

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLIER, Editor.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 5.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

The news of the week is not by any means important. The European mails have not furnished us with any interesting accounts; and owing to the recess in our own Parliamentary affairs every thing remains *statu quo*, so far as the public are concerned. We understand that a number of our Representatives in Parliament have availed themselves of the invitation extended to them some time ago by the Lower Provinces, to visit that portion of Her Majesty's dominions in America; and we presume that the country will not deplore the absence of a few of her politicians for a time.

With regard to the state of affairs on the other side of the Lines very little change has taken place. The people of the South must feel that the success of their cause is almost certain. Even the lying and contradictory reports furnished by the Northern telegrams cannot conceal the fact that although an immense amount of life and treasure is being expended in order to subjugate the Confederates, it is all to no avail, and the Union is far more distant from restoration to-day than it was at the breaking out of the war. We believe that there is very little hope for the success of General Grant, who, like his predecessors, is unable to compete with the superior generalship of the Southern commanders.

This number of our Journal completes the 14th volume. For the past fourteen years, during which the TRUE WITNESS has been in existence, we flatter ourselves in looking back from the present time, to the period when this Journal was first established, we have ever adhered to the principles set forth in our Prospectus; we have on all occasions, at all hazards, regardless of consequences, spoken boldly in defence of the position which we at first assumed, and have ever since maintained; and we firmly believe that our Catholic readers will admit, we have battled for the true interests of Catholicity, as we understood that sacred duty, and as that duty is understood by those, under whose guidance we live, and to whose judgment we are ever willing to submit.

The course heretofore pursued by the TRUE WITNESS will be faithfully adhered to in future. We will exert ourselves to secure for our co-religionists their just rights; it will be our duty to watch the progress of events, at this great crisis of our public affairs, and to take care that our interests are not neglected, and our cherished institutions subverted. But while we perform our part faithfully, we believe that our patrons ought honestly to do theirs. It is not sufficient for them to approve of our course; they must give us substantial evidence of their honesty, by settling with us their long standing indebtedness, and by paying us that which is justly and lawfully due. To subscribe to a journal is not all that is requisite, in order to constitute patronage; for without the strictest punctuality in payment, on the part of those receiving a journal, like the TRUE WITNESS, it would be absolutely impossible for any paper to subsist. We stand on our own principles; we claim the favor of no man; we pander to the prejudices of no faction;—we only ask what is justly and fairly our own, and this we hope for the future to obtain.—

The prospects of our Journal are, it is true, daily improving; but we have as yet many delinquents, of whom the majority we are sure will be mindful of their duty; and we hope at an early day to be able to announce that we have not only a large list of subscribers, but that our patrons are persons who fully understand their duty. To those, however, who will not heed our friendly warning, we will only say, that in order to remind them of their indebtedness to us, and to secure payment of our just claims, we will not spare the most effective and vigorous measures. In conclusion, we return our most sincere thanks to all those who have exerted themselves in the interests of our journal, either by paying in advance the amount of their subscriptions, or by procuring new subscribers to our paper; and we hope, by our strict adherence to the principles heretofore advocated by us, to merit at their hands similar kindness in future.

MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN RAILWAY COMPANY.—The additional rail over the Victoria bridge has been laid down, and the trains over the narrow gauge of the Champlain District have commenced to run over it. Passengers leaving town therefore for places on this line will hereafter start from Bonaventure Street Station, and not from the ferry wharf as heretofore. Thus, one more important benefit of the amalgamation of the roads has been already obtained.

THE "GLOBE" ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES.—It is an axiom that "things which are equal to the same are equal to one another." Applying this axiom to the statements of the *Globe*, we are enabled to arrive at a very correct appreciation of the merits of the Federation policy now impending over us.

The *Globe* of the 6th ultimo refers to the Reform Convention held at Toronto about five years ago, when it was *Resolved*, that a remedy for "Sectional Differences" was to be sought for, "in the formation of two or more local governments to which shall be committed all matters of a local or sectional character, and some joint authority charged with such matters as are necessarily common to both sections of the Province."

The *Globe* of the same date, 6th ult., quotes from a speech delivered at the Clear-Grit Convention of 1859, to show that this "joint authority" scheme was the basis of the Brown-Dorion alliance. Mr. Brown is reported as having delivered himself on the occasion alluded to, to the following effect:—

"I believe that, had the Brown-Dorion Administration had an opportunity of maturing its policy, and bringing it before the country as we intended to do, it would have been very much like that proposed here to-day; and I feel convinced that it would have proved entirely satisfactory to the people of Upper Canada, and I believe to the people of Lower Canada as well."

Thus, according to Mr. George Brown, who ought to know the policy, or scheme of the Clear-Grit Convention of '59 was substantially identical with the policy of the Brown-Dorion Administration.

Next we learn, and still from the *Globe* of the 6th ult., that the scheme agreed upon between Messrs. Brown and Cartier in 1864 is substantially the same as that of the Toronto Clear-Grit Convention of 1859:—

"The most casual reader can scarcely fail to perceive that the policy of the Administration is substantially that enunciated in the last two of the above quoted resolutions"—(Those declaring in favor of the "Joint Authority Humbug.")

The *Globe* continues:—
"The remedy for existing constitutional evils is, according to the Ministerial programme, to be sought in the federative principle. So it was sought in 1859. Then, as now, it was deemed advisable to give local matters to local control, while reserving for general authority matters necessarily common to both sections of the Province. In the same way, both in 1859 and in 1864 the same declaration is made, that under the new system representation according to numbers must be conceded. In all important features, the two proposals are the same; and the strictest comparison will vindicate the consistency of those who accepted the one and are now accepting the other."—*Globe*, 6th ult.

Thus, as according to the *Globe*, the policy or federation scheme of the present Administration is "substantially" the same as that adopted by the Clear-Grit Convention of 1859; and as, again the intended policy or scheme enunciated by the latter was substantially identical with that mutually agreed upon by the members of the Brown-Dorion Cabinet, it follows, that the intended policy of that Cabinet, and that of the present Coalition Administration are also substantially the same. For "things that are equal to the same, are equal to one another."

And this explains and justifies the opposition of the TRUE WITNESS to the Federation scheme of the actual Ministry. We are in 1864, just what we were in 1859; we hold, as towards the Federal scheme of the present Ministry, the identical language which in 1859 we held as towards the "joint authority humbug," and the dangerous policy of the Brown-Dorion Administration. In 1860, May 11th, treating of Mr. Brown's motion on "Constitutional Changes," and his "joint-authority" scheme, we expressed ourselves as follows:—

"Mr. Brown then moved his second resolution; that the only remedy for existing political evils is to be found in the formation of two local Governments, charged with the control of all matters of a sectional character, and some 'joint-authority' charged with such matters as are common to both sections of the Province. This is the resolution that is fraught with danger to Lower Canada; for, supposing it carried into execution, on whom would devolve the all-important task of deciding what belonged to the 'local Governments,' and what to the 'joint authority' of limiting and defining, in short, the functions of the latter? Betwixt Sovereign and Independent States, as are the States of which the American Union is composed, such a political federation as that contemplated by Mr. Brown's resolution is practicable; but betwixt Colonies the scheme is absurd. In their case there is no middle ground betwixt a Legislative Union, and its repeal *par et simpliciter*, logically tenable."—*True Witness*, May 11, 1860.

And again, under the same date, and treating of the same subject we expressed ourselves in the following sense:—

"To what a condition Catholic Lower Canada would quickly be reduced as a member of a Federation of the Protestant British Colonies of North America, it is not difficult to foretell. Her autonomy would in short be more effectually destroyed under such a Federal regime, than it would be under a Legislative Union of the two Canadas, with Representation by Population."—*Ibid.*

Thus we can boast that the TRUE WITNESS is to-day what it was years ago. Will it be the same with those to whom are entrusted the defence of the national, moral, and religious interests of Lower Canada? Will they also be consistent? or will they turn their coats, and vote to-day for a measure which in 1860 they together with the TRUE WITNESS repudiated? Time will show.

En attendant it can do no harm to remind the defenders of good principles that, in 1860, they voted almost to a man against Mr. George Brown's motion; a motion substantially the same as that about to be submitted to them at the next

Session of Parliament. In 1859, Mr. Brown's motion was rejected by a majority of 67 against 26; how will it be when again a motion, substantially the same, will be brought before the House by the Brown-Cartier Ministry?

It would be amusing, and perhaps not an unprofitable labor to search the files for May 1860 of some of our French Canadian journals, defenders of "good principles" and to quote the terms in which they then spoke of the "local governments" and "joint authority" scheme. Perhaps the consistency of the Canadian press would not thereby be vindicated.

PROSPECTS OF ANGLICANISM IN CANADA.—These, if we may trust the assertions of its own organs, are not bright. No sect, no denomination can endure, much less multiply, if it ceases to be prolific of ministers; the Catholic Church herself would languish and die were not the ranks of her clergy constantly recruited by a race of hardy, intelligent, and self-sacrificing volunteers.

But how is it with Anglicanism in this respect? One of its own organs shall tell us:—

"With reference to Lower Canada, and the observation is made subject to correction, it is a question whether there are, at this moment, twelve men reading for Orders. It is a question whether one among this number will be prepared to take Orders without entirely relying upon the Church for his support."—*The Echo*, 14th ult.

This is scarce to be wondered at; for deprived of the political and social prestige which it enjoys in England as the religion of the Government, the aristocracy and the gentry, Anglicanism has no hold on the respect or affections of the people. It is a highly respectable, though not very ancient institution; and in its own soil where it has high prizes in the shape of lucrative appointments to hold out as inducements to young men to take service in its ranks, it has hitherto been able to command a pretty fair share of popular favor. The Anglican Minister is incomparably better paid than the officer in the army or in the navy, than the lawyer or the physician, and the work required or expected of him is incomparably easier. For who likes his ease, who, averse to hard work, is fond of good living and an idle gentlemanly kind of existence, there is no profession so captivating as that of an office-holder in the Ecclesiastical Department of the British Government.

In the Colonies, however, it is not so, and here in Canada an Anglican minister stands on the same social level as does the Methodist, the Presbyterian, or the Jumper. There are no rich Bishoprics or Deaneries, no fat livings, with good shooting, pleasant families, and eligible young ladies all around; none, in short, of those things which conspire to make up a vocation to Holy Orders in the Anglican Establishment at home. The consequence is that young men in the Colonies never, or at all events very rarely, feel themselves "truly called, according to the will of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood" in the Anglican Church.

Besides, in so far as the Colonial laity are concerned, Anglicanism has no hold whatever on the hearts or intellects of the great mass even of those who term themselves members of the Church of England. A Catholic is one who holds and believes all that the Catholic Church believes and teaches, without a single exception, and because she so believes and teaches. He who denies, or even doubts, any one article of her teachings ceases *ipso facto* to be a Catholic, or member of her Communion. But were we to apply this test to the Anglican laity, the smallest room in the City of Montreal would suffice to hold the entire Anglican population of Canada. No Anglican feels any scruple at denying, and openly expressing his disbelief in any doctrine of that Church or sect of which he professes himself a member. The great majority of Anglican laity—nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand—are either Arians or Sabellians; even amongst the clergy, those who frankly accept the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, are in point of numbers but a contemptible minority; and there is no Anglican layman who would not be startled were he to be told that, if the Formularies, the 39 Articles, and Homilies of his Church be true, he was as much bound to believe them as any member of the Clergy; or the Archbishop of Westminster himself. We say it advisedly, and upon the authority of Anglican ministers, that the generally received opinion in the Anglican world is this: That there are two kinds or orders of divine truth; one of which is binding upon the clergy only, and which the laity are at liberty to deny. Of this privilege the latter avail themselves to the fullest extent.

Now although in England, where a kind of social prestige is attached to membership with the Church of England, men call themselves members of that Church, and attend once a week at its worship, in spite of their repudiation of many of its articles of belief, it is not so in the Colonies where no such social prestige obtains. The consequence is that the laity no longer care to call themselves Anglicans. If the Methodist chapel be handy they attend it: if they like animal excitement they frequent

Revivals, and get themselves converted along with the "gals"; or if intellectually inclined, they will attend upon the ministrations of the Unitarian pastor who is generally a man of scholarly attainments, and of refinement—in these things presenting a striking contrast to his more orthodox Calvinistic and Methodist brethren in the ministry. Thus it will be seen that in the Colonies two causes are in operation, either of which would in time be fatal to Anglicanism, and which, both working together and in the same direction, will soon make an end of it. There are no candidates for its priests' offices; and the laity who, even at home, felt themselves at liberty to deny its doctrines, here where all sects are politically and socially equal, naturally take up with that in which their particular animal or intellectual proclivities find fullest gratification. Indeed the only class of the community who in a short time, and as this two-fold process of destruction continues, will be likely to profess themselves Anglicans, will be infidels, and that because of all Protestant sects Anglicanism is the least exciting. To be a Methodist, to be a Baptist, or Congregationalist in good standing, to be even in good repute as a Unitarian, a man must adopt some religious observances, must attend upon some ministrations. But so long as a man is not a Catholic, and not a Dissenter, he will always pass muster for a very respectable Anglican, no matter what his opinions may be of Christianity in general. The non-Catholic who is profoundly indifferent on all religious questions, for whom the animal excitement of the evangelical conventicle has no attractions, to whom the metaphysical speculations, and pagau morality of the Unitarian pulpit are dry and tasteless, who cares not therefore to declare himself a member of any Dissenting community in particular—is by law and custom esteemed an Anglican; and this it is that gives to the Church of England, both at home and abroad, a fictitious semblance of vitality, and constant its steady and rapid decay in Canada, and the British Colonies generally.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.—This is the caption of an article in the May number of the *North British Review*, the reputed organ of the evangelical or low-church section of the Anglican community. It is also the exponent of the views and theological tendencies of the evangelical dissenting classes, and therefore beyond the reach of any suspicions as to being affected by Romish leanings. For this reason, its utterances on the great question as to the comparative merits of Catholic and Protestant Missions.

The *Reviewer* takes as his text Mr. Marshall's famous work on Christian Missions, lately reprinted by Messrs. Sadlers of New York, and other tracts and treatises on the same subject from Protestant sources. From the comparison of these rival and often contradictory authorities, the *Reviewer* proposes to elicit the truth, and to lay it in its integrity before the British Protestant public.

He begins, we suppose, with the intention of propitiating that public, with an assault upon Mr. Marshall; whom in the bitterness of his spirit, the *Reviewer* styles "Jesuit Father" and "Father Marshall," thinking that by dint of heaping these opprobrious epithets upon the peccant Papist's head, he will crush him entirely.—And yet Mr. Marshall comes out as well as his best friends could have expected, or could desire from the fiery ordeal; his reputation for veracity unscathed, his logic unscathed. In two instances, but in two instances only, does the evangelical *Reviewer* contest any of Mr. Marshall's facts or statements. Mr. Marshall in his work quotes the *New York Herald* as an "influential organ of Protestantism," and cites Miss Harriet Martineau as "a Protestant witness." Wherein Mr. Marshall has sinned against truth in so doing, for certainly Miss H. Martineau is a Protestant of Protestants, and though legitimate doubts may be entertained as to the influence of the *New York Herald*, there can be no doubt that that journal is an "organ of Protestantism." The *Reviewer* perhaps forgets that a man like Mr. Marshall uses the word "Protestant" in its strictly logical and only legitimate sense—that is to say, as denoting a baptized non-Catholic. Every man who does not believe in, or who formally protests against the teachings of the Catholic Church is, *ipso facto*, a Protestant; though it is customary to speak only of baptized non-Catholics as Protestants. Unbaptized non-Catholics we call heathens; but baptized non-Catholics we designate Protestants.

But though the *Reviewer* sneers at Mr. Marshall, insinuates that he is deficient in candor, though he quotes only Protestant authorities for every fact he asserts, our Protestant and querulous critic amply confirms all the statements of the Catholic historian of Christian Missions, and adds one more stone to the heap beneath which Mr. Marshall has for ever crushed the pretensions of those who, cut off from the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, pretend nevertheless that to them has been given the divine mission to carry the Gospel to the heathen. It is this that makes the article in the *North British Review*

so precious in our eyes. It is with the *Reviewers* as it was with Balaam the son of Beor; being sent for by the chief of the conventicle to curse Mr. Marshall, and being well disposed towards the work, nevertheless finds himself constrained by a superior power to bless him altogether.

The thesis of Mr. Marshall's work is this. That Protestant missions are costly—and in so far as the conversion of the heathen to Christianity is concerned, are costly failures. That Catholic missions, though undertaken without funds, or with small material prospects of success, have accomplished great things, and even by the testimony of Protestants have been the means of permanently converting large communities to a belief in Jesus—and to a pure morality. The conclusion from these premises is that God is with the latter, and that His face is against the former. Let us see how far Mr. Marshall's thesis is corroborated by the unimpeachable evidence of the *North British Review*.

Mr. Marshall has contrasted the Agents in Catholic missions with the Agents of Protestant Missions, and has charged decidedly in favor of the former. The *North British Reviewer* would fain insinuate prejudice against Mr. Marshall—and yet when he attempts the same contrast, or comparison, here are the terms in which he does so. It may be premised that the Rev. Mr. Morrison whom the *Reviewer* unintentionally contrasts with St. Francis Xavier, was the founder of the Protestant Mission to China, the first of all Protestant Missionaries in the East.—
THE ROMISH MISSIONARY.—ST. FRANCIS XAVIER.
(From the *North British Review*.)

"Of a noble Spanish family, and reared in all its delight, and delicacies, in 1541, with solemn consecration of himself to suffering and ignominy, he sailed for Goa, in a ship that carried the Governor, and in which a cabin was, by royal order, appropriated to the Missionary, though he slept with his head on a coil of ropes upon the deck, and lived chiefly on the mess of the common sailors, so winning from the rude mariners almost idolatrous veneration.

"By and by, he wandered away among the fishers of Comorin and the Tamul Hindoos of Ceylon, sounding his hand-bell through their streets, and by the temples and bazaars, or sitting by the plague-stricken beds, when heathen tender mercies had forsaken their kindred. Ere long, burdened with the thought the 'harvest is great, and the labourers are few' he sailed to Malacca, to Japan, guided by a real 'man of Macedonia' who cried, 'Come over and help us,' and one of whose letters still extant, bears witness to the Christian character of the work Xavier was doing. True, the Father can hardly speak any of the languages, though he reads a translation of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Commandments, to all who will give ear. True, therefore, he can certainly weep and pray, and smooth the hard pillow, and make the fevered bed, and soak the sleeve of his surplice in water, and squeeze out a few drops to baptize the dying. A very imperfect mission work though he does baptize many thousands In Goa, in Ceylon, in Japan his converts however made, endured great fights of afflictions, and died renouncing all but their faith! [very imperfect mission work indeed!]

"So this faithful servant of God, unwearying and toiling, and striving hard at last to find a way into China for the Gospel in the island of Sauchan, and on the eve of success, he at length obtained the crown of glory."—p. 224.

We need not pause to enquire how these conversions which have resisted the fury of the persecutors, and have endured even to our days were affected—for that would be to beg the question at issue. We will at once pass on to the Protestant Missionary as depicted by the not unfriendly hand of the evangelical *North British Reviewer*:—

THE PROTESTANT MISSIONARY.—THE REV. DR. MORRISON.
"More important still than any of these is the mission to China, though it has not accomplished much. It was begun by Morrison in a feeble timid spirit. The worthy home-official who excited the sorrowful wrath of Edward Irving by declaring that Prudence was the alpha and omega of the missionary spirit must, we imagine, have had Dr. Morrison in his eye. For he skulked about the sea-ports, and did not venture out of the house except at night, and in the garb of a Chinaman. If he preached to his servants, he did it with doors carefully bolted. If he distributed books, he tells us it was in such a secret way that they could not easily be traced back to him. The man was a diligent scholar, but certainly no hero; and the mission in consequence has always wanted the example and consecration of self-sacrifice. It has been most prudently conducted, but great battles are seldom won by mere prudence."—*North British Review*, p. 234.

The *Reviewer* then goes on to show the comparative results, of Catholic and Protestant Missions in China. Of the latter it says:—

"On the whole, the Mission at Amoy is the most flourishing; but there is not much doing apparently there or elsewhere."—*Ib.*

Of the Chinese Catholic Missions he remarks: "The Romanists cover the land with their priests, up to the great wall; but are still among the sea-ports, and under the consular flags."—p. 235.

And again in another passage this Protestant witness admits the excellence and the permanence of the work done by the swarms of Romish priests—the successors and faithful though humble imitators of St. Francis Xavier:—

"But it is allowed by Dr. Milne [a Protestant writer] that the learning, personal virtues, and ardent zeal of some of those missionaries will be equalled by few, and perhaps rarely exceeded by any. . . . It is also not to be doubted that many were by their labors turned from sin unto God." [A strange admission certainly for a Protestant to make if Romanism be of the devil—and the mystery of iniquity, as all sound Protestants pretend to believe. The *Reviewer* however continues:—

"Of the truth of this last statement there is abundant proof, in their patient endurance of a terrible persecution, which came duly on them [the Chinese Romish converts] as on their brethren in Japan. The accounts given of the individual martyrs are indeed more edifying than reliable. But that many of the priests, and thousands of their converts, were cruelly tortured and slain, is unhappily too clear; though it was not found possible utterly to exterminate them, as in Japan. Even in the latter country, it required a long persecution, and a final slaughter of more than 30,000 of the hated sect disappeared from Yedo and Kogosima. But the number of converts in China appears to have been still greater. At the present day they are said to amount to upwards of half a