

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

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

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. Subscribers not receiving their papers regularly, are requested to make their complaints known to the Editor of the Journal.

The Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—

Quebec.—Mr. Mathew Enright, 24, Mountain St.
Sorel.—Mr. Robert McAndrew.
Three-Rivers.—Mr. John Keenan.
Terrebonne.—M. Prevost, Esq., N. P.
St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. Patrick Flynn.
Alexandria.—D. McGillis.
Oshawa.—Rev. Mr. J. B. Proulx.
Picton, C. W.—Rev. Mr. Lalor.
Toronto.—Mr. Thomas Hayes.
Norwood.—Rev. Mr. Bernard J. Higgins.
Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. Stuart McDonald.
Perth, C. W.—Mr. John Doran.
Bytown.—Mr. Ewd. Burke.
Carillon.—A. E. Montmarquet, Esq.
Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. Jas. Doyle.
Dundas County.—Mr. Alex. McDonald, (Ich).
Brantford, C. W.—Mr. John Comerford.
Eastern Townships.—Mr. Patrick Hackett.
Chambly.—Mr. John Hackett.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 29, 1850.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN ENGLAND.

Poor Mrs. Partington, for we believe it was that very respectable old lady, who, during a heavy gale of wind, did her utmost to sweep the "insolent and insidious Atlantic" out of her back kitchen, with a birch broom: poor, dear Mrs. Partington your toil and labour were in vain; and Lord John Russell, who is about to make an overhaul of musty old Acts of Parliament, in order to arrest the onward progress of that "insolent and insidious popery," might do well to take a lesson from your fate. It is too late. It is a *fait accompli*. England, thank God, is once more restored to the list of Christian nations; and all that Lord John Russell, aided and abetted by those respectable men, (for their best friends must admit that they are respectable,) Sir Robert Inglis and Mr. Spooner, can do, will be vain and idle, as was the birch broom of Mrs. Partington. They can't help themselves. They may refuse to submit to the lawful ecclesiastical jurisdiction of his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster, and peril their souls by so doing; but still his Grace is there, and, in spite of them, will remain Archbishop of Westminster, and Cardinal to boot; hateful though that word may be to the frequenters of Exeter Hall. But what a row about popery, to be sure; and how ridiculously absurd! The creation of a Bishop or Archbishop is an act of power solely in the spiritual order; and in the spiritual order, the power to do a thing signifies the right to do it; for, in the spiritual order at least, all men must admit that all power is from God. Might and right are terms synonymous in the spiritual order. Now, the Pope either has the right, and, therefore, the power, or else he has not the right, and, therefore, has not the power, to make an Archbishop of Westminster. If he has not the right, and, consequently, not the power, the Pope has done *nothing*, and, therefore, the good Protestants of England have *nothing* to be angry about: but if he has the right, and, therefore, the power, it is not Pius IX. alone, but God Himself whom they are resisting; for, as we said before, in the spiritual order at least, all power is from God. But here lies the whole secret of the mighty indignation of our evangelical friends. With them, a Bishop has long ceased to be simply a fact in the spiritual order. They have learned to look upon him as a government nominee—something more exalted than a police magistrate, and with a higher salary than a tide-waiter or custom-house officer, yet, unlike the latter, hardly endowed with the right of preventing the importation of, or of trying, all spirits, whether they may be contraband or no, or of keeping out popery as above prof.

Thus, we see the *Courier*, here, talking a deal of silly nonsense, and other papers, still more silly, quoting it, about "titles of honor," and of "none save her Majesty having the right to confer them," and instancing the case of the Emperor of Russia creating a Duke of York or Marquis of Exeter. This solemn twaddle is actually written and read by men who profess to have common sense, as if there was any analogy between titles in the temporal order, such as Duke or Marquis, and orders in the Church, or spiritual order. A king may make a belted Knight, a Marquis, Duke, and all that, but a Bishop, as such as an honest man, is beyond his might, but Protestants can't understand that: hence the consternation amongst Bishops, who are such in virtue of 8 Elizabeth. Acts of Parliament they fear will prove of little avail against Acts of the Apostles. Yet they

may be of good cheer. No one dreams of contesting the parliamentary validity of their orders. All that King, Lords, and Commons can do to make them Bishops, has been done. They retain, and will still retain, their seats in Parliament, their titles and revenues, their wives and their little ones. Wherefore, then, are they afraid? and why does their spirit fail them? But a few weeks ago, when the Privy Council settled the doctrine of original sin, and the question of the validity of infant baptism, mighty was the indignation of Anglican prelates. The civil power was trespassing on the spiritual; and loud the outcry against the interference of the State. But now, like little Johnny running to his mamma to complain of his big brother, Bishops and Archdeacons, and all, are running, crying to the State for protection against that insidious foe, the Pope. It is well that it should be so. Protestantism is, and ever has been, but the creature and servile tool of the State, in which alone "it lives, and moves, and has its being." Established and upheld, not by God, but by law, to the law it must look for support. Not that there is much reason to fear that the old penal laws will be burnt up again, as a sharp weapon against the Papists. Bigots there are, no doubt, who would be glad to see this done; but there is one good reason why their tastes shall not be gratified. No government dares to enforce the penal laws. The *Times*, and Protestant brawlers, may try, perhaps, to excite the gallant brewers, and magnanimous draymen, to assault, with cudgels and brickbats, his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster; but, like it or not like it, the government must put up with these nominations, and as many more as it may please our well-beloved father, Pius IX., to make. The *Montreal Witness*, with more good sense than usual, recommends a *let-alone* policy. "Let the Bishops be considered only as plain Mr. Cullen, or as plain Mr. Wiseman." Good advice, only it cannot be followed. The Church of England recognises, and must recognise, the validity of the Catholic orders. If a priest, ordained by any of the Catholic Bishops, moved by his lusts, should desire to turn Protestant, the apostate will find his priests' orders reckoned valid, even by the Anglican Bishop of London; and, as only bishops can confer Holy Orders, the Catholic Bishop will be recognised in his acts. Neither is there any divided allegiance in the matter, as the writer in the *Montreal Witness* imagines. The Catholic renders to God, the things which are God's, and to Caesar, all that are Caesar's. To the Protestant it seems a divided allegiance to acknowledge the priority of the claims of God to our obedience, and he writes, under this idea, the following trash, still confounding things in the civil with things in the spiritual order:—

"It may indeed be a question whether prudence should not go farther without infringing religious liberty, than merely ignoring the titles of ecclesiastical dignitaries. When Lord Brougham wished to become a French citizen under the Republic, he was politely informed that there was no objection provided he expressly renounced allegiance to all other Governments, but not otherwise. And this was in accordance with reason and common sense. It does not do in such matters for any individual to be by turns Frenchman and Englishman, or to have a French side, and an English side; he must either be the one or the other, and the same reason applies with tenfold force to the priests of the church of Rome. They should either expressly renounce the allegiance, jurisdiction and interference of Rome, or have no title to the name and immunities of British subjects."

He should have written, that as the Protestant has thrown off his allegiance to God's Church, and, therefore, to God Himself, the Catholic, who acknowledges God in all his ways, will never make a good citizen in a Protestant country. He is mistaken. Her Majesty has not more loyal subjects than the Catholic population of Great Britain: and just because they have been faithful in great things, that is, faithful to their God, the King of Kings, will they be found faithful in little things, that is, faithful to their earthly sovereign.

COMIC HISTORY.

It is now some time since *Punch* enlivened his readers with a series of articles, entitled, "The Comic History of England," edited, if we are not mistaken, by Miss Tickletohy. But *Punch's* historic muse has long been mute; for which reason, we suppose, the learned and talented editor of the *Montreal Witness* has undertaken to furnish us with an entirely original, and, certainly, a very comic history of the Eastern Empire, and affairs ecclesiastical in general. "Not such history as Dr. Brownson creates as he goes along; nor that kind of history which the TRUE WITNESS finds;" but real, good evangelical stuff, "which has evidently been most carefully compiled from *veritable* history."

There is, it seems, a Society in Ireland for the reception of those degraded beings called apostate priests, who, not content with rendering themselves infamous for their lewdness, must needs make themselves ridiculous by a public display of their ignorance. These unhappy wretches have lately put forth a manifesto against Popery, which the *Montreal Witness* quotes approvingly, and for the accuracy of whose statements it is, consequently, responsible. We intend to amuse our readers with a few specimens of this historical fidelity, so much vaunted by our learned evangelical contemporary.

"Worship of Images introduced in the year 787. The Popes Gregory II., Gregory III., and Zachary, opposed this sin. Pope Constantine I. deposed the Greek Emperor Philip in the year 713, and put out his eyes for setting up images in the Churches.

Gregory III. excommunicated the Emperor Leo IV. for this crime." It is a pity that Gibbon had not had access to the same authorities which these careful compilers of *veritable* history have evidently consulted, for then he would not have written, Cap. XLIX. :—"The use, and even the worship of," meaning, of course, the proper respect for, "images, was firmly established before the end of the sixth century;" nor would he have attributed the deposition and mutilation of Bardanes or Philippicus, the short-lived successor of the last of the Heraclian princes, to a sudden outbreak provoked by the dissipation of a drunken emperor. But these inaccuracies are hardly worthy of notice when compared with what follows. "Gregory III. excommunicated the Emperor Leo IV. for setting up images in the Churches." Unfortunately for the careful compilers of *veritable* history, Gregory III. died A. D. 741, nine years before the birth, A. D. 750, and thirty-four years before the accession to the throne of Leo IV., A. D. 775. His father, Copronymus, deserved, and his grandfather, Leo the Isaurian, the founder of the dynasty, received excommunication from Gregory II. and his successor; not for setting up images in the Churches though, but for pulling down and destroying them; for a full account of which, we refer the learned editor of the *Montreal Witness* to any history of the Iconoclastic heresy.

"Service in Latin introduced in the year 1215." If the use of latin in the services of the Church, was introduced in the year 1215, will our well-informed contemporary inform us what language had previously been made use of, and if there be any liturgies written in that same ante-Lateran language still extant?

"Withholding the cup from the laity introduced in the year 1415." Although we do not pretend to be very careful compilers from *veritable* history, we have picked up a straw or so floating on the surface, and we assure our contemporary that if he will give himself the trouble to inquire, he will find that in the early ages of Christianity, Communion was given indifferently, sometimes under one, sometimes under both kinds; and so it might have continued to the present day, but for the Manicheans, or early Protestants, who, because of their extravagant opinions concerning the creation of some kinds of matter by the evil spirit, and because of their belief that Our Lord Jesus Christ had not true blood, refused to partake of the Eucharistic cup, although, for the sake of escaping detection, they made no scruples about receiving the body of our Lord under the form of bread. St. Leo, in the 5th century, thus complains of these heretics, who "ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno corpus Christi accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostrae haurire omnino declinant." In order, then, to detect these heretics, Pope Gelasius insisted upon Communion being received by all under both kinds. At a later period, however, new forms of heresy arose, to which the Church opposed new forms of discipline. A writer in the 12th century thus explains the reason:—

"Hic et ibi cautela fiat, ne presbyter aegris
Aut sanis tribuat laicis de sanguine Christi.
Nam fundi posset leviter, simplexque putaret,
Quod non sub specie sit totius Jesus utraque."

This was written about the year 1110. So much for the practice of receiving the Communion under one kind only, not having been introduced until the year 1415.

"Mariolatry, or the worship of the Virgin Mary. In the year 1558, Pope Bonaventure substituted the name of the Virgin for that of God, throughout the Psalms." This is the counterpart of the story of the old lady, who, in her desperate efforts to quote Scripture with exactitude, made the Apostle Job exclaim, from the whale's belly, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? art thou come to torment me before my time?" We do not pretend to say what Pope Bonaventure (A. D. 1558) did, or did not do, for we never heard of such a person. According to the history which we have been accustomed to read, and which the editor of the *Montreal Witness* so much condemns, in the year 1558, the Chair of Peter was filled by Jean-Pierre Caraffa, under the name and title of Paul IV. We have heard of a St. Bonaventure, to whom is attributed (probably erroneously) the composition of the Psalter of our Lady; but as the saint died about the time of the Council of Lyons, (A. D. 1274) he could hardly have been Pope, A. D., 1558. Perhaps the Mrs. Gamp or Mrs. Harris who does the historical part of the *Montreal Witness*, will be kind enough to inform us when Pope Bonaventure ascended the pontifical throne?

"Apocryphal Books—The Church of Rome only in the year 1546 admitted these books into the sacred canon, at the Council of Trent. They are rejected by the Greek Church, and by the Jews, whose canon is the same as ours." By apocryphal, we suppose, are meant the Deutero-Canonical books. These, we beg leave to inform our evangelical friends, were recognised as canonical by the Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, whose decrees, respecting the canon of Scripture, were ratified by many subsequent Popes, amongst others, by Innocent I., A. D. 405—Gelasius, A. D. 494—Eugenius IV., A. D. 1441. The Greek canon of Scripture is the same as that approved of by the Councils of Trent and Carthage. In A. D. 885, 1110, 1672, and again in 1835, the schismatical Greek Church has formally accepted as canonical Scripture, those books which Protestants term apocryphal. They were acknowledged as such (A. D. 1586) by the Russian Church; and, in 1672, we find the Armenian Patriarch signing a profession of faith, in which he acknowledges, as inspired, and condemns the Calvinists for rejecting, the deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament. But our readers must have had enough of these careful compilations from *veritable* history. We will conclude with one or two specimens of evangelical logic.

"Extreme Unction, as used in the Church of Rome, has no authority in Holy Writ, nor is it necessary to salvation; for God declares—the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from sin." Here we see it is not the use of, but the manner of using, Extreme Unction, which is condemned. If the manner of using it in the Church of Rome, is unscriptural, will our learned friends inform us what is the scriptural manner of using it? But let us see how this Protestant argument against the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, will look when applied to the Sacrament of Baptism. "As used in the Protestant Churches, it has no authority in Holy Writ, nor is it necessary to salvation; for God declares—the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from sin."

Monasteries and convents are condemned in the following unanswerable quotations. "Monastic institutions—convents and monasteries have no authority in Scripture; for God says—Ye are the light of the world; a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." The writer of the above precious bit of nonsense, was determined to let his folly so shine before men, that they should be unable to refrain from laughing at him as an ass: if faith, he must have been in very excellent fooling, indeed, when he wrote it; and all we can say, is, that we hope that the adversaries of our Holy Religion may long continue to write history, and deduce conclusions as correctly and logically as do our friends of the *Montreal Witness* and the "Apostate Priest's Society," those careful compilers of *veritable* history.

To the editor of the *Montreal Witness*, we would recommend a slight perusal of history, such as Dr. Brownson loves, and to eschew that which is to be found in the columns of *Punch*; so may he in future escape being laughed at for making dead Popes excommunicate unborn Emperors, or attributing to imaginary Popes, in the XVI. century, the apocryphal works of long-departed saints.

We have received an anonymous communication, which, as it contains remarks which might be painful to the members of a charitable Society, we cannot insert; although we will be very glad to hear from the writer upon the same subject, when he thinks fit to give his name.

We thankfully acknowledge the receipt of the following amounts:—Mr. Matthew Enright, agent at Quebec, £5; Rev. Mr. Maurice, Buffalo, U. S., 10s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the True Witness and Catholic Chronicle.

SIR,—In my last I gave you an outline of Mr. Wilkes' speech in Quebec on the evening of the 13th instant. During its delivery the Rev. speaker evinced much hesitation and doubt about the course which was being pursued by the "French Canadian Missionary Society." "We may be right or we may be wrong," was a qualifying expression frequently used by him. It appeared to me that conscience was at work, and that some idea of the dreadful attempt in which he was engaged, flitted across his mind. Or perhaps he was not wholly unmindful of the severe castigation formerly inflicted on him in the columns of the *Pilot*, for his furious and lying tirade at a meeting in New York, against his adopted country. Be this as it may, he evidently appeared in doubt, and therefore in infidelity, a state of mind which, according to Pascal, (so much lauded by Mr. Wilkes) will befall every person who rejects the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church.

But I must pass on to the next ruler in Israel, the Rev. Mr. Marsh. This gentleman, by one mighty Homeric effort, mounted at once to the planets, and said that, as some of the heavenly bodies made a great sweep across the firmament, and others merely shewed themselves, so would he merely shew himself and express his concurrence with the *important* proceedings of the evening. In this heterogeneous body he appeared to act the part of a disjunctive conjunction, for he advocated *unity*, and hoped they would all combine and pull together. It was he, I forgot to observe, that opened the proceedings of the evening with a long and pompous prayer; he prays well, and seems to be on good terms, and very familiar with the "Lord." He promised to make up for his former indifference, and to aid the *illumination* movement by every means in his power. I would therefore respectfully suggest that all astronomers should be on the look out for a new addition to the solar system.

I come now to Mr. Marling, a young, prim and positive divine, the Rupert of the whining school. He dashed with all the intrepid daring of youth, into the midst of difficulties from which unfortunately he could not extricate himself. He commenced his speech in a very low tone, as all very young and very ignorant persons should; towards its conclusion, however, he waxed strong in spirit, and made use of thread-bare fustian, which bore a marvellous resemblance to the religious reveries of another enemy of Christianity, the eloquent but unfortunate Dr. Channing of Boston. "Stand out of the way, let me go to Christ, why interpose yourselves between God and individual man?" Really Mr. Editor, bedlam, like another nameless place, is not yet full, or, if it be, an enlargement has become necessary. He admitted that Popery was never stronger than she is at present, she appears to have renewed her youth like the eagle, to be every where on the alert, and to be extending her sway in every quarter of the globe. There were two periods in the world's history, said he, when she appeared to be on the point of perishing, at the time of the Reformation and French Revolution.