

was consecrated Oct. 23, 1831. No remonstrance was made, no outcry raised, at this exercise of Papal power.

But to return to our colonies. It had come to pass, that with the exception of India, hardly a Vicar-Apostolic was left in our foreign possessions. Far am I from blaming the sound policy of successive administrations, which had seen the practical inconveniences of a half-tolerance, and semi-recognition, where friendly official intercourse and co-operation was necessary. But I may ask, is it anything unreasonable, extravagant, still more, "insolent and insidious," in the Catholics of England, to have sought and obtained what insignificant dependencies had received? Many of the Bishops of the new dioceses had scarcely a dozen Priests, and but scattered flocks, generally poor emigrants. And could it be supposed, that they intended to remain for ever in a temporary or provisional state, when they possessed not only stately churches, eight or ten great and generally beautiful colleges, and many extensive charitable institutions, but nearly six hundred public churches or chapels, and eight hundred Clergy; and when they reckoned in their body some of the most illustrious and most distinguished men of the country? But, moreover, the increase of Bishops, from four to eight, was already found to be insufficient, and it was become expedient to increase it to twelve or thirteen. Now, an Episcopate of thirteen Vicars-Apostolic, without, of course, a Metropolitan, would have been an anomaly, an irregularity, without parallel in the Church. Was it, then, something so unnatural and monstrous in us to call for what our colonies had received; or had we any reason to anticipate that the act would have been characterised in the terms which I do not love to repeat?

But further, considering the manner in which acts of the Royal supremacy had been exercised abroad, and taking it for granted that it could not be greater when exercised in foreign Catholic countries than the Pope's in our regard, we could not suppose that his appointment of Catholic Bishops in ordinary in England would have been considered as more "inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy," than that exercise was considered "inconsistent with the Pope's supremacy" acknowledged in those countries. I will refer my readers to Mr. Bowyer's pamphlet, published by Ridgway, for details of what I will briefly state.

In 1842 her Majesty was advised to erect, and did erect (5 Vic., c. 6.) a Bishopric of Jerusalem, assigning to it a diocese in which the three great Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, were mashed into one See, having Episcopal jurisdiction over Syria, Chaldea, Egypt and Abyssinia, subject to further limitations or alterations at the Royal will. No one supposes that, for instance, the consent of the King of Abyssinia, in which there is not a single Protestant congregation, was asked. Mr. Bowyer also shows that Bishop Alexander was not sent merely to British subjects, but to others owing no allegiance to the Crown of England. Suppose his Majesty of Abyssinia, or the Emir Beshir, had pronounced this to be an intrusion "inconsistent with the rights of Bishops and Clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation," how much would the country have cared?

Under the same statute, a Bishop of Gibraltar was named. His See was in a British territory; but its jurisdiction extended over Malta—where there was a Roman Catholic Archbishop, formally recognised by our Government as the Bishop of Malta—and over Italy.

Under this commission Dr. Tomlinson officiated in Rome, and, I understand, had borne before him a cross, the emblem of Archiepiscopal jurisdiction, as if to ignore in his very diocese the acknowledged "Bishop of Rome." He confirmed and preached there—without leave of the lawful Bishop; and yet the newspapers took no notice of it, and the pulpits did not denounce him. But, in fact, the statute under which these things were done, is so comprehensive that it empowers the Archbishops of Canterbury or York to consecrate not only British subjects, but subjects and citizens of any foreign State, to be Bishops in any foreign country. No consent of the respective Governments is required; and they are sent not only to British subjects, but to "such other Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his or their authority."

If, therefore, the Royal supremacy of the English Crown could thus lawfully exercise itself, where it never has before exercised authority, and where it is not recognised, as in a Catholic country—if the Queen, as head of the English Church, can send Bishops into Abyssinia and Italy, surely Catholics had good right to suppose that, with the full toleration granted them, and the permitted exercise of Papal supremacy in their behalf, no less would be permitted to them, without censure or rebuke.

3. But not only had Catholics every ground to feel justified by what had been elsewhere done before, doing the same when to themselves seemed expedient, without their act, any more than preceding ones, being characterised as we have seen, but positive declarations and public assurances led them to the same conclusion.

In 1841, or 1842, when, for the first time, the Holy See thought of erecting a Hierarchy in North America, I was commissioned to sound the feelings of Government on the subject. I came up to London for the purpose, and saw the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, of which Lord Stanley was the Secretary. I shall not easily forget the urbanity of my reception, or the interesting conversation that took place, in which much was spoken to me which has since come literally true. But on the subject of my mission, the answer given was something to this effect:—"What does it matter to us what you call yourselves, whether Vicars-Apostolic, or Bishops, or Multis, or Imauns, so that you do not ask us to do anything for you. We have no right to prevent you taking any title among yourselves." This, however, the distinguished gentleman alluded to observed was his private opinion, and he desired me to call in a few days after. I did so, and he assured me that, having laid the matter before the head of the department, the answer was the same as he had before given me. I wrote it to Rome, and it served, no doubt, as the basis of the nomination of Bishops in ordinary in North America. I have no doubt the documents referring to this transaction will be found in the Colonial Office. In the debate on the Catholic Relief Bill, July 9, 1845, Lord John Russell, then in opposition, spoke to the following effect:—"He, for one, was prepared to go into committee on those clauses of the Act of 1829. He did not say that he was at once prepared to repeal all those clauses, but he was willing to go into committee to deliberate on the subject. He believed that they might repeal those disallowing clauses, which prevented a Roman Catho-

lic Bishop assuming a title held by a Bishop of the Established Church. He could not conceive any good ground for the continuance of this restriction." It must be observed that there is nothing in the context which limits these sensible and liberal words to Ireland. They apply to the repeal of the whole clause, which, as we have seen, extends equally to both countries.

What his lordship had said in 1845 he deliberately, and even more strongly, confirmed the following year. In the debate on the first reading of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, February 5, 1846, he referred to his speech, just quoted, of the preceding session, in the following terms:—

"Allusion having been made to him (by Sir Robert Inglis), he wished to say a few words as to his former declaration, 'that he was not ready at once to repeal these laws without consideration.' Last session he had voted for the committee, but had reserved to himself the right of weighing the details. It appeared to him that there was one part of the question that had not been sufficiently attended to; the measure of Government, as far as it was stated last year, did not effect that relief to the Roman Catholic from a law by which they were punished, both for assuming Episcopal titles in Ireland, and for belonging to certain Religious Orders. That part of the subject required interference by the Legislature. As to preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing could be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction. He had also the strongest objection to the law which made Jesuits in certain cases subject to transportation; the enactment was as intolerant as it was inefficacious, and it was necessary that the law should be put on an intelligible and rational footing."

It would appear, therefore, that whatever hesitation Lord John Russell had about repealing other clauses in the Emancipation Act, his mind was made up about the restriction from Catholics assuming the very titles of Sees held by Anglican Bishops. Had he obtained his wishes in 1846, the law would now have permitted us to call ourselves Bishops of London or Chester, and Archbishop of Canterbury. I quote these passages, not for the purpose of charging Lord John Russell with inconsistency, but merely to justify ourselves, and show how little reason we could have had for believing that our acting strictly within the law respecting Episcopal titles would have been described as it has. For if it was puerile in 1846 to continue to prevent Catholics even taking the prohibited titles, and no good reason existed for the continuance of even that restriction, is it manly in 1850 to denounce as "insolent and insidious" the assumption of titles different from those accorded to us by the authority which Lord John acknowledges can alone bestow Episcopacy upon us?

I have already alluded to Lord Minto's being shown the Brief for the Hierarchy, printed about two years ago. The circumstance may have escaped his memory, or he may not at the time have attended to it, having more important matters in his mind. But as to the fact that his attention was called to it, and he made no reply, I can have no doubt.

I trust, therefore, that I have said enough to prove that Catholics have not acted in an unbecoming manner in claiming for themselves the same rights of possessing a Hierarchy as had been allowed to the colonies, and clearly acknowledged as no less applicable to them. One more topic remains.

§ VI.—THE TITLE OF WESTMINSTER.

The selection of this title for the Metropolitan See of the new Hierarchy has, I understand, given great offence. I am sorry for it. It was little less than necessity which led to its adoption. I must observe, that according to the discipline of the Catholic Church, a Bishop's title must be from a town or city. Originally almost every village or small town had its Bishop, as appears from the history of the Anglican Church. But a town or city a Bishopric must still be; a "territorial" title is never given. Thus, in Van Diemen's Land, while the Anglican Bishop takes his title of Tasmania from the territory, the Catholic derives his of Hobart Town, from the town. In re-establishing a Catholic Hierarchy in England, it was natural and decorous that its metropolitan should have his See at the capital. This has been the rule at all times; though, of course, those capitals may decay into provincial towns without losing their privilege. The very term Metropolitan, signifies the Bishop of the metropolis. This being the principle or basis of every Hierarchy, how was it to be acted on here? London was a title inhibited by law. Southwark was to form a separate See. To have taken the title of a subordinate portion of what forms the great conglomerate of London, as Finsbury, or Islington, would have been to cast ridicule, and open the door for jeers upon the new Episcopate. Besides, none of these are towns or cities. Westminster naturally suggested itself, as a city unoccupied by any Anglican See, and giving an honorable and well-known metropolitan title. It was consequently selected, and I can sincerely say, that I had no part whatever in the selection. But I rejoice that it was chosen, not because it was the seat of the Courts of Law, or of Parliament, or for any such purpose, but because it brings the real point more clearly and strikingly before our opponents; "Have we in anything acted contrary to law? And, if not, why are we to be blamed?"

But I am glad also for another reason. The Chapter of Westminster has been the first to protest against the new Archiepiscopal title, as though some practical attempt at jurisdiction within the Abbey was intended. Then, let me give them assurance on that point, and let us come to a fair division and a good understanding.

* Hansard, vol. lxxxii., p. 290.
† The Religious Opinions Bill, which the Government had promised.
‡ Hansard, vol. lxxxiii., p. 502.

§ I have also been told that great offence has been taken at the use of the word to "govern," found in my Pastoral, as though implying some temporal authority. I find, however, that in this appeal I have again and again used the word, because it is the usual and almost only word applied amongst us to Episcopal rule. It must be remembered that the Pastoral was addressed, in the usual form of such documents, "to the Clergy, Secular and Regular, and to the Faithful," which showed it to be meant for Catholics alone, who could understand the word. I have been in the habit of addressing several Pastorals a year to the Catholics confided to my charge, which have always been read in our churches and chapels. But this is, I believe, the first which the press has done me the honor of transferring to its columns. It thus came to be represented as addressed to all the inhabitants of certain counties, a sort of edict or manifesto, instead of a Pastoral, usually confined to Catholic hearing or perusal.

The diocese, indeed, of Westminster embraces a large district, but Westminster proper consists of two very different parts. One comprises the stately abbey, with its adjacent palaces and its royal parks. To this portion the duties and occupation of the Dean and Chapter are mainly confined; and they shall range there undisturbed. To the venerable old church I may repair as I have been wont to do. But perhaps the Dean and Chapter are not aware that, were I disposed to claim more than the right to tread the Catholic pavement of that noble building, and breathe, its air of ancient consecration, another might step in with a prior claim. For successive generations there has existed ever, in the Benedictine Order, an Abbot of Westminster, the representative, in religious dignity, of those who erected, and beautified, and governed that church and cloister. Have they ever been disturbed by this "titular?" Have they heard of any claim or protest on his part touching their temporalities? Then let them fear no greater aggression now. Like him, I may visit, as I have said, the old Abbey, and say my prayer by the shrine of good St. Edward, and meditate on the olden times, when the church filled without a coronation, and multitudes hourly worshipped without a service.

But in their temporal rights, or their quiet possession of any dignity and title, they will not suffer.—Whenever I go in, I will pay my entrance fee, like other liege subjects, and resign myself meekly to the guidance of the beadle, and listen, without rebuke, when he points out to my admiration detestable monuments, or shows me a hole in the wall for a confessional. Yet this splendid monument, its treasures of art and its fitting endowments, form not the part of Westminster which will concern me. For there is another part which stands in frightful contrast, though in immediate contact, with this magnificence. In ancient times, the existence of an abbey on any spot, with a large staff of Clergy, and ample revenues, would have sufficed to create around it a little paradise of comfort, cheerfulness, and ease. This, however, is not now the case. Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and alleys, and slums, nests of ignorance, vice, depravity, and crime, as well as of squalor, wretchedness, and disease; whose atmosphere is typhus, whose ventilation is cholera; in which swarms a huge and almost countless population, in great measure nominally at least Catholic; haunts of filth, which no sewage committee can reach—dark corners which no lighting board can brighten. This is the part of Westminster which alone I covet, and which I shall be glad to claim and to visit as a blessed pasture in which sheep of holy Church are to be tended, in which a Bishop's godly work has to be done, of consoling, converting, and preserving. And if, as I humbly trust in God it shall be seen that this special culture, arising from the establishment of our Hierarchy, bears fruits of order, peacefulness, decency, religion, and virtue, it may be that the Holy See shall not be thought to have acted unwisely, when it bound up the very soul and salvation of a Chief Pastor with those of a city, where the name indeed is glorious, but the purities infamous—in which the very grandeur of its public edifices is as a shadow, to screen from the public eye sin and misery the most appalling. If the wealth of the abbey be stagnant and not diffusive, if it in no way rescue the neighboring population from the depths in which it is sunk, let there be no jealousy of any one who, by whatever name, is ready to make the latter his care, without interfering with the former.

I cannot conclude without one word on the part which the Clergy of the Anglican Church have acted in the late excitement. Catholics have been their principal theological opponents, and we have carried on our controversies with them temperately, and with every personal consideration. We have had no recourse to popular arts to debase them; we have never attempted, even when the current of public feeling has set against them, to turn it to advantage by joining in any outcry. They are not our members who yearly call for returns of sinecures or Episcopal incomes; they are not our people who form Anti-Church and State Associations; it is not our press which sends forth caricatures of Ecclesiastical dignitaries, or throws ridicule on Clerical vocations. With us the cause of truth and of Faith has been held too sacred to be advocated in any but honorable and religious modes. We have avoided the tumult of public assemblies and farthing appeals to the ignorance of the multitude.—But no sooner has an opportunity been given for awakening every lurking passion against us, than it has been eagerly seized by the Ministers of that establishment. The pulpit and the platform, the Church and the Town-hall, have been equally their field of labor; and speeches have been made, and untruths uttered, and calumnies repeated, and flashing words of disdain, and anger, and hate, and contempt, and of every un-Christian, and un-Christian, and unchristian sentiment have been spoken that could be said against those who almost alone have treated them with respect; and little care was taken at what time, or in what circumstances, these things were done. If the spark had fallen upon the inflammable materials of a gunpowder-treasure-mob, and made it explode, or, what was worse, had ignited it, what cared they? If blood had been inflamed, and arms uplifted, and the torch in their grasp, and flames had been enkindled, what heeded they? If the persons of those whom consecration makes holy, even according to their own belief, had been seized, like the Austrian general, and ill-treated, and perhaps maimed, or worse, what recked they? These very things were, one and all, pointed at as glorious signs, should they take place, of high and noble Protestant feeling in the land, as proofs of the prevalence of an unpersecuting, a free-inquiring, a tolerant Gospel creed!

Thanks to you, brave, and generous, and noble-hearted people of England, who would not be stirred up by those whose duty it is to teach you gentleness, meekness, and forbearance, to support what they call a religious cause, by irreligious means; and would not hunt down, when bidden, your offending fellow-citizens to the hollow cry of "No Popery," and on the pretence of a fabled aggression.

Thanks to you, docile and obedient children of the Catholic Faith, many of you I know by nature fervid, but by religion mildened, who have felt indeed—who could help it?—the indignities that have been cast upon your religion, your Pastors, and your highest Chief, but have borne them in the spirit of the great Head of your Church, in silence and unretorting forbearance. But whatever has been said in ignorance, or in malice, against us, or against what is most dear to us, commend with me to the forgiveness of a merciful God: to the retributions of His kindness, not to the award of His justice. May He not render to

others as they would have done to us; but may He shower down His kindnesses upon them, in proportion as they would have dealt unkindly in our regard. The storm is fast passing away; an honest and upright people will soon see through the arts that have been employed to deceive it, and the reaction of generosity will soon set in. Inquiry is awakened—the respective merits of Churches will be tried by fair tests, and not by worldly considerations; and truth, for which we contend, will calmly triumph. Let your loyalty be unimpeachable, and your faithfulness to social duties above reproach. Shut thus the mouths of adversaries, and gain the higher good-will of your fellow-countrymen, who will defend in you, as for themselves, your constitutional rights, including full religious liberty."

LETTER OF THE HON. CHARLES LANGDALE TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

My Lord—The prominent part which it has seemed good to your lordship to adopt on the occasion of the present outcry against the Roman Catholics of England and the Head of their Church, and the most unnatural effect which this has produced in exasperating religious excitement throughout the country, must be deemed, I think, sufficient to justify a few words from one involved in your lordship's denunciation.

Your lordship terms what you are pleased to call the Pope's aggression upon Protestants as "insolent and insidious." If the Pope, as the sovereign of a comparatively petty kingdom in Italy, had, as such, either in word or deed, committed an aggression on the mighty and colossal power of Great Britain, or on the gracious Sovereign who holds undisputed sway over the temporal destinies of this mighty empire, then, indeed, your lordship's epithet would not have been misapplied.

But, my lord, the act of his Holiness bears nothing of this character. The power which he claims is not of this world—affects no temporal sovereignty. As successor of St. Peter, and invested as such with his commission from the divine founder of our religion, the authority which the Pope claims is wholly of a spiritual character. As such he inherits a jurisdiction as distinct from, as it is unaccountable to, human power. It prevailed in spite of the mighty power of the Roman empire; it extended its way over the many kingdoms into which that empire was divided; it was recognised, undisputed, for centuries in this country by our Catholic ancestors, until that bad and despotic monarch whose will no laws, human or divine, could control, consummated his claim to supremacy at the expense of the noblest and best blood of his subjects.

Still, my lord, through three centuries of persecution, a remnant—small, indeed, but faithful—of the inhabitants of Great Britain has retained that spiritual allegiance to the See of Rome which is recognised by the vast majority of the Christian world, and which is as distinct from the temporal allegiance due to our Sovereign as human affairs are distinct from spiritual—temporal from eternal.

Your lordship must be well aware that this distinction between the temporal and spiritual jurisdiction of their Sovereign and the Head of their religion was the sole bar which excluded our Catholic ancestors, and many of ourselves, for several years from the political rights and privileges of our fellow-subjects.

Your lordship may probably remember that concise but clear reply of a Roman Catholic at the table of the House of Commons, when presented with the then unamended oath of allegiance:—"I cannot take this oath, because it contains one assertion which I know to be false, and another which I believe to be so." Catholic Emancipation followed, and recognised, if not by word, at least by implication, that the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope was acknowledged by a large body of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom.

Such, then, my lord, is the spiritual jurisdiction, claiming institution from God himself, the exercise of which through eighteen centuries your lordship is now pleased to designate "insolent." Your lordship also adds "insidious." How far this epithet, too, is consistent with the charge of detailed and explicit boldness of a document which in the eyes of many form its chief offence, I must leave to your lordship to explain.

The real question, then, now at issue is, whether virtually, as regards British Roman Catholics (for an exception seems to be drawn between us and all other Roman Catholic subjects of her Majesty), the Emancipation Act, regarding the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope, is to be admitted or not—whether it can be, by being "carefully examined," to use your lordship's words, set aside? And what is the special ground of this threat of renewed penal laws? Why, the exercise of a power of appointing Bishops is as old as the See of Rome itself; it is, and must be, inherent in our religion; and though, as a temporary expedient, the Pope may, and has appointed his own Vicars, dependent upon, and removable at his own pleasure, as was lately the case in this country; yet such is neither the ordinary course of the discipline of the Church, nor consistent with the exercise of rights enjoyed by all other considerable bodies of its members. Surely, the distinction is sufficiently clear between our Bishops and Clergy in connection with the See of Rome, and the Bishops and Clergy of the Established Church, as appointed by the Queen, for no mistake to arise either on the subject of the source of their power, or on the mode of its exercises. There can be no doubt that whilst we as Roman Catholics pay all due deference to the law, in acknowledging the temporal claims and rights of the latter, we do, and must repudiate their spiritual authority, or we must renounce our religion; nor can I see how or why these latter should fear any spiritual infringement, or any rival jurisdiction from Bishops, nominees of a Pontiff whom they have denounced as Antichrist, and members of a Church which they have solemnly called God to witness they believe to be involved in blasphemous idolatry.

No, my lord, there cannot be, nor ought there to