

REMITTANCES

TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES
SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on
The Union Bank of London, London.
The Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacrament Street,
Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
TERMS:
To Town Subscribers. . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1855.

Subscribers changing their places of residence are requested to give the necessary information at this office.

TO OUR DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.

It is with great reluctance that we find ourselves compelled to address ourselves once again to our delinquent subscribers: and to make this last application to them, for an immediate settlement of their accounts with this office. If after this notice, persons indebted for more than the current six months, shall still delay in banding over to our agents in their respective districts, the balance by them due, we are determined, in every instance, to institute legal proceedings against the said delinquents. To many of our subscribers our thanks are tendered for the punctuality with which they have always paid up their subscriptions as they became due. But there are many, who seem to think that they may take a paper for two, or three, years, without paying a copper; and that it is very hard upon them, at the end of that time, to be asked for the money. We beg it clearly to be understood that we want the names of no such subscribers on our list; and that if this appeal will not induce them to discharge their debts, we must try the effects of an appeal to the Courts of Law.

We intend also to publish in a few days a list of "delinquent subscribers." But, in the mean time—for the sake of avoiding legal proceedings, and for the last time—we again take this method of endeavouring to obtain payment of the large sums due to this office. Our subscribers in the Quebec district, of whom we regret to say that great numbers are in arrears, and to a very large amount—several hundreds of pounds—are particularly requested to pay attention to this notice.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The arrival of the British mail of the 28th ult. puts us in possession of reliable intelligence from the Crimea, down to the 19th ult.; the accounts are not very flattering. At 5 A.M. on the morning of the 9th of April, during a violent storm, the Allies opened fire from 500 guns, on the Russian stronghold. Since then, day and night, has the storm of shot and shell continued falling upon the city, without, as yet, producing any very decided effects; the Russians repairing in the night the injuries inflicted during the day. "It would seem"—says the *Times* correspondent—"as if our fire was almost thrown away on the enormous mounds of earth cast up at the *Redan*, and before the *Round Tower* and *Western Batteries*. . . The real strength of the place is unimpaired; and, as long as the Russians can find new guns, fresh supplies of ammunition, and men to fight the batteries, we are not one inch nearer to the town than we were in last October." The Russians have made several unsuccessful sorties.

The Vienna Conference is adjourned *sine die*; all hopes of peace are at an end, and "war to the knife" is now the cry. Prussia scarce makes a secret of her Russian predilections; and Austria is wavering. A summer campaign beyond the Rhine, to be headed by the Emperor in person, is now spoken of; whilst the rumor, that he is about to start for the Crimea has also its supporters. All accounts represent Europe as on the eve of a long and general war.

The English journals are occupied with the details of Louis Napoleon's ovation in London; on the 21st, he returned to Paris. In Parliament, the proceedings had been of little interest. Mr. Spooner's attack upon Maynooth had been deferred until the 1st inst., when a great Protestant fire was, it was expected, to be opened upon that Popish fortress. It will be seen that the Judges have, without hesitation, granted a rule for a new trial in the case of Mr. Boyle against the Archbishop of Westminster, upon several grounds; especially those of the reception of improper evidence, and excessive damages. A petition for the total repeal of the sentence against Smith O'Brien is being signed by members of both Houses of Parliament; and it is expected that the gallant gentleman will soon be at home again. Mr. Deasy has been returned, by a large majority, for the County of Cork.

ANGLICAN "ORDERS."

The following communication has been addressed to us, over the signature of "One of Pius the Ninth's obscure, but loyal Spiritual subjects, i.e. a Papist":
To the Editor of the True Witness.

"DEAR SIR—For the sake of an Anglican friend of mine, with whom I have been conversing lately on the subject of 'Episcopal Succession,' I should be much obliged to you if you would answer me the following question through the medium of your columns: 'For what reasons does the Catholic Church reject the 'Orders' of the Anglicans, as in valid; when, concerning their validity, history is so conflicting and obscure, even in the hands of the late eminent Dr. Lingard; who, in his 5th volume, makes some statements relative to the supposed consecration of Dr. Parker, which, it seems to me, are hardly reconcilable with his orthodoxy as a Catholic priest? Since neither 'Baptism,' nor 'Holy Orders' can be administered twice to the same person without sacrilege—the Church must have sufficient grounds for rejecting Anglican 'Orders,' seeing that she hesitates not to confer 'unconditional' Ordination upon converted Anglican clergymen, when, as in the case of Dr. Newman and others, they join the Catholic Church and desire to be admitted to the office of the Priesthood; whilst, in the case of the same converts from the Anglican heresy, she is so careful as to give them only 'conditional' Baptism—'Si non baptizatus es.' Can you explain the reason of this difference, for the satisfaction of your reader, and of

"ONE OF PIUS THE NINTH'S OBSCURE, BUT LOYAL SPIRITUAL SUBJECTS."

The question here propounded by our correspondent involves several very important and intricate questions—but may perhaps be resolved into the following:—

"How can we reconcile the apparent discrepancy betwixt the language of the eminent Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard—who seems to admit the fact of Dr. Parker's consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury—and the discipline of the Catholic Church towards Anglican ministers converted to Catholicity, whose ordination she treats as invalid?"

We reply—by paying particular attention to the language of Dr. Lingard, and to the amount of his admissions. Dr. Lingard admits the fact of the consecration of Dr. Parker—but adds in explanation of that admission:—

"Whether it"—the said consecration—"was valid or invalid, according to the Catholic doctrine, is a theological question, with which, as a mere writer of history, I had no concern."—*Letter to the Editor of 'Catholic Diary.'*

Thus, with Dr. Lingard, our correspondent may, if the weight of historical evidence so determines him, admit the fact, that on a certain day of December, 1559, a certain quasi-religious ceremony was performed upon the person of Dr. Parker; but it does not thence follow, that he will be logically compelled to admit that, by, and in virtue of, the said ceremony, any particular spiritual character was stamped upon him over, or upon, whom it was performed.—And so, the Catholic Church, which does not care to pronounce any opinion upon the historical question, of which alone Dr. Lingard treats, decides upon purely theological grounds—grounds upon which, as a mere writer of history, Dr. Lingard did not venture to trespass—that the religious ceremony performed upon Anglican ministers does not confer the Holy Order of Priesthood. Dr. Lingard may have been hasty in his admissions—his reasons for making them may not be conclusive—but, as they do not affect the "theological" question—the validity of Anglican Orders—his orthodoxy, as a Catholic Priest and theologian, is safe, even though his credit as an accurate historian be impaired.

For, with all due respect to the memory of Dr. Lingard—even the historical fact of Dr. Parker's consecration is not satisfactorily established. Of course we do not allude to the old exploded joke about the "Nag's Head." We merely say—that, admitting Dr. Lingard's premises, they do not conclusively establish the fact that any form of consecration, valid or invalid, was ever performed upon Dr. Parker—and that there still remain several facts, admitted by all Protestant historians, incompatible with Dr. Lingard's conclusions. That historian's reasons for admitting the historical fact of the consecration, may be thus summed up:—

- I. There was nothing to prevent it.
- II. Elizabeth desired it, and Dr. Parker was willing to accept it.
- III. The commissioners named in the Queen's Writ were ready, and bound by law—25th Henry VIII—to perform it.
- IV. That on the 18th of December, Royal Writs were addressed to Dr. Parker, as Archbishop of Canterbury.
- V. That before the 17th of the same month, he had never been so addressed.
- VI. That, as Archbishop of Canterbury, he obtained the restoration of the temporalities of the Diocese; took his seat in Parliament, and presided in Convocation.

Wherefore, concludes the historian, it must be supposed that, on the 17th of December, Dr. Parker was consecrated according to the Ordinal, established by Law in the reign of Edward VI., and as is attested by the "Lambeth Records."

On the other hand, it is argued that:—
Though, during the lifetime of Elizabeth, the consecration of Dr. Parker was openly and constantly denied by the Catholics of England—and though—if such an event had ever taken place, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to silence them, by producing the "Records" and witnesses of the said pretended consecration—no attempt to do so was ever made; and the "Lambeth Record" itself, upon which so much stress has subsequently been laid as conclusive proof of Parker's consecration on the 17th December, 1559, was never produced in evidence till long after the death of Elizabeth; thus leaving it very doubtful whether the said "Record" be not, a

forgery. For if genuine, why was it not produced, why was it never appealed to, in the lifetime of contemporaries, and during the controversies of the XVI. century?

How easy would it not have been, by appealing to such evidence, to have silenced Bonner, the obnoxious Catholic Bishop of London, who had been forcibly expelled from his See for his adherence to the Catholic faith, and for refusing to acknowledge in the English Messalina, the Supreme Head and Governor of Christ's Church upon earth? We give the story in the words of the Protestant historian, Hallam.—In 1562—three years after the pretended consecration of Parker, and upon the fact of whose consecration depended that of the new Protestant Hierarchy established by Elizabeth—an Act was passed:—

"Entitled, 'For the assurance of the Queen's royal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions'—enacting with an iniquitous and sanguinary retrospect, that all persons who had ever taken holy orders, &c., should be bound to take the 'oath of supremacy' when tendered to them by a Bishop, &c.—The penalty for the first refusal of this oath was that of a *praemunire*; but any person who, after the space of three months from the first tender, should again refuse it when in like manner tendered, incurred the pains of high treason. Upon the occasion of this new statute, Horn, Bishop of Winchester—one of Dr. Parker's batch of Bishops—"proceeded to tender him"—Bonner—"the oath of supremacy, with an evident intention of driving him to high treason. Bonner, however, instead of evading this attack, intrepidly denied the other to be a lawful Bishop"—and therefore not qualified to tender the oath;—"and strange as it may seem, not only escaped all further molestation, but had the pleasure of seeing his adversaries reduced to pass an 'Act of Parliament,'—8th Eliz., c. i.—declaring the present Bishops to have been legally consecrated."—*Hallam Const. Hist., c. iii.*

Bonner, it must be remembered, was the most obnoxious of all the old Catholic Bishops; and the design of the new Protestant Hierarchy was, as admitted by Protestants, to take his life. Yet were these champions of civil and religious liberty foiled by the firmness of their intended victim. For so notorious was it in 1563, that the Protestant Bishops had not been legally consecrated—even according to the new-fangled Protestant form—that even the corrupt judges of the days of Elizabeth were obliged to admit the validity of Bonner's plea—that Horn was no Bishop. If, afterwards, he, or his brethren in the Anglican church ever did become so, it was wholly in virtue of the Act, 8th Eliz., c. i., which the unexpected firmness of Bonner, and the unusual regard for justice displayed by a Protestant tribunal, compelled the English Parliament to pass. Had the Government, however, had it in its power to prove that Horn was a Bishop, when he tendered Bonner the oath—and thus assuredly would have been in its power, if Horn had been legally consecrated—which again would have been the case had his consecrator, Parker, been legally consecrated—not Parliament, but the executioner would have been called upon to vindicate the Apostolic Succession of the new Protestant Bishops. This one fact would therefore seem to be conclusive against the consecration of Parker; and destroys the whole force of Dr. Lingard's argument in support of its historical credibility. But there are other reasons, not conclusive indeed, but still of great weight.

Amongst these we must include the little regard that Anglican Protestants of the XVI. century attached to "Holy Orders," as may be deduced—from the language of Cranmer—the numerous falsifications in the first Protestant translation of the Bible, which Protestants themselves have admitted by their subsequent alterations—and by their excluding "Holy Orders" from amongst the number of the Sacraments; thus denying to the ceremony of Ordination all objective value. For, by their own definition, a Sacrament is:—

"An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the same."—*Anglican Catechism.*

Now, as Anglicans deny Holy Orders to be a Sacrament, it must be because, according to them, it is deficient—in an outward and visible sign—or in an inward and spiritual grace thereby given—or as not having been appointed by Christ Himself. They can not assert, in defiance of their senses, that in Holy Orders there is no outward and visible sign; they must therefore deny—either that any grace is thereby, and therein, given; or that it is a rite ordained by Christ Himself. And therefore it is impossible to see how the Anglican, who denies the Sacrament of "Holy Orders," can attach any importance whatsoever to the act of consecration, or of conferring Ordination upon candidates for admission into the ministry. Seeing then, that diverted of its Sacramental character, Consecration, or Ordination, is but an idle superstitious ceremony, we think it highly improbable that the early Protestants, who piqued themselves upon throwing off all useless ceremonies, as superstitious and idolatrous, should have taken the pains to perform what they must have believed to have been a vain and idle ceremony upon Dr. Parker; the more so, as they well knew that it was not in virtue of any act of consecration by them performed, but in virtue of the Queen's "letters patent" and Act of Parliament, that he could pretend to bear rule as a Bishop in the Lord's Vineyard. Thus, whilst we do not deny, we see no conclusive evidence for, and therefore are strongly inclined to doubt, the historical fact even of Parker's consecration. This however is of the less consequence; as it does not in the slightest degree affect the theological value of the character thereby conferred upon Parker, or the question of the validity of Anglican Orders at the present day. This is strictly a theological, and not a historical question; and may be easily solved by a definition of the word Priest.

A Priest, in the Catholic Church, is one who is duly

authorised to consecrate the Body, and Blood of our Lord, and to "offer Sacrifice for the living and the dead." Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice are co-relatives; and where we have the first, we must inevitably have the last. Now, an Anglican minister is not, and does not even pretend to be, authorised to "offer sacrifice." The Anglican ordination service, now in use, does not so much as profess to confer any such power; and the Anglican formularies formally disclaim it. Now, as no one can be a Priest in the Catholic Church, who is not duly authorised to "offer sacrifice"—and as an Anglican minister, not only is not so authorised, but as the Anglican church has no sacrifice to offer, it follows that Anglican ministers are utterly worthless in the eyes of the Catholic Church—in which the distinctive and essential character of a Priest consists in his power to "offer sacrifice"—as may be seen in the writings of St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and all the early Doctors of the Christian Church. Our correspondent will now understand why an Anglican minister, a convert to Catholicity, must receive ordination before he can officiate as a Catholic Priest, at a Catholic Altar, whereon a true and veritable sacrifice is offered for the living and the dead.

THE REV. DR. RYERSON AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

We have been requested by the writer, to give insertion to the following communication:—

Mr. Editor,—The numerous readers of your very interesting and much esteemed journal, will easily perceive by the following communication, that Dr. Ryerson wishes either to physic his step-child, the Separate School of Brantford to death, or to annihilate it utterly out of sight. How he has harassed the gentlemen who compose the Board of Trustees for the Common Schools of Brantford, and more particularly William Johnstone, Esq., the Local Superintendent, for meeting any justice at all, to his step-child, the aforesaid Separate School, can be also gathered from the same communication:—

EDUCATION OFFICE,
Toronto, 10th April, 1855.

Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Report of your Board of School Trustees for last year, and regret to have to return it again. This return again was the third and fourth one for more statistical information relative to the Separate School. The Trustees of Separate School being under the same general regulations in regard to Reports, &c., as are the Trustees of Rural sections, it is their duty by the 19th clause of the 12th section of the Act of 1850 to transmit an annual Report to the Local Superintendent of the Municipality within which such Separate School is situated; and the proviso of the 2nd clause of the 31st section of the same Act, together with the 2nd proviso of the 4th section of the Supplementary Act, prescribe the general conditions upon which Separate, as well as Common, Schools are entitled to share in the School Fund. You will also please report the school population of your town, required by the 26th clause.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. RYERSON.

To William Johnstone, Esq., Superintendent, Town of Brantford.

This after-clap dose, Mr. Editor, prescribed by the Doctor on the 10th April, for all who had anything to do with the Separate School, shows off his skill for compounding. Its first effect was to oblige William Johnstone Esq., to resign his office. Mr. Johnstone is a gentleman, who wished to do justice to all parties; but his gentlemanly conduct and his love of doing that justice to which he was bound, were no longer to be tolerated between the step-father and his step-child; therefore, he must be harassed and obliged to give up his office, or sacrifice his honor and his conscience. A Rev. Mr. Drummond, a Scotch minister, steps into office in his stead. It is likely that the sound of his drum will be heard sweetly on the other side of Lake Ontario. His first visit, as I have been told was to the female division of the Separate School on the 20th of April. It was a Paul-Pry visit, and without any notice. The female children being in their every day dress, and some even in their bare-feet, were scared to appear before the Rev. gentleman, who introduced himself as the new Local Superintendent. They observed that if they had been informed of the visit, as they had been accustomed to be by Mr. Johnstone, they would come in their Sunday dress, and appear before his Reverence to hear the first sweet words from Mr. Drummond,—for so the children styled him,—not being able to remember the gentleman's name to be Drummond.

I have always known it to be customary, that a gentleman about to make an official visit of the kind, should previously inform the Trustees or Teacher. It is not surprising, therefore that the children should call the Rev. gentleman, Drumhead. He also beat his time so skillfully, as to visit the male school on one day out of two, during which the male Teacher lay in bed from a severe cold, that there scarcely remains a doubt, but he will by a few more sounds of his drum, be likely to cheer up the step-father to a hope of victory over his step-child at Brantford. The gentleman who presides as Chairman over the Common Schools of Brantford, being a lover of justice, I fear he will feel much annoyance from the Doctor if he continues as he has hitherto done, to do justice to the Separate School. The Doctor appears so entirely engaged seeking a loophole whereby he may cheat his step-child, that he seems almost to forget himself in asking "for more statistical information relative to the Separate School" of Brantford. He states that the Trustees of the Separate Schools have not sent an annual report; and quotes the 19th clause of the 12th section as obliging them, and also the 2nd proviso of the 4th section supplementary. The Doctor ought to know that the Act of 1850, which requires Trustees to transmit an annual report is repealed by the Act Supplementary, which requires them to transmit two semi-annual reports, one before the 30th of June, and the other before the 31st December of the same year. Now I wish to know if the Doctor wants another annual report before fifteen days could elapse from the 31st December to the 15th of January following according to the 19th clause of the 12th section, or does he so soon forget his own works of the 26th section of the Act Supplementary—"And be it enacted, that such of the provisions of the Upper Canada School Act of 1850, as