



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. I.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1851.

NO. 22.

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

(From Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper.)

There perhaps never was an occasion on which the working-classes displayed their wisdom, their integrity, and their sterling common sense, more completely than at the present instant, while the bigotry of the Prelacy is at war with the bigotry of Papacy. I am not now going to measure the respective excellence of creeds: I have no desire to rob Saint Peter of the keys to give them to Saint Paul. The gates of salvation may be in the custody of one saint, or of all: what seems irrefragably certain is that against no form of Christianity will they be closed. The Catholic has as much right to the free exercise of his worship as the Protestant: there are good and excellent men of both creeds—there are also the vilest of the vile professing either the one or the other. Neither sect is justified in denouncing or persecuting the other: nor should one assume to tolerate the other. Toleration itself is tyranny; because it is the assumption of a power on one side to grant the boon of free worship on the other—and no man nor set of men is justified in conceding as a favor that which is a positive right beyond all dispute.

What is all the present hubbub about?—a hubbub so scandalous, so disgraceful, so immitigably dishonoring to a civilised country! A few words will explain the whole matter. There is an Established Church in Great Britain and Ireland, sucking twelve millions annually from the vitals of the industrious classes in both islands. This Church is Protestant, and has many Archbishops and Bishops, who live like Princes, rank with Peers, and sit in the Upper House of Parliament. The revenue enjoyed by this Church is greater than the united revenues of all the other Church Establishments in Europe; and greater than even the whole State-revenue of Spain, which is the Catholic country *par excellence*. But in Great Britain and Ireland there are several millions of Catholics, who not only voluntarily support their own Church, but are compelled to contribute towards the maintenance of the Established Church, from the tenets of which they utterly dissent. They acknowledge the Pope as the spiritual head of their Church; and this Pope has thought it right to give them Archbishops and Bishops, for whose maintenance they are quite ready and willing to pay. It is true that they had prelates before: but their hierarchy is now, as it were, being remodelled; and, according to their notions, more suitable and appropriate titles are being bestowed upon their Archbishops and Bishops.

This is the "head and front" of the whole offending on the part of the Catholics. But the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church are raising the cry that Protestantism is in danger, and that the Pope menaces the entire country with conversion to Papacy. If such a peril did really exist, it would only show upon what a shallow foundation Protestantism rests: but that peril does not exist—no, not even in the minds of the hypocrites who proclaim it. They know full well that the intelligence of the masses and the rapid spread of Dissent are dealing death-blows at the colossal monopoly of the Established Church; and instead of crying out that "Protestantism is in danger," they should tell the truth and say, "Our revenues, our luxuries, our palaces, our privileges, and our peerages are in danger!"

But what a sad example of Christian meekness, love, and charity, do the clergy of the Established Church at present afford for the contemplation of the world! Here we have mitred prelates and black-robed clergymen denouncing the Catholics with a fend-like malignity,—endeavoring to goad the people to madness by their violent harangues and diabolical fulminations,—and perhaps aiming at a "holy war" against that sect which dares to differ from themselves. No yelping bloodhounds ever exhibited a more savage ferocity, than that which really inspires the conduct of our clergy at the present moment: and I firmly believe that nothing would please them better than to hear that their insane denunciations had driven a few ignorant fanatics to offer violence to Cardinal Wiseman in London or Bishop Ullathorne at Birmingham. But this infamous attempt to get up a war of extermination against the Roman Catholics will not succeed: the working-classes have already shown the contempt and scorn with which they treat this quarrel between the British Prelacy and Romish Papacy;—and neither the agitation of desperate clergymen nor the jesuitical policy of Lord John Russell will succeed in diverting the minds of the masses from the one grand object—Political Reform.

I am utterly opposed to Archbishops and Bishops altogether, no matter of what denomination. I believe that spiritual Princes and Peers are no more required than temporal Princes and Peers. But I declare emphatically that if it be necessary for Protestants to have prelates, it is equally requisite for the

Catholics to have them; and if the Protestants have a Bishop of London, the Catholics have a right to have a Bishop of Westminster. The Catholic Bishop of Westminster cannot possibly exercise any control over the Protestants dwelling in that city: whereas the Protestant Bishop of London does exercise a control over the Catholics in his diocese, inasmuch as they are compelled to pay towards his maintenance, and he has a voice in making the laws which they are bound to obey.

Before the nation precipitates itself headlong into idle conjectures relative to the dangers of Papacy, let it pause to reflect upon the ills which it has sustained at the hands of Prelacy. Twelve millions annually are absorbed by the cormorant Established Churches of England and Ireland: and with one or two occasional exceptions, the Archbishops and Bishops sitting in the House of Peers have invariably proved the bitterest, most rancorous, and the most virulent enemies of the people. What a pretty specimen of prelacy is the Bishop of Exeter! Look at his conduct in the Gorham case—how utterly opposed to common sense, justice, and reason. Such a man in enlightened France would be looked upon as a sort of Punch playing tragedy: but in this unhappy country his character is invested with all imaginable sanctity. Prelacy is the curse of England: it is a formidable barrier to progress—it is intolerant and illiberal to a degree—and by its ostentation, pomp, luxury, and avarice, it sets a most pernicious example to the whole community. Our bloated Church is a bye-word and a scandal throughout Christendom: its very history is written in blood, and rendered awfully memorable by persecutions as vile as any that the Catholics ever practised: it has had its Inquisition—and now it wants its Holy War.

Reader, you are of course aware that in the Tower of London there are numerous implements and engines of torture; and it has been the fashion to ascribe these diabolical instruments to Catholic invention. Indeed, the opinion has been assiduously inculcated that they were manufactured by the Spaniards to use against the English Protestants, and were taken from the ships of the Armada by Lord Howard of Effingham. I must likewise observe in this place that Lord John Russell, in his speech at the Guildhall banquet on Lord Mayor's day, eulogised the "Protestant Queen Elizabeth," and ventured to hint that Victoria would not fail to adopt her as an example in defence of Protestantism. Heaven forbid that the present Sovereign should do any such thing! And now, by what I am going to record, I will give the reader a farther insight than he may already possess into the character of the present Prime Minister of England.

The implements of torture contained in the Tower, were not manufactured by the Spaniards: nor were they made by Catholics at all. They were the handiwork of Protestants—fabricated in England—and in the time of that very Queen Elizabeth whom Lord John Russell recommends as an example to Queen Victoria. For torture was used in England during the reign of that same precious Elizabeth, and by her own special command. If she defended Protestantism, it was by torturing the Catholics; and surely the British people cannot wish to behold Victoria adopting a similar course? Elizabeth had no more right to be styled "good Queen Bess," than she had to the distinction of "the Virgin Queen." She was a vile, merciless wretch—cruel as a Sovereign and profligate as a woman. A work recently published by Mr. Bentley of New Burlington Street, and containing the Despatches of Sir Christopher Hatton, her favorite Chancellor, proves incontestably that she intrigued criminally with that infamous statesman; and no man of common sense can doubt but that she was equally loose in her amours with Leicester and Essex. With regard to her cruelty, several warrants ordaining the infliction of the torture upon Catholics, and signed by her own hand, are preserved in the British Museum; and there is one, dated 1565, commanding the authorities "to put a Papist vagrant to the rack, in order that he may be made to declare *why he wandereth abroad without a home!*" Yet this is the lady who is praised for having given England merciful laws relative to the poor and vagrant, and whom Lord John Russell holds up as a pattern-defender of Protestantism, and as an example which (doubtless directed by his honest counsel) Queen Victoria is to follow!

The British Prelacy has therefore had its Inquisition in England. Under its influence, women have been burnt as witches; and the Archbishops and Bishops have notoriously been the most strenuous opponents to all emendations in our savage criminal laws. Now they are endeavoring to get up a crusade—a holy war—against the Catholic. Blood—blood: persecution—intolerance—bigotry;—these are the words which sum up the history and describe the policy of our British Prelacy from the time of Henry VIII. down to the present day. Will the working-classes,

then, manifest any sympathy towards the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church? No such thing. Let that Church fall with a crash—and the true religion of the Saviour will receive an enormous benefit.

But how did the Established Church become possessed of the lands, patronage, and enormous revenues which it now enjoys? By plundering the Catholics. The origin of the wealth of this Established Church embraces every feature of the most loathsome scoundrelism and abhorrent villany, as I will speedily prove. In Catholic times, suppose that a rich peer, knight, or gentleman experienced certain qualms of conscience on his death-bed: he confessed his sins to the priest, and in order to propitiate heaven, bequeathed broad lands or large revenues to some particular shrine, church, or monastery, on condition that masses should be said for his soul's repose on a particular day, every year, until the end of time. Other persons, having no crimes to answer for, but through purely charitable motives, assigned lands and monies to religious institutions on condition that donations were to be given at particular periods to the local poor, and that all way-farers were to be accommodated with a night's lodging and a good meal. By these means the Catholics obtained nine-tenths of the rich endowments belonging to their Church. But when Henry VIII. proclaimed Protestantism and suppressed the monasteries, the New Established Church took possession of all those Catholic Endowments. The lands and revenues bequeathed by deceased persons on *special conditions*, became the property of the Protestant Clergy, who of course did not fulfil those conditions. But either the terms of the original donors should have been complied with, or the lands and revenues bequeathed for the express purpose should have been restored to the donors' families, or have merged in the national property. The Church, however, is not in the habit of disgorging anything: neither has it done so in the present case. The wax-tapers are not lighted—the masses are not said—the donations to the poor are not given: but the lands and revenues are tenaciously clung to by the Established Church. This Church has consequently violated all the original compacts by virtue of which those lands and revenues were bequeathed: and the possession of its inordinate wealth is thus based on fraud the most flagrant—perfidy the most infamous—and robbery the most bare-faced.

Instead of an agitation being got up against the Catholics, it should arise against the Prelacy. Let the proud, arrogant, domineering, luxurious Prelacy be destroyed: let those Archbishops and Bishops—the Judas Iscariots of the Protestant Church—be dismitted. They seek to put down Sunday travelling, cheap railway-trains and steam-boat excursions, for the working-classes, while they roll along in their gorgeous chariots, attended by their powdered lacqueys, to the gates of the temple on the Sabbath: they endeavor to suppress Sunday-trading, shut up the public-houses and the bakers' shops, and compel the poor man to go without his beer and his hot joint, while they sit down to a board groaning beneath dainties of all sorts and covered with wines of every exquisite description. The mitred impostors—the sacerdotal hypocrites! And they dare to cry that Protestantism is in danger, when it is their own flagitious conduct that desecrates the Christian creed and dishonors a Christian country. The dignitaries of the Established Church as much resemble the primitive Apostles, as darkness resembles light. These Right Reverend Fathers in God live in defiance of the morality of the very creed which they profess, and which declares it to be "easier for a cable to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven." They out-herod all the most pampered Cardinals or bloated Abbots that ever belonged to the Romish hierarchy. The Pope and all his Court have not a revenue so large as the united incomes of the Archbishops and Bishops of our Established Church. The people of Great Britain and Ireland are annually robbed of twelve millions sterling to maintain this Church in its present proud, domineering, and voluptuous condition. How can it be wondered at, if tradesmen and farmers are all crying out that they cannot possibly endure the heavy pecuniary burthens fastened upon them?—how can it be wondered at, if the working classes are starving by millions, while those in Ireland are actually furnished out of existence? Where is the Christian sympathy, where the charity, where the benevolence of these prelates who take their thousands a-year, when they know that so many of their fellow creatures are perishing with want or dragging out a wretched existence in the accursed bastilles of the Poor Law?

Let the Church of England be reformed, before it dares to impugn the proceedings of the Catholics. We are in no danger from Papacy: but we are in immense danger from farther usurpations, graspings,

and encroachments on the part of the Protestant Prelacy. There is nothing to fear from the Pope: but there is everything to fear at the hands of our own Archbishops and Bishops. Puralism, simony, and nepotism, so strongly denounced by the early Fathers of the Church, are now flagrantly practised by our Clergy of the present day. Instead therefore of vociferating, "Down with the Catholics," let us exclaim, if religious agitation there must be, "Down with our Bench of Bishops!"

GEORGE W. M. REYNOLDS.

THE ANTI-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

(From the Tuam Herald.)

If we had no other evidence of the great strides made by Catholicity in England than the excitement manifested within the last three weeks in reference to the Hierarchy question, that alone would furnish ample proof. It is clear that the Protestant Clergy are beginning to feel serious apprehensions about the stability of the principles of the Reformation. Hence their anxiety to elicit demonstrations of popular violence, to contravene the victorious encroachments made upon their flocks by the ever-active energies of the Catholic Missionaries in England. Instead of a cool and dispassionate enquiry into the principles upon which Catholic rights are maintained, and the present Ecclesiastical arrangements are based, they find it a more convenient subterfuge to have recourse to ebullitions of brute force. They would reverse the progress of civilisation and of religious liberty by again setting up the gibbet, the rack, and the burning pile. They would, if they dared to express their true sentiments, desire to see the entire of the penal laws against Dissenters re-enacted in all their barbarous proportions. However, it is now too late to dream of such fantasies. A verdict of lunacy would be recorded by the civilised world against any member of the Legislature who would seriously attempt to propose a return to the obsolete forms of exclusion or other penal enactments against nine millions of her Majesty's subjects in these countries. As far as Ireland is concerned, we perceive that the leading organs of English opinion have the killing kindness to recognise our immunity from the danger of persecution. . . . One word in reference to the English Catholics themselves. Up to this time we suspect they were not fully aware that their strength lay in being united with the Catholic people of Ireland. It would be rather ungracious now, in the days of their peril, to recur to the cowardly stabs given to the freedom of Irish Catholicity by the Shrewsburys, the Beaumonts, and even, if reports be true, by some high English Ecclesiastical Dignitaries. We are not unmindful of the storms occasionally raised against the manly attempts of the conductors of the *Tablet* in their efforts to create a vigorous and cordial union between the English and those patriotic Catholics who always manifested an uncompromising attitude of defiance against the treacherous encroachments of a bigoted though covert system of proselytism. We trust that, warned by the contempt in which their isolated position has placed them, at the feet of a fanatical mob, they will begin to see that their only hope of keeping a firm footing is by making common cause with their poorer, but yet powerful, brethren in Ireland. Even in Cardinal Wiseman's Address to the English People, we perceive that he is beginning to feel the full force of the security to which we allude. It is not yet too late to enter with us in this country into such a bond, offensive and defensive, as will protect both parties from a recurrence of such attempts at checking the full development of Catholic principles, and their free and unfettered action in reference to such arrangements as may be thought necessary by the head of the Catholic Church.

AN ANTI-CATHOLIC BOOK-COLLECTOR.

(From the Shepherd of the Valley.)

A few years since, a member of the Academy of Sciences, and a Professor the *College de France*. Brutus Timoleon Libri, created a great sensation by the description he gave in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of a book, in which, he said, were contained reports made to the General of the Jesuits by members of that body, on the character and circumstances of those who, in various parts of the world, had made them the depositories of their secrets. Every Catholic, worthy of the name, and every honest man capable of forming an independent opinion on the subject, knew that the pretended discovery was only one of the many artifices made use of by the enemies of religion to decry the Jesuits, and the Church itself; but this did not prevent M. Libri from becoming, in company with another Professor, M. Michelet, who, much about the same time, held up the confessional as incompatible with the family, immense-