

All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. Wm. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

## THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20.

As we anticipated, the *Hamilton Gazette* is become as much a sectarian as a political Journal; and all its remarks and quotations are never directed against our modern infidels, who so abound; such as Deists and Atheists, who, by their blasphemous and immoral doctrines, endeavour to break down the whole frame of Christianity;—not against the Socinians and Unitarians, our modern Arians, who deny the divinity of Jesus Christ;—not against the uncouth and ridiculous sects that are daily starting up around us, and, by their mad freaks and extravagancies, bringing religion at large, but especially the Protestant system of it, into contempt and derision:—no; it is not against such that our *Gazette* man volunteers his attacks; but against that church, from which he and these have all dissented; that church which is, and has ever been, *the dread and envy of them all*. Like his brother editor, the *Toronto Church-man*, he crams his motley and vituperative sheet with citations from the writings of parliamentary prelates and parsons, whose gorgeous establishments, whose rich endowments, whose very existence depend on keeping up the general delusion, forced upon the British public for three hundred years, by the most cruel penal statutes ever recorded in history.—But the eyes of that public are open now to the exposure of truth, since Catholics have been allowed, *by statute*, to exhibit their religion in its true light, and to remove from before it the disgusting and hideous caricatures drawn of it by Protestants.—Their Tract trash and lying anti-papery effusions have sickened and surfeited the minds of their readers; and poor is the intellect and piteous the case of the ignorant simpleton, who can believe on such unwarrantable authority, the scaring fictions so clumsily invented, and industriously hawked about by the interested to deceive, and which now seem but the agonizing throes of the scorched snake before finally expiring. Not all the testimonies which can be adduced from the interested and hireling scribblers in the Protestant cause, will ever now persuade the scholar, or the gentleman acquainted with the world, that Catholics are idolaters, worshipping the creature instead of the one true and living God;—that they are slaves to superstition more than their Protestant brethren;—or horned monsters of a more vicious breed than our bull of Bashan seems to be.

As for the *Toronto Church-man*, who is raising up to himself enemies on all sides, we shall, for the present, leave him quietly to gloat over the euphonious title, and lately invented name of his national sect,—“CATHOLIC PROTESTANTISM”!!!

*Omnia jam sunt, sicut quæ possis negare.*

We sincerely wish him to continue in his ultra-Gnathical style, his violent diatribes

against the good old “mother church; as he thereby serves her cause more than he is aware of;—and we should much regret, on that account, his removal from the editorial chair, lest his successor in office might prove to be a more acute and cunning customer.

*I am come in the name of my Father, and you receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive.*—JOHN v. 43.

In the whole course of ecclesiastical history, from the time of the Apostles to the present day, we see this saying of the Saviour realized to a tittle, so as to mark out to us, and distinguish from his own only true church, which comes, or is sent, in no name but his own, all heretical sects which come and are obtruded upon us, not in his name who was sent by the Father, but in the names of their several founders; some in the names of the countries or places where they originated, and some deriving their appellations from the new and unheard of opinions which they taught.—Thus, from the beginning downwards, the followers of Simon Magus were called Simonaites; of Nicholas, Nicolaites; of Priscillian, Priscillianists; of Montanus, Montanists; of Manicheus, Manicheans; of Arius, Arians; of Nestorius, Nestorians; of Eutychius, Eutychians; of Donatus, Donatists; of Pelagius, Pelagians; of Wickliffe, Wickliffites; of John Huss, Hussites; of Peter Waldo, Waldenses, &c. &c. In the same manner are the several sects of Protestantism distinguished; each of them bearing the name of its own particular founder; such as Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calampadians, Carlostadians, Bucerians, Calvinists, Swedenburghers, Swenkfeldians, Arminians, Wesleyans, Whitefieldites, Huntingdonites, Cameronians, Muggletonians, Hutchinsonians, Southcotonians, Wilkinsonians, Menonists, Irvinites, Davidites, and a thousand others, all grouping together in the names of the inventors of their several discrepant systems of doctrine and worship; besides numbers distinguished by the mad freaks and odd peculiarities observable in their worship: such as the Quakers, Shakers, Jumpers, Seekers, Sliders, Swaddlers, Ranters, &c. Others are named after the countries where they originated and exist; such as the Anglicans, or Church of England; the Church of Scotland. But none of these, nor of numberless others, “came in the name of the Saviour,” whom the eternal Father commanded us all to “hear,”—Matt. xvii. 5; and he himself commands all “to hear his church,” or be accounted as “heathens”—ibid. xviii. 16; and tells us, that “he who hears her pastors, hears himself.—Luke x. 16. Now, which is his church?—Surely no other but the one to which he made all his promises; therefore the first and most ancient one; the one which he said he “built upon the rock,” declaring that “the gates of Hell should never prevail against her;” the one, too, which bears not the name of any other founder but himself; which is not the church of any particular place or country; but the Church of all Nations and of all Ages since the Saviour’s time. And who are her pastors, whom he commands us to

hear as we would himself?—those only who, as he has said, enter into the sheepfold by the door; [that is, by lawful ordination] not those who “climb up another way:” such he designates “thieves and robbers.”—John x. 1.

☞ We really think there has not been, nor ever can be, a more barefaced, unblushing effrontery, than that of the Protestant Church of England, in taking to itself the title of CATHOLIC;—a name so long scoffed at, repudiated, abhorred by its teachers and their followers; against which all the persecuting statutes of their sectarian parliament were enacted; and which they endeavoured in vain for upwards of three hundred years to blot out of their national vocabulary. Yet who, but a member of the Church of Rome, can say, like an ancient Father of the church, *Christian* is my name, and *Catholic* is my surname? Would a letter directed to the Catholic clergyman of any place be handed over there to the protestant incumbent? As well might the meanest menial assume the title of his lord, and proclaim himself the rightful heir and owner of his honours and property. But in what sense can the Church of England be called Catholic, which all the world knows means universal? In its doctrines? Are they universal, their thirty-nine articles, defined and decreed by the British parliament since the days of the baby king Edward? Who will say that the English is the universal church—the only true church in the world—the only fragment of Messiah’s kingdom here on earth, to whom the eternal Father said, “I will give thee the Gentiles for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession?”—Psalm ii. 8. Has not Scotland as good a right to call herself *Catholic*, and the only true church, since she is based upon and established on the infallible decree of the same time-serving and wisely-accommodating parliament? Really the thing is quite ridiculous, and unworthy of notice, were it not for its astounding absurdity. That a national sect, owing its existence, at so late a period in the history of the church, to the lewd and murderous propensities of a Henry the Eighth—(styled Old Harry)—to the unprincipled ministers of an infant king,—and to the cunning and cruel despot Elizabeth; should shoot itself forward, and thrust itself with strumpet impudence before the church of all ages and nations since the Saviour’s time—assuming her name and claiming her honours—is an ecclesiastical phenomenon reserved for these later, and, as clearly foretold, degenerating times.

From the London Tablet.

### IS THE PRINCE OF WALES BAPTIZED?

Sir;—Having always understood that in the administration of the sacrament of Baptism, the matter and form should be simultaneously applied, or, in other words, that the water should be poured upon the child whilst the words “I baptize thee,” &c. are pronounced, I was not a little surprised to find in the report of the baptismal ceremony of the Prince of Wales, that the

matter and form were separated by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The report, which I have examined in several newspapers, and which I therefore presume is correct, runs thus:—“The Archbishop in a most impressive manner, then said, ‘Albert Edward, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.’ The archbishop then said, ‘we receive this child into the congregation of Christ’s flock,’ and after reading the prayer appointed for this part of the baptismal ceremony, the right reverend prelate sprinkled the prince with water from the font.” So far the report.

Now here, after pronouncing the form of the sacrament, the prelate announces that he receives the child into the congregation of Christ’s flock, and then he goes on to read some other prayer, and it is only after this other prayer that the matter is applied.

Is such baptism valid? Perhaps some of your theological correspondents may give an opinion on the subject.

On what authority the archbishop separated the application of the matter from the application of the form, I know not.—The Book of Common prayer orders the matter and form to be simultaneously applied. It would be strange, and much to be regretted, for the sake of the Prince, if the sacramental rite has been marred, even in the presence of half a dozen of right reverend prelates. Neither the archbishop’s impressive manner, nor Mr. Schole’s “water” from the Jordan, will be of any avail, if the matter and form have been invalidly applied, or if there has been such an interruption between the application of the matter and the application of the form as to constitute them two different, and distinct acts.

We are happy to learn that the very Rev. Michael Power has been nominated by the holy apostolic See, bishop in the western parts of Canada, which it has created into a new diocese. The episcopal consecration of our new prelate will take place at *Laprairie*, Canada East, on the first of May next ensuing.

Extract of a letter from a valued correspondent. It requires no comment:

“I have received your kind letter, and feel extremely sorry and vexed to hear of the apathy and neglect of our clerical brethren. I am sure that if they exerted themselves more, they would find more subscribers than they do. I have, I believe, one of the most scattered missions in the diocese, and the people, generally speaking, are very poor; however, from continued persuasions and exhortations to them on the subject, I believe they do pretty well. \* \* \* I have, indeed, advanced the money to some of them, in order to encourage them: they have not as yet paid me, nor do I think they ever will; however, I am not sorry, as I think whatever little money I have to spare, cannot be better expended than in thus causing the circulation among my people of so excellent and so instructive a periodical. \* \* \* I think it would be well to write to the different clergymen in the diocese to exert themselves more than they do.—It will be an eternal disgrace to have the Catholic discontinued now.”