

not in defence of *Protestantism*, (as no two of them are agreed upon the exact meaning of that foolish term) but to ensure the 'exclusion of Papists from all power, Civil and Ecclesiastical,' as the Protestant Catechism has it. This was the real, and is now the avowed object of the writers in the *Times*. All their abuse of the Catholics of Nova Scotia was intended for the coming General Election. This is no longer concealed, for in fact their last article is wound up with an Orange Electioneering Address, to excite all the Anti-Catholic bigotry that may yet linger amongst us. But if this furious tocsin of alarm should produce more effect than was ever hoped for by those Popery-hating Trumpeters—if all the Protestants of the country were to combine against their peaceful Catholic fellow-citizens—What can they do? What injury can they inflict upon us? Of what offices or emoluments can they deprive us? In what way can they render our political situation more degrading than it is? Therefore 'Englishmen, Gentlemen and Christians of the *Times*!' *Christian Gentlemen* who threatened the other day to salute the post-ers!!! of your Parsons—we laugh to scorn all your impotent threats, we defy your utmost malice. Politically speaking, we cannot be worse off than we are, and as for the free exercise of our religion, you will not find it so easy a matter to shut up our Churches, and drive our priests into the forest as of old. Catholicity flourishes, and will flourish in Nova Scotia, despite the lying calumnies of the *Times*, and all the stray bigots whom it can collect under its ragged standard of Orange oppression; for Catholicity is Truth, and the intelligent people of Nova Scotia are beginning to see how grossly they have been imposed upon by the shameful misrepresentations of our doctine.

The only other points in the article of the *Times* which require a passing notice are their reference to the Political disturbances of Newfoundland in the year 1838, and their flaming Epistle from an apostate priest in the Island of Achill. With the Newfoundland disturbances, whether political or religious, we have nothing to do. But we have very little confidence in the source from which the *Times* has derived its information. It appears from the face of this suspected evidence that the people of that colony accused one of their judges of strong political partialities, that they had no confidence in his administration of justice, that their Parliament sent a Memorial to the Sovereign, and that by a Protestant Government the Judge was removed. As for the misunderstandings between this innocent or guilty functionary and some of the Newfoundland Clergy, we cannot speak from our own knowledge with any degree of accuracy; but we should like to hear the Catholic version of the story, before we pronounce an opinion. At all events we might as well quote the disgraceful history of the memorable Protestant riots in London under the auspices of a Protestant Nobleman, or the sanguinary Church battles in more recent times, of Gurthorpe, Moincein, Carrickshock and Newtownbarry, and they would have just as much reference to the present controversy, as the case cited by the *Times*.

Proceed we now to the holy protegee of the notorious Nangle the pseudo-apostle of the Achill islands, and of whose comical pranks we happen to know more than the *Times*. We quoted the doctrine contained in the Form of Absolution in the Book of Common Prayer, both against the practice of the Church of England, and the theology of the *Times*. And how do the Editors reply? By the commentary of an ex-Popish Priest on the Common Prayer Book aforesaid, whose chief argument is, that the word *Absolve* does not mean to forgive. "The Lord has left power to His Church to *absolve*, but He is implored to *forgive*, to whom alone the power belongs." How can this be reconciled with the express terms in which this great power was communicated by Christ. We here give the simple text, and we defy all the ingenuity of the *Times* to pervert its meaning.

"He breathed upon his Apostles, and said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven to them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." John, xx. 22. 23.

It is unnecessary to add one word to this very plain text, in order to confute the interpretation of the *Times*. But as these "Englishmen, Christians and gentlemen" threatened last week in their own classic style that they would "LEATHER" us with

the Achill Herald, we will answer this vulgar boast in a more appropriate manner. We will oppose to the Divine of Achill, the authority of another apostate priest, who was much more famous in his day, than Mr. Bourke, and whom the people of the *Times* ought to revere as the founder of their inconsistent creed. We allude to that "most incomprehensible of all imaginable vagabonds" Priest *Luther*, who in his Catechism requires that the penitent in *Confession*, should expressly declare that he believes "the *Forgiveness* of the Priest, to be the *Forgiveness* of God."* But lest the *Times* should object to Doctor Martin Luther, the scandalous vow-breaker, and pot companion of the Devil, with whom he tells us himself he "often slept, and eat a bushel of salt" (Dial. de Miss Priv. Coll mensal) we will quote a more modern and more respectable Theologian of the English School—the proud boast, and renowned hero of Protestantism, CHILLINGWORTH, who, writing in the text which we have quoted above, reasons as follows

"Can any man be so unreasonable as to imagine that when our Saviour, in so solemn a manner, having first breathed upon his disciples, thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts, renewed unto them, or rather confirmed that glorious Commission, whereby he delegated to them an authority of binding and loosing us upon earth, can any one think I say, so unworthy of our saviour, as to esteem these words of his, for no better than compliment? Therefore in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted and enjoined by my holy mother (!) the Church of England, I beseech you that by your practice and use, you will not suffer that Commission, which Christ hath given to his ministers, to be a vain form of words, without any sense under them. When you find yourselves charged and oppressed &c. have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease &c. And come not to him, only with such a mand as you would go to a learned man, as one that can speak comfortable things to you; but as to one that hath authority, delegated to him from God himself, to absolve and acquit you of your sins." (Serm. vii. Reliq. 406 409).

Having poured this additional ray of illumination over the "Protestant ignorance" of the *Times*, we must in conclusion exhort its ungodly Editors to take Chillingworth's advice; and instead of applying contemptuous terms to their Parsons, to approach them with humility and respect, as to their ghostly fathers, and spiritual physicians, to "disclose freely" by a good confession "the nature and malignancy" of their spiritual diseases (their hateful calumnies against Catholics amongst the number) and to receive all the *absolution* and *acquittal* from their sins, which these ministers can grant. And with this advice, we take leave for the present, of the *Geman* of the *Times*.

* In Catech. Parv. Table Talk, c. xviii. on Auricular Confession.

EASTERN CHRONICLE.

We publish with much pleasure the following article from this Journal, in reference to the simultaneous assault on the Catholic Body by the rabid portion of our religious and political press. The sentiments are creditable to the writer, and to the respectable class whom he represents. He expresses his dissent from what he believes to be an error, but in order to convert us, he will not apply odious nick-names, nor wound our feelings, nor deprive us of our civil rights. We are grateful for the sympathy he has shown to our suffering countrymen, and for his spirited denunciation of the attempt to raise the *No Popery* cry. He does not believe that we have "either the will or the power" to injure our Protestant neighbours, and he is right. Our earnest desire has always been, to live on terms of peace and good will, with all our fellow-citizens, and above all to abuse no man's religion, because he happens to differ from us in politics. Some of our Halifax Editors ought to frame and glaze the following truly liberal sentiments.

"Our true position towards Catholics and all others with whom we differ in religious opinion, is that of extreme kindness; not because we fear them, for we do not believe that they have either the will or the power to injure us, but because while they believe us to be in error, we believe the same of them, and while we are ready to extend to them liberty of conscience, we think that