

☞ All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. Wm. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5.

☞ We take this opportunity to express our grateful thanks to our reverend and dear brethren for their zealous endeavours to promote the circulation of our paper among their people. Some, to be sure, have not been so successful as others; but all, we doubt not have done what they could, to keep our *Catholic* afloat, the first, the only English periodical ever edited in the Canadas in defence of our holy religion; nay, the only one ever edited in this country in any language for so necessary a purpose, except that excellent paper in French, the "*Melanges Religieux*," lately published in Montreal. Our outlay however is great, not less in the year than some thousand dollars. Any thing above the sum required will be at our own disposal; and will be exclusively applied towards liquidating the debt contracted in finishing our Church here; in the purchase of two lots; and the erection of our Presbytery upon them, so as to leave our people here, in this important place, in the full and free enjoyment for ever of the conveniences of their religion. We should hope therefore that no true Catholic will begrudge lending what support he can towards so meritorious a purpose. Should it happen otherwise, and that we are left in the lurch, as we have been on a former occasion; what an everlasting reproach it would be to our people in all the Canadas, that they would not support one single weekly periodical, engaged in refuting the calumnies and misrepresentations of the religious Protestant press; and of shewing the purity of our doctrines to the prejudiced and mis-directed multitude. If so, we need not wonder and complain that we are looked upon as monsters by those who for more than three centuries have been taught to consider us as such; or that, as the Apostles say, "the way of truth should be evil spoken of." 2 Pet. ii. 2.

With regard to the nicknames with which British Protestants and Dissenters, and those in the United States descended from them, choose to daub us Catholics all over, were it not just as easy to give us our own distinctive titles, which none in the world could mistake? *Roman*, and *Roman Catholic* is as easily understood as *Romish* and *Romanism*. We do not refuse the title of Roman Catholic. We alone have a right to that title ever since the Saviour was made over by the Jews to the Romans in the person of Pontius Pilate, and, with the Saviour, his religion, which, it was prophesied, would be transferred from them to the Gentiles—(MAL. i. &c.)—of whom Rome was then the capital; destined, after the destruction by the Romans of Jeru-

salem, (capital of the only then people of God) to become the capital of the Saviour's church among the Gentiles. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, before he had reached their city, gives thanks to God, that "their faith was already spoken of in the whole world."—Rom. i. 8.

The circumstance, too, of our chief bishop's residing in Rome, the centre of unity for upwards of eighteen hundred years, gives us an additional claim to the title of Roman. CATHOLIC is an appellation which cannot be denied us by any one knowing its meaning—which is UNIVERSAL. For what church is universal in any sense but the sole Church of Rome? Is it the Church of England? But England is not the universe. Neither is Scotland, that either of their churches should be the universal one. Nor can John Wesley's modern formed synagogue, nor that of any other be in any sense CATHOLIC, or the universal religion of time and place, such as the Church of Rome undeniably is: she, who alone converted all the heathen nations to christianity, and who exists in all places, wherever the name of the Saviour is known. "Go and teach all nations," said the Saviour to her pastors;—and this these alone have done, and will do, to the end of the world.

Again,—POPISH, PAPIST, PAPISTRY, PAPISTICAL—why are these terms used by Protestants in designating us; terms ignored in law, scouted by every classical writer and genteel member of society, and used only by Ligots and fanatics, and the interested, to deceive, for the uncharitable purpose of exciting contempt and hatred for the far greatest, most ancient, and learned body of christians in the world? Did Catholics ever retaliate? No, never.—They invariably give to their dissenting brethren the distinguishing titles which they have chosen to themselves—some indeed very odd and remarkably uncouth ones. These sectarian terms of scorn and reproach on Catholics, do not suit the present age, when the principal nobility of England, the descendants of the barons of Runnymede, who won for us the MAGNA CHARTA, are admitted at last as Peers into the British Parliament.

We intend in our subsequent numbers, to give a plain statement of our several doctrines, or articles of faith; that our opponents may no longer weary themselves to no purpose in beating down the merest phantoms of their own disturbed imaginations, and lest the better informed of the community should set them down as so many spiritual *Quixotes*.

How Protestants do cling to their superannuated, and a thousand times unanswerably refuted accusations against the Catholic church! It is in vain to lay before them from Reason, Scripture, and history, the clearest evidence, the most palpable proofs, of their misunderstanding and mistakes. "They have eyes, and see not; they have ears and hear not; and they will not understand." They continue recklessly to "blaspheme the things which they know not, and of which they are wilfully ignorant."—2 Peter. They are constantly foisting upon the Catholic church

doctrines which she never taught; doctrines which she rejects and abhors. In vain do their pastors and people assure them of this.—In vain do they refer them for indubitable information on the subject to her catechisms and the doctrinal decisions of her general councils. All is to no purpose. They will have us Catholics believe as they say we do. They know our doctrines better than we do ourselves. There is no answer to this; and here we are decidedly wrong in the opinion of the misinformed and prejudiced Protestant public. And no wonder. It is only of late, since the suspension of the penal code, that we have been allowed to declare openly what we do believe; though we believe nothing but what, by the sincere seeker of truth, may be known to be, and to have been all along believed by (excepting the modern sects) the whole Christian world.

As one instance of the misrepresentations of our doctrine, we shall adduce the Protestant outcry against our invocation of the blessed in heaven, and the honours we think proper to pay to these confirmed favorites of God, which Protestants affirm to be derogatory to the supreme mediation of the Saviour, and to the honour above all creatures due to him alone.

Now, to settle that point in the common sense way, do we dishonor the Sovereign by honouring his friends for his sake? Or, from the humble sense of our own distance from Majesty, by requesting them to present our petition to him, whose familiar and perfect confidence they enjoy? "The prayer of the just man [even here on earth] availeth much." Then what must not the prayer of the justified in heaven? When Protestants beg their ministers to pray for them, do they, by so doing, derogate from the mediation of Jesus Christ? How then do Catholics derogate from it by asking the saints in heaven to intercede with God in their behalf? It is rather an homage to God to honour him in his chosen servants; and they who honour them not insult the God who has honored them. But how can they hear us, whom we do not see? Is this a question to be put by a rational believer? How do the blessed in heaven know, and, as the Saviour tells us, rejoice at the conversion of the sinner? Or say, can they possibly rejoice at what they have no knowledge of? Can any one tell what knowledge God is capable of communicating to Angels, and the rational soul of man? And, finally, where in scripture, the Protestant's sole rule of faith, are we prohibited to ask the prayers of the saints? As we said on a former occasion, let our opponents descend to particular points of our doctrines, and refute them by rational arguments, if they can.

With the easy impudence with which a detected thief throws back the charge of theft upon his accuser; so does the Editor of the Toronto Church throw back upon us our just accusations of his abusive style, in speaking of our church and her members. We are to put up, without a complaint, with his ignorant and unproved calumnious assertions, that we Catholics are a set of superstitious, poor benighted idolaters. That our Church is "the mother

of harlots;" (then what is his own church whom he must confess to have sprung from her?) that she is "the scarlet lady," and her chief bishop "the man of sin;" the horned beast; that she is "a sink of corruption," &c. &c. The pages of his insipid, canting, slangish sheet, and wretchedly uninteresting compilations, with which he crams it, do nothing but repeat the same insulting and abusive terms, bestowed upon us without a single proof adduced that we deserve them.—And when we say that this is not fair fighting, that it is using filth for argument, we are represented by the aggressor as being, forsooth, uncivil. We leave the unprejudiced public to judge between us. "We are," says the Editor, "like Martin Luther, in one respect, but in one respect only.—He makes use of foul and abusive language." What! the Father of the glorious Reformation! Yes, indeed, he made use of such foul and abusive language as his children seem ashamed of; and therefore are his works carefully locked up by his followers from the inspection of the public; though, animated by the same savage hatred to the church from which the lewd monk apostatized, they are still as prodigal in their abuse against her as he was.

The wiseacre Editor says, that "he generally agrees with the purport of his communications; but cases may occur in which he does not." Any thing to fill his weekly sheet. The apothecary in vending his medicines, may tell, like him, his customers—"I generally approve of what medicines I sell you, but there are some of which I do not approve." Why then vend such? We vend no such poisonous wares in our Catholic stores.—What we vend is good, sure, and wholesome.

☞ We can assure our neighbor of the GAZETTE, that without any personal bad feeling towards him, we could not but feel indignant at the insultingly abusive article in his Editorial of last week, though we could hardly persuade ourselves it was his own composition. Our maxim, however, always is,—"*Amicus plato; magis amica veritas.*"

From the British Colonist.

SECRET SOCIETIES.

"There was no Band in attendance, and the want of music in the procession was felt. We have understood that the Commanding Officer, to whom application was made for the Band, declined complying with the request; and it has been stated that this was caused by his supposing that Masonic Lodges are comprehended in the General Order issued to the Army, respecting secret political societies excluding persons of a different religious faith. Nothing could be more erroneous; for in Acts of Parliament for the suppression of secret societies, Masonic Lodges are specially excepted. The last document of the kind communicated to the Army, as far as we are aware, was the a ever given by his late Majesty King William IV., to an address of the House of Commons, as follows:

"WILLIAM R.

"I willingly assent to the prayer of my faithful Commons, that I will be pleased to take such steps as may seem to me advisable, for the effectual discouragement of Orangé Lodges, and generally of ALL