

fair way of being smothered with attentions. Perfectly indifferent to the worthlessness of their efforts for our Reform—heedless of the contempt which Catholics necessarily feel for such impertinent meddlers with affairs that in no way concern them—our Protestant old women, with a perseverance, worthy of a better cause, and a happier issue—will persist in shoving their noses into every nook and corner, prying into every cupboard and drawer, in the hopes that they may find therein something to call forth their advice and exhortations. Good worthy people! but like many other good worthy busy-bodies, they oftentimes reap nothing but a snubbing for their pains.

Such a snubbing has been lately administered by the *Journal de Quebec* to the zealous Non-Catholic organ of Upper Canada—the *Toronto Globe*. This active, and intensely meddling gentleman, with the assistance of a correspondent signing himself “*Peter Prayer*,” and whom, from the style in which he writes, and the intimacy with the Canon Law and usages of the Church which he professes, one would strongly suspect of being a loose and disorderly Priest, about to abjure Romanism, and take up his testimony against the Pope—has just started a notable man’s nest—nothing less than a conspiracy, on the part of the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Quebec, to levy tythes upon the unsuspecting, unprotected laity of the Province, for their—the said Bishops’—special use and behoof. Of course, the *Globe* has his dander up in less than no time.

Not for the satisfaction of the *Globe*, nor yet for that of any of his Protestant friends—for the internal arrangements of the Catholic Church in Canada, and the distribution of her revenues, are matters with which they have no concern, and over which Protestants may rest assured they shall never be allowed to exercise the least control—but for the information of his Catholic readers, does the *Journal de Quebec* careen and expose the misrepresentations of the *Globe*, and of his estimable correspondent—“*Peter Prayer*,” we avail ourselves of the explanations of our contemporary.

The Catholic Church, having deemed it necessary to make fresh provisions for the constantly increasing spiritual wants of the faithful in this Province, proceeded, in virtue of that supreme authority confided to her by her Divine Spouse, to the creation of several new Dioceses, in different parts of Canada—at Toronto, which in consequence was elevated to the dignity of an Episcopal See—at St. Hyacinthe, and Three Rivers. It became necessary also to make provision for the due support of the Bishops appointed to rule over these newly created Dioceses, and therefore, at the Provincial Council, held at Quebec in August 1851, it was decided to demand the sanction of the Sovereign Pontiff to one, of the following three propositions:—

1. That the Bishop might be authorised to receive the third of the revenues of one, or two, of the parishes in his Diocese.
2. Or, that he might be authorised to receive the fourth, or fifth, part of the revenues of three, or of four, parishes in his Diocese.
3. Or, that he might be authorised to demand the tenth of the revenues of several, or of the greater number, of the parishes in his Diocese.

His Lordship the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe was chosen by the Prelates of Canada to bear the decrees of the Provincial Council to Rome, and to lay them at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff. His Holiness, after mature deliberation, approved of the third, of the three propositions for raising a revenue for the newly created Dioceses, mentioned above; in consequence, its provisions now form part of the Ecclesiastical Law of this Province, and all the rhodomontade of the *Globe*, backed by all the vituperation of his ally—“*Peter Prayer*,”—will prove perfectly ineffectual against it. In framing decrees for the government of the Church, and the distribution of her revenues, Catholic Prelates are in the habit of seeking counsel from the Holy Spirit alone; and our contemporary may rest assured, that the objectionable decrees will not be the less duly enforced, because they are offensive to the Protestant editor of the *Globe*, and his worthy friend and ally Mr. “*Peter Prayer*.”

It must be remembered that, although the demands upon the Bishops of Canada for the support of public worship—for purposes of charity and education—are very heavy, their revenues, or sources of income, especially in the newly created Dioceses, are very trifling indeed, consisting, for the most part, of the voluntary contributions of the faithful. “*Peter Prayer*,” indeed, with a disregard for truth and decency, remarkable on the part of one so well versed in the Canon Law, and so deeply read in Ecclesiastical History, has the impudence to tell his friends of the *Globe* that, the revenue of his Grace the Archbishop of Quebec amounts to £4,500, and that of his Lordship the Bishop of Montreal to £3,500. The truth is, that the whole income of the Archdiocese of Quebec is below £2,000, whilst the revenue of the Diocese of Montreal does not amount to £600 per annum. Out of these sums, it must be remembered that, the Prelates have to provide for the support of a large body of Clergy attached to their households—the Ecclesiastical establishments connected with their Cathedrals—and have to meet the hourly calls that are made upon them from all parts of their Dioceses. Instead of reproaching the Bishops of Canada for their wealth, and sumptuous establishments, “*Peter Prayer*,” would have been nearer the mark if he had reproached the Catholic laity of the Province for their apathy, and for allowing their Prelates to languish in comparative—nay, actual poverty. A few weeks of the privations and hardships to which the Bishops of Canada are compelled to submit, would have a very salutary effect upon the intellect and temper of the *Globe*’s friend—“*Peter Prayer*.”

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

An Etchemin “Subscriber” is respectfully informed that his communication, about “Railroads and Mr. Jackson,” is declined, as relating to matters, of high importance indeed, yet, which by no means fall within the province of the *True Witness*.

“Anglo-Catholic.”—It is contrary to the custom of the *True Witness* to discuss questions of dogma—that is to say, questions in the supernatural order—with Non-Catholics; you will therefore perceive why we decline the controversy you propose upon the question of Transubstantiation—a doctrine, according to you, “theologically false, and philosophically absurd.”

We cannot, for instance, discuss with you the question whether the doctrine of Transubstantiation be, or be not, “theologically false,” because we have no common standard, or authority, in the supernatural order, to which we can both appeal, and by whose decision we are both content to abide. The Catholic Church—the sole authority in the supernatural order that we recognise—affirms that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is “theologically true;” you, who deny the authority of the Catholic Church, assert that that doctrine is “theologically false.” It is evident therefore, that we have no means in common, by which to ascertain the “theological truth or falsity” of the doctrine in dispute: we will not therefore enter upon such a prolixity, upon such an interminable, controversy. Before discussing questions in the supernatural order, we must have a common authority, or umpire, in the same order, to whose decisions we are both prepared to yield an unqualified submission: such a common, and supernatural authority we have not got; there is, therefore, no use in our disputing about the “theological falsity” of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

The “philosophical absurdity” of the doctrine, which you assert, we do indeed deny; and we may also, consistently with our principles, argue that it is not “absurd,” but that the “absurdity” attaches to him, who, like Anglo-Catholic, admits a real objective change in the Eucharistic elements, after, and in virtue of, the act of Consecration, and yet rejects the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as “theologically false and philosophically absurd.”

For you do admit a change, and the philosophical question at issue between us is—“What is the subject of that change? the substance or the accidents of the Eucharistic elements?” In other words—is the change *nomenclature*, or *phenomenal*?

You admit a change in the Eucharistic elements, for you say that, whilst before Consecration they were only “bread and wine,” after, and in virtue of the act of Consecration, they “become” something else, and are “verily and indeed the spiritual body and blood of Christ.”

Now, without entering into any discussion, as to the meaning of this word “spiritual”—whether by it you mean only an “imaginary or fictitious,” as opposed to a “true and real,” body—it is sufficient for our purpose to remark that, by admitting that the “bread and wine” do, after, and in virtue of, the act of Consecration, “become” something that they were not, before Consecration, you do, to all intents and purposes, admit a change or “*Trans*,” for that which “becomes,” what it was not, must necessarily, in order so to “become,” undergo a change. You admit also that this change is effected in, or wrought upon, the Eucharistic elements, by, and in virtue of, the act of Consecration, being thus an objective reality, not dependent upon the heated imagination, or devotional feelings, of the communicant. We have therefore got the change or “*Trans*,” let us now see what is the subject of that change.

Change, to be change, must be either *nomenclature* or *phenomenal*, or both—that is to say, it must be a change—either of substance, or of accidents, or of both. A change, which is a change, neither *nomenclature*, nor yet *phenomenal*—neither of substance, nor yet of accidents, is no change at all—it is simply a “philosophical absurdity.” But as we have shown above, you do admit a change or “*Trans*,”—you must therefore recognise some subject of that change.

Now, the change is not *phenomenal*, or a change of accidents; our senses can take cognisance of these, and our senses infallibly assure us that the *phenomena*, or accidents, of the Eucharistic elements, undergo no change.

Then must the change be *nomenclature*, a fact of which our senses can take no cognisance; and the *nomenclature*, or substance, of the Eucharistic elements must be the subject of the change or “*Trans*.” But a change, of which the *nomenclature*, or substance, is the subject, is Transubstantiation, and nothing else; the very Romish doctrine which you oh! “Anglo-Catholic,” pronounce to be “philosophically absurd.”

We reply then by showing, that to deny this Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, our correspondent must deny that there is any change whatever in the Eucharistic elements, after, and in virtue of, the act of Consecration—which is contrary to his assertion that, though only “bread and wine” before—they after, and in virtue of, the act of Consecration, “become” something else—“verily and indeed the spiritual body and blood of Christ.”

Or, he must assert a change, which is neither *nomenclature*, nor yet *phenomenal*—of which neither the substance nor yet the accidents are the subject—which is indeed “absurd,” the most monstrous “philosophical absurdity” we ever had the fortune to meet with.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Montreal, February 16th, 1853.

DEAR SIR,—As the face of “the Anniversaries” is over for another year, I should like to say a few words on the subject of the proselytising system in general, and on the F. C. M.’s manoeuvres in particular. It is one of the strangest things on record, that now, in the middle of the nineteenth century, with the light of

mournful experience shining full upon them, the Protestant sects still “lay the flattering unction to their souls” that they can overthrow Popery. “Tis strange, ’tis passing strange, ’tis wonderful,” that they, who in all other things have the cunning of the serpent, and are pre-eminently gifted with worldly wisdom, should be, in this one thing, completely infatuated, and incurably blind. Day after day, and year after year, do we see them spending their money, with lavish profusion, on what they are pleased to call *Foreign*, and *Home Missions*, though what they get for their money is a mystery to us. If they could only produce one convert—that is to say—a real *bona fide* convert for every thousand, ay! or ten thousand, pounds they spend, it would be something; but the mischief is that *Rome* converts all the heathens who are converted, and it is a notorious fact that what *Rome* gets she is sure to keep. “It is *Rome*,” then, who does all the *converting*—(apostatising may be carried on, in a few instances by the sects, through the medium of famine, and the un-Catholic heart of man—naturally prone to evil;) yet how in the wide world do the Bible Societies, &c. &c., contrive to spend all their money? Why, spending money is the easiest thing in the world; nothing can be easier than to transport whole families of godly men, women and children—faciously styled missionaries—out to countries lying on any given part of the earth’s surface; providing said families with all the comforts, and with most of the luxuries of life: fine broadcloth for the men, silks and satins and velvets for the ladies, with divers and innumerable *sundries* for the pickaninnies of the family; truly the equipment of the missionaries (great and small) is a serious item on the funds of the *Christian Missions*. Then the loads of Bibles and Tracts to be provided swallow up the remainder, and make a monstrous sum total. If the Bibles and Tracts sent out yearly from the Missionary Societies only did the one hundredth part of their work of destruction, society would long ago have been disorganised—true religion would have vanished from the earth, and the world have fallen back into pagan corruption. Witness the deplorable condition of religion in the neighboring republic, where (with the single exception of the Catholics), the people are daily becoming more and more corrupt; all traces of revealed religion are disappearing, with fearful rapidity, from amongst them, and they are reveling in the wild license of unbridled passion, *forgetful of God*, worshipping only *self*, and the fell passions of their nature. Look at the Mormon with his unblushing bestiality of life; look at the great torch-light procession lately held in Cincinnati in honor of *Yon Peter*!—look at the Women’s Rights Conventions and the *Reverend Miss* and *Mrs.* such-a-one getting up to “expound the word” for the elect (bless the mark!) while deputations of *ladies* step forward (I suppose in Bloomer Costume) to present petitions at the bar of a House of Assembly; look at the frightful indifference regarding marriage, which is no longer thought necessary even for *decency*; look at the Spiritual Rappings (now being organised into a Religion—I beg religion’s pardon—I mean, a Protestant, sect) look at the abominable advertisements constantly published in American journals—showing that crimes, altogether unheard-of in Catholic countries, are of common and ordinary occurrence in Non-Catholic communities, and are, in fact, regarded as a mere matter of business. Now, Mr. Editor, all these abominations are distinctly to be traced to the Protestant principle—the negation of authority; they are all and every one the natural offspring of private judgment—that grand pit-fall prepared by the devil for proud ambitious man, nearly six thousand years ago when he urged Eve to “judge for herself” in regard to the fatal apple. Fortunately for the world, I repeat, these missiles so recklessly cast among “the unlearned and unstable” are not “*wielded to their own destruction*,”—because Catholics having the talisman of faith, are preserved from the poison of unbelief, while the heathen and the infidel laugh at the impotent efforts made by carnal missionaries to crush the Bible down their throats. If the sponsors of the Anniversary “*boards*” wish to know who it was that converted, and still converts, the nations of the earth, we point to the humble Jesuit, or other Catholic priest, going forth alone, from friends and home and country—one thin cassock and one coarse cloak his equipment; his crucifix, his beads, and his breviary his only wealth. A man of self-denial and of mortification—a man who has no other tie in this world than that which binds him to God’s holy church—a man, who is prepared to do, and to suffer, whatever God pleases, and to lay down his life if necessary for the honor of His holy name—a man whose very presence has a hallowing influence, and who bears on his mild, subdued features, the stamp of every virtue—a man who is never deterred by any danger, or by any human weakness, from the fulfillment of his duty, and who walks the earth on a mission of charity and peace—this is the converter of the nations—the authorized envoy of that Church to whom Christ said: *Go teach all the nations*. But let no one suppose that it is only Catholics who notice the impotence of Protestantism when it attempts to convert men or nations, an office which belongs solely to the Catholic Church. Alison, in his new History of Europe, (vol. 1,) admits that it is undeniable that no conversions of any account have been effected in these latter ages with the exception of those by Jesuit missions in South America. Many other impartial writers might be quoted in support of this assertion, but the limits of a letter will not permit more than a passing allusion to the fact. Let the ranters do the rest.

I know not whether you noticed the report of a meeting of the F. C. M. folk which took place in Kingston lately. As usual the report contained some rich specimens of evangelical astuteness. One of the speakers on that occasion announced that in the course of thirteen years, the society had succeeded in withdrawing 500 persons from the communion of *Rome*—and that of those five hundred, it was hoped that one hundred had entertained vital religion—or believed in Christ—query—what became of the other four hundred withdrawn from the communion of *Rome*? The *Montreal Witness* of February 9th, says:—

“Since the formation of the Society, 13 years ago, close upon 100 have been converted, not merely from *Rome*, but to the saving reception of the truth, as it is in Jesus. Not fewer than 500 have either abandoned the errors of Popery, or been more, or less benefited.”

Is there not here, Mr. Editor, matter for melancholy reflection? Five hundred souls have been decaying from the Church, and, of these five hundred, “close upon one hundred” only—even in the opinion of the Protestant proselytisers—have found the truth. It is but fair to suppose that the remaining four hundred and upwards, are, simply, and purely, infidels—that they have thrown off Catholicity, and put on—

Your, &c.,

CATHOLICS,

To the Editor of the True Witness.

DEAR SIR,—Through the kindness of a friend, I was enabled to have a look at that strange journal, the *Montreal Witness*, of the 16th of February, 1853.—What astonished me most was the coolness with which that journal lies. I could not help asking myself,—is it possible to find readers for such a paper?—is it possible that men can so allow themselves to be deceived? In the observations made by the *Witness*, on a letter of an Irish Catholic, he seriously tells his readers that there is no difference between the Bible used by the priests, and that which he, and his use, except that the one is in Latin, and intelligible to very few; the other in English, and accessible to all. Now, Sir, in that statement I find two lies; for I know that the priests have the English version, as well as the Latin; also the Septuagint, and even some copies of the original. The *Montreal Witness* lies then, when he would lead people to suppose that the priests have only the Latin version. But he lies again when he states, that the difference of language is the only difference between his Bible, and that which is used by us Catholics; for, besides the many variations, errors, and favoring error, to be found in the Protestant text, there is this very important difference—that the Catholic version is authorised and approved by the Church; while the Protestant version has no authority at all. To be sure, it is published by the special command of that slobbering creature, King James the 1st, as O’Connell called him. But where did a king, or any other layman, get authority from Christ to decide what is the Word of God, and what is not? Will the *Witness* answer this question?

Another observation of the same journal is—that there is a great unity of faith amongst all the great Protestant bodies—their differences being only on secondary matters, such as those of church government, and not in faith unosculation. Ah! now, Mr. Editor, don’t laugh; the poor *Montreal Witness* gives out his reflections so simply you should not be hard on him. So it appears that, in the opinion of the great Protestant bodies, amongst the great truths which the Apostles received from Christ, there are some matters of only secondary importance—mere trifles!—such as those of church government. Where does the Bible teach that state invention of “*Jurieu*,” the doctrines of fundamental, and non-fundamental? The church government, though distinct in one society from the church government of another society, does not hurt the unity of the church! Then a country in which there are two distinct governments, independent of each other, is but one kingdom—that is, twice one, make one! In what school did the editor of the *Montreal Witness* learn “multiplication”? The poor fellow knows not the value of a unit. Christ the Lord called His Church a kingdom, and but one kingdom; but these men would divide it into as many different kingdoms, as there are distinct church governments with them.

There is a letter also from a Quebec correspondent, who subscribes himself “Nanna.” I think, Sir, the first person of that name, were he alive, would have reason to be ashamed of this new nomenclature. This Solomon says that “he has attended closely to the discussion between you and the *Montreal Witness*, upon questions of (as he says) a casuistical nature relating to the Church, of which, like the generality of perverses that he has chanced to meet, you are such a zealous bigot.” Now it is plain to any man of ordinary penetration that the question in dispute was not casuistical, but historical. However, the firm that defrauded the poor servants and laborers in the “Savings Bank” will make no scruple to rob words of their true meaning. The word bigot too is misapplied when addressed to you; for bigotry means a blind zeal; but a zeal for the truth is not a blind zeal especially in a man of learning, like the “*True Witness*.” But Sir, as we know that even donkeys are aware when they are going to have a nose about their nose, we are not surprised that even the stupid correspondent of the *Witness* should perceive that his favorite journal was falling into a nose on the question of the “Church.” He knows full well that on that great question the *Witness* would suffer a defeat that would be damaging to the “*Evangelists*”; therefore, he prudently, but not wisely for his soul, sounds a retreat. The miserable conventional is afraid of the force of truth, and prefers to hide itself in the darkness of error. The men of the *Montreal Witness*, in declining to discuss the Church question, acknowledge their defeat; why, then, not act honestly, and confess their errors, and seek salvation by embracing the truth?—It is a sad thing for Protestantism, if it can’t produce some better defender than the *Witness*, and his Quebec correspondent.—Yours faithfully,

PHILEATHES.

ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH THE PROTESTANT RELIGION IN IRELAND.—By T. D. McGee, Esq., Editor *American Celt*.

This is an admirable work, on the most important portion of Ireland’s eventful history. Its rich and racy style cannot fail to entertain and delight the mere reader, while its faithful portraiture of the heinous atrocities and perfidious treachery of the primitive apostles of plunder and Protestantism in Ireland, will be found both interesting and instructive to the historiographer and statesman.

Mr. McGee’s account of the monstrous cruelties by which the first “Reformers” sought to torture and starve the Irish into apostasy, is a striking exemplification of the fell spirit of Protestantism. Well has the *Catholic Messenger* said that “this is the best production of its distinguished author,” for a work better suited to the times it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to produce.

The first edition of this excellent work is already exhausted, but we are happy to learn that the enterprising publisher, P. Donahoe, Esq., has a second edition in press which will shortly be ready for sale.

Stephenson, the engineer of the Menai bridge, is said to be on his way to Canada, to build the bridge across the St. Lawrence, opposite this city.

ORANGE PROCESSION.—It has, we are sorry to see, been announced that the Orangemen of this County intend celebrating the next 12th of July by a public procession in this town. The members of this, so styled, loyal body claim for themselves the character of peaceable men, but how they can reconcile this with their expressed determination to walk in public procession is beyond our comprehension. They cannot plead ignorance of the riots and murders which yearly result from these public processions.—*Brockville Recorder*.