

Where were the members of the Protestant Church or Churches for fifteen hundred years before those "Founders" appeared? Or was the Church of Christ hidden during all that time? The inference drawn from the comparison made between those "Founders" of Protestantism and Alexander VI., is unfounded, because there is no parity in the cases. Pope Alexander succeeded, perhaps unworthily, to an authority which had been established by Christ on Peter, and which descended through a long and venerable line of martyred, holy, and learned successors. But this Pope made no change in the doctrines of the Holy Church over which he presided. But it is far otherwise with the presumptuous "Founders" of new creeds. The allusion to this subject in the *Guardian* contains one of the most odious and anti-ecumenical forestries of the Waldenses.

"Popes are compelled on their accession to take an oath against nepotism, that is undue advancement of their relations (nephews) in nine cases out of ten their children."

False in fact and inference. The Pope is a temporal sovereign as well as head of the Church. The advancement of the Pope's nephews and relatives in former times to secular dignities and titles, gave undue pre-eminence in the state to certain families, and excited jealousies and dissensions during an interregnum. The solemn renunciation of nepotism is therefore more a measure of state than of religion, one of those constitutional safeguards for the violation of which the ancestors of "the people of the *Guardian*" brought an English monarch to the block. The assertion about the children in nine cases out of ten, we treat with the contempt which such a barefaced falsehood deserves. It is clear that the recent illustrious converts at Rome did not believe a word of it.

"It would be an easy matter to prove that every article (in the Litany of Anathemas) on the denial of which they stake their salvation is *part of the Romish Creed*."

False; and the Father of Lies never invented a greater falsehood. We claim as Catholics the possession of a more accurate knowledge of the 'Romish Creed' than any Protestant in Halifax. We have published our List of Anathemas before the world. If the doctrines which we condemned so sincerely were 'Romish' it would have been the duty of our clergy, and more especially of our Bishop to call us to order, and to make a public reclamation. But they have been silent, both in the pulpit and the press.—We therefore repeat our former anathemas; but we will not add a well-merited Curse on all those impious Liars who persist in charging us with doctrines which we have disavowed on our oaths, and which, as every Catholic knows, we detest and abhor more than our Protestant calumniators do.

"The crafty Church of Rome has suppressed the second Commandment."

False; Examine our Bibles in every language, and our larger Catechisms and Books of Instruction. Every word of the commandments is to be found in them. The oft-refuted charge which we here brand with falsehood, arose from the fact that in some very small Catechisms intended for young children, only the substantial parts of the Ten Commandments are given, because the insertion of the whole text would perplex the memory of an infant. Thus the words "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other Gods but me," contain the substance of our First, or what the Protestants call the First and Second Commandments. To prove that there is no crafty intention in mutilating the first or second Commandment, we will set down the remainder as they are printed for children:

- 2 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
- 3 Remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day.
- 4 Honor thy father, and thy mother.
- 5 Thou shalt not kill.
- 6 Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- 7 Thou shalt not steal.
- 8 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
- 9 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.
- 10 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.

The *division of the Commandments* has nothing to do with their *substance*. We make *one* commandment of the *two first*, according to the Protestant arrangement, because we think that

the word, "I am the Lord thy God, &c., and 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, &c.'" all have reference to the same precept of adoring God and Him alone. By this arrangement likewise, we are enabled to distribute the other commandments more suitably. Thus by our 6th and 7th commandments the acts of adultery and those are prohibited under distinct precepts—and in like manner the covetousness or desires to commit those acts are separately prohibited in our 9th and 10th. Whereas, Protestants who give separate commandments (their 7th and 8th) against the acts of adultery and robbery, are obliged to jumble into one commandment (their 10th) the prohibition of the desire to commit those distinct crimes. So far for this great Protestant lie, that we suppress the second commandment. We are really ashamed to think that any Protestant amongst us should be so ignorant as to retail this stupid calumny.

Our crowded space this week warns us to draw to a close.—We will continue from time to time our publication of Protestant Lies from the columns of the *Halifax Papers*, as long as they keep up this savage warfare, and in every instance we will "nail the rap to the counter," and hammer out its Protestant forgeries.

THE THEOLOGIANS OF THE TIMES.

"So vast our new Divines, we must confess
Are fathers of the Church, for writing less.
No commentator can more sily pass
O'er a learn'd unintelligible place:
Or, in quotation, shew'd divines leave out
Those words that would against them clear the doubt.
So Luther thought the Pater Noster long
When doom'd to say his beads, and even-song;
But having cast his cowl, and left those laws,
Adds to Christ's Prayer the "Power and Glory"
clause."—Pope.

The last editorial of the *Times* fully proves, if proof were wanted, that its adventurous divines have no confidence either in their own powers, or in the justice of their cause. Indeed their recent Editorials have become so insipid and evasive, so replete with assertion without proof, so remarkable for total ignorance of the subjects which they discuss, that our notices of them in that capacity may be speedily brought to a close. We find that we have been flinging water on drowned rats, and wasting our powder and shot on game so small that they are not worth the trouble of carrying home. To honour such drivellers with a special Editorial, would be to treat them as if they had some pretension to literature; to discuss theology with them, would be to fight a windmill. Alas! poor Church of England, if these be your chosen champions, you are fallen indeed from your high estate.

These helpless creatures in their last No. say that we brought "forward with singular inconsistency the practice of some EPISCOPAL Bishops (!!) to show, &c." This will give our readers a fair sample of their qualifications, not only in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, but also in the vernacular. What a learned linguist we are doomed to cope with in the writer of the above! Who can blame us for addressing him with the Poet:

"You prove yourself so able,
Pity! you was not Druggerman at Babel
For had they found a linguist half so good,
I make no question but the tower had stood!"

We quoted Prelates of the Church of England against them on the meaning of the Book of Common Prayer, and they tell us we bring forward these EPISCOPAL Bishops with singular inconsistency! The inconsistency is all their own.

Either the doctrine of Absolution and Confession is contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or it is not.

If it be contained there, the "Episcopal Bishops" are right, and the Theologians of the *Times*, and the practice of the Church of England are wrong.

If it be not contained there, the Prayer Book is a treacherous guide speaking one thing, and meaning another—and the "Episcopal Bishops" and Sacerdotal Priests (we thank thee Jew for teaching us the word!) and numerous Divines of the English Church who agreed with the Bishops in their interpre-