

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 603 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
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 Depot, Single copies 3d.

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, JAN. 14, 1870.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JANUARY—1870.

Friday, 14—St. Hilary B. D.
Saturday, 15—St. Paul, First Hermit.
Sunday, 16—Second after Epiphany.
Monday, 17—St. Anthony, Ab.
Tuesday, 18—Chair of St. Peter at Rome.
Wednesday, 19—St. Canute, M.
Thursday, 20—St. Fabian and Sebastian, M. M.

Mr. Gillies has proceeded West, on a collecting tour, and we bespeak for him a good reception.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

There have transpired no events of much importance in Europe since our last. Great reductions in the French army are again promised; it was reported on the 8th that the French Ambassadors at London and Berlin had resigned; the editors of the *Rappel* have been sentenced to fine and imprisonment. These are the most important items to be gleaned from the telegraphic reports by cable.

The second Session of the Council of the Vatican was held on the Feast of the Epiphany. There are plenty of rumours current, but nothing is known. Affairs in Spain are in the old state; settled government seems as remote as ever.—Signs are not wanting that the rebellion in Cuba will soon collapse from the exhaustion of the insurgents.

Mr. McDougall, like the King of France with his ten thousand men, has returned from his Red River expedition. What the upshot of this sadly bungled, and very intricate affair will be, no one can tell.

EXCLUSIVE SALVATION, AND PROSELYTISM.—The doctrine, or belief is the necessary logical antecedent of the practice—Proselytism; the latter is in like manner the logical consequence of the doctrine of, or belief in Exclusive salvation. If Christians, for instance, did not in theory hold that none but Christians can be saved, they would have no reason, no excuse whatever for their missions to the heathen.

So with Catholics. Right or wrong, they believe that outside the Church there is no salvation; and therefore they are proselytizers. If, however, they held that salvation was obtainable outside, as well as inside, the Church, their attempts at proselytism would be illogical, inconsistent with their professed belief, and would justly expose them to derision, and worse than derision.

Thus too we contend that, as from the doctrine of Exclusive Salvation we may always conclude to the practice—Proselytism; so wherever we find the latter, we should always assume, or predicate the existence of its necessary logical antecedent belief; that is to say a belief in the doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.

What then should we logically assume in the case of Protestant Missions to Roman Catholics? This—That, the promoters of these Missions believe that they are in possession, and in exclusive possession, of some truth essential to salvation, for the want of which all Roman Catholics are doomed to perish everlastingly. On this hypothesis alone can such Missions be reasonably accounted for, or logically defended.—How absurd for instance, how inconsistent, nay how wicked, would be all Christian Missions to the Chinese, if Christians believed that a conscientious, and faithful disciple of Confucius had as good a chance of getting to heaven as has the disciple of Christ! Of course,—the child can see it—the only reasonable excuse for a Christian Mission to the Chinese must be found in the antecedent belief that salvation is impossible for the Chinaman, unless he become a Christian.

These considerations have been suggested to us by the perusal of a Report, given in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 6th January, of the Annual Meeting of the Sabrevois Mission, presided over by a gentleman lately arrived in Canada—the Protestant Bishop of Montreal. The object of that Mission, as defined by this gentleman, is "to bring the truths of the Gospel, before the French Canadian people." From this we must conclude that Protestants, or at all events that that portion of the Protestant community over which Bishop Oxenden presided, hold—first, that some truths of the Gospel are not at present known to the Roman Catholic portion of the population of

Lower Canada; and secondly, that without the knowledge of, and faith in these truths of the Gospel, the said Roman Catholics, and indeed all Roman Catholics, are doomed to perish everlastingly. If the said Protestant Missionary Society and its President do not hold both these opinions, then we say, their attempts at proselytism are illogical, and worse than illogical: they are wicked.

Now we ask, and respectfully would we crave an answer to our question,—What are these truths of the Gospel, essential to salvation, of which the French Canadian people, in that they are Roman Catholics,—that is to say, in that they hold and believe all that in her Formularies, her Creeds and Canons of Councils, the Roman Catholic Church believes and teaches—are necessarily ignorant? and which truths therefore it is the duty and the object of the Sabrevois Mission, with Dr. Oxenden at its head, to bring before them, the said Roman Catholics of Canada, lest through ignorance thereof, and disbelief therein, they perish everlastingly?

Surely this is a pertinent question: surely it is one that should provoke no ill-will, should give no offence to those to whom it is addressed, and which deserves a reply in the spirit of Christian charity: a virtue which we are happy to recognize in the accomplished gentleman to whom we have already alluded, and who if he proposes to bring the light of Gospel truth to us Roman Catholics, now unhappily sitting in darkness, proposes to do so "not offensively." Certainly we give him credit for meaning what he says: for we believe him to be a gentleman of refinement and high culture, honestly bent on doing what he deems his duty as a servant of Christ, even though we differ from him altogether as to the manner in which that duty should be discharged. Surely there may be such differences of opinion without lack of courtesy or Christian charity; surely such differences may be expressed,—to use Dr. Oxenden's own words,—"not offensively."

We will say more. It is a question which every one calling himself a Christian is bound to answer, when addressed to him by a brother Christian, for whom and for whose salvation, Our Dear Lord suffered the bitter agony of the Cross. No man believing himself to be in possession of some truth of the Gospel, essential to salvation, for the lack of which his brother was in danger of perishing, and who should on any pretext whatsoever decline to impart that truth to his brother asking for information on this vital point, would be worthy of the name of Christian. And if there be a single Gospel truth unknown to French Canadian members of the Roman Catholic Church, then is it a truth of which all Roman Catholics everywhere, no matter of what nationality, from the Pope upon his throne, down to the humblest layman, are all as ignorant as is the new born babe upon whose brow the life giving waters of Baptism have just been poured. Rich and poor, learned and unlearned, all Roman Catholics, who believe what their Church teaches, believe alike: if one be in ignorance, because he is a Roman Catholic, of some Gospel truth essential to salvation, all are in like sad plight. All therefore are alike vitally interested in an answer, concise and explicit, to the question which we have ventured to propound to the Sabrevois Mission, and its promoters. "What is the Gospel truth essential to salvation, of which you deem yourself in possession, but of which we Roman Catholics who believe all that our Church believes and teaches, are necessarily ignorant?"

And we are the more justified in asking this question, because this "Gospel truth,"—if such Gospel truth there be—is certainly not to be found in those Creeds which the Anglican Church retained when it broke off from Rome. It can not be found either in the so-called "Apostles' Creed," or in the Nicene Symbol, since no man can be a Roman Catholic who does not firmly hold and believe all that is therein contained; and therefore it is evident, that in the opinion of our friends of the Sabrevois Mission, there must be some essential Gospel truth not to be found in either of the above indicated Creeds, or Confessions of Faith. What then is this truth? Is it a belief in the Royal Supremacy? We suppose this is what the Sabrevois Mission implies: for in so far as it asserts anything, this is the one positive dogma wherein the Anglican differs from the Roman Catholic Church. True it differs widely on many other most important points; but it does so, not by asserting something which the Roman Catholic Church does not hold, but by denying something which the latter does hold—and certainly a "truth of the Gospel" cannot consist in a bare negation.

We have had enough, and to spare of mere personal controversies—as to whether this man be a liar, or that man an undergraduate of Oxford. These controversies tend not to edification, do not become Christians. But would it not be well for our Anglican brethren to tell us charitably, and concisely, what is that great Gospel truth of which, in that we are Roman Catholics, believing all that our Church teaches, we are necessarily destitute.

In conclusion, and out of respect to a worthy gentleman who but a short time ago occupied

the seat now filled by Dr. Oxenden, we will reproduce his words of caution to the over zealous members of his flock who, then as now, were laboring for the conversion of French Canadian Papists; these words are given in a work recently published, containing a memoir of the late Dr. Fulford:—

"Be careful how you destroy the hereditary religion of a people, and before you do so, be well assured that such people are in a condition to receive something better than that which you take away."—*Dr. Fulford's Caution to the Missionaries.*

We commend these words of wisdom to the attention of the successor of him who uttered them, and to that of the members of the Sabrevois Mission.

The *Witness* of Saturday last complains that we have not mentioned his reply to our challenge to him to cite the "truculent" language—language more truculent than that of the most truculent of Irish orators in Ireland—in which he had accused the *True Witness* of indulging when treating of the Irish Land question.

The *Witness* has given no reply, for he has cited no one word of ours, to which the most prejudiced can attach a truculent meaning. He has cited indeed from an article of ours of Oct. 8th, written expressly for the purpose of refuting the *Globe's* thesis, that Free Trade in land in Ireland would be "the true remedy for the evils of the Irish land tenure" (*Globe*, 30th Aug.) We, for that purpose, cited the violent language of the *Dublin Irishman*, and of the *Nation*—the leading organs of the so-called Irish "national" party, with the design of showing, that the object of that party, as represented by those organs, was, "the absolute, unconditional restoration to the people of Ireland of the lands which are now, with the connivance of the British government, wrongfully claimed, and held iniquitously by individuals called landlords;" from whence we concluded that, neither the Free Trade scheme of the *Globe*, nor the plan proposed by Mr. Bright, could have any effect towards allaying Irish discontent on the Land question. But not one word of approval of these sentiments has the *True Witness* ever uttered: on the contrary, it has on many occasions denounced them, as revolutionary, and favoring of Communism to be abhorred of all Catholics.

The question then, as betwixt us and the *Witness* remains where it was more than a month ago. He accused us of employing with reference to the Irish Land question, language far more "truculent" than that which any of the speakers at the tenant right meetings in Ireland indulge in:—

"We do not see that any of the the speakers at tenant-right meetings in Ireland are half so truculent as our own *True Witness*."—*Mont. Witness* Dec. 3. (Our italics are our own.)

We challenged him to cite one truculent word of ours on the Irish Land question: and he evades the challenge by producing extracts which we had made from the *Dublin Irishman*, and *Nation*, with the expressly avowed purpose of showing that the plan of Free Trade in land advocated by the *Globe*, would not promote "the only settlement of the Irish Land question which the popular party, as represented in the national press, will so much as listen to."—*True Witness*, Oct. 8th; an expression of opinion as to the views of that "party," in which the most conservative and loyal British organs, such for instance as *Blackwood*, and many others (whose language is as "truculent" in this respect as is that of the *True Witness*) do fully coincide with us.

The *Witness* also cites as a pretended specimen of our "truculent language" on the Irish Land question, two paragraphs on that subject from the *True Witness* of Nov. 5th:—

(1.) "To day it is not so much compensation to the out-going tenant for improvements, as fixity of tenure, that is called for: and even the demand for 'fixity of tenure' is giving way to a cry for peasant proprietorship. The latest form in which the Irish Land question presents itself is then simply this—'Why should we pay rents at all?'"

(2.) "In short the Irish Land question is simply this—'To whom does the land belong? To the people in common: or to the several individuals among whom it is at present parcelled out, and who now call it their property.'"—*True Witness*, Nov. 5th.

It would puzzle, one would think, even the malice of the *Witness* to find one "truculent" word in the above passages, in which we merely stated the Irish Land question, as it is stated by the organs of the extreme so-called "national" party in Ireland. And yet betwixt the two paragraphs cited by the *Witness* there occurs another in which we did pretty plainly express our own opinion of the language, and theories of that extreme party, whose language says the *Witness* is not "half so truculent" as is that of the *True Witness*. Here is the passage in question, which with his ordinary lack of honesty the *Witness* suppresses:—

"This is the language of the numerous and daily increasing class, to whom the *Contrat Social* stands in lieu of the Gospel, and with whom Jean Jacques is the Prince of the Apostles of liberty, and of social progress."—*True Witness*, Nov. 5th.

Here we would be content to let the matter rest, for to a gentleman it is as unpleasant as it is unprofitable, to have a personal controversy with

the editor of the *Montreal Witness*. But as many see his paper who do not see ours, we have the right to call on him, since he has made an attack upon us, and accused us of being far more truculent on the Irish Land question than the most truculent of speakers at Irish tenant-right meetings—thereby attributing to us views and principles which we abhor—to tell his readers the plain truth:—That in his pretended reply to our challenge, he has, in the extracts by him given from our article of the 5th of November last, suppressed the passage in which the editor of the *True Witness* does give expression to his own opinions on the merits of the language and theories of that extreme party in Ireland, who deny the right of property in land: and in which the *True Witness* says:—

"This is the language of the numerous and daily increasing class, to whom the *Contrat Social* stands in lieu of the Gospel, and with whom Jean Jacques is the Prince of the Apostles of liberty and social progress."—*True Witness*, Nov. 5th.

The *Montreal Witness* having accused us of dealing in language far more "truculent" than that of any of the speakers at Irish tenant-right meetings, and having pretended to bolster up his charge by garbled extracts from the *True Witness*, we addressed to him the following communication, which he refused to insert. In consequence we sent it to the *Gazette* whose editor with his usual courtesy, and love of fair play, kindly published it:—

(To the Editor of the *Montreal Witness*)

SIR,—You complain in your paper of Saturday last that the undersigned, the editor of the *True Witness*, has taken no notice of your reply of December 23rd to his challenge to cite from the *True Witness* language on the Irish Land question far more "truculent" than that usually indulged in by speakers at Irish tenant-right meetings.—*Witness*, Dec. 3rd.

If I have not done so, it is because you have not hitherto been able to cite one word, or expression of opinion on the question, from the *True Witness*, worthy of the name of "truculent," or to which the staunchest loyalist in the Empire, the most zealous champion of the rights of property, can take exception.

You cited in your issue Dec. 23rd articles copied by me from organs of Irish opinion, such as the *Dublin Irishman* and *Nation*, and which I copied into the *True Witness* with the avowed object of showing that Free Trade in land, which the *Globe* of Toronto argued would settle the Irish difficulty, would not meet the views of the so called Irish nationalists. But as I never insinuated approval of, or sympathy with the views of these journals; as I quoted their words for the sole object of refuting the Free Trade in land theories of the *Globe*, I am neither legally nor morally responsible for the "truculence" of Irish writers.

You also quote two paragraphs—not consecutive—from the *True Witness* of the 5th November, wherein again I state the views, and the ulterior objects of the party represented by the *Dublin Irishman*, the *Nation*, and others, and the arguments with which they support their views, and advocate their objects. But you are careful to suppress the words of a paragraph which occurs in the same article as that from which you quote with the view of convicting the *True Witness* of "truculent" language. You cannot plead ignorance of the passage, for it occurs in a paragraph intermediate betwixt those from which you did quote, and you had before your eyes the files of the *True Witness* which I had sent to your office. Here is the passage by you suppressed, in which I plainly expressed my abhorrence of the views, the arguments, the principles, and language of those who attack the rights of landed proprietors, whether in Ireland or in England:—

"This is the language of the numerous and daily increasing class to whom the *Contrat Social* stands in lieu of the Gospel, and with whom Jean Jacques is the Prince of the Apostles of liberty and of social progress."—*True Witness*, Nov. 5th.

Should you wish to verify this quotation for yourself, the files of the *True Witness* are again at your service; in which you will see that the passage—all important in this controversy, as it shows conclusively how far I sympathize with revolutionists, or surpass in "truculence" on the Irish Land question the most "truculent" of speakers at Irish tenant-right meetings—will be found. It may have suited your purpose to suppress it; but as you taunt me with "misrepresenting everything connected with evangelical religion," of which you are the exponent, allow me in conclusion to remark that the religion which I profess, teaches that the suppression of, is as infamous as is the *suggestio falsi*.

GEORGE E. CLERK.

Monday, Jan. 10th, 1870.

We are sorry to say that there was a disgraceful row in Craig Street on Sunday evening last. It seems that the Rev. Mr. Chiniquy was preaching in the French Canadian church, when a crowd of rowdies, estimated at from two to four hundred, gathered near the building, and disturbed the proceedings by their yells and shoutings. Some stones were thrown, of which two, so says the *Witness*, passed through the windows into the body of the building.

Who were the guilty parties, and what their object, in these outrageous proceedings, we know not, and there is as yet no evidence to show. They may have been blackguards intent only upon a row, and availing themselves of the visit of a somewhat notorious person to indulge in their favorite pastime. Or it is as likely that they were a lot of roughs engaged by Mr. Chiniquy's friends, and set on to make a row for the purpose of winning for him a cheap reputation as a mar-

tyr, and exciting in his behalf the sympathies of Protestants in other parts of the Dominion. The dodge, or artifice is somewhat stale, but is still very effective. Readers of Thackeray's tale of *The Newcomes* will remember how, in order to set the Rev. Mr. Honeyman on his legs again, Fred Bayham organised at the *Running Footman* public house, a persecution against that meek man of God. This too may be the explanation of the row on Sunday night; for it is remarkable that, though there was a maximum of noise and demonstrations, there were, with the exception of the two stones spoken of by the *Witness*, no acts of physical violence resorted to. This harmonizes with, though it does not prove, the bogus, or "got up persecution" theory.

However we assert neither one theory nor the other, knowing nothing whatsoever to justify us in expressing an opinion further than this:—That we sincerely hope that, if any attempts be made to molest, or insult Mr. Chiniquy or his congregation, the guilty parties may be arrested, and severely punished as a warning to others. He, Mr. Chiniquy, has as good a legal right to preach his opinions in a Protestant church, as has our own Bishop to preach in his own Cathedral; and if the sermons of the first named are distasteful to any, they have the remedy in their own hands: they need not go and listen to him. But if they do go, whether they be Catholics or Protestants, they must be made to behave themselves quietly. "To do as they would be done by," is the golden rule which, when in a majority, Catholics should never forget.

A HOPEFUL SIGN.—In the *Montreal Herald* of the 6th inst., we find the following announcement:—

"Connecticut proposes to pass a law restricting people from procuring divorces until they have been married at least two weeks."

This is a move, even if but a small one, in the right direction, and would seem to indicate that the evils accruing from the laxity of the marriage laws in the U. States are becoming apparent even to the most Protestant of the New England States. We congratulate them however, even upon this slight retracing of their steps. In time it is to be hoped that they may still further revise their matrimonial code, so as to prohibit divorce betwixt couples who have not been married for one year at least.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MONTREAL, Dec. 6, 1869.

MR. EDITOR,—The *Montreal Gazette* of the 3rd inst., contains an extract from the *London Times* reporting a silly story from "a correspondent" in Rome. This glib writer pretends "on good authority" that the Pope and Cardinal de Bonnechose have had rather a warm discussion on the subject of infallibility. It seems that a Liberal paper in France, called *La Liberte*, has translated this *bon morcean* for the edification of the French Liberals. But as,

"There is many a slip
Between the cup and the lip,"

the savoury dish was dashed to the ground before they had hardly time to taste it, by the following letter from His Eminence to *La Liberte*. (See *L'Univers*, 19th Dec.)

"MONSIEUR LE REDACTEUR,—I have just read in the number of your journal, dated the 7th inst., a letter from Rome containing the recital of an audience which I am supposed to have had from His Holiness.

"Your correspondent has been deceived, and I must protest against a letter which he has written in his letter relative to myself, in as much as all, absolutely all, is false and the result of pure imagination.

"I beg you will insert this denial in your next number, and I expect it from your justice. I would fain hope that all newspapers having reproduced your article, will make it a point of honor, as in duty bound, to publish likewise the present rectification.

"I have the honor, &c.,

"H. CARDINAL DE BONNECHOSE,
"Archbishop of Rouen."

What says our friend the *Gazette*?

X.

(To the Editor of the *True Witness*.)

SIR,—Will you allow me to suggest through your columns a few reflections which I have made while following the controversy which has been going on so long in one of the daily papers, concerning the question of Ritualism? Peregrinus, the correspondent of the *Tablet*, to whom Father Merrick makes allusion in his letter—in anterior letters to the one quoted from—complained of the Ritualist newspapers as not representing fairly the views of the Ritualistic party. These papers being in the interest only of a portion, and that a minority, according to him and the writers in the *Tablet*, keep up the old Protestant tone of hostility to the Church, which displeases the more Roman, so to say, party—that is, the majority of the Ritualists. Perhaps the Anglican gentlemen engaged in the Montreal controversy have thus been led into an error of fact. Living in a Colony, at a distance from the mother country, it is naturally through the journals that they seek for knowledge of what is going on there, and this is not an exact means of obtaining information. We Catholics could have prophesied