

with regard to Ireland, every principle of humanity and religion, has only just commenced, and her present embarrassment is but "the beginning of the end." Had she opened her ports last Autumn for the reception of that food which Providence had so abundantly bestowed elsewhere, Death would be cheated of the thousands of victims whose blood now cries to Heaven for vengeance against those cruel worshippers of mammon, who sacrificed the lives of God's creatures at the shrine of their golden Idol.

Let not the *Times* then be surprised if those whom he calls "the people of the Cross," feel very little sympathy for England. We owe her none, and we will feign no sympathy. When we recollect her long career of blood in our poor country, we would be as great Pharisees as the people of the *Times*, if we pretended to entertain any feelings of compassion, we will not say for the *English people* whose generous liberality, and noble qualities, we admire, but for the English aristocracy, the English Church, and the English Government who were the cause of all our misfortunes. If, we go on our knees then, as the *Times* recommends, it will not be to express contrition or regret for sentiments in which we glory, but to pray that the just judgments of Heaven may be averted from the authors of our country's calamity.

In its allusion to our article on the Mexican war, the *Times* states "the thing that is not," when it says that our "sympathy extends merely to the sin and disgrace of Papist fighting against Papist." We condemned Irish interference in this war, because the war itself was, in our opinion, an unjust one—a war of wanton and unprovoked aggression. We condemned it next, because the Irish in the States volunteered their services in attacking a people, with whom, neither they, nor the Americans had any just cause of quarrel. We used the fact of Catholics fighting against Catholics, merely to make them "ore aggravated criminals" if we may borrow a choice epithet from our friend of the *Guardian*.

In reference to the Fancy Ball, we must alas! express our regret that "the age of chivalry is gone" when the would-be Nuns can find no other defenders than the gallant Cavaliers of the *Times*. We wonder how they could have pent up their rage so long, but we suspect our article of last Saturday which so completely unmasked all their political manoeuvres, had no small share in producing this and other bilious manifestations of gallantry and zeal.

The *Times* is again at fault, in its allusion to our remarks on the Letter of a correspondent who complained some time since of the indecorous behaviour of a woman in St. Mary's Church. The *Times* will, perhaps be surprised when we tell him that as far as we could ascertain, and we have made enquiry since, the woman who has become the object of his mock sympathy is no Catholic at all! that Catholics are always remarkable for due reverence in the House of God, and that no later than the very last Sunday Protestant females or women were seen giggling and talking during one of the Sermons at St. Mary's. The Annals of Catholic Europe are full of similar instances of Protestant reverence in the Temple of God. Our brief notice to a *Catholic Philomath* is held forth by the *Times* as a specimen of Catholic intolerance. We are ready to do battle with the *Times*, and its holy allies, on the sacred principle which we have there advanced, respecting the obligation of preserving the integrity of that Divine Faith, "without which it is impossible to please God;" that Faith once delivered to the Saints; that Faith, which is one, and simple, like the God from whom it is an emanation; that Faith so absolutely necessary for salvation, that its Divine "Author and Finisher" Christ Jesus in his last commission to his Apostles declared it to be more essential than even Baptism itself, if we wish to escape damnation. "Go preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believes and is Baptized shall be saved; but he that does not believe shall be damned." We have done nothing more than this when we gave a charitable advice to Catholic Parents to save their children from the danger of using, what we conscientiously believe to be, that only faith of God. The people of the *Times* follow the same principle when they recite those words in the Athanasian Creed

'Whosoever wishes to be saved, it is necessary above all things that he should hold the Catholic Faith.'

'Which unless any one shall keep whole and inviolable, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.'

And at the end of the Creed

'This is the Catholic Faith which unless a man shall faithfully and firmly believe, he cannot be saved.'

But we are not guilty of intolerance, rash judgement, or want of charity. Whilst we generally proclaim the above scriptural truth, we never pronounce on the fate of individuals, because that would be to usurp the prerogative of the Great Searcher of Hearts. The sin of unbelief, like all other sins, must be wilful and deliberate before it can provoke the indignation of Heaven. And who can tell, but He 'who knoweth what is in man' whether the unbeliever, or the man who professes erroneous doctrine, is labouring under a culpable ignorance or not? Indeed we would charitably hope that the 'Protestant Ignorance' of the *Times* is an 'Invincible Ignorance' of the most impentable obscurity.

No. 9 on the List of the *Times*, is an allusion to a forged Letter, which it admits to be forged, but which, nevertheless it prints for the edification of its readers. Such modesty as this deserves, and will receive its reward. We need not tell the *Times* that it was written under a false name, as that fact is admitted; but we deny that it is the production of a Catholic as the *Times* insinuates. When you admit that a man writes under a false signature, you destroy the value of his testimony altogether. But even if the conjecture of the *Times* be correct, the crawling creature who wrote it, usurps the name of Catholic only to disgrace it—one of those noxious weeds of which we lately gave a botanic description, and which 'the Pope sometimes contemptuously flings over his garden wall,' to use an expression of the witty Arthur O'Leary.

Now for a felonious murder of the Queen's English, and a polished specimen of the literary powers of the *Times*. "The Editors of the *Cross* should have recollected, before placing a proper name at the foot of this article, that the using any person's signature, without their consent"—. But we must in pity forbear. "We can make neither head nor tail" of this. We fear that the "Protestant ignorance" of the *Times* has "put its foot" in it altogether, and we must recommend them to take a few lessons in Lindley Murray from the "aggravated criminal" of the *Guardian*. When we shall begin to erect our Della Cruscan Academy in Halifax, that matchless pair of Arcadians, the *Times* and the *Guardian*, the Castor and Pollux of the Literary hemisphere, will assuredly form two of its Corinthian Pillars. We are next treated to a theological dissertation on the power of forgiving sins, of which we shall say no more at present than that the theology of the *Times* is exactly on a par with its grammar. When we shall have cleared the decks from the other rubbish of "Protestant Ignorance" we may pour in a broadside which will shake to pieces the foundering bark of Anglican Protestantism. Meantime, as the people of the *Times* have thought proper to sneer at our Clergy for teaching the doctrine and exercising the power of absolution from sin, we may as well pour another ray of light over the darkness of their ignorance—light reflected by themselves from that Church of Truth which they abandoned.

"Book of Common Prayer."

Rubric: in the Order for the Visitation of the sick.

"Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins; if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners, who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy, forgive thee thine offences, and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father," &c.

If there be any meaning in plain language, this Rubric admits, and recognizes the power of absolution in the Church, and the essential part of the Form of absolving sinners is similar to that used in our Church. With what consistency then can the *Times*, or its people, abuse the Catholic Clergy for the exercise of a power which they admit themselves? Or, with the above