

THE CATHOLIC.

QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS CREDITUM EST.—WHAT ALWAYS, AND EVERY WHERE, AND BY ALL IS BELIEVED.

Very Rev. W. P. MacDonald, V. G., Editor.

OFFICE—CORNER OF KING & HUGHSON STREETS.

J. Robertson, Printer and Publisher.

VOLUME IV.

HAMILTON, [GORE DISTRICT] NOVEMBER 22, 1848.

NUMBER 10.

Ernest and the English Orangemen.

His dark Majesty of Hanover has availed himself of the period of his departure from England to endeavour to perpetuate those party feuds which have caused such misery throughout this land. Upon the 22d day of August he published his thanks to the grand lodge of the Orangemen of England for their address. He acknowledged their "kindly attention, and proclaims "his gratification that he possesses the undiminished regard and esteem of his brethren." He admits his perfect concurrence in the sentiments which that address contains; and he counsels them as to the course which, as subjects of "his illustrious niece," they should continue to pursue.

Now, we ask, and we hope that some one of those who sustain his Majesty's interests in this country will reply, what right he, the Sovereign of a strange people, has to receive political addresses from any portion of Queen Victoria's subjects? We ask what right he has to act as the avowed head of any confederation existing in this country? We desire to know how it is that he presumes to recommend a course of action which may be adverse to the wishes of the Sovereign of these realms, contrary to law, and to the interests of her people. Is it thus he proves his affection to his niece—is it thus he sustains her authority? Are these the means he takes to show his zeal and devotion to her person and her throne? Is it thus he intimates his appreciation of the hospitality with which he was received, and of the peculiar obligations which might, at least, purchase forbearance towards the people? Is it thus he proves his obedience to the laws of the country in which he was a dweller? He encourages an illegal confederacy—he holds communication with an illegal association—he acknowledges, nay rejoices, in a brotherhood with men who avow that they look upon a foreign monarch as their leader, and he counsels them as to their proceedings, though he must know, what they also know, that he violates by that countenance and that counsel the laws of this empire.

And what are the counsels to which King Ernest thus binds himself? The Orangemen of England attribute all the agitation—all the "rebellious proceedings" which are "distracting their sisterland" as a righteous retribution; as "unerring judgment" of the Lord for the national sin of emancipation to the Irish Catholics. They call it "a just punishment for the departure from pure Protestant legislation," which distinguished the era through which the principles of Orangeism were triumphant. Their address is a proclamation of "Protestant ascendancy" and a "pledge" not to their country or their Queen, but to a "foreign potentate"—to the King of Hanover that his "voices shall ever be uplifted against "further concessions" to the Irish nation.

Now we ask is this the period when such language should be used towards the people of this country? We ask not whether these are the opinions of the English Orangemen or of the King of Hanover. We believe they can be too injurious towards Ireland for either to prove. But we ask is this a safe and prudent time at which to publish them? If those sentiments are entered towards us by the King of Hanover—if he can give the law and encourage disaffection, while he is actually received at the court of our Sovereign and supported by the produce of our soil, is that the best mode to repay the loyalty of the Irish people, but to perpetuate the oppression of a foreign Prince? They pronounce sentence of perpe-

tual oppression against Irishmen. They stigmatise our "proceedings as rebellious," and they declare that all future concession to our country they will oppose. The foreign Prince, the bitterest enemy of our name and country, is "rejoiced at their determination." And yet this Prince, as hateful to our people as he has ever been inimical to our interests, speaks of his "loyalty and his attachment" to our Queen! What is meant by this? Is it intended to impress the Irish people with the belief that their Sovereign participates in those vile principles and opinions, and that she, too, rejoices in the "determination" which would refuse us all redress? What is the meaning of permitting this miserable old man to come amongst us that he may revive intolerance, sow dissensions, propagate hatred, and reorganize associations which, illegal in this country, are only tolerated in England because of their presumed incapacity for mischief. But when we find that fealty is permitted to a foreign prince, that that prince is fostered, courted, and pampered, by those who govern us, and paid from the taxes contributed by those to whom he proclaims undying enmity, how can we hope for justice?—how can we expect impartiality? how can we but understand the prevalence of the sentiments which a bad prince only avows, but which inimical statesmen act upon?

This is not the way to persuade the Irish people—to subdue them by such means is as impossible as to assoilize their antiquated enemy.—*Dublin Freeman's Journal.*

We copy from the New York American an article, professing to be a true version of the interview between Bishop Onderdonk and his clergy, after their recent triumph in the convocation.

The clergy, if the writer be the true representative of their views, do not wish it understood that they received the blessing of Mr. Onderdonk, but of God, at the prayer of their Bishop and superior.

These gentlemen will begin at last to understand distinctions. Formerly, when Catholics declared that their sins were forgiven in confession by the priest, not as man, but as a minister of Christ, they were too dull to comprehend this, and still cried out, you got your forgiveness from men. When Catholics were seen kneeling before a crucifix, and said that the image brought vividly to their minds the scene of Calvary, and that all their pious thoughts were fixed upon Christ, they said, no! you adore the image itself. They would admit no distinction of this sort. And now, when they kneel before their Bishop and are blessed by him, and some laugh and taunt them, they tell us that they asked the blessing of God at the hands of the Bishop. They did not kneel to man but God.

When did they commence this pious practice? Who before in this country had heard of such things among Protestants? It is for them to answer. We do not blame them for this reverence, but we cannot help wondering at their strange inconsistencies, and at the striking manner in which their principles and practice at present, stamp censure and condemnation upon their principles and practice in the past.—*Catholic Advocate.*

The Cross.—It is well known that the ancestors of Episcopalians, once cordially reprobated the use of Crucifixes and images. Not only would they not allow them upon their Churches, but even would not in England allow Catholic families to have them in their houses. The discovery of a crucifix in a family was sufficient evidence

to convict of the grievous crime of Popery. Such a family was in consequence subjected to all the rigors of penal persecution. Nothing was more heinous in Protestant eyes than a symptom of respect and reverence for this symbol of Christianity, or for any similar representation of the passion and death of the Blessed Redeemer. To show disrespect to the portrait and cross of Christ, was esteemed good evidence of love for Christ himself.

And now, *mirabile dictu*, Protestants must place the Cross upon their pointed steeples, as has lately been done in this city.

Why such a change as this? What does it signify? Have the followers of Henry VIII, the Boy Edward, and "Good Bess," lately received some new revelation? Have they at last found in scripture some justification of this Catholic practice? Or do they usurp this symbol, as lately the Presbyterian pastors tried to usurp the title of Bishops, *ad captandum*, in order to hold out to the world the idea that they belong to the Church of primitive times?

We understand that the erection of this sign of Catholic faith on St. Paul's steeple has already led to some misadventure. Soon after it was placed there, at bright and early dawn, some wayfarers of our fold, left the steamboat which had landed during the night, and came up into the city with pious intent to assist at the holy sacrifice. Seeing the blessed sign of Faith glittering from the spire of St. Paul's church, bathed as it was, in the first hues of the rising day, they took it for granted that this was a church of their own cherished faith. Entering they piously knelt, crossed themselves, and began to pray while waiting for the hour of sacrifice. Meantime, came forth in flowing robes the priest without altar or victim, who began, according to his rubrics to rehearse, what royalty once characterized as "an ill said mass;" but which our deceived thought no mass at all. Confused, if not bewildered, they arose hastily and left the church, no doubt wondering why the Episcopalians of Louisville have thought it necessary to put a cross upon their church in order to deceive strangers.—*Id.*

ROME.—Cardinal Pacca, Dean of the Sacred College, opened the Academy of the Catholic Religion this year, by an eloquent dissertation, in which he reviewed the state of Catholicism in the principal countries of Europe, during the last sixty years, being the period of his own public career. Germany, at present, seems to him to give room for hope, the rationalism; to which the Protestant principle had led, causing many are struck by its horrors, to take refuge in the Catholic church. France affords a brighter vista, the clouds of 1682 being dissipated, and the union of the Hierarchy with the Holy See becoming daily more intimate. Poland and Russia offer matter for tears. Spain and Portugal are in a critical condition. England gives much consolation; yet too sanguine expectations should not be entertained of its immediate and entire return to unity, whilst so great temporal interests oppose formidable barriers. The King of Belgium is praised by him for his just policy, which has left the Catholic Religion free. Italy is happy in her natural advantages, and highly privileged in possessing the chair of truth, altho' some of her rulers do not sufficiently respect its rights. They have done wonders, not only in church government but for the temporal interests of the world and of civil society, by their beneficial influence and wise authority. The voice of Peter strikes terror into the hearts of those who affect to disregard it, and consoles and animates the faithful. The venerable Cardinal concludes this admirable review: "Be not surprised, beloved colleagues and illustrious hearers, at the liberty and boldness with which I address you. Reflect that a man bent down by the weight of 87 years, and ready to sink into the tomb, is usually deaf to the pusillanimous suggestions of human prudence."