



# CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. I.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1851.

NO. 28.

## THE LAW ESTABLISHED CHURCH— THE CATHOLIC HIERARCHY.

(From the Catholic Standard.)

It must, we think, be manifest to the most superficial observer of passing events, that the Church erected and established by Act of Parliament in the Empire, has already reached its culminating point. We do not enter into or attach any importance to any prophecies that may be in existence on this subject, in forming our own opinion respecting the durability of the Protestant Establishment. The testimony of one risen from the dead is not at all requisite, in our opinion, to satisfy any reflecting mind, that the decadence of that institution is at hand. Its origin did not, indeed, afford justification for anticipating even so long a career as it has already run. Springing from impure sources, carrying along with it from the hour it cracked its shell, the seeds of destruction, its existence at the close of three centuries is, in the purview of human judgment, solely attributable to the enormous temporalities attached to it, and the deep interest these temporalities gave to the higher classes in its preservation. The "Reformation" implied two things, the subversion of the Papal power and the plunder of the Church, and the former was adopted and used as the means of facilitating the latter. A foul monarch, to be revenged upon the Holy See for not pandering to his filthy passions, involved his subjects in a fearful schism; and a profligate aristocracy abetted the sovereign, in order to enrich themselves by the spoils of the monastic institutions. Thus did crime generate crime, and schism and spoliation went hand-in-hand, and have from that dark hour even unto the present day, propped one the other. But though the staunchest supporters of the Church "as by law established"—we mean the higher classes—have shown no sympathy of desertion from her banner, there have appeared signs of disunion in the institution itself, which leave little room to doubt the rapid approach of its decline and fall. It is in truth already cracking to its base. The rent in its walls, produced by latitudinarianism in the first instance, has been widened into a chasm by the counteracting agency of the Puseyites; and the Gorham battering-ram has caused a practical breach. The lopping off of one, and that the first of its two remaining sacraments, by the State, aided and abetted by the two Archbishops, has sealed the doom of Anglicanism. It is utterly impossible that any person, whether lay or clerical, who really feels the influence of Christianity, can remain for any considerable length of time, a professed member of a Church which ignores the Sacrament of Baptism, and travesties the Eucharist. There is no longer any sign or symbol of Faith or Grace in the so-called Church of England. The few sincere believers in its Articles are denounced as "nummers," and the great bulk of its nominal disciples are Calvinists, Methodists, and Free-thinkers with no small sprinkling of Pharisees. This fact has been incontestably established during the phrensy of the Anti-Papal agitation. Savage as the outcry against the Pope has been, more bitter still have been the animadversions on the most eminent members of the Anglican Prelacy. Who have received heavier blows than the lordly incumbent of London House? who has been more contumeliously treated in his own city and by his own clergy, than the slippery Bishop of Oxford? And richly have both these unprincipled charlatans deserved all that they have received in the form of popular rebuke. In the annals of no other Church can there be found more shameless instances of disgusting tergiversation than has been barefacedly displayed by these two Bishops. Their renegade tractarianism, the Methodism of the Sumners—highest in the Church—the Socinian theories of Whateley, the Sabellian opinions of Hampden, the anythingarianism of York and Durham, the liberality of Thirlwall, honest alike in his religious and political opinions, the unbending firmness of Exeter in upholding his High Church theories, the furious diatribes of the Ashley tribe against the clergy in general whom that Generalissimo of the canting forces amid the applauding yells of his followers, holds up to scorn and reprobation as the authors of all mischief, and the avowed resolve of the State, represented by the Queen's Cabinet, to reduce the ecclesiastical partner in the firm to absolute subjection and abject dependency; all these things render it, we think, impossible to doubt that the days of the Law Church are numbered. And so the Bishops and Parsons and Laity of that Church feel. And hence the fury of their indignation against what has been so preposterously termed the "Papal Aggression." Twenty, nay, ten years ago they would have treated with lofty scorn the Papal Brief, and ridiculed, if they condescended at all to notice, the restoration of our Hierarchy. Serenely reposing in their exalted position, defying all outward assaults upon their fancied impregnable citadel, these very parties who are now so panic-stricken, would have then scouted the idea of

danger from a foe armed for the attack with only spiritual weapons. *Sed tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis.* Divided, broken to pieces, disorganised within, hating, fearing, vituperating each other; this once mighty host now quails before a Cardinal's hat, and Anglicanism, in its craven apprehensions, howls for the Shield of penal laws against the deadly perils of a Papal Rescript.

If you point out to them the inconsistency of their conduct, the absurdity of their clamor, the uncharitableness of their proceedings, the disgraceful cowardice of their appeal to the State for succor against ecclesiastical rivals, who are destitute of every attribute of temporal authority, who possess no one peculiar privilege or immunity, and whose whole influence rests in the consciences of those only who, of their own free-will, submit to their spiritual jurisdiction, they reply with most lugubrious face and tone, "Has not the Pope ignored us?" As if they had not hitherto made it their glory to "ignore" the Pope and his authority? Have they not all sworn on the Evangelists that the Pope neither has, nor ought to have any temporal or spiritual power or authority whatsoever within this realm? That oath, 'tis true, was a flat perjury, for, in their hearts they knew that the Pope had and has spiritual authority, which he has never for a day, from the introduction of Christianity into these islands ceased to exercise in those United Kingdoms. But let that pass—sworn it has been by every University educated man in England that the Pope has no such nor any sort of power in this realm. What does it concern them, then, whether the Pope "ignores" their Church or not? Do they admit His Holiness to be the visible head of the Universal Church? If so, we can comprehend their chagrin at the appointment by the Pope, in the absence of Deans, Chapters, and parish Priests, of Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of dioceses, in lieu of Vicars Apostolic in districts in this country. But if they admit this, while vindicating themselves from the imputation of intense absurdity, they will have admitted that they are schismatics and false-swearers. To deny the Pope's supremacy—to repudiate with a solemn oath, his pretension to any, even spiritual power or authority in this kingdom, and yet to cry out that his Holiness has "ignored" them as an ecclesiastical body, and to make this "ignoring" the plea for a revival of penal laws against the Catholics—forming, as they undeniably do, one-third at least of her Majesty's native subjects—is, all rational, sober-minded, dispassionate men must allow, one of the grossest absurdities that can be imagined. Such incongruity springs from conscious weakness alone. A Pope not only ignored, but excommunicated Elizabeth; she reciprocated the anathema, and her eulogists contend that she sanctioned the penal laws against Catholicity, not to indulge a spirit of religious persecution, but to retaliate upon the Court of Rome for declaring the British throne vacant. No such pretext for religious intolerance exists now. Mary Stuart and her unfortunate descendants are all gathered to the tomb of the Capulets; and if England, under God's providence were to become Catholic to-morrow, our gracious Queen and her descendants would remain in undisturbed and secure possession of that sceptre she wields so gently, and that throne she adorns by her public and private virtues.

There has appeared a further evidence of the internal disorganisation and panic that prevails in the broken ranks of the Law Church. At the period of the Legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland, it was enacted, that the Churches of England and Ireland, as then by law established, should be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called "the united Church of England and Ireland." This designation the Bishops and Clergy have for fifty years invariably used on both sides of the Channel. One, only exception, has there been to this rule. When the English prelates addressed the throne, on a late occasion, in reference to the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy, they, for the first time, repealed the union, and severed the connexion between themselves and their Irish brethren. The document in question was entitled, it will be remembered, "An humble address of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England;" and commenced with the following significant words: "We, the Archbishops and undersigned Bishops (Exeter and St. David's having declined,) of the Church of England." There could be no misapprehending the pregnant meaning, the deliberate purpose of this unwonted phraseology. The legal definition of the Established church was there *designedly* departed from; the connexion between the English and the Irish branches of the institution was ruthlessly severed; the ligature that bound the ecclesiastical Siamese was boldly cut by the Archbishops of Canterbury, and the existence of such Archbishops of the Church of England, as they of Armagh and Dublin was deliberately "ignored." Small wonder, certainly, that the ignored

Irish Prelates should wax indignant at such unhand-some treatment. Only think of the plebeian Sumner disclaiming all knowledge of, and spurning all manner of connexion with Lord John George de la Poer Beresford, by favor of Lord Liverpool, and through the influence of Orange ascendancy, Lord Archbishop of Armagh. It was not to be supposed, that the ignorant brethren would patiently submit to this insolent repudiation. Neither have they done so. Their remonstrance to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his Grace's reply, will be found in our present impression. *The law is clearly with them; prudence as clearly rests with the English Bishops.* There is not, unquestionably, such a thing known to the new law, as the "Church of England;" so that the Episcopal address to the Queen, was an undoubted illegality; yet it is manifest from Archbishop Sumner's characteristic reply, to him of Armagh, that the description was deliberately adopted. "It did not," says his Grace of Canterbury, "appear to any of the Bishops whom I had an opportunity of consulting, that we could *properly* (mark that) invite the Irish Bishops to complain of an aggression which only affected the Church in England." The church in England! is it not one church by act of Parliament, 39 and 40, George III., c. 27? The Irish Bishops quote the law, chapter and verse, and Slylock like, they stick to the terms of the bond. Aye, but the English Bishops, like men of common sense, decline to encumber themselves with destructive "alien" lumber, in their campaign against Catholicity; and the Irish Protestants now feel the force of Lord Lyndhurst's celebrated ban. Yet, most unfair would it be for us, to blame the English Bishops for displaying mere common sense in this matter. When a ship is tempest-tossed at sea, when every billow threatens to submerge the foundering vessel, when her rigging is tattered to shreds, her helm torn away, and her timbers creak as if the next wave would split her in pieces, a fierce mutiny raging meantime among the crew, he would be a sorry master indeed, who kept on board a large quantity of *sinking* lumber. To cut away the masts in such emergency, is often the only chance of riding through the hurricane. The Archbishop of Canterbury and his co-addressers, have done no more. The instinct of self-preservation has obliged them (according to the remonstrance of the Irish Bishops, the task was not a painful one) to fling the heavy and dead weight of the Irish Establishment overboard. And that establishment can condemn them for their rational deeds? On this earth there never was so foul an outrage upon all propriety, as the Irish Law Church. To that Church has been sacrificed, for centuries, the happiness of a people,—the prosperity of a nation,—the peace and strength of an Empire. It has produced more demoralisation, it has caused more unsocial sympathies, it has nurtured more foul passions,—it has generated more lawless outrage,—it has kept alive more pernicious prejudices,—it has prevented more good, than any other institution, of any sort, that ever was founded in any country, or in any age. From the first dawn of its existence, to the present moment, it has been a nuisance in Ireland, and a curse to the United Kingdom. In truth, it has been the first, the middle, and the last cause of all the disunion and strife that has led to the deplorable state of things which all parties now lament. Every rebellion, every insurrection that has purpled the soil with the blood of its people, and their oppressors, for three centuries, has issued from that well-spring of mischief. Pampered by the iniquitous plunder of a people, who repudiated its ministrations, and rejected its doctrines, wallowing in wealth heaped upon idleness, active only in fomenting discord, insolent, overbearing; the perpetual foe of every liberal, or enlightened proposition for the amelioration of the condition of the people, upon the produce of whose toil it fattened, the persistent antagonist of any, the slightest relaxation of the penal code, the constant, bitter reviler of the large population, which surrounded its own miserable minority, and of the cherished priests of that population, it has necessarily become odious in the eyes of all reasonable persons, who prefer imperial to factious interests; and to link their own fate indissolubly, with such an abomination, would have evidenced excessive imprudence, to say the least, on the part of an establishment which is admitted to be, for the present at all events, the Church of the majority.

## THE ANTI-CATHOLIC AGITATION.

(From the London Morning Chronicle.)

The reaction which has long been evidenced to careful observers against the intolerant agitation which lately disseminated itself through the country, has been publicly exemplified in the petition adopted by the Town Council of Leeds, against any "interference with the rights and liberties of the Roman Catholics of England." In the greatest heat of the controversy, we have neither expressed nor felt any

fear of the ultimate prevalence of the persecuting spirit which found a vent in noisy and practical denunciations. Almost alone among our contemporaries, we have remonstrated with the agitators, not merely because their clamor was a display of bigotry, but chiefly because it was empty nonsense. The objects to be attained by it were unreal rather than mischievous, though the collateral effects of a sectarian disturbance may be deeply injurious to the country. That common sense would resume its sway, as the tendencies of the movement manifested themselves more clearly, we never for a moment doubted. The most important of the bodies which originally took a part in the agitation are already prudently withdrawing. The friends of the Establishment have no desire to see Lord Ashley's "enemies"—consisting of a large portion of the clergy and laity of the Church—excommunicated by a philanthropist, metamorphosed into a divine, and driven to worship, as a dissenting community, by some metaphorical "river side." Observing that every new assembly which meets to denounce the Pope exceeds preceding meetings in its zeal against all the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Church of England, the great body of the Anglican community has discovered in time that the Popedom of Lord John Russell and Lord Ashley may be more intolerant and burdensome than that of the distant Italian pretender, who has failed, during three centuries in re-establishing the domination which it has lately suited the purpose of politicians to revive as a party bug-bear.

At the same time the friends of "civil and religious liberty" are beginning to discover that they have been duped. In proportion to the temporary success of the appeal to their prejudices, is their resentment at the discovery of the play upon their weaker points. The Minister circulated cant phrases of "superstitious nummeries," "precipices," and "chains for body and soul;" and at this moment his unwelcome initiators are directing feeble invectives and feebler scoffs, against the peculiarities and even the paraphernalia of Romanism. It was an ingenious device to address to a free, liberal, and Protestant people, an appeal exclusively directed to their Protestant feelings, with the miserable object of compromising their principles of freedom and toleration. But now that Protestantism has asserted itself to satisfaction and to satiety, old doctrines of political liberality and justice begin to resume their sway. It is felt that we have sufficiently announced our theological disapprobation of Romanist doctrines. The equally respectable proposition, that English politics have nothing to do with theological differences, begins to make itself heard, as the clamor though straining to make itself louder, becomes more coherent and inarticulate. The Town Council of Leeds consists in all probability, of steady and zealous Protestants; but the members of that body have had practical experience of the advantage arising to the Establishment from an attachment to the peculiar characteristics of the Church of England, as well as to its common character of Protestantism. They have also watched the errors into which sectarian excitement has hurried a large portion of the population; and highly to their honor, they have given one of the first examples of a popular body capable of resisting and discouraging a recently prevailing popular fallacy. The turn of the tide is as clearly indicated by the Leeds Corporation petition as it was by the first acquittal directed by Scroggs, when the Popish plot was going out of fashion.

While popular enthusiasm is dying away, the condition of the Minister who roused it, in the hope of diverting public attention from practical and political objects, is, in many respects, deserving of compassion. The No-Popery enthusiasts, who welcomed his adhesion, are already suspicious of a betrayal, which he must necessarily perpetrate sooner or later. Some of the organs of the agitation already denounce him as a traitor, while others, not less unkindly, invite him to justify their confidence by the dismissal of Lord Grey and Lord Clarendon, and as we would suggest, of Lord Lansdowne, Sir Charles Wood, and Lord Carlisle. It is by no means clear that Lord Palmerston would consent to remain for the purpose of sharing with his colleague the honors justly due to the enthusiastic champion of Protestantism. But, in fact, so lamentable a disruption is no degree to be feared at present. If Lord John Russell hates "superstitious nummeries" much, he abhors the Opposition benches more; nor will the colleagues whose flag he has borne so long, be willing to push him to extremities. He will hardly persist in "directing the law officers of the Crown to examine the state of the law," for fear he might discover more than is convenient: Sir Edward Sugden has already furnished him with the information that he may commence a prosecution if he dare. Nor will the Premier be able to force down the throats of his party any measure which will be really effectual. He may enact laws against the