

## REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND &amp; WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Union Bank of London, . . . . . London. The Bank of Ireland, . . . . . Dublin. The National Bank of Scotland, . . . . . Edinburgh. By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1855.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Pacific* with London dates down to the 27th ult., arrived at New York on Wednesday. The new Ministry had already broken up; partly from internal dissensions; partly also, on account of the success in the House of Commons, of Mr. Roebuck's motion for a Committee, to enquire into the causes of the disasters in the Crimea. Sir James Graham, Messrs. Gladstone, and S. Herbert, had resigned; Sir Chas. Wood was spoken of as First Lord of the Admiralty, and rumor assigned the Chancellorship of the Exchequer to Mr. Lewis; Lord John Russell is, for the moment, to do the duties of Colonial Secretary; and the Earl of Carlisle is to be Viceroy of Ireland. The arrangements however for the new Cabinet were not completed at the time of the *Pacific's* sailing.

There have been stormy debates in Parliament. Mr. Roebuck talks gloomily of an impeachment of Lord Raglan, who is about to resign his command; Lord Lucan has already been recalled, but their successors had not been named. Government speaks hopefully of the prospects of peace, now rendered necessary to England, upon almost any terms however degrading—seeing that her army is destroyed, and that at home the distress of the working classes has become almost unbearable. Serious riots had, in consequence, occurred at London and Liverpool, but had been suppressed for the moment.

From the Continent we have rumors that the French Emperor, in spite of the admonitions of England and Austria, is about to proceed in person to the Crimea. The Vienna Conference was about to open; and no doubt every exertion will be made to patch up a dishonorable peace, as every peace must be, concluded, before the capture of Sebastopol by the Allies, and without exacting from Russia, material guarantees that she shall not, immediately on the withdrawal of the Allied forces, recommence her hereditary policy of aggression upon Turkey. War however had been declared between Russia and Sardinia; and war preparations were still being actively continued throughout Europe.

From the Crimea we have nothing new, with the exception of an indecisive engagement betwixt General Liprandi, and the Turks at Eupatoria. The former had retired with the loss of about 500 men. Before Sebastopol, everything remained unchanged. The weather was less severe indeed; but the miserable remnants of the British army were still melting away under the combined influences of fatigue and disease. Siege operations, of course, were said to be progressing; but from long repetition this official phrase has no longer any charms for the public. Of course, also, an immediate assault was spoken of; but nobody now believes in assaults. The Baltic fleet is again preparing for sea; it looks formidable enough on paper, but will no doubt prove very harmless—as far as the Russians are concerned—in action.

Upon the whole, we feel inclined to conclude that the British nation is heartily sick of the war, and will be only too glad if the diplomatists and red-tapists shall be able to come to terms amongst themselves at Vienna. The people of England have learned that they are essentially a commercial, and not a military nation; that fighting is not their vocation, nor glory their legitimate pursuit; and that henceforward their best policy will be to eat humble pie, and deal largely in hardware, and dry goods.

The *Africa* has arrived, and announces the death of the Emperor of Russia.

## PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday, the 8th inst., Mr. G. Brown moved his long threatened resolution, to the effect that a humble address be presented to his Excellency the Governor, praying him not to exercise the power, conferred upon him in the 3d clause of the Clergy Reserves Bill, of commuting with the holders of stipends under the said act. The exercise of this power, Mr. Brown contended, would defeat the main object of the secularisers, viz.—the full establishment of the voluntary principle; and would serve to perpetuate jealousies and agitation in Upper Canada.

A long debate ensued. The Attorney General McDonald, reminded the mover of the Resolution that, if Government had decided to commute with individuals, it was on the condition that the consent of the religious bodies to which they belonged, was to be given to such commutation. Mr. Spence denied that there was any general feeling in the country in favor of Mr. Brown's motion; and contended that it was unwise to open again a question that had been settled last autumn.

Mr. Wilson contended that, if the commutation clause were acted upon, the pretended settlement would be but a delusion. Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Jackson deprecated any further agitation of the Clergy Reserves question. Mr. Foley supported Mr. G. Brown's motion, as did Mr. MacKenzie; who improved the occasion by a long rambling discussion on the dispute now pending betwixt the Bishop

of Buffalo, and a handful of German Protestants who have, in virtue of an iniquitous law, seized upon and retain possession of a Catholic Church. Mr. MacKenzie was called to order by the Speaker, with but little effect; for the Hon. Member went off on a new tack, and made a long prosy harangue about Judas Iscariot and the Know-Nothings of America. At last, much to the delight of the House, he sat down and held his peace. Messrs. Cayley, Aikens, Southwick, Roblin, and Flint then addressed the House; after which a division was called for, and Mr. Brown's motion was negatived by a majority of 63 to 42.

On Friday, the time of the House was taken up in hearing the case of the Reporting Officers accused of fraudulent registry of votes at the last election. Upon motion of Sir A. McNab, a whole batch of these gentlemen were sent to prison for ten days, upon the Speaker's warrant. One of them however, named Guy, managed to make his escape from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms. The prisoners have made application to be released on a writ of *habeas corpus*.

On Monday, Sir A. McNab, introduced his Bill for regulating the Provincial Militia; after which a discussion ensued on the delays incurred in bringing down the Legislative Council Bill. Long debates on the Corruption Committee, and its shortcomings, and proceedings upon contested election questions, have occupied the rest of the time of the House.

We accept as a good omen of the intentions of the present Ministry towards our Catholic institutions, the firm stand they made in the Legislature against M. Darche's insidious motion for subjecting all the educational establishments of the Province, receiving the slightest assistance from the public purse, to the control of the Government; for this, though not expressly set forth, was the design of the Bill which M. Darche introduced—and the second reading of which, upon the motion of the Hon. M. Cauchon, was ordered for "this day six months"—the usual way in which unpalatable measures are summarily dealt with.

No one, either Catholic or Protestant, will deny that, if the Government gives of the public money to any private institution, the former is entitled to ask for, and the latter is bound to furnish, when called upon to do so, full details respecting the manner in which the said grant from the public funds, has been expended; but here the rights of the one, and the obligations of the other, cease. The Government has no right to demand, nor are the recipients of public funds bound to give, any account of the manner in which monies not derived from the public funds, have been expended: neither has the former any right to assume, in virtue of the trifling assistance by it given, the right to exercise an inquisitorial control over the general affairs of the institution receiving its assistance. It is enough if the latter accounts to the public for the manner in which it has employed the money, by it received from the public, without being called upon to account for the disposal of funds not received from that source.

This is the principle which dictated the opposition offered by the Hon. M. Cauchon, and his friends, to M. Darche's motion; which if passed into law would have had the effect of compelling all our Catholic educational institutions—either to renounce all share in the legislative grants, for educational purposes—or to submit all their affairs, and the entire control of their establishments, to the absolute dictatorship of the secular power. To the second alternative it was manifest that Catholic ecclesiastical institutions never would submit; to force upon them the former, would be most unjust, so long as Protestant, or Non-Catholic, educational establishments are allowed to remain recipients of the Government bounty.

This was well understood by M. Darche and his friends, both of Upper and Lower Canada. The former, headed by Mr. George Brown of the *Globe*, voted for M. Darche's motion, because they saw plainly the intention of the mover; and as Protestants heartily sympathized with a measure dictated by a spirit of bitter hostility against Catholic institutions. The latter, or "rouges" as they are called, supported the same motion; because, though not having the courage or honesty openly to avow their Protestant predilections, and hatred to Catholicity, they, no less than Mr. George Brown and his party, seek by every means in their power to destroy the influence of the Catholic Church over the people of Canada—knowing well, that so long as the French Canadians are moral and religious, so long as they are educated as Christians and Catholics, so long will they hold in abhorrence the principles which the democrats of the Province, whether called "rouges" or "Liberal Protestants" are endeavoring to disseminate; that, so long, there will be no hopes for the triumph in Canada of the miserable dregs of the vapid French philosophy of the XVII century, upon which, thank God, all honest and educated men now a-days look back with loathing and contempt. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean to liken M. Darche or any of his friends to Voltaire or Diderot; neither do we pretend to institute any comparison betwixt the *Avenir* and the famous *Encyclopédie*—and for this simple reason—that a bad heart does not necessarily imply a good head. Our French Canadian demagogues, the *demi-savants* of the *Avenir*, possess indeed all the hatred of Catholicity and of its sublime morality, which distinguished the "philosophes" of the reign of Louis Seize. But here all resemblance ends; for the latter were undeniably men of brilliant talents, and extraordinary abilities.

A clamor however has been raised against the Government, as if, because it did not choose to accept M. Darche's particular proposition, it therefore intended to stifle all enquiry into the manner in which the funds given by it to educational establishments, for educational purposes, are disposed of. To show how groundless is this clamor, it is sufficient to refer to

the speeches of the members of the Ministry, during the debate in question, who announced the intention of the Inspector-General to introduce a Bill, calling upon all recipients of public monies to account for the manner in which said sums had been by them expended. The Ministry opposed the motion of M. Darche, not because it demanded such accounts, but because, under the pretence of enforcing an equitable enquiry into the expenditure of public monies, it aimed a blow at the independence of the Catholic educational establishments of the Province. A Ministry pursuing such a bold and honorable policy deserves the support of the Catholic community; and will not, we trust, refuse to take into its early and serious consideration the demands of the Catholics of Upper Canada, for "Freedom of Education." Nor of Catholics alone; Protestants of the better sort join with Catholics in denouncing the tyrannical and essentially irreligious system that now obtains in Upper Canada—as we showed in our last, by extracts from Mr. Angus Dallas' pamphlet—upon which even the *British Canadian*, a Protestant journal of Toronto comments:—

"Of the many essays which have been written upon it"—the Common School system of Upper Canada—"there is not one which in our opinion has supplied more conclusive evidence of the failure of the Common School system in Canada."

Supported, then, by Catholics and Protestants, our Ministers need not fear. They have but to make up their minds to disregard the bellowings of George Brown and his clique; and thus, setting to work earnestly to redress the wrongs of which the Catholics of Canada have so long complained, and whose existence is now admitted by the organs of the most respectable and influential of the Protestant sects, they will soon earn for themselves a title to the gratitude and hearty support of the great majority of the Canadian people.

The *Montreal Witness* takes exception—most unjustly and unphilosophically it appears to us—against the use of the term Protestant, as applied to Voltaire, by the *TRUE WITNESS*; and for so employing it, our cotemporary accuses us of wilfully perverting the truth. We repeat however, and defy contradiction, that Voltaire was in his latter years a Protestant, and an Ultra Protestant to boot; in spite of his having been born and brought up as a Roman Catholic, and having received his education at a Jesuit College. Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin were born and brought up Roman Catholics; they also received their education from Roman Catholic teachers; and yet it does not follow that Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin were not Protestants, in their advanced years. Let us however define; for in controversy, religious controversy especially, there is nothing so desirable as sharply drawn definitions.

A "Protestant" is any baptized person who is not a Roman Catholic; or, to adhere strictly to the literal meaning of the word, he is one who "Protests" against all, or any part of, the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. But Voltaire, there is every reason to believe, had been baptized in his youth;—and as in his advanced years he Protested, both by his writings and his conduct, by word and deed, against the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, Voltaire was, to all intents and purposes, a thorough Protestant. We do not say that he was a Christian, in any sense of the word; for a Protestant is not essentially a Christian, though he may be one by accident.

If our, not very intellectual, cotemporary would take the trouble to reflect on the meaning of words, he would perhaps at last perceive the truth of the definition, which we have often endeavored to impress on his dull brain, viz.—that a Protestant is not one who believes or asserts anything, but, simply one who denies or protests against something; and that—as it is not in virtue of believing anything, but of denying something, that a man is a Protestant—so also, no one is, or can be, a Christian merely in virtue of his Protestantism. For a man is a Christian, not in virtue of what he denies, but of what he believes.

We do not intend to withhold from Protestants the appellation of Christian. Protestants have, by virtue of baptism, been regenerated, and made members of the Catholic Church; and we know that, in spite of their subsequent Protestantism, they still retain the indelible character imprinted on their souls in baptism. But if Christians at all, Protestants are so, wholly and solely in virtue of that wherein they agree with Roman Catholics, or in so far as they are Non-Protestants. Wherein they differ from Papists—that is, in so far as they are Protestants—they agree with heathens and infidels, and therefore are not Christians. A moment's reflection will make this clear.

A Protestant—say a Unitarian for instance—a Milton, or a Channing—if a Christian at all, is so, not in virtue of his Protest against, or denial of, the divine personality of Christ—for the Jew, the Mahomedan, and the heathen deny this as well, and Jews Mahomedans and heathens are not Christians; but because he agrees with the Roman Catholic Church in so far as to admit, either that, in some sense, Christ was the Messiah promised from of old, or that He was a teacher sent from God. So with other Protestant denominations—Anglicans, Baptists, Methodists, Mormons, Presbyterians and Tinkers.—It is not in virtue of what they deny, or Protest against, but of what they admit or do not Protest against—in virtue of that wherein they agree with the Roman Catholic Church, and not of that wherein they differ from her—that they have the slightest claim to the title Christian. The Baptist is not a Christian because he rejects infant baptism; but because he does not Protest against all baptism. The

We do not call unbaptized persons "Protestants," as they are simply heathens.

Anglican or the Presbyterian is not a Christian because he denies Transubstantiation, and Protests against the "Immaculate Conception" of Mary; for infidels (who are certainly not Christians) as well as Anglicans and Presbyterians, deny Transubstantiation, and Protest against the "Immaculate Conception." But, if a Christian at all, the Anglican or Presbyterian is so solely because he has not Protested against all the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church; it is solely in virtue of that wherein he agrees with Roman Catholics; that the Anglican or Presbyterian is, in any sense, a Christian. In so far as he differs from Papists—or Protest—he does so, in company with Jews, Mahomedans, and infidels; and therefore, in so far as he Protests—or in so far as he is a Protestant—the Anglican or Presbyterian is as little entitled to the appellation of Christian, as is the Jew, the Mahomedan, or the infidel. No man, therefore, can be a Christian because of, though he may be one in spite of, his Protestantism.

If the *Montreal Witness* objects to this definition of Protestantism, we call upon him to furnish us with another and a better—clear, comprehensive, and exhaustive; which shall exclude all Roman Catholics, that is, all who believe and practise what the Roman Catholic Church believes and teaches; but which shall include all who are commonly known and spoken of as Protestants—whether Anglicans, Mormons, Quakers, Swedenborgians, or Unitarians—from Luther and Zuinglius, through Laud and John Knox, down to Milton, Locke, Watts, Channing, Neander, Joe Smith, Theodore Parker, and the recognised leaders of the chief Protestant theological schools in Germany and the United States. Such a definition will be not only a theological, but a literary, curiosity; and we shall have much pleasure in laying it before our readers—when we get it.

"FABIOLA; OR, THE CHURCH OF THE CATACOMBS." By His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Messrs. Sadliers, New York and Montreal.

The originators of the plan of a "*Popular Catholic Library*" having submitted their design to the Archbishop of Westminster, His Eminence not only highly approved of it, but consented to furnish the first volume of the series; suggesting, at the same time, the propriety of publishing "a series of tales illustrative of the condition of the Church in different periods of her past existence. One for instance might be called 'The Church of the Catacombs'; a second, 'The Church of the Basilicas'; each comprising three hundred years; a third would be on 'The Church of the Cloister'; and then perhaps a fourth might be added, called 'The Church of the Schools.'" The work before us is the first fruits of the above suggestion; and, as its title indicates, is intended to illustrate the state of the Church, before the days of Constantine, and more particularly during the last great heathen persecution, known in history as the Dioclesian persecution, from the name of the Emperor under whose reign it was waged; and which is especially famous, not only as the last, but as the longest and most cruel persecution, to which the early Church was subjected by the heathen Emperors.—Since then indeed the Church has often been, and still is, the fruitful mother of martyrs; but her oppressors have for the most part been, and still are, her own unnatural children; for still, as in the days of the "Catacombs," the Catholic Church upon earth is the Church Militant, warring with error in all its forms, whether under the name of Paganism or Protestantism.

Christians in the beginning of the IV. century held, with respect to the corrupt heathen population amongst whom they dwelt, a position very similar to that which Catholics at the present day, in Great Britain and America, hold towards the Protestant world. They were exposed to the same calumnies, and were hated with as intense a hatred. The very charges brought against them were identical with those which are now urged against obnoxious Papists; the same arts were employed to arouse the fury of the rabble against them; and the same pretences as are now employed by a Spooner, a Drummond, or a Garazzi, for persecuting Papists, were then put forward as justifying the cruelties practised against the professors of a religion, unknown to the State, and which recognised an authority distinct from, and higher than, the authority of the Cæsars. The great charge against Christians, then, as now, was that they were disloyal to the Emperors, and subjects of a foreign prince. The author of *Fabiola* does but cite the very words of a Roman Emperor when he makes the savage Maximian deliver himself as follows:—

"For my part"—he said—"I have another and a stronger reason for my abhorrence of these Christians. They have dared to establish in the heart of the Empire, and in this very city, a supreme religious authority, unknown here before, independent of the government of the State, and equally powerful over their minds as this. Formerly, all acknowledged the emperor as supreme in religious, as in civil rule. Hence he bears still the title of *Pontifex Maximus*. But these men have raised up a divided power, and consequently bear but a divided loyalty. I hate, therefore, as a usurpation in my dominions, this sacerdotal sway over my subjects. For I declare that I would rather hear of a new rival starting up to my throne, than of the election of one of these priests in Rome."

These were the very words of Decius, on the election of St. Cornelius to the See of Peter; and with scarce the alteration of a single letter, might they be quoted as the substance of every charge urged by Protestants of the present day against Pope and Papists; Lord John Russell, in one of his anti-Papal Aggression harangues could not have delivered himself in more appropriate terms. Indeed, it is impossible to get rid of the suspicion that, in describing the fury of the heathens of Rome in the fourth century, the author of "*Fabiola*" had an eye to the English Protestants of the nineteenth. What an admirable