

THE TRUE WITNESS

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. OLLIER
FOR GEORGE S. OLLIER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving
their papers through the post, or calling for them at
the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not
paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by car-
riers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance;
but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, three pence; can be had at Messrs.
Sellers' Book Store, Notre Dame Street—Flynn's,
McGill Street—and Constant's, Great St. James St.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor
of the TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post
paid.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 20, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The last arrivals from Europe are devoid of in-
terest. The British Parliament was prorogued
on the 2nd inst; in the speech from the Throne,
a confidence in the maintenance of peace in Eu-
rope was expressed, and a high compliment was
paid to the gallantry of the troops in India.

It seems that some unexpected difficulties in the
transmission of messages through the Atlantic
Telegraph Cable have declared themselves; but
these it is hoped will soon be overcome. Through-
out the United States the rejoicings at the com-
pletion of the laying of the Cable have been most
enthusiastic. Indeed at New York they manag-
ed almost to burn down their City Hall in the
excess of their joy, and the exuberance of their
demonstrations.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

After a weary and unprofitable Session of some
six months, this body, to the great joy of the
community, and of the reporters in particular,
was prorogued with the usual ceremonies, by the
Governor General, on Monday 16th inst. The
following speech was delivered upon the oc-
casion:—

Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council and Hon.
Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

I congratulate you on having closed the business
of this lengthened session, and I am happy to find
that the subjects which I recommended to your
consideration have received attention at your hands.
The Act abolishing imprisonment for debt in cer-
tain cases, and preventing preferential assignments
in Upper Canada will, so far as it goes, tend
to assimilate the law of the two sections of the
Province, and must, I think, be beneficial in its
operation.

The Jury Laws and the Municipal Law of Upper
Canada have in like manner been dealt with by you,
and measures have been adopted for diminishing the
cost and facilitating the administration of Criminal
Justice in Lower Canada.

In my speech at the opening of the present session
I adverted to the Expediency of providing for the
registration and protection of persons qualified to
vote at the Election of Members of the Legislature.
I rejoice to find that a Bill on this important subject
has been passed by you.

I trust that the Act relating to Fisheries will suc-
ceed in encouraging this branch of industry.

Our steam communication with Europe has con-
tinued to work successfully; and I have little doubt
that you have done well in providing for a regular
mail service by steam, during the season, to Gaspe
and the Lower Provinces.

The appropriation for establishing a Postal Line to
the Red River, and opening a continuous mail
route, under the control of the Canadian Govern-
ment, from that settlement to Nova Scotia [sic in
telegram.]

Another link in our railways has been completed
by the opening of the Buffalo and Lake Huron Line.
Everything that tends to increase the commerce of
the lakes is, in my opinion, of great importance.

Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

I am glad to find that our Customs Tariff has under-
gone your revision. I hope that, without undue
pressure on the people, it may suffice to maintain the
public credit, and may work advantageously for the
commerce and productive industry of the country.

It is also a source of pleasure to me to find that a
measure relaxing, in some degree, the restriction on
the interest of money, so much desired by the com-
mercial community, has been favourably considered
by you.

I thank you for the supplies which you have grant-
ed to Her Majesty, and assure you that I will not
fail to use all due vigilance and economy in the re-
gulation of the several departments, and the admin-
istration of the funds entrusted to me.

Hon. Gentlemen and Gentlemen:
I regret that I cannot speak of the Commercial
crisis, which has pressed on the country, as having
entirely passed away. The recovery from such
difficulties must be gradual, but I earnestly pray that
the complete restoration of our prosperity may not be
yet delayed.

I will not fail to forward to Her Most Gracious
Majesty the Queen your Address relating to the ter-
ritory of the Hudson's Bay Company, as well as that
which solicits Her consideration for the scheme of
the Intercolonial Railroad.

I propose, in the course of the recess, to com-
municate with Her Majesty's Government and with
the Governments of our sister Colonies in another
matter of very great importance. I am desirous of
inviting them to discuss with us the principles on
which a bond of a federal character, uniting the
Provinces of British North America, may perhaps
hereafter be practicable.

I now release you from your labors by proroguing
the present Parliament.

THE ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH.—This gigan-
tic undertaking, the marvel of the XIX century,
the greatest feat that the world has witnessed
since the day when Columbus gave to Europe a
New World—is at last *un fait accompli*.
After several day's delay, necessary in order to
get the cable into proper working order, the
Queen's message to the President of the United
States, and the reply of the President, were flash-
ed across, or rather beneath the Atlantic on
Tuesday last; and the successful termination of
this great enterprise was hailed with loud accla-

mations in this City, and throughout the whole of
North America. We subjoin the "Queen's
message" and the President's reply thereto:—
TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHING-
TON.

The Queen desires to congratulate the President
upon the successful completion of this great inter-
national work, in which the Queen has taken the
deepest interest.

The Queen is convinced that the President will
join with her in fervently hoping that the Electric
Cable, which now connects Great Britain and the
United States, will prove an additional link between
the Nations, whose friendship is founded upon their
common interest and reciprocal esteem.

The Queen has much pleasure in thus communi-
cating with the President, and renewing to him
her wishes for the prosperity of the United States.

Washington City, Aug. 16.

TO HER MAJESTY VICTORIA QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The President cordially reciprocates the con-
gratulations of Her Majesty the Queen on the suc-
cess of the great international enterprise accomplished by
the science, skill and indomitable energy of the two
countries.

It is a triumph more glorious, because far more
useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror
on the field of battle. May the Atlantic Telegraph,
under the blessing of Heaven, prove to be a bond of
perpetual peace and friendship between the kindred
nations, and an instrument destined by Divine Pro-
vidence to diffuse religion, civilization, liberty and
law throughout the world. In this view, will not
all nations of Christendom spontaneously unite in
the declaration that it shall be forever neutral, and
that its communications shall be held sacred in
passing in their places of destination, even in the
midst of hostilities?

JAMES BUCHANAN.

We confess that we do not exactly see how
the sub-marine telegraph is destined to be an in-
strument "to diffuse religion" throughout the
world. But our Republican neighbours are
strongly addicted to cant, and whilst yet in bibs
and tuckers, even the little ones lisp in "bunkum"
for the "bunkum" comes. It is a disease that
they have inherited from their "Pilgrim Fa-
thers," and one that will never we fear be wholly
eradicated; but we do think, that the President
of a great nation, and upon so great an occasion,
might for once have dropped the twaddle of the
conventicle. And yet perhaps the President
was not so far wrong, considering what it is that
his countrymen generally understand by "re-
ligion," i.e., the worship of the "Almighty Dol-
lar." This kind of "religion" may, no doubt,
be diffused by the electric telegraph; but we
fear that that other religion, which consists in visit-
ing the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and
in keeping one's self unspotted from the world,
will be but little advanced thereby. It may af-
fect the trade in breadstuffs, in potash, and in pork,
but can hardly be expected to influence the
hearts of sinners; and though it may stimulate to
unusual briskness in the markets, we fear that it
will do but little towards enkindling the fire of the
love of God amongst the Brokers and other fre-
quenters of the Exchange.

In Montreal the news was received in a
worldly spirit, and celebrated in decidedly a
carnal manner. Flags were displayed from the
Banks and other Public Offices; a salute of 100
guns was fired on the *Champ de Mars*; and most
of the bells of the churches rang a merry peal,
whilst the fountains in the public squares
were set in motion. In the evening we noticed
two or three feeble attempts at an illumination;
and a vast multitude of profane little boys,
evidently quite indifferent to the promised diffu-
sion of religion—amused themselves, and annoy-
ed the passers by, with an incessant discharge
of crackers and other juvenile fire works. The
unregenerate condition, and worldly mindedness
of the boy population of this city, and their total
disregard of "gospel privileges" will we doubt
not be suitably rebuked by our saintly cotem-
porary the *Montreal Witness*, when next it
"improves the occasion" in its own manner.

But the great demonstration has, in order to
give full time to make the requisite arrangements,
been postponed for some days, in order that the
"carnal-minded" may also "improve the oc-
casion" in their manner, and on the same day,
throughout the world. This day will be fixed
by the London potentates; and due notice there-
of will be given by our Civic authorities, so that
the great event may be celebrated with pomp
becoming the commercial Capital of British
North America.

PRESBYTERIAN DESPOTISM.—We read in one
of the United States journals that—"the Gen-
eral Assembly of Presbyterians recently in Ses-
sion in Chicago decided by a vote of 160, to
52, 'that divorces cannot be granted unless adul-
tery can be clearly shown; and that any one
marrying a person divorced for any other cause,
is himself guilty of adultery in a moral view of
the case.'"

With the decision itself we have no intention
to deal; but we should like to know from our
learned cotemporary, the *Montreal Witness*—
who is incessantly inveighing against the arrogant
assumption of the Catholic Church—whence the
"General Assembly of Presbyterians" derived
their right of jurisdiction in the premises?—
and from whom they received authority to decide
upon the morality of an act, upon whose legality,
"in a moral view," there exists a great differ-
ence of opinion amongst Protestants? Who,
we ask—who gave the "General Assembly of
Presbyterians" the right to sit in judgment upon
their brethren? or to impose its views of the
morality of divorce upon the public?

This question we put to the *Montreal Wit-*

ness, because in its issue of the 11th inst. our
cotemporary again makes the late action of the
Bishop of Montreal, with regard to the perusal
of immoral and heretical works, the subject of
an indignant criticism. He would concede to
His Lordship—he says in substance—a right to
admonish and advise; but not to judge, and pro-
nounce sentence.

"Had he" (the Bishop) "limited himself to advis-
ing the Canadian Institute, and expressing his op-
inion as to dangerous publications in their library,
leaving it to their own judgment to decide what
book, pamphlet, or paper to keep, what to dismiss,
or at least refuse to pay for, then his course would
have been justifiable."—*Montreal Witness*.

"But the Bishop did just the reverse. He ad-
dressed the Institute, not as a friend, or an adviser,
but as an absolute and inflexible master. He would
not acknowledge their right to judge for themselves
as to what books should compose their library. He
gave them to understand distinctly, . . . be alone,
their tyrant should decide for them."—*Id.*

That is, he acted precisely as the "General
Assembly of Presbyterians" acted. They did
not, when treating of the—amongst Protestants—
vexed question of divorce, "limit themselves to
advising," and to an "expression of their op-
inion" as to its immorality; "leaving it to the
judgment of their flocks to 'decide' in what
cases divorce, and the re-marriage of divorced per-
sons, should be tolerated, without entailing loss
of Church-Membership. No! the "General
Assembly of Presbyterians" acting like a tyrann-
ical Popish Bishop, "would not acknowledge the
right of their flocks to judge for themselves" in
what cases divorce should be allowed, and in
what, refused; they gave their flocks to under-
stand distinctly, that they alone, "their tyrants
should decide for them;" and of their own au-
thority proceeded to pass sentence upon all re-
cusants, as "guilty of adultery in a moral view,
of the case," and therefore as outcasts from the
kingdom of heaven. Wherein does the tyranny
of the "General Assembly of Presbyterians"
differ from that of the Bishop of Montreal? or
who has given to the former any better right to
"decide" as to the morality or immorality of any
particular act, than that which in virtue of their
office is claimed by the members of the Catholic
Episcopate?

Now if tyranny be—not the mere exercise of
power, but—the exercise of a power usurped by
or not rightly inherent in, him who claims to ex-
ercise it—then certainly it is the "General As-
sembly of Presbyterians" who are justly ob-
noxious to the charge brought by the *Montreal
Witness*, against the Bishop of Montreal. What-
ever may be the case with the latter, it is
certain that the former—and upon Protestant
principles—have not even the semblance of any
better right to "decide" upon the guilt or inno-
cence of any particular act, than that which is
inherent in every individual member of their sev-
eral congregations. According to the true
Protestant principle, every one is at liberty to
decide for himself, and by his "private judg-
ment," whether a particular act be in harmony
with the will of God as revealed through the
Christian dispensation; whether, therefore, di-
vorce be not as lawful for drunkenness, deser-
tion, or for mere incompatibility of temper, as
for adultery; and whether there be any prohibi-
tion in the said revelation, against the intermar-
riage of divorced persons. For any individual,
professing himself a Protestant, or for any collec-
tion of such individuals—even though they be
clad in black coats and white chokers—to pre-
sume to sit in judgment and "decide" upon these
questions, and to pronounce guilty of mortal sin,
and, therefore, as outcasts from the kingdom of
heaven, all who in the exercise of their "private
judgments" think fit to differ in opinion—is in-
deed a most audacious act of tyranny, and an
extent of absurdity to which none but a Protes-
tant could attain.

But the members of the Canadian Institute
called themselves Catholics; they therefore ac-
knowledge in the Bishop of their Diocese the
right to take cognisance of, and to adjudicate on
all questions involving disputed points of faith or
morals. That—subject of course to an appeal
to the higher tribunal of the See of Peter—
every Bishop is the supreme judge in his own
Diocese upon all questions of faith and morals, is
as much an axiom of Catholicity, and recognised
by all Catholics, as the "right of private judg-
ment" upon all such questions, is an axiom of
Protestantism. The Bishop of Montreal there-
fore, in condemning certain books in the library
of the Canadian Institute, as immoral and heret-
ical, and in pronouncing guilty of sin all who,
after timely warning, should peruse or keep in
their possession any works so condemned, exer-
cising a right, not by him assumed, but implicitly
recognised as inherent in him, in virtue of his of-
fice, by those over whom he exercised it. He
therefore cannot be accused of a tyrannical
or usurped exercise of his power; and if any
blame is attributable to either party in the trans-
action—to the Bishop who condemned, or the
members of the Canadian Institute who by their
refractory conduct became obnoxious to eccle-
siastical censures—it is attributable solely to the
latter; because the conduct of the latter was in-
consistent with their professions.

It was because the members of the Canadian
Institute professed to be Catholics, and therefore
ipso facto acknowledged the right of the Bi-

shop as supreme ecclesiastical judge in his own
Diocese, to adjudicate in the matter in dispute,
that His Lordship interfered with their books and
library. The members of that Society there-
fore, if honest men, would have pursued one of
two courses. Either they would openly and in
a straightforward manner have proclaimed them-
selves to be Protestants, or Non-Catholics; or
they would have at once humbly submitted them-
selves to his Lordship's decision—reserving to
themselves, of course, the right of appeal to a
higher tribunal, if by that decision they felt them-
selves aggrieved. This we say *would have been*
the course which all honest men, which all en-
emies of cant, of sneaking, and hypocrisy, would
have pursued; for intellectually and morally there
does not crawl a more contemptible wretch on
the face of the earth, than the fellow who still
persisting in calling himself a Catholic, refuses to
submit to the well known discipline of the Cath-
olic Church. The conduct of the avowed
Protestant, or Non-Catholic, who denies altogether
the right of any man, or set of men, to judge
for him in questions of faith and morals,
we can understand; we can understand also, that
of him who, calling himself a Catholic, faithfully,
and to the best of his ability, makes the laws of
his Church the sole rule of his conduct; but he
who, calling himself a Catholic, claims, as against
his Bishop, the right to judge for himself on ques-
tions of faith or morals, must, because inconsistent,
be either a fool or a knave; and as such his con-
duct is altogether unintelligible, and inexcusable.
We can respect an open enemy; but we detest
the pitiful, sneaking, two-faced scoundrel, who
shows false colors, and whose practice is ever at
variance with his hypocritical professions. The
Montreal Witness however has another and
altogether different code of morals. Like a
thorough evangelical Protestant, his predilections
are altogether on the side of the inconsistent Cath-
olic; and it is sufficient for a Catholic to be
a liar and hypocrite, to enlist in his behalf all the
sympathies of our saintly cotemporary.

How the Protestants of Chicago will treat
the "remorseless cruelty and high-handed
brutality" (*vide Witness* of 11th inst.) of the
"General Assembly of Presbyterians" we know
not; but in the words of our Montreal cotem-
porary:—

"We are much mistaken in the calibre of Protes-
tantism, if many are not found amongst them, who
will spurn the thunders of the General Assembly,
and refuse to sacrifice their dignity and freedom to
the grandiloquent assumptions of these self-appointed
janitors of Hell and Heaven."—*Montreal Witness*,
11th August.

THE REV. MR. FLEURY AND THE "RAT-
STORY."—The Kingston *Commercial Adver-*
tiser denies that the Rev. Mr. Fleury ever told
in the course of his No-Popery lectures, any
such story as that which we copied in our issue
of the 6th instant, from the *British Whig*, and
which that journal attributed to the aforesaid
reverend "Swaddler." Of course as we were
not present, we offer no opinion as to the cor-
rectness of the report given by the *British
Whig* of the reverend man's lecture, but leave
it and the *Commercial Advertiser* to settle that
matter amongst themselves. Our strictures upon
the Rev. Mr. Fleury's lecture, were based of
course upon the assumption of the accuracy and
fidelity of that report; and as we had, and still
have, every reason for relying upon the veracity
of the *British Whig* upon a matter wherein as
a Protestant journalist, he had no interest to
deceive—we must confess that we do not con-
sider those strictures uncalled for, or too severe.
We would also remind the *Commercial Adver-*
tiser that Mr. Fleury himself does not contra-
dict, or call in question the substantial accuracy
of the *British Whig's* report.

And that that report was not far from the
truth, we have excellent reasons for believing
from additional evidence of the lecturer's gross
ignorance of Catholic doctrine, and of his con-
temptuous indifference to truth when discoursing
of that doctrine, furnished us by the report of
his lecture given in another Protestant paper—
the Kingston *Daily News* of the 2nd inst. Of
the first, take the following as a specimen.

The reverend lecturer was treating of what
he called the "very novel doctrine" of inten-
tion—and gave the following illustration:—

"According to the doctrine of intention, the
priest might perform any ceremony he pleased, and
yet if he did not intend to perform it, the whole was
void. He might marry a couple, and in the sim-
plicity of their hearts, they might believe it was all
right. Yet if the priest did not intend to perform
the ceremony the whole matter was void, and the
parties were not married."

From the above it is evident that, though he
sets up to lecture on Popish errors, and is an ac-
credited agent of the "Irish Church Missions,"
the Rev. Mr. Fleury is in such complete ig-
norance as to the doctrines of the Catholic
Church—as to believe that that Church teaches,
that the priest is the minister of the Sacrament
of Marriage; and that it is by his act that the in-
dissoluble union is contracted. Such ignorance,
if but a venial offence on the part of another, is
unpardonable on the part of him who sets up for
a No-Popery lecturer; and undertakes to enlight-
en a perhaps, still more stupid audience on the
doctrines of the *Romish* Church. Suffice it then
to say that it is not, and consequently never was,
a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that

the Priest is the Minister of the Sacrament of
Marriage; or that it is in virtue of any act by
him performed that that Sacramental and there-
fore, indissoluble union is contracted. It is in-
deed a wise disciplinary provision of the Church,
and that in order to prevent clandestine mari-
riages, which she abhors—that the Priest should
assist at the matrimonial unions of her children.
But he assists, not as Minister of the Sacrament,
but in the character of a witness; for matrimony
is the only Sacrament of which a person in Holy
Orders cannot, as bound to celibacy, be the
Minister. Another office of the assisting Priest
is to bless the unions of the contracting parties.

Were it otherwise, were a Priest the indispen-
sable Minister of the Sacrament of Marriage,
the Catholic Church would not treat the mat-
rimonial unions of our Protestant brethren as Sa-
cramental, and therefore as indissoluble. But
she does so treat them; she does recognise them
as valid; and does not therefore insist upon the
Priest as the indispensable Minister of the Sa-
crament, without which the unions of Protestants
would not be Christian marriages. If asked then
who is the Minister of the Sacrament?—we re-
ply that the contracting parties are themselves,
to themselves—if no impediments arising from
consanguinity, or other causes indicated in the
24th Session of the Council of Trent, exist—
the Ministers of the Sacrament; and that the
sacred indissoluble tie is contracted, not in vir-
tue of any act of the Priest, but by, and in vir-
tue of, the deliberate consent, sensibly expressed,
of the contracting parties—contracting however
with the intention of uniting themselves in the
bonds of Christian matrimony. In so far as the
validity of the marriage so contracted is affected,
the intentions of the Priest are not of the slight-
est consequence whatsoever.

Hence it appears that the harrowing picture
drawn by the Rev. "Swaddler" of two persons
cohabiting for years under the impression that
they were really man and wife—whilst, owing to
a defect of intention on the part of the Priest
before whom they were married, no valid mat-
rimonial union had been contracted betwixt them
—is but the production of a morbid imagination,
and ultra-Protestant ignorance. Such ridiculous
displays are by no means uncommon however;—
and often cause us to wonder why men who
might have been respected as tinkers, or useful
members of society if devoting themselves to
the labors of the scavenger, should still persist in
making themselves conspicuously ridiculous and
hateful, by propagating falsehoods against Catho-
licity, and discoursing about subjects on which
they are profoundly ignorant.

Again, we would take the liberty of informing
our friend, the agent of the "Irish Church Mis-
sions," that, as Rome has "no idolatries to sup-
port," so neither does she have resource to such
arguments "to support the *no*" as those which he
again very foolishly, puts into her mouth. The
falling down of the Apostle before the angel
spoken of in the Apocalyptic vision—ix. 10—is
susceptible of two interpretations; neither of
which is repugnant to that respect which, for
God's sake, Catholics render to God's most ex-
alted creatures. Whether with St. Augustine we
hold that St. John took the angel to be God, and
was about to pay to him the supreme worship
which is due to God alone, and which Catholics
distinguish as *latreia*;—or whether with St. Gre-
gory and other commentators, we incline to the
opinion that the veneration offered by St. John
was of that inferior kind called *dulia*, and we re-
fused by the angel, because of the dignity to
which Christ had by His Incarnation elevated hu-
man nature—matters very little in so far as the
text in question is concerned, as an argument
against the practice of Catholics. If we adopt the
first hypothesis, it is clear that the worship by St.
John offered, was that supreme worship due to
God alone; and that therefore the words of the
angel—"see thou do it not"—are not applicable
to that essentially distinct—distinct not in *degre*
merely, but in *kind*—worship, or honor, or adora-
tion which Catholics offer to God's Saints; and
which the Anglican bridegroom proffers to his
bride in the Marriage Service of the Church of
England. If, on the other hand, St. John knew
that his celestial visitor was but an angel and fel-
low-servant—and since in spite of the warning
"see thou do it not"—ix. 10—he fell down a
second time before the angel to worship—xxii.
8—it is clear that the "beloved disciple" did not
believe that every kind of homage, worship, or
adoration offered to God's creatures is idolatry;
and we must therefore conclude that he to whom
the Holy Ghost had been given, was either in
Popish ignorance as to the nature of the sin of
idolatry—which is irreconcilable with the com-
mission "to teach," given to him by his Lord; or
we must admit that there is a worship, homage,
or adoration distinct in *kind* from that which is
due to God alone, and which may lawfully be
offered to God's Saints, and to the Blessed Mo-
ther of God.

Such we have no doubt is the line of argu-
ment followed in the Roman Catholic "truth"
which Mr. Fleury stated, had "been picked up
in the street;" but whose title, together with
the name of its publisher, he, in order to avoid
detection, prudently suppresses. The *suppression*
veri, if there be any, is on his part; and in or-
der that this may be made clear, we challenge
the production of the tract to which the Rev.
Mr. Fleury referred in his Kingston lecture of
Thursday the 29th ult., and which is reported
in the Kingston *Daily News* of the 2nd instant.