

I attribute, in a great measure, within the last few years, the increase of crime, and particularly that of murder, in this country."—pp. 32, 33.

It will be seen from the above extracts, that neither Dr. Nelson, nor the Catholic Chaplain of the Penitentiary, object to education, or undervalue its efficacy. What they protest against is, the giving to the convict such an education, as shall make his situation an object of envy to others; in other words, they protest against placing a premium upon crime, by making the condition of the convicted criminal better than it would have been, had he remained an honest man, and better than that of thousands of others, who prefer gaining their livelihood, by the sweat of their brow, to picking and stealing.

Mr. Dickson dissents from the views of his colleagues, because:

"It is true that such sentiments were entertained very generally one or two centuries ago, and it is possible that even at the present day some good and religious men have held to similar notions; but it is equally true that the majority of intelligent men"—in which category Mr. Dickson places himself—"have long since abandoned such sentiments, and that they are totally repugnant to the feelings of all enlightened men of all classes in Canada."—p. 14.

"If these statements of the Roman Catholic Chaplain are correct, the whole system of instruction in the Provincial Penitentiary, even the limited education given to convicts ought to be swept away. But so far from the instruction here given being an inducement to commit new crimes, it is a strong proof to the contrary, that of the fourteen re-commitments during the year, there was not one well instructed and intelligent convict returned."—p. 15.

This is no answer to the objection of the Catholic Chaplain against turning a Penitentiary into an Academy. The reverend gentleman does not say that education is the cause of, or an inducement to commit, crime; but—that there is danger to society if the opinion should go abroad that the convict in the Penitentiary, besides being—as he already is—better fed, lodged, clothed and tended—than many an industrious and honest laborer—should also be furnished, at the expense of the State, with means of acquiring knowledge, greater than are enjoyed by those who have not offended against society. This fear is by no means groundless, as the statistics of prison discipline in England abundantly show; where the effect of enforcing the system advocated by Mr. Dickson, was manifested by an immense increase in the number of crimes, and consequent commitments. Destitute parents, anxious to get the benefit of the jail education for their children, would swear against them falsely for the mere sake of getting them committed. The magistrates—knowing the object of the parents—and that the charges were false, would dismiss the case; the mother, or father, would retire with the child, but the latter would next day re-appear before the Court, duly qualified, this time, for admission into the government Academy. So glaring did this abuse become, that the attention of government was directed to it, and a change in the system of prison discipline was introduced.

The question, as between the two Inspectors, is not without difficulties, and can be solved only by ascertaining, what is the primary object of all human punishments—and what authority man has, under any circumstances, to inflict them. If the moral reformation of the individual culprit be that primary object, then certainly Mr. Dickson is right; but if, on the contrary, that primary object, be the prevention of crime, we would decidedly side with Dr. Nelson, and the Rev. A. McDonnell. According to the first theory, a prison is a moral hospital, to which the morally diseased are sent to be cured of their complaints; according to the other, it is a place of punishment, in which such amount of pain should be inflicted on the criminal as shall suffice, by the suffering it entails and the terror it creates, to deter not only him, but others, from offending in like manner; and the reformation of the peccant individual is a matter of importance certainly, though still of but secondary importance. It is only by adopting the latter hypothesis that capital punishment can in any case be justified; for of all ways of reforming a man, or making him a good citizen, we should say that hanging him by the neck till he is dead was the worst. Nor do we see how the advocates of the former can maintain their position except by insisting upon the paternal theory of government; and by assuming that the duties of the State towards its subjects are analogous to those of a father towards his child, whom he chastises, not so much for the sake of an example to others, as with the view of correcting him, or setting him right, and training him up to become a good member of society.

If then the primary object of human punishments be the prevention of crime, and the reformation or correction of the peccant individual, only a secondary consideration for the statesman, it follows that in all systems of prison discipline the reformatory process should be subordinate to the penal; and that punishment rather than instruction should be the object of that discipline. It is therefore, not without good reason, that Dr. Nelson objects to the introduction of a system which, has the tendency to exchange the prison yard for the school room, and to substitute for the hard, unremitting labor which should be the convict's lot, the lighter and comparatively speaking, enviable occupations of the student. Convicts are sent to the Penitentiary, according to Dr. Nelson's theory, to be punished; if to this punishment, the moral reformation of the convict can be added—well and good—reforma him by all means; but, first of all punish him; and above all, do not so treat him as that, either he, or others, shall ever have cause to fancy, that a member of society can ameliorate his condition by a deviation from the paths of rectitude. The condition of the convict should always be worse, in this world at least, than it would have been had he not sinned; any other mode of treating criminals, is but putting a premium upon crime.

"A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

In our last we endeavored to show, in as far as our limits would permit, what were the claims of the Bishops of Rome during the first five centuries of the Christian era; and how their pretensions to Supremacy, or a special jurisdiction, over the whole Christian Church were treated by their contemporaries. It remains now to examine some of the objections which Protestants generally urge against, the Supremacy of Peter, and the transmission of that Supremacy through the Bishops of Rome, as his successors. In so doing, it must be borne in mind that we are not attempting to establish the lawfulness of the claims of the Bishops of Rome; it is sufficient for our purpose, if we can show that, the objections urged by Mr. Jenkins are not irreconcilable with the thesis—that St. Peter was, by our Lord, constituted Prince of the Apostles, and that this office, with its necessary privileges, and duties—has been transmitted, even to this time, and for ever, through the Bishops of Rome, as successors of St. Peter.

The first objection urged as fatal to the theory of the Supremacy of Peter is, by Mr. Jenkins, based on the assumption that, at "the first Christian Council that ever assembled"—the Council of Jerusalem mentioned in Acts xv.—"though Peter was present, and addressed its members you do not find, either in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any authenticated copy of the Fathers, even the shadow of an intimation that he assumed authority over the other Apostles. So far from this, we learn that James pronounced the decretory sentence,"—p. 56. Let us turn to the brief record of the transactions of this first Christian Council, as contained in the Acts of the Apostles.

The attempt of certain Judaizing Christians to enforce the Mosaic ritual upon converts from the Gentiles, had caused much trouble in the Church, which the exhortations of St. Paul, and Barnabas, were insufficient to allay; it was, therefore, agreed that they should go up to Jerusalem, and consult with the other Apostles upon the matter in dispute. In the assembly that was held, there was much diversity of opinion; we read—"And there was much disputing"—vii. v. Then "Peter, rising up," pronounced his opinion, as to what should be done—reminding his hearers "that God had made choice among them, that the Gentiles by his mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe"—vii. v.; and warning them, that, to put the yoke of the Mosaic ritual upon the necks of the Gentile converts, would be a tempting of God—x. v. Thus spoke Peter, in the midst of the assembly, amongst whom, up to that moment, there had been so much disputing; and what was the result? In the simple words of our text—"All the multitude held their peace"—xii. v. Peter had spoken; the cause was finished; the voice of discord, was hushed; and, as at the bidding of His Lord, the winds ceased, the raging of the waves was rebuked, and there was a great calm, so, at the voice of Peter—"All the multitude," but lately so contentious, "held their peace." If, after St. Peter, others rise to speak, it is but to express their agreement with him, and to suggest measures for carrying into execution the principles laid down by the Prince of the Apostles. The judgment of St. James is but the echo of St. Peter's—an address in answer to the speech from the Cathedra Petri. To St. James, as Bishop of Jerusalem, the city in which the Council was held, was committed the charge of drawing up the decree arranging the details, by which effect should be given to the principles enunciated by Peter, and unanimously adopted by the assembly; but to Peter it belonged, first of all, whilst yet "there was much disputing," to lay down the rule for the guidance of his perplexed colleagues, and thus to fulfil his Lord's behest—"Confirm thy brethren"—St. Luke xxii., 32.

So far then from seeing in the conduct of St. Peter, and in that of the assembled Fathers at Jerusalem, any thing irreconcilable with the theory of the Supremacy of the former, we find therein the strongest proofs, both of the assertion of that Supremacy, and of its cheerful recognition by all the other Apostles. In this view of the case also do the early Fathers of the Church agree. Tertullian sees in it the exercise of the binding and loosing power conferred upon St. Peter—"The decrees of Peter loosed such things of the law as were set aside; and bound fast such as were retained"—*De pulcritia*. St. Jerome speaks of Peter, as the author of the decree—"principem hujus fuisse decreti"—*Ep.* 45; and, writing to St. Leo, adduces the conduct of the "great Peter," and the deference shown to him by St. Paul, as a reason why "we who are abject and weak should have recourse to the Apostolic See, to receive therefrom remedies for the wounds of the churches."—*Ep ad Leon.* Whilst in the condescension of Peter, in allowing the discussion to proceed, before interposing his authority, St. Chrysostom admires the wisdom, and charity, of the Prince of the Apostles, whom the Master had placed over his household.

In the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, Mr. Jenkins finds another objection to the Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome—the style is too mild and conciliatory; the language is more that of an affectionate father exhorting his children to peace, than that of an imperious master imposing silence. The writer assumes no air of authority over those to whom he writes:—

"In this epistle he expostulates with them"—the Corinthians—"on their having deposed their ministers, and having permitted contentions amongst themselves. It will be observed that Clement here affects no superiority over the Corinthian Church, but addresses it as having equality with the Church at Rome."—p. 59.

It is true that in his Epistle to the turbulent Corin-

For these quotations we are indebted to Archbishop Keble's treatise on the "Primacy" before mentioned, in which the whole question is completely exhausted. We have not the presumption to suppose that we can say any thing new, or throw any fresh light, upon the subject; we would therefore recommend our readers to the Archbishop's work itself for ampler details.

thians, St. Clement employs persuasion, rather than threats; and, in the true spirit of Christian charity, relies upon admonitions, rather than upon any assertion of authority, as the means of allaying the angry disputes which, at that time, furiously raged in Corinth. But, so far from there being in this anything to shake our faith in Papal Supremacy, we find, in the simple facts—that St. Clement took it upon himself to address the Corinthians at all, upon the internal affairs of their Church—and that he expostulated with them thereupon—the amplest corroboration of our thesis that, in the first century, it was the opinion of the Church, that, to the Bishops of Rome, in virtue of their office, as successors of St. Peter, belonged of right, supreme jurisdiction over all the churches. For, the Apostle St. John was still living at the time when St. Clement wrote; Ephesus was as easy of access to the Corinthians, as Rome; nor would the Corinthians have allowed the Bishop of a distant Sea to interfere at all in their disputes, if they had not believed that he had the right to do so; especially when they might have had recourse to the instructions of one of the Apostles. Why then did St. Clement, rather than St. John, undertake the task of expostulating with the Corinthians? Not because of any superior personal dignity, or privileges, belonging to the former; nor because, through age, or infirmities, the latter was no longer capable of laboring in his Master's vineyard; but because he, St. Clement, sat in Peter's Chair. That in the life time of St. John, St. Clement presumed to expostulate with the Corinthians, is conceivable only upon the hypothesis, that the latter asserted, and that the former recognised, the right of the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, to exercise supreme jurisdiction over all the churches. The high value that the Corinthians set upon this Epistle of St. Clement, may be learned from Eusebius, who tells us that it was long read in their religious assemblies with the other Scriptures; and from this we may infer that it was written with authority, although combining the *suaviter in modo*, with the *fortiter in re*.

The conduct of Victor towards the churches in Asia, and the language of St. Irenæus upon that occasion, upon which Mr. Jenkins founds another objection against Papal Supremacy, afford, if fairly examined, but additional proof of the claims of Rome, and of the recognition of those claims by the universal Church, in the second century.

Victor, Bishop of Rome, had threatened Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, with excommunication, on account of his refusal to adhere to the Easter regulations adopted by the West. St. Irenæus wrote to Victor, deprecating such rigorous proceedings upon what to the writer, appeared, an inadequate cause; but neither Polycrates, nor St. Irenæus, contested the right, or authority, of the Bishop of Rome, to excommunicate the refractory Asiatics, as most assuredly they would have done, had Victor arrogated to himself a jurisdiction which they did not believe him to possess. On the contrary,—St. Irenæus contented himself with merely deprecating recourse to such an extreme measure as excommunication, for, what to him appeared, a mere matter of discipline, unconnected with faith, or doctrine. From the fragments of his letter, given by Eusebius, it would appear that St. Irenæus appealed to the different line of conduct pursued towards St. Polycarp, by Anicetus, who not only allowed the Asiatic churches to retain their old customs, but, as a token of his esteem for St. Polycarp, permitted his illustrious visitor to preside at the celebration of the sacred mysteries. All that we can gather from this is, that, in the time of Anicetus, the same reasons for enforcing uniformity of discipline, did not exist, as, a few years later, compelled Victor to exercise his supreme authority. So long as the question was one wholly external, relating merely to days and seasons, there was no stringent necessity for insisting upon a mere outward uniformity. But, in process of time, and in the days of Victor, the Easter question had assumed a doctrinal importance, which it did not possess in those of his predecessor. The Quarto-decimans, at the latter period, were Judaizers, who insisted upon the perpetual obligation of the old Paschal ceremonial law; and it was because of this alleged perpetual obligation that they insisted upon retaining the practice of celebrating the Christian Easter festival upon the same day as that on which the Jews sacrificed the Pass-over. Victor therefore had reasons, which Anicetus had not, and which St. Irenæus did not appreciate, for, adopting rigorous measures against the Asiatics, who, under the pretence of adhering to an old custom, were preparing the way for the introduction of new doctrines. Whilst therefore, in Anicetus, we admire the condescension and charity of the Shepherd to whom was committed the charge of "feeding Christ's lambs"—and in Victor, the wisdom and foresight required of the pilot to whose hands is entrusted the helm of the vessel of the Church—in the conduct of neither do we see anything irreconcilable with our theory that, in the second century, as in the first, the Bishop of Rome claimed, and rightfully exercised, supreme jurisdiction over, the Church of Christ. In the first century, and during the life time of an Apostle, we find a Bishop of Rome writing from the Chair of Peter to the litigious Corinthians: in the second, we see a disciple of St. John undertaking a long and laborious journey to Rome to take counsel with another occupant of the same Chair; and again, towards the close of the same century, we hear the voice of the Supreme Pontiff menacing with excommunication the refractory churches of Asia. And what is of equal importance to our argument, we do not find, either that St. John rebuked St. Clement for his officiousness, or that the Bishops of Asia ever impugned the legality of the sentence with which they were threatened. From these facts, we again come to the conclusion, that, in the early ages of Christianity, the Supremacy of the Bishops

of Rome, as successors of St. Peter, was constantly asserted, and generally recognised, and that Protestantism, which protests against this Supremacy, is not the "Old Religion."

And here we must conclude our remarks upon Mr. Jenkins' lecture upon "The One Head of the Catholic Church." We have noticed the most prominent of his objections against Papal Supremacy; and though we have not the presumption to suppose that, upon such a worn-out subject, we can say any thing new, or brilliant, we hope that we have said enough to induce our readers—to pause, ere they assent to the claims put forward by Mr. Jenkins in favor of the high antiquity of Protestantism—and to consult the authors in whose pages the question is more ably discussed, and to whom we would refer the reader for information upon this most important question.—We propose, next week, noticing some of Mr. Jenkins' subsequent lectures on the peculiar doctrines of Catholicity, and continuing our contrast between modern Protestantism, as defined in these lectures, and old Christianity. In concluding this part of our subject, we would address Mr. Jenkins in the words of St. Augustine to the Donatists, whom, because of their separation from the Church of Rome—the See of Peter—he declares to be cut off from the true Church, and thus exhorts to return to the centre of unity:—

"Venite fratres, si vultis, ut inseramini in vite
Dolor est enim vos videmus propositos in iudicio
Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede
Et in ordine illo Patrum quis cui successit videtur
Ipsi est petrus, quam non evincunt superbia inferiorum porta."
—St. Aug. in Ps. Con. Part. Don.

His Lordship the Bishop of Cleveland, will preach in St. Patrick's Church, on Sunday next, immediately after Vespers. His Lordship's object is to make an appeal to the Catholic charity of his Irish hearers, in favor of the Catholic orphans of his diocese, who, alas! from the want of a fitting asylum, too often fall a prey to the arts of the proselytiser. We trust that in spite of the many claims upon the means of our people, this appeal may not be made in vain.

We are happy to have it in our power to announce the determination of the Corporation of Quebec to make good the injuries inflicted on Chalmers' church, during the Gavazzi riots. This is but an act of justice towards the trustees, and contrasts pleasantly with the conduct of the Protestant Legislature of Massachusetts, which has constantly refused compensation to Catholics for the wanton destruction of the Ursuline Convent, by a Protestant mob, and, as there is too much reason to believe, at the instigation of Protestant ministers.

On Sunday last, the new Church on the Coteau St. Pierre, was consecrated to the worship of Almighty God, by the Bishop of Cleveland, assisted by a numerous body of clergy. A liberal collection in aid of the funds of the building was taken up on the occasion. The Church of St. Anne, destined for the use of the Irish Catholics of Griffintown, is rapidly advancing towards completion.

We see by the Quebec papers that the printing-office of the *Protestant Times* has been seriously injured by fire, said to be the work of an incendiary. The Insurance Companies are interested in probing this matter to the bottom.

Acknowledgments in our next.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Toronto, September 20, 1853.

DEAR SIR—I transmit you the enclosed list of the newly elected Officers of the Toronto Catholic Institute, with the request that you will give it publicity in the columns of the only Catholic Journal published in Canada, in the English language. The Institute is now after passing over two years of existence, and I may say without some profit (with the co-operation of the sister Institutes) to the Catholics of Upper Canada. The Institutes are the first organization the Catholics of this section of the province have ever adopted for social and civil purposes; and it is now admitted, beyond doubt, that this organization is suitable and wise. So far, something has been accomplished; and by a more vigorous action a vast deal more may be accomplished in the future. They have not yet originated anything; but they ought to, and may, originate a literary spirit among our young men, which is, indeed, very desirable.

Catholics, as a body, have not by any means an influence in Upper Canada equal to their number and importance; I mean, chiefly, Legislative influence. They have not a single man on the floor of the Legislature to speak their sentiments. This is a great evil, and one discreditable to the energy of Upper Canada Catholics. It may be redressed by an earnest support given to the Institutes; in fact, the Institute organization fills what was a vacant niche in society; but to prove itself equal to its assumed position, it must receive the hearty and active support of all good Catholics.

Neither is the present moment a time for Catholics to slumber. The settlement of a vast ecclesiastical property question is agitating the country, and about it bigots are brawling. How are Catholics to arrive at a just conclusion on this question, but by analysing it in the Institutes? I may here mention that the Toronto Institute has this question under discussion; and I have no doubt but the result will be both wise and unanimous.

To give you an idea of the spirit that pervades the newly elected officers, for 1853-54, and what may be expected of them, I will mention that, at their first meeting, a few evenings since, not one of their number was absent.—Yours, &c., W. H.

List of Officers of the Toronto Catholic Institute, elected for 1853-4:—

President—T. J. O'Neill, Esq.; Vice-President—D. R. Feehan, Esq.; 2nd Vice-President—Thomas Barry, Esq.; Correspondent Secretary—Thomas Hayes, Esq.; Recording Secretary—James Mallon, Esq.; Treasurer—Honorable John Elmsley.

Committee of Management—Charles Robertson, Esq.; S. Lynn, Esq.; James Halliwell, Esq.; James Tracey, Alexander McCarty, John McGee, Patrick Doyle, Patrick Mullin, Wm. Mitchell, Francis Sullivan, Peter J. O'Neill, and James McCurry.

Birth.

In this city, on the 19th instant, Mrs. D. Laigan, Notre Dame Street, of a son.

Married.

At Shipton, on the 19th inst., by the Rev. L. Trahan, A. Donnelly, Esq., to Miss Bridget Mulvena, daughter of John Mulvena, Esq., of Danville.