

James Doherty	1	0	0
Robert Devaney	1	0	0
Denis O'Sullivan	0	10	0
Gregory Kelly	0	10	0
Paul White	0	10	0
James Ferguson	0	10	0
William Colbert	0	10	0
Henry Swaine	0	10	0
Thomas Callahan	0	10	0
Thomas Buckley	0	10	0
James Hardy	0	10	0
John Fogarty	0	10	0
Edward Walsh	0	10	0
Cornelius Harrington	0	10	0
John Hayden	0	10	0
Timothy Grady	0	10	0
Michael Conway	0	10	0
Thomas Hunt	0	10	0
John Barton	0	10	0
William Dooley	0	10	0
James Sutton	0	10	0
John Murphy	0	13	2
William Lynch	0	13	9
Richard Fliinn	0	13	6

(To be continued.)

## REV. P. FORBES' LETTER TO THE GLASGOW PARSONS.

(Concluded.)

But to return to the charges; I am then accused of "a plain premeditated conspiracy to injure and even blacken the character of the Established Clergy of the City!" Passing over the editorial correctness of a conspiracy being constituted by one man alone, I would ask, does the Editor of the *Scottish Guardian* really imagine that the efforts of one Priest could blacken the character of the *holy and electing body* of the Established Clergy of Glasgow? Is that a point so vulnerable, Mr. Editor? A Conspiracy! What! One poor Priest against the whole host of Established Parsons, reinforced and backed as they have lately been by the resistless, matchless powers of the learned *Shanks*, the *immaculate Crotty*, and the veracious O'Sullivan!!! Ye powers! What a daring enterprise—and the whole camp of parsons already in dismay!!! I have often heard that in the days of romance whole garrisons have been put into a state of terror and alarm by the threats of one valourous knight to storm their strongholds; but the feat ascribed to me by the Editor of the *Scottish Guardian* surpasses anything related in the annals of chivalry!

But to be serious, Mr. Editor! In what consists this deadly conspiracy? For what am I accused of conspiring against the Established Clergy? Merely because I kindly acquainted two or three of them that certain individuals of their communion were lying sick and very ill in the Infirmary! This is the whole extent, height, width, and depth, of my conspiracy. Now, Mr. Editor, I understand you are a clergyman, and I ask you, is it fair—is it becoming in you to accuse me of conspiracy for an act so much in consonance with the great principle of Christianity, whose first and leading characteristic is *universal charity*?

Is it just to accuse me of a conspiracy for an act of genuine kindness, of clerical courtesy, and generous liberality? Must I be taxed with conspiracy for affording a Christian Minister an opportunity of fulfilling what ought to be to him a hallowed and a sacred duty? O; this may well besit the character of a Law Church Minister, but it is a stain upon the very name of a *True Christian Clergyman*.

In the next place, I am accused of sending these notices with the design to entrap the poor parsons. Well, supposing for a moment even that I did, was there not an easy means of escape? Could they not have done what was their duty? Could they not have gone quietly to see their sick, and then they would have avoided the snare? But, sir, any such sinister intention I utterly deny; and I appeal to the candid, honest, open manner in which I dated, signed, and sent these notices, as demonstrative proof that there never was, nor even could be intended conspiracy or trap. But it was the conspiracy looking means you made use of. Yes; to be sure I wrote a letter, dated it Great Clyde Street, and signed P. Forbes, C. C. Other two were written—dated Great Clyde Street, and signed Peter Forbes, Catholic Clergyman—at full length, and in large characters. O this dark design! O thou deep designing, court concealed, and hidden conspirator!!!

Really, Sir; must here give you a lesson; you, being a Minister of the Gospel, may be somewhat annoyed at being sent back to your catechism—but I am under the necessity of making the reference, since you seem so entirely to have forgot your questions. In the Larger Catechism; then, "misconstructing intentions" is declared a sin; now you have misconstrued my intentions—therefore you have committed a sin.—Then in the Shorter Catechism it is asked, "What doth every sin deserve? Every sin deserveth God's wrath and curse, both in this life and that which is to come." I hope, Sir, you will make the sins against what you call the *Ninth Commandment*, one of the chief points of your examination of conscience to-morrow evening.

But whence all this delicacy, all these fears about character? Have I said anything not true of you, and are you afraid of the truth being known? Is it not a notorious fact that you Established Parsons do not attend your sick? Is it not a fact that you might almost as soon look for a white crow on the steeple of the Tron Church, as for an Established Minister of Glasgow in the ward of a fever hospital; Now, the "public has a right" to know what is the reason of this? O, it is needless to shuffle—the reason is found in that magnanimous declaration, *I am afraid*. Is it not a well known fact, also, that ministers have been sent for again and again, to see persons sick out of the Infirmary have not come? I could tell a tale not yet three months old, when no less than three ministers sent for, and none came; one, in particular, absolutely refused. But why dwell on a matter so well known. Now, is all this fight—is it Christian? Is then, I ask, the religion that that these men practise, the religion of heaven? I am taxed with saying "will you follow such men as these?" I am not sensible that I ever made use of such an expression; but, as already mentioned, I said then, and I say now, "Is this the religion of the religion of a crucified God, who gave his life for man?" I said then—and repeat now—is it? I appeal to my honest countrymen—I appeal to the Christian world if it be? Is this the religion of St. Paul, who was willing not only to expose his life, but to become even an anathema for his brethren? I am accused of saying "will you follow such men as these?" I am not aware of saying so then, but if I did not, I say so now "Will you be followers of such pastors as these?" I say it to the sensible citizens of Glasgow, I say it to all unbiased and impartial men:—Will you be followers of Parsons who can lend a deaf year to the dying cry of the afflicted Christian? Will you be followers of Parsons who will suffer the poor forlorn sinner to die, perhaps without a hope? Will you be followers of men who are so cowardly, so afraid, that they will abandon you at the very hour when most you need their help? Will you be supporters of men who will come to your feasts, but fly when you are sick? Will you be supporters of men who with their wives and their families, who will live on your substance, but leave you to die in despair? Will you, in fire, be supporters of men, who, were you to die and be buried in hell, would not stir a foot to save you from the appalling doom?

Christians! believe not all who come to you "in sheep's clothing"—"by their fruit you shall know them."

But, we are told there is an "essential difference" between the priest and the minister, as to, the fever patients in the