

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & 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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 12, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The following are the most interesting items of European news, brought to us by the *Canadian* from Liverpool on the 27th ult., and which arrived at Quebec on Tuesday last:

English political news unimportant. Breadstuffs slightly advanced. From France there is nothing new. The Spanish government was busy robbing the Church, by way of replenishing its empty exchequer. From Naples we have rumors of a collision betwixt the Neapolitan troops and the Swiss; two more armed steamers had sent in all haste to Palermo. Sardinia is supposed to be preparing for war; the fortifications of Alexandria are being rapidly proceeded with. The Prussian government has determined to take vengeance on the pirates; it is said that England and Russia will co-operate. The Russians have evacuated Kars.

VICTUALS AND EXPLANATIONS.

The "Cauchon Feed" at Quebec having turned out a dead failure, an attempt was made on the 3rd inst. to get up another Ministerial demonstration, in the shape of a dinner to M. Lemieux. The *Quebec Gazette* of the 5th inst. gives full details of the "victuals" that were served up on this occasion; it remains for us only to notice some of the Ministerial "explanations" which were handed round during the course of the repast.

The health of M. Lemieux having been most enthusiastically received and acknowledged in copious libations of cold water, that gentleman is reported by the *Journal de Quebec* to have delivered himself as follows:—

"It has been insinuated that we have not done justice to our fellow-countrymen—the Catholics of Upper Canada—on the question of separate schools. But we have neither said nor done anything to the injury of those schools: we have merely postponed to a more favorable time, amendments which some pretended to wish to obtain immediately. The law in force in U. Canada upon the subject of separate schools, not only gives to Catholics their legitimate rights in the matter of education, but five Catholics, or more, if they give previous notice to the Mayor or Prefect may establish a separate school. This shows that in Upper Canada, Catholics enjoy, in fact, as complete religious liberty as do Protestants in Lower Canada. I believe that our Clergy in Lower Canada do not approve of the language of some of their brethren in Upper Canada, respecting the conduct of certain public men on the question of separate schools."

The Italics are our own. We need not waste time or words in commenting on the very bad taste—to use the mildest form of expression—of which M. Lemieux was guilty in endeavoring to make it appear that there exists a fatal difference of opinion betwixt the Catholic Clergy of Upper and Lower Canada; and that the conduct of the former is condemned by the latter. We may however tell M. Lemieux that whatever he may "believe," he has no right thus publicly to insult and malign our Clergy; and that he has, and can assign, no reasons for the faith that is in him. It may be very convenient for M. Lemieux and his brother "Jacks-in-Office" to misrepresent and calumniate our revered Clergy; but he must permit us to tell him that by so doing he does but give us another proof—if other proof were needed—that he and his colleagues are unworthy the respect and confidence of any honest Catholic layman. We have not, like M. Lemieux, the impudence to pretend to be the mouth-piece of the Catholic Clergy, either of the Upper or Lower Province; but this at least we may assert of both—that they are ever, and in all things, mindful of the great precept of the Apostle of the Gentiles, as given in the portion of Scripture read at Mass in the Epistle of Sunday last:—

"Soliciti servare unitatem Spiritus in vinculo pacis. Unum corpus, et unus spiritus."—EPI. IV., 3, 4.

But if M. Lemieux manifested very bad taste, and approved himself a very bad Catholic, in thus publicly announcing to the world that the Catholic Church in Canada was, as it were, a house divided against itself—what shall we say of either his extraordinary disregard of truth, or ignorance of facts—as manifested in the other portions of his speech upon the subject of Catholic schools for Upper Canada?

First, he tells us that he and his colleagues have done or said nothing against these schools.

This is not true. For it is owing to him and his colleagues that Mr. Bowes' Bill was not suffered to pass during the last session of Parliament. "This too crying an iniquity"—as the Rev. M. Cazeau of Quebec in his letter of April last, by anticipation, well calls it—was the work of M. Cauchon, Lemieux & Co. It is therefore not true that they have done nothing prejudicial to the interests of Catholic schools. They have impeded the passing of a just and most

necessary measure, which, by their antecedents, they had given the Catholic Clergy of both sections of the Province the best reasons to believe that they would do their utmost to carry. So completely was this the case, that only in April last, when rumors of M. Cauchon's treachery first began to obtain publicity, and reached the Rev. M. Cazeau's ears, that Reverend gentleman at once indignantly repudiated them, as too monstrous, too incredible. "I cannot believe"—wrote the Rev. M. Cazeau—"that M. Cauchon would dare to deny his antecedents: so much as to oppose Mr. Bowes' Bill. It would be too crying an iniquity." Will M. Lemieux dare to deny that both he and his ministerial colleagues "have opposed Mr. Bowes' Bill?" and have therefore perpetrated that incredible, that "too crying an iniquity," which the Rev. M. Cazeau only in April last, would not, could not believe possible? For this act of treachery, we sincerely trust the Catholic electors of both U. and Lower Canada will hold our ministerial betrayers responsible at the next general election.

Secondly, M. Lemieux tells us that he and his colleagues only postponed "to a more favorable time," the consideration of those amendments to the separate school law, which others desired to obtain at once—thereby virtually admitting that the present law does need amendments, and that the complaints of Catholics against it are not unreasonable. These complaints however must be put off for hearing to a "more convenient time"—though when that time is to come, or what prospect there is that such a time will ever come at all, M. Lemieux does not deign to inform us. So Felix, the Governor, postponed the hearing of St. Paul, and the amendment of his morals, "to a more convenient time."—ACTS XXIV., 25. But after two years' waiting, this "convenient" time came not; and so Felix, willing to gratify the Jews—(or Protestant majority)—left Paul—(the Catholic minority)—bound. Thus is it ever when rulers wait for a more "convenient time" to do justice.

Thirdly—having told us that he and his colleagues had not refused, but had only postponed to a more "convenient" season, those amendments which the Catholic minority clamored for, and which justice required, M. Lemieux goes on to show that no amendments to the school law, to the advantage of Catholics, are required at all. 'Tis the old story over again of the lawyer and the kettle—"First, your honor, we contend that it was broken when we got it; secondly, that it was whole when we returned it; and thirdly, that we never had it." Thus also M. Lemieux—"the law in force," he says, "gives to Catholics their legitimate rights." The conclusion is inevitable. "Therefore, neither now, nor at the more convenient season, will we grant them more; for that would be to grant them more than their legitimate rights, which they have no right to ask."

M. Lemieux was singularly unfortunate in the instance by him assigned in attestation of the religious liberty enjoyed by the Catholic minority of Upper Canada. "Five Catholics or more"—so he is reported by the *Journal de Quebec* as having said—"if they give previous notice to the Mayor or Prefect may establish a separate school." We learn from the *Quebec Gazette* that at the Lemieux feed, cold water was the only drink: the laws of physiology prevent us therefore from putting down M. Lemieux as drunk, or "in a state of beer" when he thus delivered himself. We will not venture to accuse him of wilful and deliberate falsehood; for that would be a violation of the laws of courtesy. We have therefore no other alternative but to conclude that M. Lemieux was grossly ignorant of the provisions of the Separate School Act of 1855—and that his hearers were in the same plight.

We therefore again take this opportunity of telling M. Lemieux—that it is false, that "five Catholics, if they give previous notice to the Mayor or Prefect may establish separate schools"—and that, as we showed in our last, one of the grievances complained of by the Catholic minority of Upper Canada, is, the number of vexatious formalities required of them by law, before they can so much as establish a school for their children—formalities, as we have also shown, from which the Protestant minority of Lower Canada are entirely exempt. We would recommend M. Lemieux then, in all charity, to read carefully the first, third, and fifteenth sections of 18th Vict. cxxxii., before again venturing upon an after dinner—even though it be a cold water dinner—speech upon the subject of the Upper Canada School Laws.

Another topic upon which M. Lemieux—under the influence of reiterated draughts of cold water—ventured to touch, was the "General Corporations Bill" of last session, which the Ministry did its best to carry:—

"It is said"—gasped M. Lemieux—"that I and some of my colleagues have encouraged the formation of secret societies. Far from such being the case, the act for incorporating them stipulated that they shall make a public report of their proceedings."

Here again M. Lemieux must pardon us if we venture to set him right on a matter of fact.—Though in Mr. Drummond's Bill there was nothing to prevent the members of Orange Lodges,

or other dangerous societies—that is, societies whose members are bound by secret oaths, and which have secret signs and passwords—from becoming incorporated under its provisions, this was not the chief objection urged against it, and its Ministerial supporters, by Catholics. They complained more particularly of those iniquitous amendments, by which, by way of yielding to the bellows of Protestant fanaticism, the sacred and indefeasible "right of testament" was arbitrarily interfered with; and by which a wanton and unpardonable insult was inflicted upon the Catholic Clergy of Canada and religion generally. If M. Lemieux will refer to some of the files of the *Journal de Quebec* in the early part of the month of June last, he will see what were the real grounds of the objections urged by Catholics against Mr. Drummond's Bill—as we should call it, had not Mr. Cauchon and his colleagues, by voting for it, and doing their best to force it through the Legislature, made it their own. Why even now, the *Journal de Quebec*, docile "Government hack" as he is, and broken in to Ministerial harness, dares not say a word in defence of that measure which M. Lemieux and his colleagues supported.

We need scarcely mention that M. Lemieux did not condescend to explain to his audience the motives by which he, M. Cauchon, and his other ministerial colleagues were actuated, when they tendered their advice to Sir Edmund Head to give an official reception to the Orangemen of Toronto on the 12th of July last. Upon this somewhat important, and to Irish Catholics especially, this very interesting episode in their Ministerial career, M. Lemieux had not one word to say. This was perhaps prudent; but, after all, the explanation is only postponed to a "more convenient season." To the next general election, for instance, when, we have no doubt, that Irish Catholic voters will be very particular in insisting upon a full explanation of the unprecedented encouragement given to Orangeism, by M. Lemieux and his colleagues. For that "more convenient season," we must wait patiently; but when it does come, we sincerely trust that Irish Catholics will remember the twelfth of July last at Toronto; and give our "Ministerial betrayers" good cause to remember it likewise.

In spite of the *Montreal Witness*, we contend—that there can be no surer test of the general morality and chastity of a people than the general fertility of its matrimonial unions; and that—if, on one and the same soil, under one and the same clime, and subject to the same physical or material accidents, we see that, amongst one class of the community, the said unions are constantly and universally more prolific than are those of another—we may safely conclude to the superior morality of the former.

For, every effect must have a cause. Now, as the *Montreal Witness* accepts the conclusions to which the *Journal de Quebec* arrives, he must admit also the truth of the premises from which those conclusions are evolved.

But of those premises, the major is—that, both in Upper and Lower Canada, the marriage unions of Catholics are more prolific than are those of Protestants. Here then is a fact, which, if the *Montreal Witness* rejects, he must also reject the conclusions of the *Journal de Quebec* in favor of the existing school laws of Upper Canada.

And again—for every fact there must be a factor; for every effect, a cause. What then is the cause why, throughout Canada—where certainly the external or physical circumstances of the Catholic population are not superior to those of their Protestant neighbors—the marriage unions of the former are always, and everywhere, more fertile than are those of the latter? If the *Montreal Witness* rejects our explanation, or solution, of this problem, he must either assign some other solution—which we defy him to do; or he must admit that there can be an effect without a cause, a fact without a factor—which is absurd.

Our cotemporary's remarks upon the greater increase of population in "heretic England," since the Reformation, than in "devout Spain," are at best irrelevant. For, before we can draw any conclusions therefrom, as to the "moral" superiority of the former, it must be shown that the material circumstances of the two populations, have been, in all respects, identical during the last three centuries—and that the physical resources of the two countries have been developed with equal rapidity during that epoch. Unfortunately for the *Montreal Witness*'s argument, and still more unfortunately for Spain, this has not been the case. Since the Reformation, owing to her insular position, England has never seen the glitter of hostile steel, or heard the tramp of alien foes upon her soil; whilst Spain, during the same period, has scarcely known a moment's peace. To say nothing of "Wars of the Succession," or the devastation of the Spanish Peninsula by the contending hosts of France and England at the commencement of the present century—the civil wars and internal dissensions, which, fomented by British intrigue and British gold, have never, during the last twenty years, ceased to harass that noble country—are amply sufficient to account for any diminution in the

numbers of its people. Still that population has more than doubled itself since the beginning of the XVIII. century.

But, is it a fact that, since the Reformation, the population of England has much increased? No doubt large cities such as London, Manchester, and Birmingham, have grown up in the interval; but it is by no means so certain that the rural population is larger now, than it was before the great apostasy of the XVI century. Upon this point we will not dogmatise however, like our cotemporary; because we have no certain data whereon to support our opinions. The science of Statistics is of modern growth; and the fifteenth century has furnished us with no census tables. We must therefore content ourselves with such hints as we may pick up from cotemporary historians, and ancient monuments. One or two facts are however pretty clear.

For instance—it is certain that Catholic England, without the aid of either Ireland or Scotland, could, in the days of the Plantagenets, bring larger bodies of men into the field, and with much greater facility, than can the Empire of Queen Victoria; whence we conclude that men—not miserable abortions of gin and mercury such as now swarm in our factories and cotton mills—but stout bodied yeomen, were once more plentiful in England, than they are in Great Britain and Ireland at the present day. In this opinion we are further confirmed by the traces of ancient cultivation, and the ruins of those noble abbeys and monasteries with which the soil of both England and Scotland is still covered; and which establish beyond the power of cavil, that at the time of their erection, both England and Scotland were populous, and highly cultivated countries. For these reasons we are not prepared to admit that the population of Protestant England has much, if at all increased, since the Reformation; though it has no doubt greatly increased since the days of the Stuarts; whilst on the other, hand we know that the population of Protestant Scotland has fearfully diminished, and is still rapidly diminishing. It would be difficult, rather should we say impossible, to raise in the Highlands of Scotland in the nineteenth century, such an army as that which little more than a hundred years ago, shed a last lustre on Scottish history, and made an Elector of Hanover tremble upon his usurped throne.

Still more unfounded is the following illustration, which the *Montreal Witness* adduces by way of discrediting the test of morality as afforded by the fertility of marriage unions:—

"If there be any virtue in the test of the True Witness, let him compare Catholics with the far more prolific Hindoos and Chinese, and conclude that Buddhism is a religion infinitely superior to Romanism."

To this we reply, in the first place—That it would be absurd to compare European or Canadian Catholics, with Chinese or Hindoo idolators; because the physical circumstances—which of course must be taken into account—of Canadians or Europeans, and of Chinese or Hindoos are entirely different. As we compare Canadian Catholics with Canadian Protestants, whose physical conditions are identical, so must we compare Chinese and Hindoo idolators, with Chinese and Hindoo Catholics. In the second place we reply that, so comparing them, our test holds good; and that the matrimonial unions of the latter are far more prolific than those of their idolatrous fellow-countrymen. But we will go further: and comparing the increase of population in China, with that of any Christian community in the world, we shall find the advantage altogether on the side of the latter. China is densely populated indeed; but its annual increase of population is fearfully small, in comparison with that of any other country. This of course is owing chiefly to the practice of infanticide; a crime even more common in idolatrous China, than it is in Protestant England or Scotland—though, to the credit of the former it must be admitted that we have no proof of the existence of any "Burial Clubs," the members of which drive a lucrative trade by poisoning their children, and then pocketing the burial fees. This commerce is we believe peculiar to our Anglo-Saxon and Protestant races; amongst the lower orders of whom it is however almost universally practised, if newspapers and police reports can be credited.

All recent writers agree in representing the population of China as "retrograding."

THE DENISON CASE.

It hath ever been the policy of the Church of England, and more especially of late years, to avoid as much as possible all sharp or clear definitions: and to frame her formularies, or articles of faith, in such loose, vague, or general terms as to allow of the greatest possible diversity of opinion amongst her members. Following the precept of the Apostle, she has in turns been all things to all men; and ever ready to sacrifice truth on the altar of expediency, her great object has been, never to commit herself, never to give a decided opinion upon any of the great controversies wherewith, since the dawn of the Reformation, the Protestant world has been distracted. The Church of England is neither "High" nor "Low," but "Broad"—is at once the admission and the boast of her admirers.

But above all, on the doctrine of the Eucharist has the language of the Church of England been

studiously evasive and elaborately unintelligible. At first indeed, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, and with Peter Martyr, the notorious Zuinglian for her apostle and teacher, the Church of England, in the Confession of Faith set forth in 1551 denounced the doctrine of a Real Presence in the strongest terms, as incompatible with Our Lord's Ascension. But in the days of Elizabeth this article was altered; and the strongest passages thereof omitted, with the intent as Burnet tells us, to avoid driving away "the greatest part of the nation" which still continued to hold the old Catholic doctrine. "Therefore"—says the Protestant historian—"it was recommended to the divines to see that there should be no express definition against it; that so it might lie as a speculative opinion, not determined, on which every man was left the freedom of his own mind."—*Vide Hist. of the Variations*, l. x. sect. 5. The consequence of this policy was, as intended, that numbers, whom the violent and unmistakable Protestantism of the earlier "Confession" repelled, were induced to submit themselves to the Church as by Law Established; and to seek quiet within her pale, as a spot wherein the most contradictory opinions might find room to indulge themselves without risk or inconvenience. The fold of the Church of England was intended to be very "Broad."

Of late however, controversies between her own children have so multiplied, and have been waged with so much acrimony, and so much publicity, that it has been no easy matter for her rulers to adhere to the prudential maxims of their predecessors; and so loud and so frequent have been the calls of the hostile combatants for a decision, either on the side or the other, that the poor old lady's ingenuity has been taxed to the uttermost to avoid compliance with the importunate, and most inconvenient clamors of her troublesome children. To decide in favor of either one party or the other, would, as she clearly saw, be fatal to her. Her policy has therefore been to leave all questions "open questions," and if hard pressed for a verdict, to render one that should settle nothing. That "of contraries both may be true"—has been hitherto the one great-fundamental doctrine of the Church of England; for which her dignitaries have, in the true martyr spirit, been ever ready to renounce everything, except their preferences.

It was thus the Gorham controversy was silenced, not settled. The value of the Sacrament of Baptism was declared to be an "open question," upon which the Church of England held no decided opinions; and upon which therefore her ministers were at liberty to believe and teach as they pleased. Presuming upon this liberality, the Rev. Mr. Denison naturally supposed that he also might propound his views upon the only other Sacrament which Anglicanism has retained; and that, at the worst, the same indulgence would be shown to him, as to the deniers of Baptismal Regeneration—the Inspiration of Scripture—the Divinity of Christ—The Vicarious Atonement; all of which doctrines may be, and are, denied, or Protested against with impunity by office-holders in the Church of England as By Law Established.

Herein the reverend gentleman acted imprudently. He forgot to take into account the all important fact that the Church of England is essentially "Protestant;" and that is of the essence of "Protestantism" to "Deny." Any amount of "Denial," or Protestantism, may therefore be sure of toleration, if not of welcome, in the Establishment. Now it was the misfortune of the Rev. Mr. Denison, that, instead of merely "Denying," or protesting against, some fundamental doctrine of Christianity, he distinguished himself amongst his brethren by boldly asserting an article of the Catholic faith, which many of his cotemporaries and predecessors have held, and covertly insinuated. For such an offence it was not probable that there would be much indulgence in a Protestant or "Denying" society.

It was therefore with but little surprise that we perused the report of the finding of Dr. Sumner in the proceedings instituted against Mr. Denison. The charge brought against this gentleman was, as our readers may remember, that he had taught the doctrine of a real objective presence in the Lord's Supper, independent of the subjective apprehensions of the recipient; thus in fact, in so far as he went, preaching rank Catholicity. The fact having been proved against him, Mr. Denison—by the sentence of the Court presided over by Dr. Sumner, and Dr. Lushington—has been commanded to renounce this fragment of the ancient faith of the Christian world by a certain date, under penalty of deprivation and loss of his government situation.

Here then for once the Church of England has deviated from her traditional policy, and has fully committed herself, we do not say to the holding, but—to the denying—of a particular opinion held by a large body within her communion, and certainly by the most respectable, by the most learned, and by the most devout of her clergy. What these men will do—whether they will renounce their, now condemned, opinions, or whether they will conceal them under the vague phraseology in which English churchmen delight; or whether they will openly avow their opinions,