

"Some difficulties arose about a practical point, and publication was delayed. In 1848, another bishop, Dr. Ullathorne, was deputed to Rome to remove them, and the measure was again prepared, when the Roman revolution suspended its final conclusion till now.

"All this time there was no concealment, no attempt to take people by surprise. All Catholics knew of the intended measure; the papers announced it. So notorious was it, that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster petitioned Parliament against it, and a friend of the writer's heard the Dean of Westminster say most openly, 'Well he may call himself what he pleases, but at least he can never be Dean of Westminster.'

Finally his Eminence concludes the introduction by stating that for all these measures, he, and English Bishops alone, are accountable, the Bull having been granted by his Holiness, in simple compliance with their petition.

THE APPEAL.

The Appeal commences with a rapid and graphic sketch of the agitation in England:—

"In the press," says his Eminence, "sarcasm, ridicule, satire of the broadest character, theological and legal reasonings of the most refined nature, bold and reckless declamation, earnest and artful argument—nothing seemed to come amiss; and every invocable agency, from the Attorney General to Guy Fawkes, from *præmure* to a hustling, was summoned forth to aid the cry, and administer to the vengeance of those who raised it."

His Eminence next notices the conduct of the Established Church, of the Premier and of the Law Authorities. Of the Premier he says:—

"At the recent crisis, the Catholics of England had no right to expect any co-operation from the Government of the country—they asked for none; but they had the right of every citizen to impartiality. They naturally might have expected that he to whom was entrusted the helm of State would keep himself above those influences of party feeling which disqualify the mind for grave and generous counsels; would preserve himself uncommitted by any hasty or unofficial expression of opinion; would remain on the neutral ground of his public responsibility, to check excess on every side, and moderate dangerous tendencies in any party. Instead of this, the head of her Majesty's Government has astonished, not this country alone, but all Europe, by a letter which leaves us but little hope that any appeal to the high authority which rules over the empire would be received, to say the least, with favour."

And he ends this part of the pamphlet by appealing earnestly to the people of England against the bigotry of their clergy and statesmen.

The following section examines the Questions of

The Royal Supremacy, and Bishops named by the Crown.

The argument of this section is summarised in the following sentences:

"A Catholic, before 1829, in the eye of the law, was a person who did not admit the royal supremacy, and, therefore, was excluded from full enjoyment of civil privileges. A Catholic, after 1829, and, therefore, in 1850, is a person who still continues not to admit the royal supremacy, and, nevertheless, is admitted to full enjoyment of these privileges.

"The royal supremacy is no more admitted by the Scotch Kirk, by Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, Independents, Presbyterians, Unitarians, and other dissenters, than by the Catholics. None of these recognise in the Queen any authority to interfere in their religious concerns, to appoint their ministers for them, or to mark the limits of their separate districts in which authority has to be exercised.

"None of these, any more than Catho-

lics, recognise in the bishops appointed by our gracious Queen, in virtue of her supremacy, any authority to teach them or rule them. The real sway therefore, of her spiritual prerogative is confined to that body of Christians, who voluntarily remain subject to the ecclesiastical establishment called the Church of England. Any one can, when he pleases, separate himself from this body, and from that moment he ceases to consider the bishop appointed by the Crown as his pastor, superior in spirituals, or master in faith.

"When a Dissenter denies the Royal Supremacy, he institutes, perhaps, for it some other authority, in some synod, or conference; or he admits of none other to take its place. But when the Catholic denies it, it is because he believes another and a true ecclesiastical and spiritual supremacy to reside in the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, over the entire Catholic Church. And as it is perfectly lawful for him to deny the one, and so it is equally lawful for him to assert the other. Hence Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, in the House of Lords, May 11, 1846, spoke to the following effect:—

"He said that it was no crime in the Roman Catholic to maintain and defend the supremacy of the Pope; but that if he did it for mischievous purposes, and circulating immoral doctrines and opinions, he was liable to punishment by the common law; but if he merely maintained and defended, as he was bound to do, the spiritual authority of his superior, then he said that he was guilty of no offence against the laws of the country."

Next follows:—

Sec. II.—What was the extent of Religious Toleration granted to Catholics? Have they a right to possess Bishops or a Hierarchy?

The argument in this section runs as follows:—

"The Act of Catholic Emancipation was considered, not only by those whom it benefited, but by all who consented to it, as an act of justice rather than of favor. It was deemed unjust to exclude from fair participation in constitutional rights, any Englishman, on account of Catholic Emancipation. By this act, preceded and followed by many others of lesser magnitude, the Catholics of the British empire were admitted to complete toleration. The law made a few exceptions; but the enumeration of these only served to prove, that, in every other respect, the law recognised no restrictions. 'If the law,' observed Lord Lyndhurst, 'allowed the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be allowed to be carried on perfectly and properly.' Hence, to have told Catholics, 'You have perfect religious liberty, but you shall not teach that the Church cannot err,' or, 'you have complete toleration, but you must not presume to believe holy orders to be a sacrament,' would have been nugatory and tyrannical. Now, holy orders require bishops to administer them; consequently, a succession of bishops to keep up a succession of persons in orders. Hence, the Catholic Church is essentially episcopal; and to say—'You Catholics shall have complete religious toleration, but you shall not have bishops among you to govern you,' would have been a complete contradiction in terms: it would have amounted to a total denial of religious toleration. When, therefore, emancipation was granted to Catholics, full power was given them to have an episcopate, that is, a body of bishops to rule them, in communion with the Pope, the avowed head of their Church.

"To have then said to Catholics—'You are perfectly free to practise your religion, and to have your own church government, but you shall not be free to have it in its proper and perfect form, but only in the imperfect form in which it has been tolerated, while you had not liberty of conscience,' would have been a tyranny, and, in fact, a denial of that very liberty of conscience. But the fact is a simple and plain one, that the law did not say so, and did not put on any such restriction."

His Eminence then gives an analysis of the law, and especially of the sections forbidding Catholic Bishops to assume the dignities of Protestant Sees; and concludes:—

"First. That Catholics, by law, had a right to be governed by bishops. Secondly. That no law or authority bound them to be for ever governed by vicars-apostolic, and that they were at liberty to have a hierarchy, that is, an archbishop and bishops with local titles from places in the country. Thirdly. That accordingly such titles are not against any law, so long as they are not the actual titles held by the Anglican hierarchy. Fourthly. That all these conditions having been exactly complied with, the present Episcopacy is perfectly legal."

This section concludes with a reference to the purely ecclesiastical agitation against the measure. "This is not," says his Eminence with subtle irony, "an attempt to diminish any of the moral and religious safeguards of that Establishment, which views our new measure with such watchful jealousy. Whatever that institution has possessed or done, to influence the people or attach its affections, it will still possess, and may continue to do. That clear, definite, and accordant teaching of the doctrines of their church, that familiarity of intercourse and facility of access, that close and personal mutual acquaintance, that face to face knowledge of each other, that affectionate confidence and warm sympathy, which form the truest, and strongest, and most natural bonds between a pastor and his flock, a bishop and his people, you will enjoy, to the full, as much as you have done till now. The new bishops will not have occasion to cross the path of the prelates of the Anglican Establishment in their sphere of duty; they will find plenty to do, besides their official duties, in attending to the wants of their poor spiritual children, especially the multitudes of poor Irish, whose peaceful and truly Catholic conduct, under the whirlwind of contumely which has just assailed them, proves that they have not forgotten the teaching of their church—not to revile when reviled, and when they suffer, not to retaliate. But, in truth, when I read the frequent boasting of the papers, and the exulting reports of bishops, that this movement in the Catholic Church, instead of weakening, has strengthened the Established Church, by rousing the national Protestantism, and awakening dormant sympathies for its ecclesiastical organization, I cannot but wonder at the alarm which it expressed. The last measure is ridiculed as powerless, as effete, as tending only to the overthrow of Popery in England. Then, act on this conviction; show that you believe in it; give us the true odds of a title which bestows no power, rank, wealth or influence, on him that bears it, and keep undisturbed those other realities, and let the issue be tried on these terms, so much in your favour. Let it be a fair contention, with theological weapons and fair arguments. If you prevail, and Catholicity is extinguished in the Island, it will be a victory without remorse. It will have been achieved by the power of the Spirit, and not by the arms of flesh; it will prove your cause to be divine. But if, in spite of all your present advantage, our religion does advance, does win over to it the learned, the devout, and the charitable—does spread itself widely among the poor and simple—then you will not check its progress by forbidding a Catholic bishop to take the title of Hexham or of Clifton."

(To be concluded in our next.)

THE EXAMINER.

Saturday, December 21, 1850.

"PAPAL AGGRESSION."

THE local press having lately occupied much of its space with long extracts from the English journals, under the ominous heading of "Papal aggression," all characterised by the most rampant hostility to the Pope and the newly appointed English Bishops, without giving a line in justification of the course pursued by his Holiness—we hope the saints will not take alarm at our devoting several columns

of to-day's paper to the same subject. It will be admitted that in this we deal more impartially than our Island contemporaries, for we give both sides of the question. First, we re-publish Lord John Russell's letter to the Bishop of Durham; though rather stale, yet it is the only great gun that has been fired by the anti-Popery belligerents, and is supposed to have done the most fearful execution;—and next we insert some passages from Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal to the people of England," which has lately come with a thundering boom, in answer to the Premier, and all who have chorused his hacknied cry of "No Popery!"

We are very far from desiring to disturb, by these or similar republications, which we may, from time to time be induced to give, the harmony that now happily prevails in this Island between the different classes of religionists. We have, Heaven knows, quite enough of contentions and disputes on questions of a purely temporal character, without seeking to quarrel with our fellow subjects on spiritual topics. But since the other papers of the Island have given proofs of their sympathy in the outcry which has been senselessly raised against the Catholic Church, and have shown no disposition to accord the smallest measure of justice to the claims of the Catholics, we think that, in fairness, we ought not to be censured for presenting our readers with both sides of the question; and we must, moreover, declare it to be our firm and conscientious belief, that in the present instance the Catholic Church is *not* the aggressor. We had hoped that since the passage of the Catholic Relief Bill, all appeals to the bigotry of the Nation had become well nigh extinct. By that Bill the oath requiring Catholics to declare the Throne supreme in religious matters was repealed, thus recognising the legality of Roman Catholics denying its supremacy. The recent act of the Pope is nothing more than such a denial—a denial only such as Methodists, Baptists, Independents, and other Dissenters make. There is no invasion of the Queen's prerogative in temporal matters. Her Majesty will sit securely on her throne as ever; and the Catholics of the United Kingdom, who have ever (often under the most trying circumstances), willingly borne allegiance to the Crown—a fact attested by the blood of many a "Papist" soldier—will remain unshaken in their attachment, no matter what Bulls may emanate from the Vatican. There is no aggression upon the privileges—no assumption of the emoluments, enjoyed by the Protestant Bishops of England, contemplated by the establishment of a Catholic Hierarchy. Such a Hierarchy has long existed in Ireland, without aggression upon, or assumption of, Protestant rights. What injury, then, can be effected by the establishment of a similar Hierarchy in England?

It is now an acknowledged maxim in the British Constitution, that all sects have a right to the enjoyment of full religious liberty. This was long the stereotyped sentiment of the Whigs. Is it not then flagrantly inconsistent for the leader of that party, practically to deny the right, by objecting to Catholics managing their own affairs as they think best, and dividing their people into what classes or dioceses they think best? But it is not