

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1852.

We most earnestly request of our Subscribers to remit to us, without delay, the amounts due to this Office.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On the 16th ult., Mr. Keogh, in the House of Commons, called upon Ministers for an explanation of the insolent Proclamation, to which we alluded last week; he called the attention of the House to the facts, that, since 1829, the clauses of the Relief Act prohibiting Catholic ecclesiastics, and members of religious orders, from exercising the rites of the Catholic Church, and wearing their ecclesiastical habits in public, had been allowed, by all administrations—by that of the Duke of Wellington—of Earl Grey—of Lord Melbourne—of Sir Robert Peel—and of Lord John Russell—to remain dormant; and that now, just when the country was on the eve of a general election, her Majesty's government—by way of getting up a little popularity—by way of conciliating the Protestant *canaille*, and making atonement for their shabby, shuffling behaviour on the Maynooth question—had once more presumed to insult a large class of her Majesty's subjects, by reviving against them the unjust and obsolete clauses of the Act of 1829. The hon. member called upon Ministers to answer him two questions—1. Whether it was their intention, with that malignity and sincerity, for which they were so highly praised, to cause their Proclamation to be published in the *Dublin Gazette*, with the view of giving it the same effect in Ireland, as in England? 2. Whether it was their intention to direct the Attorney-General for Ireland, to prosecute Catholic ecclesiastics in that country, for doing that which they have been permitted to do, without observation or punishment, since the year 1829, by every government—or whether the Proclamation was to be considered merely as a set off to the shelving of the Maynooth question?

Mr. Walpole in reply, declined answering Mr. Keogh, as to whether it was the intention of government to publish a similar Proclamation in the *Dublin Gazette*; he indulged in a long rigmarole, cock-and-a-bull story, about some impertinent letter that he, or his under-strappers, had addressed, in May last, to his Lordship the Bishop of Clonfert, upon the occasion of his Lordship, and the Catholic Clergy of the diocese, having walked in procession, and laid the foundation stone of a new church, but of which letter it does not appear that his Lordship condescended to take any notice. Having thus shuffled out of the first difficulty—for Mr. Walpole well knows that the Derby administration does not dare to attempt enforcing their impertinent Proclamation in Ireland, the hon. member addressed himself to the second of Mr. Keogh's questions. To this he replied, not by answering, but by evading it. Mr. Keogh's question was—"Is it the intention of her Majesty's government to direct their Attorney-General for Ireland, to prosecute the Catholic ecclesiastics of that country, for doing that which they have been permitted to do, without molestation from any government, since 1829?" Mr. Walpole's answer was—"that the law had not been dormant"—a statement, so notoriously false, that even the friends and supporters of the present administration must have heard it with surprise. However, from the vagueness of Mr. Walpole's reply, we are left in a state of uncertainty, with respect to the intentions of the Derby government towards Ireland: all we can predict, with any amount of certainty is—that its conduct towards that country will be cruel when it has the power; mean, shuffling and treacherous if resisted, and that Earl Derby will not belie the antecedents of "Scorpion Stanley." In the mean time, this uncalled for outrage upon the feelings of the Catholic population, is exciting great indignation in England and Ireland. The question is still asked, by the Irish Catholic press—"Will the government attempt to enforce their ukase?" The answer is—"Let them try it."

The majority in favor of Mr. Horsman's motion is looked upon, by the Liberal portion of the Protestant press, as a great victory over the Establishment; it is accepted as a final settlement of the important question—"Is the Anglican Church the creature of Parliament, and, as such, amenable to its authority?" That question has now been answered in the affirmative; the House of Commons has asserted its right, to exercise supervision over, to control, and, if need be, to make the needful alterations in the constitutions of its creature; this principle, if carried out, which, doubtless, will be the case, will lead to some important changes in the Articles and Liturgy of the State Church. The Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds are still part of the law of the land, and the Divinity of Christ is yet asserted in the Statute book, much to the annoyance of many sound Protestants, who naturally look upon these dogmas, as rags of Popery. Now, as they only exist as Articles of Faith, in the Protestant establishment—by virtue of an Act of Parliament—it is not at all unlikely, that, encouraged

by the success of Mr. Horsman's motion, the Protestant electors of England will insist that these remnants of ignorance, and Popery, be expunged from the Liturgy and symbols of the Church; that the Protestant hierarchy be brought under the more immediate control of the people; that Bishops, Bishops, and other high ecclesiastical functionaries, be elected by universal suffrage, and that the administration of the sacraments be, for the future, dispensed with. But whatever changes may be made in trifling matters of detail, the great principle has been established, that the House of Commons is supreme over the State Church, and that Protestant Bishops, Priests and Deacons, are to exercise their functions subject to its good will and pleasure. Such is the view of the meaning of the vote on Mr. Horsman's motion, taken by the *Weekly News*, a London Protestant journal—it says:—

"The debate of Tuesday night, on Mr. Bennett and the Bishop of Bath and Wells, was highly gratifying in itself, and in its results. The discussion transcended the limits of the motion upon which it arose, and almost necessarily led to the expression of views upon the present anomalous state of Church matters, which cannot be without a valuable influence on the mind of the country. Mr. Horsman, in his admirable and effective address, having to deal with the oft-repeated fallacy that Parliament can no longer interfere with the affairs of the Church of England, because no longer exclusively composed of members of the Church—conclusively showed that this argument, if good for anything, proved too much; the clear and logical result of such reasoning being neither more nor less than this, that when a nation is so divided in religious opinion as to be necessarily represented by a Legislature, whose religious opinions are also divided, the State establishment of any one form of religion has become a soleism and an absurdity. In fact, the argument, whose force we see no means of escaping, lies in a nut-shell. *Parliament must have supreme control over that Church, which, as we know from history, Parliament alone established.* That is the first position. If the Church rebels at this, and, as a spiritual corporation, would assert her spiritual freedom, well and good. But then she must exist purely and solely as a spiritual corporation, leaving in the hands of the State those revenues which were only settled on her at the Reformation, under condition of her subjecting herself to the supremacy of the temporal power."

The Missionary Records of the Evangelical Sects have been making a great song lately, about the activity of the Missionaries in Jamaica: consequently, it is not at all wonderful, that Lord Derby has been obliged to bring before the notice of Parliament, the wretched condition of that colony. The noble Earl stated to the House of Lords, that he had received a memorial from Jamaica, from Clergymen of all denominations, bearing witness to the demoralisation of the people, and "to the barbarism into which a large proportion of the colored community were rapidly relapsing." And yet, with the results of Protestant missions staring them in the face, people are to be found, simple enough to waste their money on Baptist, and Methodist missions, to the West Indies!

In reply to a question from Mr. Scully, Mr. Napier said that the Rev. Mr. O'Brien, and some other friends of Mr. S. O'Brien, had waited on him, soon after the accession of the present government, and that he (Mr. Napier) had distinctly stated that he could take no part in any official communication to government, on the subject of the Irish exiles; he had neither advised nor drawn up the memorial that had been presented, nor had he, nor had any other member of the government, ever held out hopes that the sentence of those unfortunate gentlemen would be mitigated.

Though the Maynooth question is dropped for the present, the subject will be brought before Parliament during the ensuing session. On the 14th ult., Lord Winchelsea gave notice of his intention to move for a select committee, to enquire into the moral and religious principles inculcated at Maynooth, and whether they be not subversive of Protestant governments.

The insanity of the unfortunate Mr. Feargus O'Connor has been fully established, and he has, in consequence, been discharged from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms, and consigned to the care of his friends and relatives.

The lectures of the Rev. Dr. Newman upon University Education, will have to be suspended for some weeks, in consequence of the presence of the Rev. gentleman being required in London during the approaching trial of Achilli, v. Newman.

Our readers may have heard of an unhappy man named G. Evison, who abandoned the Church some months ago. This week we have the pleasure of announcing the return of the wanderer to the fold of Christ; anxious to make all the reparation in his power for the scandal he has caused, the penitent has addressed the following communication to his Lordship the Bishop of Southwark, which we copy from the *Tablet*:—

"THE RETURN OF THE REV. G. EVISON TO THE CHURCH.
"The following documents, addressed to the Bishop of Southwark, should have preceded those we published last week; they tell their own tale, and show when, and how, Protestants entrap Catholics who are so unfortunate as to desert the paths of rectitude:—

"22, Lambeth-row, 10th May, 1852.

"My Lord,—I have written a statement of facts which I have given to the Rev. J. Collingridge. I leave it to your lordship to adopt whatever course you may think proper to give publicity to them, and remain my Lord, your Lordship's obedient servant,
"GEORGE EVISON.

"The Right Rev. Dr. Grant, &c."

"My Lord,—Having on the 29th of February last performed an act, openly and publicly in the Protestant Church of St. Paul, Bermondsey, by renouncing the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Faith, I deem it my duty to make a statement in order to repair, by every means in my power, the great scandal I have given, so that my unhappy fall may not be a stumbling block to my weaker brethren.

"My Faith has always been what it now is. I never

entertained any doubts of the truths of that religion which I have so long professed. My fall from truth to error was through pride and pecuniary distress. Had I only attended to the wishes of my Ecclesiastical superiors a year ago, what has now happened would never have a place in existence.

"I now retire from the world for a time to weep and repent, exclaiming with holy David—'O God be merciful to me a sinner,' humbly requesting the prayers of all who may read this.

"Again expressing my deep contrition and sorrow, I remain, my Lord, your Lordship's obedient servant,
"GEORGE EVISON.

"In the presence of the undersigned witnesses—
"James Foley, John-street, Commercial-road.
"John Ainsworth, Holy Trinity Church, Dockhead, Bermondsey.
"Joseph King, 3, Mulkin's Corner, Bermondsey-wall.
"John Fitzpatrick, 4, Smith's-place."

We copy from the *Sydney Morning Herald* the following advice to intending emigrants:—

"We have ample employment for many thousands of emigrants, provided they be men who really give a good day's work for a good day's wages. We do not want idlers, neither do we want any more of that swarming class of young gentlemen who can do nothing but sit on a stool and handle a quill; of these we have always more than enough. But persons accustomed to hard work, whether mechanical or rural, and persons having money to invest, whether of large amount or small, will find in New South Wales a finer opening than any other part of the world presents, or than was ever before presented. Let them remember, that for mildness and salubrity, our climate cannot be surpassed; that our soil is capable of producing all that man requires for sustenance, and most of the luxuries which he prizes; and at the time our gold fields were discovered, the population of less than 200,000 souls possessed above 100,000 horses, 1,500,000 horned cattle, and more than 8,000,000 sheep, yielding an annual income of £600,000; and exported of her own produce or manufacture to the extent of £1,100,000 per annum, independently of her gold."

The steamer Canada arrived at Halifax on the 6th inst. The news by telegraph is of no great interest. One paragraph evidently relates to the trial betwixt Achilli and Dr. Newman, but is couched in such extraordinary language as to be perfectly unintelligible. The difficulty between Louis Napoleon, and the *Corps Legislatif* has again assumed a threatening appearance; the members of the latter have refused to sanction the amendment made to the budget by the Council of State, and the funds have, in consequence, met with decline. Generals Changarnier and Lamoriciere have been cashiered.

CONVERSIONS.

We have had forwarded to us, with a request to publish it, a letter written by a priest, of the name of Richard Wall, to the Right Rev. Dr. Foran, Bishop of his diocese, in which the writer assigns his reasons for leaving the Catholic Church, and joining the Lord-knows-what-sect, for the writer does not consider that trifling circumstance worth mentioning—suffice it to say, he has become a Protestant, or Non-Catholic. This letter, dated May 5th, originally appeared in the *Chronicle*, and differs in no way from those miserable apologies for their apostasy and perjury which unchaste priests usually put forth, when their lewd conduct has rendered their longer stay in the Church impossible. Our correspondent, *Veritas*, requests us to make some remarks thereupon; with this request we have no objection to comply, because the remark that we are about to make is applicable to all cases of conversion from Catholicity to Protestantism,—and that remark is, that the reason assigned is a false reason—it is a mere after-thought, put in to please the old women of Exeter Hall.

There is one standing story, ready upon all occasions to explain the circumstance of a priest's conversion; names, dates, and a few trifling accessories, or embellishments, thrown in at the pleasure of the narrator, alone are altered. From the days of Luther to the present, the following is the regular stereotyped version of these conversions: Mr. A—was for many years a priest of the Church of Rome, during which time he led a most irreproachable life; never was he known, upon any occasion, to manifest the least tendency towards putting his neighbor's silver spoons in his pocket; he could not bear to look upon the face of a woman, more especially if she were young and well favored; and he always manifested a strong aversion, both to "hot-with" and "cold-without;" but he had never seen the Bible, and his theological acquirements were confined to a smattering of "Butler's Lives of the Saints, and a more intimate acquaintance with the monkish legends of the Breviary." At last this exemplary priest stumbles upon the Word of God, and is quite surprised, both at what he finds, and what he don't find. He finds that the Pope is Anti-Christ, and the Catholic Church the Scarlet Woman, with a hinder end of such extraordinary dimensions as therewithal to cover seven hills. He does not find the words, Transubstantiation, nor Trinity, nor Incarnation, but feels it strongly "born in" upon his soul, that he should break his oath of continency, and take unto himself a concubine, that he should renounce fasting and abstinence, and, taking pity upon his own bowels, that he should henceforward refrain from mortifying the lusts of the flesh; he, therefore, in the language of Richard Wall, "resolves to remain no longer within the pale, or communion, of such a corrupt Church, to separate from her errors, her impostures and abuses, to come out from the Whore of Babylon, lest he should be a partaker of her fornications and abominations," &c., &c., &c., and to come "unto the bosom of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Protestant Church of Christ, as by Divine, and human law established in these realms." We believe the above is a fair average description of the process by which a Catholic priest turns a Protestant. It is touching, very, and has a strong effect on the nerves of elderly females at Exeter Hall—it has only one defect, and that is, that it is not true.

We will not stop to point out the absurdity of the calumny that is usually insinuated in the narrative of these conversions from Popery,—that to the priests of the Catholic Church the Bible is a sealed book, or at least, one but little known; we will even, for the sake of argument, admit it to be true. But it would not thence follow that the priest's conversion to Protestantism was the effect of the perusal of the Bible—on the contrary, he was a Protestant in principle, before he ever opened the book. Protestantism is the assertion of the principle, that the individual's conscience is the supreme judge of the meaning of the contents of the Bible, and the denial of the absolute authority of the Church to declare with infallible certainty what is the revelation of God to man. Now, no man who does not doubt that the Catholic Church is the sole infallible witness to that revelation—is the sole infallible interpreter of scripture—that is, who "Believes in the Holy Catholic Church, will ever seek elsewhere for a guide or teacher; it is not until he begins to doubt, of the truth of the doctrines taught by the Church, and, consequently, of the absolute authority of the Church as a teacher, that he will begin to search; the doubts, must, logically precede the enquiry; but the moment a man doubts, he has to all intents and purposes ceased to be a Catholic; for a Catholic is one who has faith, but faith and doubt are incompatible. But, if these doubts precede the enquiry, which they must, unless an effect can precede the cause, the enquiry was not the cause of the doubts; and, as it is the *doubting* in the absolute authority and infallible veracity of the Church as a teacher, which constitutes Protestantism, it is clear that the enquiry was not the cause of the individual's Protestantism, which must be traced back to some other cause, antecedent to the enquiry, or searching of the scriptures.

What that cause really is we do not pretend to decide, for we have no right to sit in judgment upon any man's motives; we only know, that the true cause is not the cause assigned. Our Non-Catholic brethren are slow to see, and unwilling to acknowledge this, because they do not understand wherein the essential difference betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism consists. Non-Catholics generally argue as if Catholicity meant a belief in one set of dogmas, and Protestantism a belief in another set of dogmas, and that a man was a Catholic or a Protestant, because he held one, or the other, set. But, in reality, this is a most absurd notion, though a very prevalent one in the Non-Catholic world. A Catholic is one who believes all the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church believes and teaches, because the Church believes and teaches it with infallible certainty, as God's divinely commissioned, and supernaturally assisted, institution; a Protestant is one who does not necessarily believe what the Catholic Church believes and teaches, because he does not recognise in her, a divinely commissioned, and supernaturally assisted, teacher; the latter may, indeed, believe—we do not say that it is a thing likely to happen,—but he may believe a good deal, or even all that the Catholic Church believes and teaches; but so long as he believes it, from any other reason but because the Catholic Church so believes, and so teaches, he does not cease to be essentially a Protestant, and *formally* a heretic; for, it is not so much in what a man believes, as in why he believes, that consists the essential difference betwixt the Catholic and the Non-Catholic. Now, the moment a man takes a book into his hands, with the idea that from the contents of that book, and without the teaching of the Church, he can ascertain the truth, or falsity of the dogmas of Catholicity, or that the teaching of the Church is to be judged of by the contents of that book, as interpreted by the private judgment of the individual, that moment, though the reader should still profess to retain every dogma of Catholicity, he is as much a heretic, and an outcast from the Church, as if he had explicitly denied every article in the creed, from the "*Credo in unum Deum*," down to the "*Vitam venturi seculi*," and that because he has already implicitly asserted the fundamental principle of all heresy—the right of the private judgment of the individual against the authority of the Church. The convert will, perhaps, give out that his change was caused by reading the Bible, that through reading the Bible, from a Catholic he became a Protestant; and his Non-Catholic allies will credit, and repeat the story; it is, nevertheless, false, for before reading one line of the Bible, the convert was already essentially a Protestant, and, therefore, formally a heretic. In fine, he who has admitted the principle, that the truth of the teaching of the Church can be tested by the Bible, or any other book interpreted by the "private judgment" of the individual; or that the Bible can be of any authority against the Church, is, to all intents and purposes, a Protestant, or heretic.

By way of insulting the Catholics of this city—both Clergy and laity—some of our evangelical friends caused to be printed, and posted up, copies of the Royal Proclamation against Catholic ceremonies; they had also the decency to stick them up on the walls of the Seminary, so that the gentlemen of that institution might be reminded, at every moment, of the intolerance and bigotry of the British government. What the object of this conduct, we cannot tell; but if the perpetrators hoped to provoke the Catholics of Montreal to a breach of the peace, they have, we are happy to say, been most signally disappointed. With but one exception, the whole of the Protestant press, beginning with the *Montreal Gazette*, have denounced the authors of this insult, and disclaimed any sympathy with its perpetrators: they have done well; they have confirmed us in the opinion that we have often expressed—that the great majority of our Protestant fellow-citizens desire to live on good terms with their Catholic brethren; and that the insults and calumnies which are so often