



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. I.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1851.

NO. 29.

"WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?"

(From *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*.)

THE AGITATION IN SCOTLAND.

In Scotland, where Popery is more deeply abhorred by the populace than in England, and where Papists are represented not by premier dukes and ancient gentry, but mainly by reckless or pauperised Irish immigrants, the matter has been taken with a coolness contrasting instructively with the fever in England. Of course, there have not been a-wanting many very willing to take advantage of such a capital opportunity to resume harping on the old strings, which have hardly given forth a sound since the No-Popery agitation against the Melbourne Ministry. But in Scotland only that class can be said to have spoken, and spoken with less power and acceptance than they used to speak with when the themes of their enunciation were the "Appropriation Clause" and the Irish National Schools. Even in the Church Courts of the Establishment, a minority of the Clergy—a minority greater than supported any of those liberalising measures which the Legislature has adopted, and the Churches have opposed during the last half century—have resisted the agitation as proceeding on an enormous mistake, and conducted in an intolerant spirit. We lately observed in the Scotch papers (such documents don't seem to find their way to the London ones) a string of resolutions moved by the Minister of the High Church of Edinburgh, and seconded by another of the city Clergy, and Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University, from not one word of which do we dissent; and which state, with a remarkable clearness and closeness of logic, precisely and to the fullest extent the views we are here maintaining. The Scottish Voluntary Dissenters also, a body much more numerous and powerful in proportion to the population than their brethren in England, have almost to a man refused to join the agitation; and some of their chief men have even declared it inexpedient to make the theology of Popery, at this time, the subject of pulpit discussion, lest they should be held as countenancing "an absurd and unchristian agitation." The Liberal newspapers of Scotland are also stated to be—with not above half-a-dozen exceptions, compensated for by recruits from the non-Liberal sections—strenuously opposed to the movement. Not a dozen meetings in support of the agitation have been held north of the Tweed, and of these not one was really "public." Hurrah for *canny* Scotland! We might say *canny* Lancashire, too, for there also the Liberal press is, in the main, sound; and in the list of attendants at the Liverpool and Manchester meetings, you will look in vain for the names of any of the well-known Liberals of these districts—the Phillipses, Greys, Armitages, and Heywoods, of Manchester; and the Earles, Rathbones, and Aikins, of Liverpool. In short, as Scotland is cool compared with England, the English provinces are cool compared with the metropolis. The centre of the heat is London, and especially the London press. Why, the bulk even of the Clergy—nay, the very Bishops—are not so furious as some London journals that have all their lives before been treating "No-Popery" as a humbug and a disgrace.

With some further chance, we would fain hope, of getting a hearing, we now resuscitate the simple facts of the case, long since drowned amid floods of declamation and irrelevancy. The Church of Rome has two modes of conducting her Ecclesiastical affairs; one that which existed in England till last October, the other that which exists in England now. The former system is adopted, apparently, in countries where Roman Catholics are few, or (as in countries such as China) have not full toleration; the other in countries where Roman Catholics are in considerable numbers, and have the same liberties as all the other religious bodies, or (where there is an establishment) all the other Dissenters. In acting under either of these systems, the Pope (who in such matters acts not of his own knowledge and desires, but under the guidance of the ruling portion of his Church in the country concerned, has also two ways of proceeding. In countries where the Romish religion is more or less acknowledged by the State—whether the general character of the country is Romish, as in France, or Protestant, as in Prussia—he makes his nomination and arrangements, to some extent, in co-operation with the Governments. In countries where the Romish religion is not acknowledged by the State—whether as in our own country, from another and only one, or, as in the United States, from there being no religion adopted by the State—he proceeds, and necessarily proceeds, without consulting the Governments; in fact, our own Government is legally prohibited from holding any communication with the Court of Rome. Accordingly, the Pope, who had in England nominated and re-arranged as he chose, under the former of the two systems described, has now, on the advice, judicious or not, of his leading adherents here, changed to the second of the two

systems, and made his nominations and re-arrangements accordingly. In other words, he has disused a system which, so far as we can find, is in use in no country where the circumstances at all resemble those of Great Britain, and has adopted that which, so far as we can find, is in use in every country similarly situated—the system which, to take familiar and unexceptionable instances, has been long in use in Ireland and the United States.

WHAT HAS REALLY BEEN DONE?

The thing that has been done is simply this:—The English Roman Catholics used to be Ecclesiastically governed, first by four, then by eight persons, called Bishops, but taking their Episcopal titles from places in Barbary, and styling themselves "Vicars-Apostolic" of southern or northern districts in England, for the purposes of which arrangement England was divided into four, and then into eight districts; the English Roman Catholics are now governed by twelve persons calling themselves Bishops, and taking their titles from the districts where they actually reside, for the purposes of which arrangement England has been divided into twelve districts. The difference between a Vicar-Apostolic and a Bishop is simply this, that the former acts merely as the Vicar of the Pope, and according to directions proceeding immediately from Rome; while the latter, and his Clergy with him, form a Church, still acknowledging, indeed, the Pope as their spiritual head, but managing their own Ecclesiastical affairs among themselves, and not, as formerly, through the Pope.

IS IT AGAINST THE LAW?

The only clause in the Emancipation Act having any bearing on the present matter, is one (24th) quite irrelevant to the objects of that Act, which was introduced in the Lords avowedly (such was the Duke of Wellington's explanation) to please the Bishops with a meaningless trifle, and which the Roman Catholics have, in this case, demonstrably, neither broken nor "evaded." That clause merely prohibited the Prelates of the Roman Catholic Church from distinguishing themselves by the names of places already in use by the Prelates of the Established Church; and that it was not thereby meant to prohibit them using the names of other places is plain, not only from the clause not simply prohibiting them doing so, which would have been incomparably more natural and simple, but from the fact that the operation of the clause is restricted to England and Ireland, Scotland being excluded, for the obvious and only possible reason that there the name of no place is legally in possession of any Prelate—consequently, in Scotland, any place was left open, while, in England, the places in use by Established Prelates, and such places only, were prohibited. But this clause not only does this—it shows plainly that the framers of the act contemplated the probability or certainty of the Roman Catholic Church in England leaving, as it now has, the undeveloped for the developed form; as they already saw it not only in the foreign countries around, and in the United States, but in Ireland, a portion of the United Kingdom. We confidently ask any man of common sense, (by the bye, it was strange that even Cardinal Wiseman should miss this point,) would any man have prohibited the Roman Catholics from taking the names of certain places as titles if they had intended that there should not be any such Bishops at all? The second objection on the point we are here dealing with is, that the "territorial divisions" are somehow or another "unconstitutional," or something of that sort, variously and vaguely expressed. This objection has the fortune of being popular—the great card of the shallow, the unthinking, and dishonest portion of the agitators—and of being expressly repudiated by the ablest and honestest. Thus, the chief speaker at "the great Edinburgh meeting," the principal of the Free Church College, confessed he "could find no civil element in it;" and the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Hinds) in his excellent but too tardy reply to his Clergy, declares that the Roman Catholic, or any other episcopally-governed Church, "is not tolerated" if it has not power to make these "territorial divisions." Indeed, the thing is as plain as day; you cannot have twelve Bishops all with equal power everywhere; and, moreover, what difference in principle is there between the twelve territorial divisions existing now, and the eight divisions existing till last October, or the four divisions existing till a few years ago? And some kind of territorial divisions being necessary, what kind were they to take? Were they to take the territorial divisions of the Establishment? Even if that would not have looked more like "aggression" than the other course, how could they have managed it, when they only needed twelve Bishops and the Establishment has twenty-four Dioceses?

REAL EFFECT OF THE CHANGE.

What is the practical effect of the thing done?

On the English Roman Catholics themselves, the effect is to render them more independent of the Court of Rome. Yes, we repeat—and, amid all that has been said, we have never seen this disproved nor even denied—that the effect of the change which has created so much "alarm and indignation" is greatly to deprive the Pope of influence and the functions he has hitherto exercised in this country, without any one feeling called on to become alarmed or indignant. To illustrate the change by a Protestant parallel, the former position of the Roman Catholic Church in England was similar to that of an English Protestant Mission (say in the colonies, where the missionaries act under the orders of the society or Church that sent them out; its present position is similar to that of such a Mission when it has assumed the organisation of a Church, and when its missionaries have become Ministers by being formed into a Presbytery, or passing under the form of local Bishop. The effect in the one case is to make the mission more colonial and less mother country; in the other to make the English Roman Catholics, in their Ecclesiastical connection, less Romish and more English. That is all the effect of the change on the English Roman Catholics. And what is its effect on non-Catholics, or the community at large? Nothing—literally, absolutely, demonstrably, nothing. Not one man within the four seas is affected by it to the extent of one farthing of his purse or one feather of his dignity. These Bishops acquire no new power, nor have any power "to tithe or toll in our dominions;" no man, unless he is so minded, need call them Archbishop or Bishop, any more than he need apply the same title to the Bishops of the Episcopal Dissenters of Scotland, or call the Presbyterian Dr. Cumming "Moderator," or the Wesleyan Dr. Hannah "President;" and the Bishops of other Churches—the Bishops of the Church chosen by the State—are left unmolested in the possession of everything civil, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, that is theirs: their powers, their palaces, their peerages, and their magnificent revenues. The change, we say, is one which, besides affecting Roman Catholics only, as rendering them more independent of Rome, does not affect or concern other people at all.

A REAL PAPAL AGGRESSION.

(From the *Tablet*.)

Positively a penal law is necessary to stop the Papal invasion by which all England will otherwise be overrun. What will become of us? Where will it all end? The fury of the English public, big talk, stump oratory, and floods of Anglican-Episcopal wash, have hitherto produced no effect whatever. Nay, it would rather seem, if our private accounts are to be believed, that they have produced an effect, but altogether in a wrong direction. Instead of stopping the march of the Pope's forces, they have quickened the speed of their movements. A little while ago it was supposed that all the Bishopsricks were not to be filled up for a long while to come, and that several of them were to be held *in commendam*; but it seems this is not the case. The fury of the tempest now raging in England attracts Bishops to that favored region, who are anxious, one would suppose, to undergo some form of martyrdom. Every Bishop must have Bulls; and if Bulls are to be excluded by the new theological tariff, it is, no doubt, thought well to place the matter out of doubt before that tariff can receive the sanction of the Legislature. So we are told that Dr. Cox is to be the new Bishop of Southwark; Dr. Newman the new Bishop of Nottingham; Dr. Errington of Salford; and Dr. Tate and Dr. Grant of the two other vacant dioceses. Everything, it seems, will thus be ready for Lord John to work upon when he gets his *Parliamentum indoctum*—his ignorant, or, rather, his daft and brainless Parliament together. The added heads of country squires and Cockney Liberals will have ample materials upon which to employ their hands. Not only will England be divided into dioceses, parcelled out, cut and squared, at their wicked will and pleasure, by Cardinal Franzoni and Antonelli, but the new Sees will, as far as we can judge, be actually full before the new penal law can well have passed the second reading. The Conscript Fathers will not, perhaps, all be in the Senate House when the barbarian Whigs enter the walls; but they are hastening to take their seats, and they will be ready, with crook in hand, to rebuke the savage who shall assault them, and to be massacred or martyred when the invading-chief gives the word, to fall on.

But this is not all. A very well-informed correspondent writes us that while "Arrangements are being made for the immediate filling up of the vacant Sees, it is understood that in the early part of the summer a full Provincial Synod will be held; and that a uniform discipline will be published for the government of the whole Province."

This is exactly what terrifies us. Not only Bishops,

but a Synod! Why, this is the very thing the *Times* wrote against last Wednesday, in answer to Mr. Cobden.

"That Synodical action!" The *Times* thinks it would not be tolerated in America, and that it must not be tolerated in England; and yet there is actually to be a Synod, "a full Provincial Synod," and that in the early part of the coming summer. Just about the time that the Queen in person, or by Commissioners, will be uttering over the new penal code the magic words "*La Reine le veut*," which are to consign Bishops and Hierarchy to one common destruction, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster—regardless of the terrors of her Majesty's most gracious brow, and acting under the authority of Bulls which will just have received their final condemnation from Omnipotence, that is, from the British Parliament—will be seated in a private room, in an arm-chair, presiding over twelve other Bishops, all equally breakers of the law—holding, in short, an illegal assembly—administering illegal oaths—enacting illegal statutes—and, in a word, violating the law right and left, without scruple, but with the utmost audacity and good sense.

(From the *Tablet*.)

The *Times* of last Wednesday begins by referring to the appointment of Dr. Keane to the Bishopric of Ross, in which matter he says "our indignation is provoked by a second Bull." As no human being with whom we are acquainted, values at one straw "our indignation," or the indignation of those whom "we" represent, or of whose opinions "we" are the echo, it may be well to reciprocate this magniloquent nonsense with the expression of "our contempt," and to pass on to the next clause, which is as follows:

Our readers are aware that it has been our wish, as far as possible, to separate the English from the Irish question; and while admitting that the state of the latter country is as little satisfactory in point of religion, as in every other respect, to adjourn to a calmer time and a more opportune season the consideration of the remedies which her case may require. This, however, the Pope and his advisers seem determined shall not be done.

"Our wish!" No doubt, it is "our wish" to eat our meals by degrees; to take a comfortable breakfast in the morning; a lunch about two o'clock in the afternoon; a dinner at six; and, from time to time, such other refreshment as the bodily man may require—all at "our ease." Cold English Catholic, with tea and mullin, make a very good first meal on rising. Pickle Sawney, in the middle of the day, answers the double purpose of a refresher and a whet. And, then, towards a solid meal in the cool of the evening, an Irish stew of twenty-eight Bishops, well served up, with a hash of the second order of the Clergy, would make a very comfortable day's work for the great "us," on whose behalf the *Times* wields the thunder of the skies. All these dishes, divided into separate meals, are very well, and even fattening; but to take them altogether? To crowd the gastric operations of twelve hours into two? To overload the stomach, and (like a Greenlander hospitably treated) to stuff yourself up to the very corners of your lips? Every one has heard of the dog who gorged himself with a large joint of meat, the bone of which he picked with exemplary cleanliness, and then lay down to choke. The persons interested in his welfare, enraged, indeed, at the loss of their mutton, but solicitous for the dog's welfare, had him carefully stretched out before the kitchen fire, and well greased and heated, in order to promote digestion by facilitating the action of the stomachic muscles. If John Bull—large as his digestive capacity may be—were to take three such meals as we have described all in one day, it might be the death of him. Nobody can tell whether he would or would not choke. At best, he would be like the over-gorged hound, and his keepers would certainly have to spread him out before the fire and have him well oiled, warmed, rubbed, and manipulated. Nor would it stop there. Depletion in some form or other is the necessary consequence of repletion; and after such a feast must come physic. So, to avoid these unpleasant consequences, it has been proposed, it seems, to take the meals of the day with the ordinary interval between them; and to settle the English and Irish Catholics on the principle vulgarly expressed by the phrase, "one down, another come on." The English Catholics—so it was "our wish"—were first to be placed *hors de combat*. While their hash was being settled, the Irish Catholics were supposed to lie quietly by and wait for the next turn. This is the principle on which the throats of geese and turkeys are cut for the market, and it was thought the Catholics of Ireland would follow the illustrious precedent. The English Catholics once effectually gagged, the next step would be to gag the Irish; and if the Irish Catholics were to lie by till their own turn came, the work would be then already half done, and the Irish Catholics would find themselves concluded.