

religion of the Pope. They were deceitful teachers. They did not teach the people the papala, lost their wickedness and deceit should be known. They taught the people to assent to the words of the priests only. They said to them, that they would repent for the sins of the people. It was good for them that the people should remain in their sins, and that the heart should fear death. Then by paying a large sum of money to the priests, he would repent for them. The priests would not repent for the sins of the man who paid but little money. But if the sum was large then all was well; though he was a murderer, a thief, a rebel, the priests repented and appeased God."

One statement more and I have done. It is this. No mission in this country will give a dollar towards furnishing books and instruction to any Catholic country, unless they are permitted to interfere with the established faith. It is in the power of either board to establish good primary schools from one end to the other of this continent, in which a sound scripture elementary instruction would be a part of the system; yet not one will move in the matter. Many, very many of the priests of South America will stand ready to work in the cause and make such true evangelical books as "The Peep of Day," a part of the routine of study, but no mission board comes forward to plant the vineyard. Shall we infer that they wish to destroy rather than purify; to tear down another sect, rather than repair the walls of the fold; that to convert and not to enlighten, is their darling plan?

Certain it is they utterly refuse to enter a field in which they can cooperate with Catholics in dispensing religious instruction. They would rather leave it in the profoundest darkness, than offer one ray of light in other than a Protestant candlestick. Let the christian public look diligently to this, and they will find that money enough has been wasted on sectarianism, to instruct and regenerate every nation known in our geography.

#### A Protestant Minister Converted.

About 25 years ago a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the State of New Hampshire, had his attention awakened to the validity of his ordination, and sought in vain to sustain himself by the testimony of Couryar. Our readers will be pleased with some short extracts from a pamphlet written by DANIEL BARBER, wherein he explains how he was led to abandon the Protestant Episcopal ministry, and seek the place of an humble layman in the Catholic Church.—*Catholic Herald.*

"At the age of thirty I was ordained a Protestant deacon, by Bishop Seabury, in Christ Church, Middletown, Connecticut, and afterwards Priest by Bishop Provost, in the Church at Schenectady, state of New York. I continued for nearly thirty years clear of the least doubt or suspicion concerning the correctness and validity of our ordinations. But at a certain time, and while on a journey, a Catholic author was put into my hands, and as chance would seem have it, the first page I opened, called my attention to a subject, which seemed to bear a near relation to the challenge given me so long before, by my friend D. P., and reminded me of the common saying, "Bad news is apt to be true." The passage I mention contained some reflections on the consecration of Archbishop Parker. It set forth, that after the Queen had in vain applied to several Catholic Bishops to consecrate Parker, she, by virtue of her own authority, empowered a certain character, namely Barlow, with certain others, to perform the consecration. An order made afterwards by the Queen was as follows:—"Supplying, nevertheless, by our supreme royal authority, from our meer motion and cer-

tain knowledge, if anything either among those things, that were done by you according to our aforesaid mandate, or in you, or in any one of you, your condition, state, or power be, or shall be wanting, of the aforesaid things, to be done which, by the statutes of the kingdom, or by the ecclesiastical laws are required, or are necessary, the state of the times and the necessity of affairs demanding it." Unfortunate as it may seem for the Church of England whose ecclesiastical authority depends wholly on the validity of Parker's consecration, it could never be made to appear that Barlow himself was ever consecrated by any body. The truth is, according to the history of those times, and what even the first Bishops, of the Reformation themselves have left on record, no authority excepting what flowed from the Crown was considered of much importance in the Church. Fretted and perplexed at finding this unlucky passage in the Catholic author; and still entertaining hopes that some more skilled in the Church history, who might put my apprehension asleep again, I soon wrote to a very learned clergyman but received no answer. I have since concluded that he possessed an equal share of wisdom and prudence with the congregationalist minister before mentioned.

To each one who exercises the ministry, we recommend a similar examination, with the full determination to follow truth and conscience—"Go and do though likewise!"

I well know, that, of late, some have sought a subterfuge under Couryar, a desperate Roman Catholic Priest. Honest minds, however, will defer any conclusion from his reasoning, until they shall have examined these writers on the other side of the question, viz: D. Gervaise, Hardoin, Le Quien, &c., not forgetting that although Couryar labors to establish the consecration of Parker, he seems not to hesitate in saying, that the Church of England, by her separation, has cut herself off from the communion of the true church, and seems to advise that she again return to her mother. His conclusion on the subject, very clearly leaves it at least no better than he found it.

As to the validity of Parker's consecration, Heylin, a candid Protestant author, states a cause, brought by the Protestant Bishop, Horne, against Bonner, the Catholic Bishop of London, for refusing to take the oath of the Queen's supremacy. At the commencement of the trial, Bonner entered a plea, as a bar to the prosecution, stating that Horne the prosecutor was no Bishop. The court agreed that the fact, whether he was a bishop or not, should be determined by a jury of the country. What was the issue? Why, rather than that a jury of twelve honest men should determine the question, the cause was taken from the court without a trial and carried up to Parliament; there it was suffered to sleep the sleep of death, and Bishop Bonner was suffered to rest quietly without any further trouble. Although the Queen was far from entertaining a favourable opinion of Bishop Bonner, yet it should seem that her principle judges, possessed some share of the prudence I mentioned of

the ministers; for, no doubt had they declared Horne, to be a true Bishop, there might be some danger of "bringing an old house about their ears;" since, at the period, none could well be in doubt what was the fact, nor of the reason why the Queen first applied to the Catholic Bishop to perform Parker's consecration.

On the 15th of November, (if I am correct) A. D. 1818, having taken regular dismissal from my parish, I took my final leave, publicly by an address from the pulpit, it being Sunday, and we parted, generally speaking, as friends, and in the spirit of that peace and harmony in which we had for so many years lived and walked, wept and rejoiced together.

#### A Word to the Men of the North.

When we remember the energetic patriotism, devoted attachment to Ireland, and determined resistance to English tyranny, that formerly distinguished our Protestant fellow-countrymen of the North, we are overwhelmed with regret, not unmingled with shame; for a shame it is, and a disgrace, that there should be found in any country a brave intelligent, and free-hearted body of men, severed by imaginary fears and unreal dangers from the common fate, or indifferent to the honor and advantage of their common country.

Why should this be so?—There was a time, and a glorious time it was, when the Protestants of the North went farther in resistance to the injustice of Britain than ever went Repealer—when, composing a constitutional Irish army, they presented a bold, undaunted front to the common enemy of their manufactures, trade, and independence; and, invincible in the love of fatherland, triumphed gloriously, leaving an inheritance of honor eternal to their children.

For what object did they, with arms in their hands, at that time contend?

For the self-same object that Repealers, without arms in their hands—in the peaceful exercise of their inalienable rights as British subjects—are contending at this day—the right of self-government, for self-benefit—the right to home-legislation for those who live at home—the right that makes a province a NATION, and keeps her so—the right that transfigures slaves to MEN—the right that, with the power of magician's wand, fills a poverty-stricken land with the hum of productive, independent industry—the right "that Ireland shall be governed [we use the very words of the Volunteers] by the KING (QUEEN,) LORDS, AND COMMONS OF IRELAND."

Sons of Volunteers of '82, are ye ashamed of your fathers, that ye look on in apathy and silence while we struggle more wisely and as well for that right which your fathers, had they not gained, had died to gain?

We have said that imaginary fears and unreal dangers withhold many of our Northern fellow-patriots from uniting with us in our present peaceful struggle for home-legislation: let us exhibit the remoteness of these dangers and the weakness of these fears.

Bugaboo—Bugaboo—Pope and Popery—No Pope—No Popery!

This is one of the fears that disturbs the sleep of many an honest Protestant, though he knows not for what.

Now, if a man finds either profit or pleasure in hating the Pope, or any other gentleman, we have nothing to do with it. If a man detests Popery, we do not see that we can help it; but that a brave Man of the North should hate a brave Man of the South, because he does not hate the Pope—that an Irishman and a Christian should bear malice against another Irishman and a Christian because of Pope and Popery, and nothing more, is unworthy Christian men, and a disgrace to reasonable creatures.

The truth is, the No-Popery cry is a trade by which the anti-Irish Irish, who do the dirty work of England in Ireland, get their living, at the expense both of the poor Protestant and the poor Papist. Our weakness is their strength—our disunion, their union. These fellows have no fear either of God or man, but they have what answers their purpose every whit as well—a pretence of fear.—They have just as much fear of the Pope as they have of the Pretender.

History records, in Ireland, no persecution of Protestants in times of Catholic ascendancy. Common sense, to take no higher rule of conduct, would restrain Catholics from adopting a course that would again enslave their country; but, what will be to Protestants, perhaps, the most satisfactory security, they ever have been, and, with the sympathies and aid of Protestant England and Scotland, ever will be, able to take care of themselves.

Believe it fellow-countrymen of Ulster, no honor is to be gained by hating one's country. Let us now as you are discreet, sensible matter-of-fact men, whether there is any profit in it; for to hate one's country, or to go against her in the hour of her difficulty and trial, is dishonor enough; but to hate her for nothing—to go against her, and be no better off, is, as we say, the devil entirely.

Ask yourselves, if you are in years—ask your fathers, if you are young, whether your manufacturers in Ulster are not day by day declining; whether, while France shuts her ports against you abroad, Ireland opens for you any market at home; whether wages are not lower, employment scarcer, rents higher; whether the chief trade of your merchants is not bill-discounting; whether the men who made money before the Union are making money now; whether the middling classes are now crushed by taxation, and reduced nearly to pauperism, whether there are not cabins, and sowens, pig's potatoes and buttermilk, over the face of your country, and in the hearts of your towns, where once there were cottages and plenty of good victuals; whether there are not now rags where once was broad-cloth; whether there is not idleness and desititution where once was the music of the shuttle and the loom, and young and old enjoying the wages of industry, protected by home-legislation, by your Irish Linen Boards, and your Irish Parliaments?

If these are the effects, is not the Union the cause? If the Union be the cause, is not Repeal the remedy? The great objection we have to fighting about religion is, that it does not pay; slaves fight with and degrade—freemen stand by and enrich one another.

If anybody tells you that a man over in England can protect your industry, improve your wages, and advance your condition, better than you can do it yourselves, and you believe him, don't be a Repealer; but, if you think otherwise, why should you not apply the principle of home-government, (which you insist on for yourselves, as men,) to your country, as CITIZENS?