

The True Witness

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 7, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. The steamer 'Plover' from Liverpool... arrived at New York on Wednesday.

ORANGEISM.

The excitement consequent upon the disturbances at Montreal and Toronto on the 12th and 13th ult. having now considerably subsided...

1. That Protestants do not take offence at, or endeavor to disturb the Catholic procession of the Fete Dieu; and that therefore no Catholic should take offence at, or offer any opposition to, Orange processions and demonstrations on the 12th of July.

2. That French Canadian Catholics, who are as sincerely attached to their religion, and as zealous for the honor of their Church, as are Irish Catholics, take no notice of Orange processions or demonstrations; and that therefore it is monstrous that Irish Catholics should take offence thereat.

We meet the first of these arguments by the assertion, that it is not true that Protestants do not take offence at the Catholic processions of the Fete Dieu. They do take offence at them; they pronounce them "illegal," brand them as "idolatrous," and would, if they had the power, put a stop to them entirely.

In the next place, there is nothing in the Catholic procession to wake up painful memories—to wound the feelings, or to arouse the passions of any section of the Christian world. The great event which it commemorates is one, not of strife and persecution, but of divine love; an event upon which every Christian can look back without a pang; for that event is the redemption of mankind by Our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, and the institution of the Sacrament which, as an unfulfilling pledge of His love, He left in perpetual commemoration of His passion.

But the event commemorated by the Orange procession is, and must be, one deeply painful to the feelings of the Catholic, and the Irish Catholic in particular. It commemorates the conquest of Catholic Ireland by a foreign Protestant army—and is therefore insulting to the religion and nationality of Irishmen; it commemorates the establishment, by force of arms, of "Protestant Ascendancy" over a Catholic people—and is therefore painful and insulting in the highest degree to the professors of the Catholic faith; and it is avowedly designed as a public declaration of the object of those who take part in it, to establish, if possible, in Canada, and perpetuate the same "Ascendancy" of one denomination

over another—and must therefore be offensive to every true friend of "civil and religious liberty." Roman liberty consists in perfect equality, and as "Ascendancy" is incompatible with perfect equality, so "Protestant Ascendancy" is incompatible with, and is the direct contradictory of, civil and religious liberty.

We should not therefore wonder at the hostility which these party demonstrations—so insulting to the national pride of Irishmen—so offensive to their religious feelings as Catholics—suggestive of so many years of "Protestant Ascendancy," and so incompatible with "civil and religious liberty"—provoke from Irish Catholics in particular; neither can we conclude from the acts of violence to which the latter are sometimes provoked, to their intolerance, and natural propensity to outrage.

Let us take a case in point; though to be sure it would be difficult to find in the history of the world any two countries which have stood to one another in precisely the same relations as have Protestant Anglo-Saxon England, and Catholic Celtic Ireland, for the last three hundred years. Something however very closely approaching thereunto may be discovered in the relative positions of Mahomedan Turkey, and Christian Greece; though far be it from us so to malign the Turk as to insinuate that Moslem rule over a Christian population was, even at its worst, so foul and cruel a thing as has been Protestant rule over the Catholic population of Ireland. Compared with the latter, the worst atrocities of the Turk seem but the legitimate severities of a wise and paternal Government.

Even the massacre at Scio does not present the hideous and revolting features that does the massacre of the Papists at Dolly's Brae by the Orangemen in 1849.

Now we ask any candid unprejudiced person, what in his opinion, would be the result if, in the streets of Athens, or Napoli di Romania, a procession of Turks, to commemorate the defeat, and subsequent captivity of the Greek Christians, were to make its appearance, with shouts of to "hell with the Giaour," and loudly proclaiming the design to re-establish "Moslem Ascendancy" in the Morea? Would it be thought a proof of a particular blood-thirsty, intolerant, and malignant disposition on the part of the Greek Christians if, thus insulted and outraged, they drew pistols and yatagans on the insulters and oppressors of their creed and country? Yet whatever cruelties may have been inflicted by the Moslem stranger on the children of the fair isles of the Aegean, far deeper are those which the sons of Catholic Erin have suffered from the hands of the Anglo-Saxon Protestant "alien;" and the Greek or Irishman who unmoved could look upon a procession commemorative of the wrongs and sufferings of his Church and country, and listen calmly to the taunts of his alien oppressors, "aliens in blood, in language and religion"—would be either less than a man, or more than an angel.

The plain fact of the matter is, that no high spirited people ever did, or ever will, submit to be taunted with national defeats or national misfortunes. Nay—in spite of all their affected philosophy, we cannot but think that, if a procession were to make its appearance in the streets of Montreal, triumphantly commemorating the sound thrashing that the British troops received from the "Irish Brigade" at Fontenoy, or the repulse of the British attack upon the Redan, its members would be roughly handled, and that the majority of the British Protestant press would bring in a verdict of "serve them right." And yet neither the defeat at Fontenoy, nor the repulse at the Redan, recall memories so painful to the British Protestant as does the conquest of Ireland by the Anglo-Dutch, to the patriotic and high-spirited Irish Catholic.

That French Canadian Catholics do not get excited as do Irish Catholics by Orange demonstrations, is simply because the former have not yet suffered from Orangeism as have the latter. But suppose that amongst our French Canadian Catholic population there were numbers still living who remembered, as do many of our Irish Catholics in Canada to-day, the time when, with every returning twelfth of July, their churches and houses were attacked and given to the flames—who had seen—as have Irishmen still living in Canada—their friends and relatives, perhaps an aged father, a grey haired mother, or the innocent prattling babe, murdered in cold blood, and without provocation, amidst shouts of "Johnny Crapaul lie down," and to "hell with the Pope and Popery;" who had heard the shrieks for help, of sister or sweetheart writhing in the brutal grasp of an infuriated mob of Orangemen—we doubt much, we say, whether if French Canadian Catholics had seen and suffered all these things from the hands of Orangemen, they would manifest the same indifference towards an Orange procession, that they do today. Nor let it be thought that our picture of Orange atrocities in Ireland is overdrawn. Here is one, which, though we have published it before will bear publishing again; and which when Orangeism is again about to uplift its foul head in Canada, it is well to keep prominently before men's eyes, in order that they may know what kind of monster it is that they have in their midst. Let us premise that this picture is from

the hand, not of a Catholic, or an opponent of Orangeism, but of an impartial Committee of the House of Commons in 1835, appointed to inquire into and report upon, the principles and practices of Irish Orangeism; and of a Court appointed by the British Government, to investigate the Orange outrages of 1849.

From the Report of the House of Commons, it appears that the object of Orangeism is the "political supremacy" of Protestants over Catholics; that under the pretence of loyalty, Orangemen attempt to palliate their cruelties towards their offending fellow-citizens—that this pretence of loyalty is a sham, a lie—that the "Orange oath of loyalty" is avowedly conditional; and that, contrary to law, attempts have been repeatedly made to tamper with the allegiance of the army, by issuing warrants to military bodies.

"Nothing"—we are told—"could be more praiseworthy than the published rules of the society. . . . But never did any society exhibit such a glaring inconsistency—rather such a positive contradiction—between its professed principles, and its actual practice. . . . The practice of the Society was to resort to every contrivance" by songs, speeches, party tunes, processions, emblems, and mottoes—to insult, to domineer over, to offend and irritate their Roman Catholic neighbors; and the results of its working was seen in outrages, murders, house wrecked, villages destroyed, riots without number, law perverted, justice denied, and the animosity of the rival parties wrought up to madness."—See Edinburgh Review (Protestant.)

Such is the picture drawn of Orangeism by Protestant hands; such the object and result of Orange processions. Can it therefore be wondered at—whilst human nature is what it is—that the sufferers by these outrages, the sons of the victims of Orange murders, the men who have been made houseless, and driven from their native land by Orange persecution, should become excited in Canada, at beholding in this land of their adoption, the same "processions, emblems, and mottoes" with which in Ireland they had been so often insulted; and which are renewed in Canada with the express design of imposing "Protestant Ascendancy" with all its attendant horrors upon the Catholics of this hitherto free country. To exhort their people to forbearance under insult and outrage is the duty, as it is the invariable practice, of the Catholic Clergy; to use every legal and constitutional means in his power to check the progress of Orange despotism in Canada, is the duty of every good citizen; but the right to condemn the violence of the Irish Catholic, who, smarting under the sense of high two centuries of persecution, is provoked to acts of illegal violence, belongs to him only who, during the course of his life, has never once yielded to the impulse of passion, and who, under the bitterest of provocations, has always, with the grace of God, been able to control his natural indignation. Certainly it is, to say the least, highly indecorous for those very men, who looked calmly on at—if they did not actively encourage—the burning of our Parliament House in 1849, and the subsequent disgraceful riots and cowardly outrages upon our most estimable citizens—riots and outrages by-the-by in which we never heard it insinuated that Irish Catholics took any part—to affect a holy horror at the comparatively trifling, excesses which, in so far as the firemen are concerned, we strongly condemn, but which in other respects, were provoked by the Orangemen themselves. Had it not been for the unprovoked assault made upon a reverend member of the Catholic clergy upon the 12th, we firmly believe that the disturbances of the 13th would not have occurred; and though we attempt not to justify those disturbances, we cannot allow them to be made the pretext for branding the Irish Catholics of Montreal en masse, as a set of Thugs and ruffians.

As they do in Canada to-day. At first we were inclined to doubt this story; but we have now full confirmation of its truth in every particular.

THE HEADSHIP OF THE CHURCH.—We cannot but think that the Montreal Herald has been guilty of injustice towards the Minerve, in taxing that journal with ignorance, for asserting that Henry VIII claimed to be Head of the Church, in the same sense that the Pope does so; and guilty also of much disingenuity in the manner in which he shifts the question at issue betwixt himself and the Minerve, from the theories put forward by Henry VIII, and sanctioned by the obsequious Bishops, Clergy, and Parliaments of his day, to the practise of the Anglican community in the XIX century.

Whatever may be the practise of the present day, we assert—and, if the Herald contradicts us, will prove from history—that according to the theory of the Anglican Church, as great powers in things spiritual are attributed to the Crown of England, as are, by the most ultra-montane Catholic, attributed to the Papal Tiara; and that Henry VIII not only claimed, but constantly exercised, with the sanction of the servile Protestant hierarchy, with the sycophant Cranmer at their head, powers such as no Catholic ever dreamt of assigning to the successor of St. Peter.

According to the theory of the Church of England, the King is the source of all jurisdiction, spiritual, as well as temporal. It is from him that priests derive their power to administer the sacraments, and Bishops authority to confer the Holy Ghost in Ordination. He, and he alone, has, according to the Anglican theory, the sole and absolute right to hear and determine all causes, spiritual as well as temporal: to declare in matters doctrinal, what is true and to be believed—what false and to be rejected. Bishops and priests are but his ministers, to whom he confides the management of his affairs spiritual and ecclesiastical, in precisely the same manner as Lords of the Treasury, and Justices of the Peace are his ministers for the management of his tem-

poral affairs. And though some of the more extravagant of these pretensions may appear to have been explained away by the Proclamation of Elizabeth, yet, if Cranmer may, in any sense, be accepted as the exponent of Anglicanism, and as a fair interpreter of the principles upon which it was originally founded—the King of England is Universal Bishop—"episcopus episcoporum" of the entire realm. If the Montreal Herald denies any of these our statements, we are prepared to prove them by authentic documents, and the testimony of history.

In the meantime, as a proof of the extent to which, in theory, if not in actual practice—for of course Protestants are always consistently inconsistent, and their practise is ever at variance with their theories—the "Royal Supremacy" extends, we would call the Herald's attention to "His Majesty's Declaration," prefixed in the Book of Common Prayer to the "Articles of the Church of England;" and which—no protest having yet been made against it by the clergy or laity of that communion—we are therefore entitled to look upon as embodying the doctrine of the Anglican Church, as to the origin, extent, and nature of that Royal Supremacy:—

"Being"—says this Declaration—"by God's Ordinance"—i.e., of divine right, "supreme governor of the church within these our dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our Kingly office, and our own religious zeal . . . not to suffer unnecessary Disputations, Alterations, or Questions to be raised which may nourish faction both in the Church and commonwealth."—Book of Common Prayer.

His Majesty then proceeds to declare:— "That the Articles of the Church of England . . . do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform Profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles."—Ib.

Here then we have the king claiming to be "Supreme Governor" of the Church of England by divine right, and not by the consent of the people; declaring what is the "true doctrine" of the Church of which he is Head; commanding all his subjects to continue in the profession of that doctrine, by him ratified and confirmed; and prohibiting the least difference or departure therefrom. No Pope, assuredly, even in the plenitude of the Papal power ever pretended to have greater power or spiritual authority in virtue of his Headship or Supremacy in the Catholic Church, than does the King of England at the present day.

Again His Majesty, as "Supreme Governor," thus makes known his royal pleasure:—

"That in those both curious and unhappy differences which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside."—Ib.

When, or where, would we ask the Herald, has the most imperious of the Roman Pontiffs—a Hildebrand or an Innocent—ever claimed greater authority over the human conscience? When, or where, would we ask our cotemporary, has the Papal Church ever shown herself a greater enemy to "freedom of enquiry" than does the Church of England—which, speaking by its "Head upon earth," prohibits "all further curious search" into those doctrinal questions which have long excited the Christian world? We pause for a reply.

Perhaps the Herald will tell us that after all, all that is claimed for the King of England—or rather for the officers by him appointed to hear and decide spiritual and doctrinal questions—is the power to declare, what is the actual doctrine of the Church of England; that it is not claimed for him, that he is the subject of any especial revelation, or that he can make, or do away with, an article of faith. But this is precisely what a Bellarmine, and the most ultra-montane of Popish theologians predicate of the Pope. He is a judge indeed of doctrine, but cannot make an article of faith. Speaking ex Cathedra, and addressing the universal Church, he can in all cases define what is, and has been, the doctrine of that Church—"quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus;" and though the Catholic believes that in thus delivering judgment, the Pope, because guided, and assisted, by the Holy Spirit is infallible, no Papist ever dreamt for one moment that the Pope has power to make new doctrines, or is the medium of a new revelation from God to His Church. There is then after all, no appreciable difference betwixt the power claimed by the Kings of England to "declare the true doctrines of the Church of England," and the authority which Catholic theologians assign to the Pope. The one declares judicially, what is the "true doctrine of the Church of England" z.c., what it is that that body holds or believes to be true; the Pope does the same, and no more for the Catholic Church.

Both—Pope and King—claim of divine right, or by "God's Ordinance." The one appeals to the express promises of Our Lord, to Peter, and the testimony of the Church from the first century of Christianity; the other, to the precedents of the Jewish theocracy, and the Acts of Parliament passed during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth. The difference betwixt them consists in this, that whilst the Supremacy of the Pope over the Catholic Church, is a fact—which enemies may denounce as an abuse if they will, but whose reality they cannot dispute—the Supremacy of the King of England over the Anglican Church is a farce, for which no one pretends even any respect. Virtually, that "Supremacy" is lodged in the House of Commons, or rather in the majority of that House for the time being; and that fearful power which in the XVI and XVII centuries sent Popish priests to the rack and the stake,

and consigned the Puritan dissenters to stocks and whippings post, is hardly deemed worthy of an occasional sneer from the keen satirist Punch. Not that the Church of England is therefore the less the creature, the slave of the State, or Civil Power, than it was in the days of the Tudors and Stuarts. It has retained its abject condition, though it has changed masters; and its destinies are controlled not in the "Star Chamber," but at the hustings, and amidst the clamor of a contested election.

We should be very happy, to oblige our friend of the Christian Guardian; but really his twaddle about Popery is so very silly; so much below the average of Protestant drivelling upon the subject, that we cannot, in justice to the readers of the True Witness, inflict his tediousness upon them. We would however take this opportunity of remarking that, not "in the estimation of a dark and infatuated Papist" alone, but in that of every intelligent and humble minded person, must it sound blasphemous to hear any one pretending to have received a special and miraculous assurance from Heaven—whether by a "voice coming down a tree," or any other supernatural agent—that all his sins were forgiven, and that he was made an heir of eternal life.—Such assurance God vouchsafes not to mortal man; but, bidding him that stands, or thinks that he stands, to take heed lest he fall, tells all His children that they only who keep His commandments; and who persevere unto the end, shall be saved, and shall be allowed to pass the gates of the city of life. Now, as no one living can be assured of his constant obedience, and of his final perseverance—as no one living can have assurance that he shall never fall again into sin, or that if he fall, God will give him time and grace to repent—no one living can be assured here on earth, that he is "an heir of eternal life." Methodism may teach its votaries to look for, and to believe that they have this assurance; but the humble Papist, mindful of God's warning, will still be content to work out his salvation with fear and trembling—knowing that though God is faithful to His promises, man's life on earth is a continual warfare, and that to win the crown, he must fight the good fight.—1 Tim., vi., 12.

The Christian Guardian is correct in assuming that Papists are taught that priests can absolve the truly penitent sinner of his sins; but we cannot see anything "stupid or impious" in this doctrine. That Christ did give power to certain men to "remit sins"—St. JOHN, xx., 23—is, unless the Gospel be a lie, a fact. There is therefore nothing "stupid or impious" in believing that certain men may have that power now, unless it be "stupid or impious" to believe that Christianity be a divine institution adapted for all successive ages—unless it be "stupid or impious" to believe that sinners in the XIX century stand in as much need of the remission of their sins, as did sinners in the first century; and that God, Who is just and impartial towards all His creatures, has given to the sinner of the present day, precisely the same facilities for obtaining that needed remission of his sins, that He accorded to the sinner in the days of the first preachers of Christianity. In attacking then the absolving power of the priest, or denying to him the same power as those which Christ gave to His Apostles, the Christian Guardian is—perhaps unwittingly—assailing Christianity itself. For, either, the powers given by Christ to His Apostles, as recorded in the 20th chapter of St. John, were necessary for the salvation of sinful man, or they were not. If they were not necessary, in giving such powers, Christ was guilty of a gross mistake; if they were necessary then, and as the nature of man has not changed, as his spiritual necessities are still the same as in the first century of our era, God cannot have withdrawn those powers from earth, without having been guilty of a gross partiality, without having deprived man of something necessary for his salvation.

Such of the miraculous gifts of the Apostles indeed, as were needed merely to strike the senses of the heathen, and thereby to give sceptics sensible demonstration that the Apostles were the divinely credited ambassadors of an Almighty Being, may have been partially withdrawn, as they became no longer necessary. But the gift of the power to "remit" and to "retain" sins, was one of which the senses could not, under any circumstances, take cognizance; and was therefore useless as a sign or proof of the divine mission of the Apostles. Therefore we cannot logically conclude from the partial cessation of one set of miraculous powers with which the Apostles and their first successors were endowed, to the cessation or withdrawal of the other. The one was given to authenticate the divine commission of the first preachers of a new religion, and as a means of establishing the truth of their doctrines, to a Pagan world. The other was conferred with a very different object; and unless it can be shown that that object has been fully and finally accomplished, he must be either "stupid or impious" who calling himself a Christian, denies that there are still on earth men with power from Christ to "remit" or to "retain" sin.

* This "cessation" we by no means admit. There is as good evidence of miracles wrought by Catholic missionaries in modern times, as there is of the miracles attributed to Christ and His Apostles. The evidence for both consists in the testimony of intelligent eye witnesses, who could not have been deceived, and who had no motives for being deceivers.

The Ottawa Railway Times is better able to abuse an opponent than to refute him, and shows himself to be far more familiar with the vernacular of Billingsgate, than he is with theology, or the writings of the most eminent modern Protestant divines. In calling hard names, in applying such epithets as—"scurrilous, blasphemous, reprobate," &c., he displays a marvellous proficiency; his logical attainments are, unfortunately for him, very small.

To a short paragraph in the True Witness a short time back, in which we ventured to express a doubt whether an All Merciful God