

The True Witness.

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.  
 PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
 At No. 369, Notre Dame 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, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

AUGUST—1865.

Friday, 4—St. Dominick, C.  
 Saturday, 5—Notre Dame des Neiges.  
 Sunday, 6—Ninth after Pentecost—Transfiguration of Our Lord.  
 Monday, 7—St. Cajetan, C.  
 Tuesday, 8—SS. Cyril, Large, &c., MM.  
 Wednesday, 9—Vig. St. Peter of the Shackles.  
 Thursday, 10—St. Lawrence, D.  
 The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—  
 AUGUST—1865.  
 Saturday, 5—Notre Dame de Pitie, Montreal.  
 Monday, 7—St. Martine.  
 Wednesday, 9—St. Philomene.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Our latest English files are taken up almost exclusively with the details of the General Election now going on in Great Britain and Ireland. The returns up to the evening of the 19th ult.—our latest date,—show 578 members returned, of whom 334 are Liberals, and 244 are Conservatives. The net Liberal gain so far is 20.

A Valencia telegram says the *Great Eastern* and *Caroline* arrived off there. The former goes to Bantry, whilst the latter is laying the shore-end of the cable, and this was to have been accomplished on the 21st or 22nd, if the weather kept moderate. The *Moniteur*, the official organ of the French Government, denies the truth of the rumor regarding a contemplated congress of European powers. Cholera had broken out in the Birmingham workhouse, and a large number of paupers are said to have been attacked.

From the neighboring Republic, we have nothing of interest to relate. Negro suffrage continues to be the principal topic of public discussion.

Death has been busy this week amongst the ranks of the public men of Canada. Our columns to-day contain accounts of the deaths of Sir E. P. Tache, Premier of Canada, the Hon. Judge Morin, and the Hon. Mr. De Beaujeu.

THE "TIMES" AND THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.—If proof, other than that furnished by statistics, by the increasing number of churches, bishops, priests, convents and religious of both sexes, were needed to establish the fact that in England Popery has increased and is increasing, it would be found in the attention which the leading organ of British Protestantism pays to every act, to every movement, and to every utterance of the Catholic Church. No man heeds what the Methodists, or what the Baptists, what, in short, the Protestant dissenters say or do. No one deems their words or their acts of such consequence to the Empire as to require to be noted down, criticised, and, if possible, refuted. Spurgeon may rant as he listeth, and no man heareth him; but if a Catholic dignitary, an Archbishop of Dublin, or of Westminster, address a few words of exhortation or of encouragement to their respective flocks, the entire Protestant press is a-gog, quoting, and misquoting, distorting and criticising the expressions of the speaker: and thus betraying, by their excitement, the nervous apprehensions under which they labor; and with which the consciousness that there is growing up around them an order of things hostile to Protestantism, and destined seriously to affect the political, social, and religious condition of the British Empire, inspires them. The attention which the Protestant press pays to the Pastorals of the Prelates of the Catholic Church is, we say, a proof most convincing of the powerful influence which that Church exercises on the public mind, and is therefore the highest compliment that our opponents can pay us.

Very naturally a Pastoral from the Archbishop of Westminster follows close upon his consecration; as naturally follows the criticism of the London *Times* upon that document, since the *Times* is *par excellence* the censor in all matters spiritual as well as temporal; and in a long editorial, more remarkable for its ill-temper than brilliancy, the London journal clearly establishes, to its own satisfaction, no doubt, and to that of its readers, that Dr. Manning is little better than a silly one, and that his flock who listen to his voice are the most stupid and the most fanatical of mortals.

Two points in the Archbishop of Westminster's Pastoral, especially, provoke the indignant comments of the *Times*: In the first place, it seems that the writer expects Catholics to accept the dogmas of the Church, in whose name he addresses them, "not upon their intrinsic truth," but on the authority which propounds them. In the second place, the Archbishop of Westminster, very mildly indeed, but still very plainly, and very firmly asserts the doctrine of "exclusive salvation." These are the two cardinal errors or defects of the religious system which Dr. Manning hopes that the people of England may yet be brought to embrace; errors, according to the *Times*, so monstrous, "that it is a marvel how any craving for spiritual opiates can reconcile an educated intellect" to them.

There can be no doubt, however, that all Catholics, and all Protestants to boot, who retain any tincture of Christianity,—that is to say, of Christianity as distinguished from mere natural religiosity,—do and must entertain both those errors which provoke the marvel of the *Times*. He who requires "intrinsic evidence" for his faith, who bases his belief in his religion upon the "intrinsic truth" of its teachings, can never rise above the natural to the supernatural order; can never hold or believe any one of these truths which alone distinguish Christianity from Theism or pure natural religion. There is, there can be, no "intrinsic evidence" for the supernatural truths of Christianity; and he who will not accept them except upon their "intrinsic truth," must reject them altogether. Where, or what is the intrinsic evidence for the truth of any one Christian dogma? for the doctrines of the Incarnation, of the Trinity, of the Atonement, of the Personality of the Holy Spirit, for the Inspiration of the Christian Scriptures, for the Resurrection of the body, and Life everlasting?—There is, there can be, none whatever. Our belief in all or any of these supernatural truths cannot rest upon their "intrinsic truth," but solely on an extrinsic basis, upon the credibility of the authority propounding them. It matters not whether that authority be a dead book, or a living Church; for in either case the principle is the same. Only in the natural order can we possibly have intrinsic evidence of the truth of any proposition propounded to us; and the first complaint of the *Times* then simply amounts to this: that Catholics are Christians in the sense that their religion is something more than mere natural religion or Theism; but to this reproach all Protestants who have not yet entirely eliminated the supernatural from their several religious systems, are obnoxious equally with Catholics, if not to the same extent.

But the doctrine of "exclusive salvation!" This is a nut too hard to crack; this is a proposition to which it is marvellous that any "educated intellect can reconcile itself!" And yet somehow or other, it is a doctrine which all Christians hold with the exception of the Universalists who indulge in pleasant dreams of impenitent strumpets, thieves and cutthroats—nay of Old Nick himself we believe at last—reigning with Christ in bliss, and, together with virgins, and martyrs and the undefiled hosts of heaven, singing the praises of the Lamb, with voices it is to be feared a little cracked, or out of tune with over-indulgence in doubtful whiskey, and a halloing of Falstaffian anthems at midnight. With this exception—that of the Universalists—all who call themselves Christians profess, either implicitly or explicitly, the offensive doctrine of "exclusive salvation;" all recognise that some are, and must be, excluded from the realms into which nothing impure or defiled can enter. Like the barber in Nicholas Nickleby, who would shave the baker, but who excluded the coal-heaver from the benefits of his razor, all admit that "you must draw the line somewhere," though they do not all agree where that line shall be drawn. One sect will have nothing to do with any one below the grade of bakers: another more comprehensive or more liberal extends its charities to the coal-heaver whom the other excludes; but all, with the exception of the Universalists, who take in everybody, rich or poor, clean or dirty, do draw a line, or limit beyond which there is no salvation. In matters of detail there may be differences: but in so far as principle is concerned, there are none in this respect, betwixt the most rigid and uncompromising of Papists, and the most lax and accommodating of all Protestant sects, with the exception of the Universalists. All the rest hold to the doctrine of "exclusive salvation."

What says the Anglican Protestant, for instance? According to him, all, without exception, who do not believe the several articles of the Athanasian Creed are damned; and he professes to believe, that "whosoever will be saved before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith." (*Book of Common Prayer*). And that there may be no mistake about the matter, the 18th of the 39 articles, to which every Anglican minister must, before God, solemnly profess his entire and unqualified adherence, expressly declares that "they are to be had accursed that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature." Here is the doctrine

of "exclusive salvation" set forth in the plainest and strongest possible terms; and if it be a doctrine which men of refined intellect cannot reconcile themselves to, then of two things one:—Either the members and Ministers of the Anglican Church are not men of refined intellect since they profess solemnly before God to hold, and promise, to teach the said obnoxious doctrine; or they are the worst of perjurers and hypocrites since they solemnly attest before the Lord, their unqualified and hearty belief in a doctrine to which they cannot reconcile themselves.

We might, had we time, analyze the recognised symbols or formulas of other Protestant sects—such for instance as the Westminster Confession of Faith, the formula of all strict Calvinists—and therefrom deduce the same conclusions as those which we have drawn from the liturgy and formulas of the Anglican sect: for in every one of them, and in one shape or another, is to be found the obnoxious doctrine, that there are conditions assigned by God Himself; compliance with which is essential to salvation; though all the sects are not yet agreed what these conditions are. This, however, is a mere matter of detail which in no wise affects the principle at issue. All, like our friend the aristocratic shaver of beards, "draw the line somewhere."

So also does the Catholic Church. Claiming as within her pale all who have been baptized, and who have not by their own act separated themselves from her, she says to all, that beyond her pale there is no salvation. She does not strictly determine who are beyond that pale; for there may be some, and we hope that there are many, who belong to the invisible Church although in material error, or heretics through invincible ignorance or some intellectual defect. Now, not intellectual, but only moral error can exclude the person once baptized from the Kingdom of God. There must be resistance to grace vouchsafed, an obstinate closing of the eyes to the light, a wilful and malicious rejection of the presented truth, or indifference to it to constitute the latter or moral error: and thus, though there is nothing in these explanations to encourage a false confidence, it will be seen that, by her doctrine, the Church does not pretend to set any limits to the mercies of God; and that there is no incongruity betwixt the doctrine of "exclusive salvation" as by her held and taught, and the conclusions which the most refined intellect may deduce from natural premise, as to God's dealings with His creatures.

But not only do all the Protestant sects, not only does the Catholic Church teach the doctrine of "exclusive salvation" but we find it taught in its most uncompromising form by Christ Himself:—

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—*St. Mark*, 16, 16.

"He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."—*St. John*, 3, 36.

Here again we might multiply instances to any extent, to show that Christ Himself professed to limit His salvation *i.e.*, that He preached the doctrine of "an exclusive salvation," the very doctrine, in principle, which, in his Pastoral, Dr. Manning is taken to task for preaching, and which the *Times* tells us the refined intellect cannot reconcile itself to. And yet it is a doctrine which, so long as men admit a moral and an eternal distinction betwixt good and evil, the human conscience, heedless of dialectics, will recognise as intrinsically true. God is love, no doubt; but if He be all-wise and all-just, it is impossible to conceive that He can have made a revelation, and given laws to His creatures; and that He should ever cease to discriminate betwixt those who have accepted that revelation and obeyed those laws—and those who have scorned the one, and violated the other.

There is however one other consideration with regard to the doctrine of "exclusive salvation" as held and taught by the Church, which essentially distinguishes it from the same doctrine as professed by all Protestant sects. The latter make intellectual compliance with certain propositions the one condition *sine qua non* of salvation. The Catholic Church requires an intellectual assent to, or belief in, her teaching; but she requires more. With her, faith without works profiteth not; and with her it is not enough that a man believe, he must also do the works of justice or his belief will naught avail him.

Now, how is a man to do these works? It is not enough that he be told or taught his duty—or what he must do to obtain eternal life, for it is rarely from ignorance of their duty that men err. It is no use saying to the blind man "see," to the deaf man "hear," to the lame man "arise and walk," to the hungry "eat and be filled," unless you at the same time open the eyes of the one and the ears of the other, restore strength to the crippled limbs, and give solid food as well as good counsel to the hungry. The sects may tell a man what he should do, but, at the same time, most of them admit that, owing to his weakness, he is unable to do these things. The Catholic Church alone not only tells her children what they must do, but she professes to give them power to do it, and this she does through the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist which can be had in

her Communion alone. There are the ordinary and the divinely appointed channels of grace: and to her hand has been committed that bread of the strong of which whosoever eats shall have eternal life. Though this means we receive strength in the hour of need, by these are the flames of concupiscence quenched, and the fire of divine love kept burning strong and bright within us: so that he who faithfully and frequently participates therein, lives with a new life, and conscious of the change within him wrought by the life-giving sacraments marvels as he recognises the strange and unaccustomed fruits, not his own, which by the grace of God he is enabled to bring forth.

Exclusive salvation is, in short, the corollary of the proposition that something is essential to salvation, either sound doctrine or a sound and holy life. The body or sect which should profess a creed—and which at the same time should not assert belief in that creed as essential to salvation, would stand self-convicted of inconsistency, and therefore of falsehood: for of what use propounding a creed which it is not necessary to believe? Universalists who open the gates of heaven to all indiscriminately are consistent: so also are Catholics who have a creed and symbols of faith which, they pretend, embody truths revealed by God and therefore necessary to salvation. But the Protestant, who still professes to hold some of the truths of supernatural religion, and who does not assert belief in them to be essential to salvation is the most inconsistent of mortals, and all inconsistency is characteristic of error.

The reverend gentleman next proceeded to refer to the great change that had taken place in Italy within the past few years, where not less than fifty thousand copies of the Bible had already been distributed.—[Dr. Fuller's speech before the Orange-men of Toronto, as reported in the *Leader*, July 13.]

However extravagant may be the expectations which our worthy D.D. has found from this *distribution*, the whole experience of Protestant missions has taught wise and prudent men somewhat of moderation. Whether the Doctor's "great change" has been effected like Mr. Tomlin's, through the "medical department," or whether, by the mere "sowing" of bibles broadcast over the land, we fail to determine; but of this we feel sure, that unless the *distribution* be blessed in Italy with far other results, and the agents employed be of far other metal than those of China, Dr. Fuller's *gushing* nature is indeed doomed to bitter disappointment. That we may moderate those expectations, and thereby charitably lessen the disappointment, let us offer a few Chinese missionaries to the worthy Doctor's condescending notice. The first we would beg leave to introduce is Dr. Morrison, whom Gutzlaff, in his "China opened," terms, with more of bombast than historical accuracy, "the first herald of the Gospel in China." Dr. Fuller with his usual historical acumen, will not fail to discover the either unparalleled impudence or atrocious ignorance of this claim, and will see in it only another of those cases where Protestant egotism leaves itself open to every bungling impostor. Passing over the monumental stone discovered in 1625 near the city of Sin-gan-fou, the authenticity of which, though ridiculed by Voltaire, no one now disputes, and which proves China to have been evangelized before the seventh century, the learned Doctor will remember that even Gibbon allows that "the Christianity of China between the seventh and thirteenth centuries is unvincibly proved by the consent of Chinese, Arabian, Syriac, and Latin evidence." He will remember also that as early as the 13th century, there was already an Archbishopric of Peking, with four suffragan bishoprics, and that in the following century Pope Clement the Fifth appointed as Metropolitan the celebrated John de Monte Corvino, "a man," as Neander observes, "in whom we recognise the pattern of a true missionary, who"—(though not a hireling of any Protestant Society)—"spared no pains in giving the people the Word of God in their own language." In fact, Mr. Morrison's widow and second wife, informs us that it was from a Jesuit *Harmony of the Gospels* that this "first herald"—her husband—obtained any little knowledge of the Chinese language he ever possessed. But leaving these little historical and verbal inaccuracies to the Church Missionary Societies, let us consider the efforts and success of this "first herald."

Lest however the worthy Doctor, in reading over the sad records of the miserable failure of "missionary efforts," (to use the cant phraseology of the Societies,) should lay the flattering unction to his soul, that if Protestant missions have failed, so also have Catholic missions, let us premise, that long before the advent of this "first herald," Catholic "missionary effort" had been rewarded with thousands of thousands of converts, with their due proportion of glorious martyrs and confessors in all classes of society, from the haughty mandarin to the humble cooly; until Modern China may be said to have rivalled in faith and fervor the splendor of the Ancient Church—the glorious Church of the Catacombs.

But to return to our Missionary Doctor.—Whist Catholic missionaries, unpaid by Bible

Societies, were penetrating into the interior of China to preach the Gospel to whole villages of Catholic Chinese—perhaps to lay down their lives for Christ—our *first herald* was silently residing at Macao with locked doors. "So strong was his sense," writes his apologist, the Rev. W. Ellis, "of the necessity of caution, so unwilling was he to obtrude himself on the notice of the people of Macao, that he never ventured out of his house." As, however, there was no danger even of insult, much less of martyrdom, for our valiant missionary, his reverend apologist is pleased to remark, that "he carried his precaution further than was necessary; but adds, "it seemed better to err on the safe side." Certainly! Mr. Ellis, certainly! The hireling "fleeth because he is an hireling;" and with hirelings, prudence, even if unnecessary, will always be the better part of valor. Passing over, without comment, the dove-like cooing of this missionary Doctor, with his newly found and "beloved Mary," which he has been pleased to leave on record for the benefit of missionary Societies in general, and the spinster portion of their subscribers in particular, we will follow this ardent lover—no—apostle and first herald to Canton. We do so the more cheerfully, not it is true on account of any splendid missionary achievements, but because we find this *first herald* on an advanced pension of £500 a year (probably on account of the increased danger of the situation) coolly acknowledging the pre-existence of Catholic "efforts," and his indebtedness to Chinese Catholics for gifts of Catholic books and bibles, all in good Chinese. In his journal he says—"I cannot refrain from inserting, that I have now the assistance of Chinese Christians of the *Romish Church*." (One would have thought that out of gratitude to his assistants, he would at least have called their Church by its proper name.) Continuing his acknowledgments, he elsewhere records, "I read part of the Exposition of the Ten Commandments by the *Catholics*." His immediate teacher was Abel Yun, "a Roman Catholic Chinese from Peking," a convert of the Jesuits, who had "taught him the Latin language, which he speaks fluently." At another time the entry is, "Received from a Chinese Roman Catholic a present of three small volumes; his younger brother, an intelligent boy, sold me a book of Meditations."

LANCASTRENS.

DOES THE FAMILY-TIE EXIST ANY LONGER IN THE UNITED STATES—OR, AT LEAST, IS IT NOT WEAKENING EVERY DAY?

(Continued from our last.)

The end of marriage is not only the reproduction of human beings, since that end can be attained without marriage, but also the preservation of the child. Divorce is an obstacle to the attaining of that end; it is therefore opposed to the growth and improvement of family affection.—The principle of indissolubility, and therefore of preservation, no longer asserted, there must be necessarily a relaxation of the family tie in the community.

The principle of divorce implies a principle of injustice, generally towards one of the parties, but always towards the children, as is admirably proved by Viscount De Bonald:—

"Marriage, which precedes the family, and which produces it, composed of man and woman, is an *eventual* society.

Children supervening, this society, from having been *eventual*, becomes *actual*; if there are children, there are men to preserve and to educate, and there is a *reason* why the marriage should not be dissolved.

"If marriage is an *eventual* society, if this society is composed of three persons, the father, the mother, and the child, marriage is then really a contract between three persons, two present, one (the child) absent, but represented by public authority, voucher of the engagement taken by the parties of forming a society; for public authority always represents in the family, the person absent, the child before his birth, the father after his death. The contract enacted between three persons cannot be annulled by two, to the prejudice of the third, the weaker of the society; and this third person can never consent to a dissolution of the society altogether to its prejudice, for it is always minor in the society, even when it is of age in the State.

"Marriage is a natural, and not a commercial, association. The stock taken therein is not equal, since the man puts into this association the protection of strength, the woman the necessities of weakness; the results, in the case of a separation, are not equal, since the man goes out of this society with his full authority, and that the woman does not leave it with all her dignity, and that of all which she brought into it, virginal purity, youth, beauty, fecundity, consideration, wealth, she can, in case of dissolution, take nothing back but her money.

"Marriage is therefore naturally indissoluble."

In another place he says:—  
 "The engagement taken between three cannot be dissolved by two with prejudice to a third, since this third person is, if not the first, at least the most important; that every thing has reference to it, and that this person is the *reason* of the social union of the two others, who are no more father or mother without the child, than the child is son without them. . . . The father and mother who divorce are therefore two strong persons who agree in despoiling a weak one, and the State that consents to it become an accomplice in their brigandage."

The injustice which flows from divorce is, for its victim, the most galling that can be conceived and, consequently, the greatest foe to the family tie. Figure to yourself the shame and vexation of a woman, often innocent, sent back without honor, without a name, without any recognised position in society, to that paternal home she had left with the happiness and pride of unspotted beauty and the dignity of a wife; the spite and hatred of her family, wounded in the object of