

ON OUR SAVIOUR'S PASSION AND DEATH.

(Extracted from a MS. poem on Charity.)

With pray'r in solitude he next prepares
For his last mortal conflict; ev'n to death
Himself devoting; guiltless for our guilt:
Our ransom's willing victim, doom'd to bleed.

Behold him stretch'd in agony's severe
Of mortal anguish; now prelusively felt
To his great suffering tragedy display'd:
With all our crimes his innocence oppress'd,
That loath'd the load it bore; till from him forc'd,
His sweat of blood the ground had all imbrou'd;
And pitying angels stay'd their sinking Lord;
As from its task his human nature fell
Sbrank shudd'ring back, and felt unwont dismay.

Next see him by his faithless bosom friend
With treach'rous kiss betray'd; and now by all
His frighten'd followers left, the butt exposed
To unrelenting hate, and hostile scorn.

In Idiot's guise, was wisdom's self array'd
By man derisive; sore his sacred sides
Smarted beneath the ruffian's scourge applied:
And emblems mock of Majesty were giv'n
To Him, great Nature's universal Lord.
The purple round his naked shoulders flung:
The red his sceptre; and the thorny crown,
With prickly wreath his bleeding brows that bound!

And, more insulting, ev'n with him compar'd
The worst of felons, ready preference found.
Then to the fatal Mount, as Isaac erst,
Bearing the wood of his own sacrifice
He journey'd onwards: nor himself refus'd
A ready victim at his Father's call.

Pierc'd were his limbs, and pinion'd to the tree,
The fruit of which forbidd'n had mortal prov'd:
Now fruit that yields divine; death's antidote
Sovereign prescrib'd: mid all the guilty doom'd
Solo guiltless he, the criminal chief appears.
Where on his mercy's throne, 'twixt heav'n and
earth,
Conspicuous rais'd; and thirsting for our weal,
Loath'd sorrow's cup ev'n to the dregs he drain'd,
Sparing us, else reserv'd, the bitter draught.

Next for his murd'rous earnest he implores
Forgiveness; pleading meek their crime's excuse.
When, loud proclaim'd our ransom's full dis-
charge,
Like faded flow'r, that bends beneath the blast,
With all her blushing honors round her strew'd,
He drops recumbent on his peaceful breast
His holy head, resigned; and calm expires.

Yet did not Nature calm th' event behold:
She shook throughout, in all her vasty frame
With horror palsied, while th' affrighted sun
Turn'd from the sight; and darkness interpos'd
In deepest gloom the Deicide that veil'd.

GAME CONVICTION.—On Monday last, no less a personage than one of the Coroners of the District was convicted at Sandwich before John A. Wilkinson, Esq., of having killed a Deer on the 2nd instant contrary to law, and was fined in the mitigated penalty of £1 and costs. It cannot be too generally known, that by the Provincial Statute, 2nd Victoria, chap. 12, all persons are prohibited from hunting or killing "Deer or Fawns between the 1st of February and the 1st of August, and wild turkeys, grouse, partridges, quails, and woodcock, between the 1st of March and the 1st of September in every year; and all persons are prohibited from hunting and shooting on Sundays, under a penalty of not less than £1, nor more than £5 for each offence, besides costs of prosecution.—*Chatham Journal*.

All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. Wm. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23.

THE PROTESTANT MODE OF INTERPRETING THE SCRIPTURE.—"If you love me, (says Christ) keep my commandments."—John xiv, 15.

"He that keepeth my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved by my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him."—Ibid. vs. 21.

"If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love, as I also have kept my Father's commandments, and do abide in his love."—Ibid. ch. xv, 10.

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."—Matt. ix, 17, &c. &c.

Protestant Westminster Catechism says,—"No mere man, with any grace received in this life, is able perfectly to keep God's commandments; but doeth daily break them in thought, word and deed."

So, according to this doctrine, (which is the plea of the very devils) God has not the power of preserving his creatures, by any grace he can give, from breaking his commandments in every possible way—in thought, word and deed,—yet Zacharias and Elizabeth are declared in scripture both just before God, walking in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame.—Luke i, 6.

So God is thus blasphemously accused, like a weak, a foolish, and an unjust tyrant, who issues mandates, which he knows none can obey, and punishes the disobedient for not performing impossibilities.

Besides, how can they break daily in thought, word and deed, the commandment of keeping holy the Sabbath day? &c., &c.

But this article of the Presbyterian's Creed is evidently as absurd as false and blasphemous. For it affirms of every one what is impossible to any one; that he daily breaks God's commandments in thought, word and deed. He may indeed break some commandment daily; but must he so break all, and that too in thought, word and deed? Or if he keeps some, why may he not keep all? Or should he daily kill in thought or in word, though this last way of killing is not very intelligible; must he also daily kill in deed? the worst of sinners then is not so bad a wretch, as this wretched blasphemy would make the best of christians.

The Catholic says with St. Peter, that we should endeavor by good works, to make our calling and election sure.—1 Pet. i, 10.

The Protestant says that this doctrine of works is a popish, false doctrine; for that we are saved by faith alone; that the apostle St. James was wrong, in affirming that faith without works is dead.—James ii, 17, 18, 19, 20. For Luther

proved that the apostle was mistaken, and called his Catholic Epistle, an Epistle of straw.

The Catholic, with St. Peter, still says, that in St. Paul's Epistles, there are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do the other scriptures, to their own damnation.—2 Pet. i, 20.

Protestants say that all prophesy of scripture is made by private interpretation; and that there is nothing in scripture so hard to be understood, but what the unlearned, as well as the learned, may rightly of themselves expound.

When we have more leisure, we shall resume this subject.

Still our *Gazette* man's muzzle in the mud! He has, for this time, got a rich piece of ordure to turn up—the loose conduct of a libidinous priest, named Costello, fitted now, by the breach of his solemn vow, to become an edifying Protestant Parson. Of such the humorous Dean Swift used to say: "I wish the Pope, when he weeds his garden, would not sling all his filth into ours." The case, however, of this Costello has nothing mysterious or wonderful about it, as it is pompously announced to be. It is but the misgiving of poor frail human nature, to which the apostle St. Peter alludes, where, speaking of the influence exercised by false teachers on certain weak and carnal minds, he says, "Speaking proud words of vanity, they allure, through the desires of fleshy riotousness those who for a little while escape such as converse in error"—2 Peter, ii. 18.—promising them liberty, whereas they themselves are the slaves of corruption; for, by whom a man is overcome, of the same also is he the slave."—Ibid. v. 19.

It was in the lewd propensities of certain forsworn priests and friars that Protestantism originated. Had Luther, Carlstadt, Zwinglius, Osiander, Bucer, Knox, and all the dissentient fathers of the Reformation, not fallen in love, and wished to get their vows of celibacy abolished, and their mistresses acknowledged as honest women, we should have at this day no Protestant antagonist to contend with. Even the English Church has the brutal and beastly Henry VIII., and his vile creature Cranmer, secretly married to Osiander's sister, to thank for its existence. It was the lewdness, avarice, and cruelty of such, that gave birth, and, in some countries, ascendancy to all the varieties of Protestantism. If a doubt on this subject is expressed by our *Gazette* man, or his polemical contributor, we shall feel a pleasure in removing it; and in laying before the public, on unexceptionable authority, the edifying career of the notorious worthies alluded to.

As to the "Romish Catholic priest" introduced as an old man earnestly pleading for wives being allowed to the supposed love-sick of his celibatary brethren; since neither his name nor his place of residence is given, we have good reason to suppose him a fictitious character, such as we daily find woven up in the lying Protestant tract tales, and stupidly forged stories of scriptural conversions from Popery.

Never, however, did we see so boldly advanced before the public, one continued tissue of the most glaring falsehoods, as the precious morsel copied into the *Gazette* from the *Quarterly Review*, "On the Roman Catholic Irish peasantry."

Nothing can tend more to serve the cause of Catholicity than such unblushingly forged notorious untruths, as the last Defence of Protestantism. We would beg our worthy contemporary to republish the elegant extract once more, and again, for the real good effect it will have on the minds of our community.

THE GREATEST THIEF CRIES THIEF.

"In our paper of Monday last, (*Gazette* of March 14th) we maintained that the power of priestly absolution was as boldly believed by the Church of England as by that of Rome, and, of course, so is our belief also: yet this hoary headed man deliberately states that we call this a damnable doctrine.—The only doctrine which we called damnable was the peculiar Tenet of the Church of Rome, that pardon of sins can be obtained only by confession, and absolution from a priest; that God cannot pardon sin in any other way."—*Gazette* of March 21.

Barring this last clause, and the only, which is altogether the *Gazette* man's property, we say, and our dunderheaded antagonist says also, that his church affirms the same, viz: that God has granted to his clergy the power of absolving from sin, by confession. Otherwise, why should the sick of his church be moved to confess their sins to their minister? And could their minister with truth pronounce over them his absolution in these words: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power in 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, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen," if he had not the power of absolving them from their sin? Then he declares to his confessing penitents that he does what he has not the power nor intention to do; that is, that he absolves, or loses them from all their sins—what, he thinks, God could not give man the power to do! But can this mock polemic, and, we guess, as ignorant a law-man, as he is a home-spun theologian,—can he suppose, as he asserts, that Catholics believe that God cannot pardon the truly penitent without confession to a priest? Did he but read the Catholic two-penny Catechism, he would see there that perfect contrition obtains immediate pardon from God, without confession, though the obligation remains, when it can be accomplished, of shewing our spiritual leprosy, which is sin, to the priest. Is it not as absurd for a minister to say to his penitents, I, by Christ's authority, committed to me, absolve you from all your sins, which I know nothing of, as it were in a temporal judge to say to delinquents before him: I, by the Sovereign's authority, committed to me, absolve you from all your crimes, not one