Father Hyacinth's* baby-
boy is indefensible; he is illegitimate; he is a
bastard. All men, even the most depraved—
(we wonder that the editor of the only religi-
ous daily does not see this)—look upon con-
tracts as binding—(there is honor, they say,
amongst thieves)—and Protestants hold that no
earthly authority, not even the Pope, has
power to dispense them. Now, Pere Hyacinth's
marriage could only be solemnized by an ex-
press, deliberate and often meditated violation
of his vow of celibacy, made, remember, not
to man, but to God, and made prior to all other
annulling vows. On what principle then does the
Witness hold up this baby-boy to the admiration
of the Canadian world? He may be "a fine
boy of his age;" he may be "remarkably like
his papa;" but surely he is out of place in the
world of good morals, if he be the embodiment
in the flesh of vows broken to God; and surely
as such he is equally out of place in "the only
religious daily." *Father Hyacinth's* promise
of celibacy made to God (by vow remember),
was made after all rational deliberation, and
with all the freedom and solemnity of sacerdotal
ordinations. Nay! he was even warned not to
take it, if he feared he could not keep it. The
baby boy, therefore, is a *huge lie*. Is it for
this then that the *Witness* parades him before
the world? Surely not, whilst any truth and
honor remains amongst men. Surely, lying
and broken vows to God, with their consequent
disgrace and crime, cannot be the *beau ideal*
of the *Witness's* Protestant Utopia. But be-
sides being a huge lie, this unfortunate baby
boy is an earnest of the fearful force of carnal
passion unstained by divine grace. Milton
makes Satan almost noble and loveable, and
though he has given to the world a magnificent
work, he has not improved the world's morals
thereby. The Montreal *Witness* has given a
pretty picture to its subscribers, but when
they recognize therein the fallen monk whose
animal passions were too much for him, the
discreet portion at least will scarcely wish
their pure daughters and sons to see it, much
less to read the commendatory remarks ap-
pended to it by the editor of "the only reli-
gious daily."

Allow us, therefore, in the name of the Rev.
Clergy of Canada, married and unmarried,
Protestant as well as Catholic, to protest against
the parading of this unfortunate Baby Boy,
and this insulting dedication to their honorable
body. As well publish and dedicate to them
the portraits of Montreal's most prominent
demi-monde.

Poor Baby Boy! when you shall have grown
to manhood (which God avert!) and learn
that your father was a fallen monk, and your
mother his mistress, you will not feel any very
kindly feelings towards the editor of "the only
religious daily" who, to satisfy the cravings of
a not too chaste public, has thus published
your father's dishonor, your mother's frailty,
and your own misfortune to the world.—SACER-
DOS.

On Friday, July 3rd, a solemn Mass for
the repose of the soul of the late Rev. John
McCormick was celebrated in St. Patrick's
Church, Ottawa, by the Pastor, Rev. J. J.
Collins, and a sermon suitable to the occasion
was pronounced by the Rev. E. J. J. Stenson.
Our readers will remember that poor Father
McCormick was drowned on the feast of *Corpus
Christi*, within a few yards of his residence, at
Mount St. Patrick.—R.I.P.

POOR DEGENERATE POPISH SPAIN.—It has
been often said that you must take the virtue
of its women as the surest criterion of a coun-
try's enlightenment and civilization. If this
be the case—(and we see no reason to doubt
it)—poor despised (because?) Popish Spain
ranks high, even on Protestant showing, in the
social scale. N. L. Thieblin, better known as
Aramat Batick, has written a book on Spain
and the Spaniards. After interviewing the noble
Don Carlos, the windbag Castalar, and the aged
Countess of Meotijo, mother of the ex-Empress
of France, and giving us in most piquant style
the result of these interviews, he thus sum-
marises the Spanish women:—"You would
soon discover on studying the Spanish woman,
that you must take all the virtue of the most
virtuous Englishwoman, all the grace and wit
of the most graceful and witty Frenchwoman,
and all the beauty of the most handsome Ital-
ianwoman to make something approaching to a
perfect Spanish lady." Well done! Catholic
Spain!

It has often been said that Protestants can
have no true ideas of religious liberty; the
very principle of private judgment making
every man's opinion absolute with him, leads of
necessity to absolutism and tyranny whenever
any man arises in the world, who has faith in
himself and his ideas, and the power to carry
them out. Be this speculation as it may,
facts are certainly against them. The Rev.
Dr. Lord who, in 1869, lectured in Montreal