

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Showthrough/
Transparence

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THE CROSS.



NEW

SERIES.

VOL. 3.

No. 15.

god forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is Crucified to me, and I to the world.—St. Paul, Gal. vi. 14.

HALIFAX, APRIL 10, 1847.

CALENDAR.

- APRIL 11—Sunday—Low Sunday.
- 12—Monday—St. Julius, I. P. C.
- 13—Tuesday—St. Hermenegild, M.
- 14—Wednesday—St. Sixtus III, P. C.
- 15—Thursday—St. Francis of Paula, C.
- 16—Friday—St. Isidore, B. C.
- 17—Saturday—St. Anicetus, P. M.

THE ANGLICAN FRACTION OF "THE ABSURDITY CALLED PROTESTANTISM."

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Sixth of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England as by (Cannon) Law established.

This self-contradicting article was lately quoted against us, by a Journal, in which, we also read, that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Before we proceed to dissect the sixth article, we would be glad to know, where is the necessity of compiling articles, creeds, or homilies at all, if the Bible alone be the religion of Protestants? What right has the Church of England to draw up a list of specific doctrines, and to require the assent of any individual to them? What right has she to step in between the Bible and the Bible Reader? She has disclaimed infallibility. She admits that she is liable to err. What can be more absurd than to require others to follow her, when she admits she may lead them astray? or more cruel than to punish them for not doing so? If this unfortunate Church wished to preserve any decent show of consistency, she would first prove, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; she would next present them to her children, and leave them entire freedom of interpretation, without the fear of pain or penalty, excommunication, or privation of office. But the modest Church of England does no such thing. She hypocritically

proclaims the right of Private Judgment, and cries aloud that the Bible is the religion of Protestants. But when one of her dupes receives the Bible as God's Word, and has the misfortune to interpret it in a sense unfavourable to the Thirty Nine Articles, she pounces upon him with the full weight of her vengeance. Then she clamours loudly for an authority altogether different from the Bible, an authority outside the Bible, although according to her the Bible alone is her religion. To be consistent, she should admit every Protestant to be a member of the Church of England, for every Protestant strictly follows her Rule of Faith. Either the Church of England is infallible in her doctrine of Thirty Nine Articles, or she is not.

If it be said she is infallible, she is ignorant of this great privilege, nay she disclaims it, and her admission of the fallibility of Christ's Church proves this hypothesis to be absurd.

If she be fallible, as indeed she admits, then it follows that her teaching may be false, her doctrines erroneous, her Thirty Nine Articles unscriptural, and therefore, according to herself, not to be believed.

What guarantee then, can she give her votaries that they are safe in following her interpretation of Scripture, or how can she require their assent to her doctrines, unless from authority or tradition? But in revolting against the Catholic Church, she has rejected both tradition and authority. She has nothing, consequently, to present her disciples, but the uncertain declaration of an avowedly fallible Body—a declaration upon whose meaning her gravest doctors are still divided.

Hence, when Dr. Priestly was engaged in controversy with the Church of England Divines, he was pressed by arguments drawn from Scripture and Tradition, and what was his reply?

"Hold gentlemen!

You quote Scripture.

So do I.

You think you give it the proper sense.

So do I. (st)

You are no doubt sincere in your pursuit of Truth.

So am I.

You have prayed the Holy Ghost to enlighten you,
So have I.

Your salvation is dear to you.

Not more so than my soul is to me.

You admit your fallibility.

I am but an erring mortal myself.

As there is no one then to decide which of us is in the right, and which in the wrong, it must be a drawn battle between us."

To their arguments from Tradition the Doctor very properly replied:

"These arguments have no consistency or weight, except in the mouth of a Roman Catholic. If they have any force with the Church of England man, they should lead him back to the pale of the Roman Catholic Church;" and the cunning Doctor was right.

The Church of England is like certain sectarians of old, described by St. Irenæus, who, when they were pressed by the authority of Scripture, had recourse to Tradition. and when tradition was quoted against them, fled back to the Scriptures, not being able to trust one or the other. The inevitable result is, that they adhere to neither. Even it itaque, neque Scripturis jam, neque Traditioni consentio eos. *Irenæus*, Lib. III. c. 2.

On nothing is Scripture more explicit than on the necessity of observing the Sabbath. If you ask a minister of the Church of England, why he presumes to transfer the celebration of the Sabbath from Saturday—the Scriptural day—to Sunday, he will begin to quote Tradition, and the authority of the early Church. Quote Tradition or Church authority for him in favour of any Catholic doctrine, and he will admit none of them, but cry out for Scripture alone, as if the Devil himself did not cite Scripture against the very Founder of the Church.

Now for the dissection of the 6th Article.

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

But Holy Scripture no where declares this; and even if it did, its authority on the subject cannot be admitted, unless its *divine inspiration* be first proved. There are portions of Scripture, even in the New Testament, which contain no prophecy, no miracles, no distinctive mark of inspiration, no intrinsic evidence beyond that of the writings of any of the early disciples or first fathers of the Church.

Again: The written word of God cannot be greater than the Incarnate Word.

But the Incarnate Word required a testimony different from himself to prove his divine mission, and hence he said. "If I bear witness of myself my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me." (John v. 31, 32.) And we read therefore, that "John was sent from God as a witness to bear witness of the Light, that all men might believe through him." (Ib. I. 7.)

Therefore, Scripture cannot be an evidence in its own cause; because if we admit this, it will follow that the *Dead Letter* of the Written Word is superior to the *Living Voice* of Jesus Christ himself.

Is it not "necessary" for their "salvation" that infants should be baptised? And yet where does Holy Scripture contain any injunction or direction to baptise them? Our Saviour did not say, *Go baptize* and teach; but, *Go teach* all nations bap-

tizing them. The teaching precedes the baptism, and as infants cannot be taught, on what authority does the Church of England baptize them? Alas! she can make no answer to those who press this argument against her. But the Catholic Church consistently can. She will declare with St. Augustine that if there be any obscurity in the Written Word on this point, the Baptism of Infants rests on the authority of Apostolic and Divine Tradition.* And this tradition on a tenet so practical in the Church, brought as clear conviction to the early Fathers, as if it had been written ten thousand times over.

How did the early Church know that persons baptized by heretics or schismatics were not to be baptised? Certainly not from Holy Scripture which is altogether silent on the point, but from Apostolic tradition, as the same Holy Doctor assures us.†

Is it not necessary for salvation to keep the Sabbath in the manner, and on the Day, that the Lord has appointed? Now God has appointed *Saturday* in the Scripture, and we have no text in Holy Scripture to prove that he changed the Day. But the Church of England keeps her Sabbath on *Sunday*, contrary to Scripture, and she has no more Scriptural authority for doing so, than if she kept it on Tuesday or Thursday. The principle is the same.

St. Paul tells the Thessalonians to respect oral tradition as well as his written communication, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, either by word, or by our Epistle." (2 Thess. II. 14) Upon which text St. Chrysostom observes, (Comment in 2 Thess. c. II.)— "Hence it is clear that they did not deliver all things by Epistle; but many things also which were not written. And the latter are equally worthy of faith as the former. For this reason we believe the tradition of the Church also to be worthy of Faith. It is tradition, inquire nothing more."

That ancient and truly Scriptural Father, St. Basil in his Book on the Holy Ghost, addressed to S. Amphilocheus Bishop of Iconium, writes thus; "Of the dogmas preached in the Church we have some transmitted in writing; others, which were delivered in mystery, that is, in a secret manner, we have received by means of Apostolic Tradition. Both are equally efficacious in promoting piety. . . . For if we proceed to reject as of little moment, such points as are not transmitted in writing, we shall by our impudent daring also condemn those things necessary to salvation, which are contained in the Gospel; nay, we shall reduce the whole preaching of the Faith to a mere name. . . . Who has taught us in Scripture to mark with the sign of the Cross those who have placed their hope in Christ? In what part of Scripture are we taught to pray facing towards the east? Which of the Saints has left us in writing, the words of Invocation when the Bread of the Eucharist and the Chalice of Benediction are exposed to view? For, not content with those which the Apostle or the Gospel mentions, we also use, both before, and after, as of great moment to the Mystery, other words which we have received from Tradition, and which have not been reduced to writing. Again, by what Scriptural authority do we consecrate the water of Baptism, and the Oil of Unction and the person baptized? Is it not on the authority of silent and secret tradition? What words of Scripture teach us how to anoint with oil? Where is it revealed in Scripture that man should be thrice immersed, or from what part of Scripture, do we derive the other ceremonies used in Baptism, such as the renouncing of Satan and his angels? Is it not from the doctrine

*August. De Genes. ad Interan. x. 22. Lib. I. c. 26. ad Marcellinum.

†Aug. de Bapt. cont. Donat. II. 7 and y. 23.

our Fathers preserved in silence, which keeps about equally inquisitive and worthless idlers? The reason why some things were delivered *unwritten* is, lest the knowledge of the dogmas might, by too great a familiarity, come into contempt amongst the bulk of the people."

Christ never wrote (unless on the ground) nor did he command his Apostles to write anything. Nay there are certain things St. John was commanded *not to write*. The Apostles preached and taught as they were ordered by Christ, before they ever wrote. Only some of the Apostles wrote, and they did so, as necessity required, to supply the want of their presence and their preaching. They never wrote to hand down the entire doctrines of faith, nor did they instruct all people on all subjects. They wrote to meet the exigencies of each case as it presented itself, and their letters sent to various parts were not collected together for a very long time after their death.

"Whatsoever is not read therein (Holy Scripture) nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed, &c."

Here is *hocus pocus* and loggerdemain which Connt. Cagliostro himself could not unriddle. Let us follow the Protestant absurdity step by step.

- 1 Holy Scripture contains every thing necessary to salvation.
- 2 No man is to be required to believe what is not read therein.
- 3 No man is to be required to believe what cannot be proved thereby.

The first is a very dubious proposition, as we have already shown. It is a simple assertion by a fallible Church.

The second is vague and unsatisfactory, because it does not inform us, *who is to be the Judge* of what is read, or not read in Scripture.

One Protestant sect reads one doctrine there, another a totally different one. Who is to decide between them? On this important point the Article is silent. The Church of England does not, cannot, pretend that she is competent to determine whether a dogma be contained in Scripture or not. Hence, in this article she supposes the existence of some authority, of some judge outside herself, to decide this essential point. But who, or what is this authority? She does not condescend to inform us, and we must therefore, grope for her meaning. Scripture itself cannot tell whether a doctrine is to be found in it or not; for it is not a living speaking authority, but a dead letter. The only ultimate tribunal to which an appeal can be made is, the Bible Reader himself, and his pride of understanding is appealed to, in somewhat of the following fashion:

"Behold the word of God; (says the Church of England, referring to the corrupted English translation) whatsoever you read there, you must believe. But you must not be forced to believe by me or any one else, whatsoever you do not read there." I don't read anything there about the Trinity, says one; I cannot read anything there about the divine institution of Episcopacy says another; I read no warrant in Scripture for infant Baptism, says a third; I can read nothing about the change of the Sabbath from Saturday to any other day, says a fourth; I do not find the doctrine of original sin there, says a fifth; I see no proof there that a layman, or a woman can be the Head of a Church says a sixth; I can find nothing about the necessity of good works, or the eternity of hell, says a seventh, and so on, *ad infinitum*. until the cycle of Bible readers has disproved every tenet of the Church of England from Scripture alone. And what answer can she make? What authority can she claim? What light or assistance does she render to every doubting reader, to every blind wanderer? None whatsoever. Her poor dupe of a Protestant soul is as wise at the end as the beginning. He can't read the Bible with her spectacles. He can't find any proofs of her tenets. He dissents, and protests against her, and if she presumes to whisper the *Thirty Nine Articles*, he replies that the Bible and not the *Thirty Nine Articles*, is his religion, that the Articles themselves tell him he cannot be required to believe any thing which is *not read in the Bible*, and that he *cannot read* any thing of the doctrines of the Church of England there.

"No man is to be required to believe what cannot be proved by the Bible."

All our former reasoning applies here with equal force. There is no indication of a Judge, of an authority to determine what *can*, or what *cannot be proved* by the Bible. It is indeed hinted obscurely that a right of deciding exists somewhere, as some body or some individual is prohibited and restrained in the power of exacting belief.

This great Protestant blunder is made still more ridiculous in the XX Article where it is said: "The Church hath authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." In other words the Church has authority, and has not authority. She has authority in controversies of faith. But if, in the opinion of any individual she "ordains any thing contrary to God's word written" she acts unlawfully, and she may be disobeyed. Thus the Church is to control the individual and the individual is to resist the Church; each part is to rule the whole, and each member the aggregate of this precious Church. Let her dare to say for a moment that she never *does*, and never *can*, "ordain anything contrary to God's word written" and she claims the character of Infallibility which she denies to be a mark of Christ's Church, and for asserting which she so furiously bellowed against the Catholic Church

"Thus all disputes for ever must depend,
For no *dumb rule* can controversies end.

We cannot resist the temptation of closing this article by another specimen of the bungling absurdities and contradictions of this English Church.

In her 8th Homily, Against Perils of Idolatry she declares "That laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees, of men, women and children, of *whole* Christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable and damnable Idolatry, and that for the space of eight hundred years and more" (A modest declaration truly for a Church that accuses us of the doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.) But in her 16th Homily *Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost* she presents us a totally different doctrine, viz: That the Holy Ghost the spirit of Truth has been, and will be always present with the Church, governing and directing it to the world's end: so that it never has wanted, nor never will want, while the world endures "pure and sound doctrine. &c."

How are we to reconcile this conflicting evidence? Or what credit can be given to a Church which thus blows hot and cold in the same breath? The poor Protestant dupe, "tossed about by every wind of doctrine," who attempts to steer by her false Lights, must necessarily encounter the rocks of infidelity or the quicksands of error. The only comfort he can get in his distress will be something like the precious assurance of one of the English "Episcopal Bishops" (Bishop Watson) who in a charge to his clergy in the year 1783, alluding to the Christian doctrines, thus speaks:

"I think it *safer* to tell you *where they are contained* than *what they are*. They are contained in the Bible, and if in reading that book your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbours, or from those of the Church, be persuaded on your part, that Infallibility appertains as little to you, as it does to the Church!"

There!—There's your *wandering Light*, Englishmen, Gentlemen, and Christians! If you go astray with that before your eyes, may the Lord enlighten your "Protestant ignorance."

You want to be saved, says this Thimble-rigging Church to a gaping neophyte of *English Christianity*. *Yous*, replies Hodge.

Well then, you must believe in the doctrines of Christ.
Aye, aye, but which be they?
Now then stupid; that's none of my business to tell. Here's one of King Jamie's Bibles, and you'll find them all there.

* We hope the Bishop includes *Catholic* neighbours. If so, the Church of England may have been wrong in condemning our interpretation of Scripture, as Infallibility so little appertains to her.

Why, I'm blest if I can! But, wont you lend me a hand to make it out!

No, stupid! I'm as little infallible as yourself, replies the Old Dame; but I give you permission to read and expound for yourself, and thank God, you clodpole for your Protestant independence.

Thank'ee Maam! —

How truly did the Poet sing!

“As long as words a different senso will bear

And each may be his own interpreter,

Our fairy faith will no foundation find—

The Word's a weathercock for every wind.”

REFUTED CALUMNIES OF THE BIGOTS OF THE TIMES.

Those mendacious Christians, recently declared, with all the impudence of Beech-hub, that the present controversy was begun by the Catholics, and as an instance they cited the case of the Municipal Election in Ward No. 3. We shewed that even here, the religious war was commenced by themselves. We asserted that many of the liberals and Irishmen who engaged in that victorious contest were forced to do so, by the intolerant announcement of their opponents. *This is a Protestant Ward, and we must keep it so*, was their watchword in the morning, and they cry out, the ogots, because one green flag belonging to some society, was seen amidst the rejoicings of the evening. We do not see what occasion there was for any flag at all. But, at the same time, it was rank hypocrisy in those who hoisted the Orange flag in the morning, to complain of a little green in the evening. The green is the national colour of an ancient Kingdom, as well as the beautiful livery of all nature. The orange is the blood-stained banner of a sanguinary and traitorous faction, who were ignominiously discarded by Peel and who were declared by Lord Gosford to be “a greater terror to his Majesty's subjects, than to the enemy.”

If this Protestant exclusiveness of Ward No. 3. be fully carried out, we may expect to behold some remarkable changes in the city. The next step, we suppose will be, to get Notices over some of the stores, shops and offices, stating that **NO PAPIST NOR VULGAR IRISH NEED APPLY.** And, at those large auctions which so frequently take place at our Wharves, rebellious Catholics will be warned off by the hoisting of an Orange flag with the words *N.B. A STRICT PROTESTANT AUCTION! NO PAPIST PERMITTED TO BID!*

We also stated in answer to a calumnious charge brought against our Clergy, and which the “people of the Times” knew to be a *wicked falsehood*, that one of the Clergymen waited on Mr. A. Unacke to conjure him to exert his influence with these good people to put a stop to their insulting articles against the Catholics of the Province, and to inform him that the Catholics of Hanfax had long suffered in silence from those attacks, and that much ill will and social strife would be the consequence unless they desisted.

How have the Editors of the Times met this statement? By two new falsehoods; one expressed, and the other implied.

First they say that the Clergyman was an ambassador, and that he was sent from St. Mary's on this mission. This is totally false. He was sent by no one. He went of his own accord, and influenced by the purest motives of charity and good will. It was only very recently, we ourselves heard of the fact from a person to whom the worthy clergyman happened to mention it.

The implied falsehood is this, and we appeal to the readers of the Times for the propriety of the epithet.

The Editors endeavoured in their reply to turn the whole affair into derision, and asked whether the priest went in his canonicals, and whether Mr. Unacke burst his buttons with laughing at him, &c &c. The whole tendency of the reply is to insinuate that they knew nothing about it, or that Mr. Unacke treated the priest cavalierly for his impertinence in applying to him on such a subject.

Now, what will the readers of the Times say, when we tell them, that Mr. Unacke *actually went* to the Editors and informed one of them, in presence of a highly respectable Pro-

testant gentleman, of the feelings of the Catholics and complained that the Times was injuring him, his cause, and his friends by those wanton attacks on their Catholic neighbours?

And yet after all this, the Time with those facts in its possession, has the diabolical assurance to come out before the people of Nova Scotia, and to repeat that it was the Catholic Clergy wanted to embroil the community in religious strife!!! Ah! gentlemen, christians, and Englishmen, if these be samples of your creed, or code of honour, we are disgusted with your *English Christianity.*

PROTESTANT INDULGENCES! MORE SPECIMENS OF THE “TOLERANT SPIRIT” OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TIMES.

Notwithstanding all the shameful perversions of our enemies we must still claim the privilege of knowing our own creed better than they do. When they tell us, therefore, that an *Indulgence* in the Catholic Church is a permission to commit sin, or a Pardon for the guilt of sins committed, we laugh at their “Protestant ignorance.” We know that this is not Catholic doctrine; our numerous converts also know it, and every Protestant lie of this description serves only to increase their disgust and to strengthen their faith. The SEVENTY Protestant ministers too, who according to the statement of the London Morning Post received by the last packet, have conformed to the Church of Rome within the last eighteen months past, are fully persuaded of the falsehood of this and many other unfounded charges against the Church of Christ.

An Indulgence in the Catholic Church so far from countenancing, permitting; or absolving from sin, presupposes the destruction and removal of sin. This is so true, that no Catholic can gain what is called an Indulgence as long as he is in grievous sin. It is essentially necessary that he should first be in the *state of Grace*, and that his sins be pardoned by the merits of Jesus Christ, and sincere repentance, *before* he can derive any benefit from an Indulgence.

This is sound Catholic doctrine, and if all the bigots that ever belloyed, were to roar out against it in full chorus, they can neither change nor destroy it. How much wiser would it be to spare their breath for those tenets which we really admit and believe?

However, the Catholic Church is not the only one that grants Indulgences. There are *Protestant Indulgences* too of a very comprehensive and comical character. In “the Envy of surrounding nations, and admiration of the world” if a capricious sinner gets tired of his lawful wife, and has plenty of money he can get a divorce from the House of Lords, with an *Indulgence* to marry again. His divorced partner can have a similar Indulgence to marry any other sinner.

The Church of England too has given an *Indulgence* to her Parsons to hold as many as half a dozen or half a score of livings at the same time, to exact tithes in places where there was no Church, and where they never resided, to charge us poor Papists for the cure of sinful Protestant souls at enormous sums varying from fifty to two hundred Pounds a-piece,* to enforce those exactions at the point of the bayonet, to become civil magistrates and adjudicate in their own causes, to order out

*In Irish parishes where there were not 4 Protestants, the Tithes have amounted to nearly £1000. God knows those sinful Protestant souls cost enough; but we think they ought to have been saved at their own expense.

horse, foot, and dragons in their bloody campaigns against the recusants; to seize the widow's pot, and the dying poor man's only blanket; to whip and wound, to shoot, slay, and kill; to break their solemn oaths for keeping schools in their parishes, to sell, alienate and destroy the property of the Church to suffer their Parsonages to fall into ruin; to reside any where and every where, but in their own parishes; to quarter their numerous progeny on the public revenue, nay, to be Half Pay Captains, and Parsons at the same time—receiving the money of the Church for “the cure of souls!” (and well *corned* no doubt those unfortunate souls sometimes are) and the money of the state for their *expected* services in shedding blood!

We could enumerate a long catalogue of little Protestant *Indulgences* of this nature, which would far exceed the List in the “Tax Book of the Roman Chancery,” so impudently *forged* by Protestants, but we think it unnecessary at present, as we are anxious to publish a celebrated Protestant Indulgence which was given by the Father of the Reformation himself—we mean that Apostolic man who proclaimed himself “Doctor Martin Luther,”† and whom we once heard an English Parson in the presence of Four hundred Protestant ladies, call “the ever Blessed, and ever-to-be-venerated Martin Luther!”

Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, had been married for sixteen years to Christiana daughter of the Duke of Saxony, and they had several children. He was “violent and passionate unfaithful and superstitious,” according to the testimony of the Protestant historian Menzelius. He was however, not only an ardent Reformer, but an indefatigable Bible Reader. Having conceived an adulterous passion for Miss Margaret Saal, a maid of honor to his sister, he was unable to accomplish his base purposes. So this holy man lost his appetite, and fell into a gloomy fit of the dumps, and had recourse to his Bible! (like Henry VIII in a similar predicament) to ease his mind! and found out in Genesis that Lamech had *two* Wives at the same time and concluded that a “babe of grace” like himself should enjoy as many privileges as any Jew in the Old Testament, and accordingly drew up a case of conscience! to be submitted through Bucer to “Doctor Martin” himself and the other New Apostles of Wittemberg. In this Evangelical document, the love-sick libertine stated, “that he never loved his wife, that he did not marry her through inclination or love, that he had not been more than three weeks faithful to her, that he could not abstain from fornication (adultery?) nor renounce his licentious habits, unless he could get Mademoiselle Saal for his wife.” So he humbly prayed “Doctor Martin” and Philip Melancthon to grant him an *INDULGENCE!*

†The Immaculate Protestant Lord Bacon, (who as Chancellor contrasts so well with the immortal Catholic Sir Thomas More) has the impertinence to utter the following sentiment on this subject:

“A numerous married clergy, giving life to great numbers of idlers, or persons never to work, is very dangerous to a state, by creating mouths, without creating a suitable portion of labour at the same time.”

† I Doctor Martin Luther, an unworthy evangelist of our Lord J. C., do confess this article, that *faith alone without works* justifies in the sight of God, and I declare that in spite of the Emperor of the Romans, the Emperor of the Turks, Tartars and Persians, the Pope, all the Cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, kings, princes, all the world, and all the Devils, it shall stand unshaken for ever!”—*Glossa in Edict. Imper. Op. Latin, tom XX.*

For the enlightenment of “Protestant ignorance” we will print an extract or two from the Bull of Indulgence which was published in consequence, and “dated at Wittemberg the Wednesday after the Feast of St. Nicholas, 1530.”

After some preliminary remarks, “Doctor Martin” and his brother Reformers proceed in this godly fashion.—

“But if your Highness do not abstain from an impure life, because you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that your Highness were in a better state before God. . . . But if your Highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly, as we have said above with respect to this Dispensation; that is to say, none but the lady herself, and a few trusty persons, obliged to secrecy under the seal of Confession (!!) know anything of the matter.—Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses: and though the *vulgar* should be scandalized (!) the more prudent would understand this “moderate method” of life (!) and would prefer it to adultery, or other brutal or foul actions.—There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all be right with conscience. . . . Your Highness hath therefore, not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the considerations we have made thereupon. . . . We are most ready to serve your Highness.—Signed: Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Anthony Corvin, Adam, John Lenigio, Justice Wintferte, Dionysius Melancthon.” A precious lot of scoundrels truly!

Poor Christiana of Saxony would have had a much better chance of justice from calumniated Rome which has always been the indomitable defender of the rights of injured woman. The weaker sex owes everything to Catholicity for its inviolable respect for the conjugal tie.

What will our English Christians say to this great Protestant Bull of Indulgences? It exposes the leading Reformers in all their true colours. But we must bring this chapter on Protestant Indulgences to a close. We will therefore omit the *Penary Indulgence* granted by the Church of England to her children, to dispense themselves from the obligation of keeping all vigils, Fast days, and Lenten mortifications as prescribed in that quaint Repertory of curiosities the Book of Common Prayer, and conclude with a very general and perpetual Indulgence from “Doctor Martin” also, in which he gives permission, as clearly as possible, to commit adultery. He has published no Tax Book to be sure. In this however, he has only made the crime cheaper. Even the restraint of a pecuniary fine is removed. We are forced for obvious reasons to give his language in the original Latin, lest the English delcacy of the “Gentlemen and Christians” should be shocked:

“Ut non est in meis viribus sim, ut vir non situm, tam nec eat etiam mei juris, utabsque muliere sim. Rursus ut in tua manu non est, ut femina non sis si nec in te est, utabsque viro degas. . . . Tertia ratio divortii est, ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit—Hic oportunum est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris altera volent. Si domina nolent, adveniat ancilla!!!”
Oper. Lut. Ed. Writ. tom. V. 119, 123.

And we have seen Four Hundred Protestant Ladies clapping their hands, and waving their scented mouchoirs in a perfect agony of delight when this Monster of obscenity was stiled the ever Blessed, and ever to be venerated!” and we sighed deeply for their “Protestant ignorance” because we felt that if the delicate creatures knew “Doctor Martin” as well as ourselves, they would shudder at his name, and loathe his memory.

Oh Protestantism, Protestantism! in what profound darkness thou envelopest thy unsuspecting dupes!

HELPLESS IMBECILITY OF THE “CRIMINAL.”

This poor Ignoramus in his last Editorial spends a whole column of nonsense on an expression of ours in a recent number, respecting one of the vilest of all the vile Protestant calumnies that are uttered against our Religion. When we were told that in the Catholic Church money can purchase leave to commit

sin, and absolution from sin, and that a Tax Book regulating the prices for sin, was published at Rome, we very properly stigmatized this odious, villainous lie, as it deserved, and to show the intensity of our indignant denial we declared it to be

FALSE AS HELL.

We did so for the very effect it has produced—to rouse the attention of all honest Protestants to the disgraceful system of misrepresentation which none but the Devil himself, the King of Hell, could have inspired. He was called by a very high authority, the Father of Lies, and a Liar from the beginning, and we thought we could not better express the supreme enormity of this wicked slander than by pronouncing it *false as hell*. And will our readers believe us when we inform them that the driveling scribe in the Guardian wants to prove from the above words that we *denied the existence of hell itself*? There is an antagonist for you, worthy to match with the "Episcopal Bishops" of the Times!

—"Arcades ambo."
i. e.—"Blockheads both."—Free Translation.

We again repeat that the Devil himself never told a greater lie than the above; and though our enemies have been woefully disconcerted by that Litany of Curses which we lately published, and which deprives them of all their usual stock in trade, we will print another malediction, as we have as good a right to do so as those who framed the Book of Common Prayer.—Listen then, inveterate calumniators to the following:

Cursed is he, and he deserves an eternal curse who wickedly believes that any power on earth can give him permission to offend God, or that he can purchase for money leave to commit sin, or absolution from sin committed. And moreover, Cursed is he, who in violation of truth, justice and charity, wilfully charges his innocent neighbour with this hell born and soul-destroying doctrine.

Another anonymous calumniator who evidently derives all his information from scurrilous Protestant Pamphlets and second-hand Reformation Tracts, has attempted to prove the forgery of the Tax Book by what he calls Catholic authorities. Like the rest of the tribe of Protestant scribblers who are now inundating the Newspapers with their crude and ignorant essays, he proves to any Controversial scholar that he knows nothing of the subject on which he writes. We could make him a present of twenty stronger objections of which he is clearly ignorant, but which do not weigh a feather in our estimation. They talk to us of *D'Espence*? His book was placed on the Index at Rome after it appeared, just as the forged Tax Book was; and hence as an argument against us, one is as good an authority as the other. We have a long flourish too about the notorious Dupin, who is cited against us with as much confidence as if he were one of the Popes of Rome. Dupin a Catholic authority indeed! The man who was opposed by Bossuet, condemned by the Archbishop of Paris, banished by Louis XIV, and reproached by the head of the Catholic Church? He a Catholic, who was in close intimacy with Wake, the "archiepiscopal Archbishop" of Canterbury (as the Times would call him) who wanted to abolish confession, to give up transubstantiation and the Pope, to proscribe the fast and abstinence of Lent, to break religious vows, and to permit priests to marry—Luther and Calvin lived long after the period when it is alleged that this Tax Book had been repeatedly published. Yet in all their charges against the Catholic Church they are silent on this point. Any logician who understands the laws of evidence, the character of those heroes, and their violent invectives against the Catholic Church, will know what inference to deduce from their silence. It is equivalent to the testimony of 200 Editors of the Forged Book printed during the next two centuries after Luther at the Hague, and Amsterdam, and Cologne and other parts of Germany, the authenticity of which were always denied by Rome and Roman Divines, just as we deny it to day.

r. e. fin! Protestant gentlemen and Christians 'don't persist in accusing us of what we reject with as much horror as your-

selves. Our real and admitted doctrines are surely numerous enough to try the temper of your theological weapons. Why waste your strength then, in desperate encounters with wind-mills, enchanted castles and all that sort of Quixotic warfare? You have the Seven Sacraments, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and Transubstantiation and Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints, and the veneration of God's Holy Mother, &c. All these we admit, and are prepared to defend.

There are various garbled extracts, and unfounded inferences in the Protestant Papers, about the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Inquisition, and the fires of Smithfield, and the persecution of the Waldenses, Hugonots, &c. &c. We have our conclusive answers on all these points, but we cannot reply all at once to a half a score of Protestant howlers, whose calumnies, misrepresentations and perversions of history, would require as many volumes to answer. We will not shrink from one of them, but as far as our space will permit, and their importance demand, will freely discuss them.

These Protestant Christians are fond of vapouring about persecution, though their own cloven foot is now beginning to appear. They first falsely charged us with an appeal to physical force because we said we would have 'peace on honourable terms, or else ———.' This harmless stroke by which we plainly signified that if they continued to abuse our religion and country in the Press, we would not tamely lie under our Protestant accusers and suffer ourselves to be kicked, trampled and spat upon, but defend ourselves through the same Press with the weapons of truth and free discussion—has been abominably tortured into a threat of another description which we have never used in our lives, never shall, and which in this Province would be as ludicrous as criminal. Is this fair play? Or did the scribbler who made the charge, believe it, when they ransacked the English language for coarse epithets to shower on the mystics and Clergy of our faith, and this in the presence of ten thousand Catholics? Not they indeed; but in the absence of argument, it was a glorious trick *ad captandam vulgus*.

They afterwards began to abuse our Clergy, and every anonymous scribbler was permitted to level his cowardly shaft at them with the solemn hope, we believe, of provoking them to notice their infamous scurrility. Here again they have failed. Our Clergy have treated them with the silence, either of pity or contempt.

As a last resource, the poor devils of the Protestant Press, are now calling out for pains, penalties, and exclusion against all Irish priests! Give them Canadians, Frenchmen, or Priests from any other nation, and they will tolerate their existence. This Hypocritical plea for persecution reminds us of a similar declaration made by the anti-Catholic faction at home, when the Catholics of the Empire were seeking for their Emancipation. The Irish Priests united then with the Irish people in their efforts to obtain freedom of conscience. A violent outcry was raised by all the bigots against what were called the Maynooth or Modern priesthood, and the persecutors exclaimed—Give us back the good old Irish priest, educated in France, who was a polished gentleman of the old school, and an estimable character in every respect! But we cannot abide this home-bred clergy, (they were too clever for the ignorant bigots) And how did the immortal Edmund Burke reply to their exclamations?

'Tell me; holy hypocrites, how did you treat these good old priests and polished gentlemen of the French school, who you had them? Did you not set a price on their heads, hunt and persecute them, drag them from the very altars, chain them with felons, and frequently torture them to death? Give you back the old French priests indeed! Avant vile hypocrites!'

One of the lads who is foremost in getting up this laughable anti-Irish cry in Nova Scotia is a grateful Protestant sinner (we won't say of what ilk) who owes nearly all his business to the patronage of an Irish Catholic Priest!

Exclude Irish Priests indeed! Ah Protestant Christians of the Times and Guardian, we know full well, what you *would* do if you *could*. You would drive out the Irish people too, after the prices, aye, and all the priests and Catholics in the Province. But why get up those ridiculous "grinning matches" of teeth which cannot bite? Irish priests have been the heralds of the Gospel to every part of the Globe. Irish priests have

converted the Pagan nations of Europe to the knowledge of the living God. Irish priests have left the memory of their virtues and their zeal in the grateful breasts of every christian people. Irish priests are venerated as national Apostles in some of the fairest countries in Christendom. A Columbanus at Bobbio, a Cataldus at Tarentum, a Donatus at Fiesole, a Fugidian at Lucca, a Gall in Switzerland, a Piacrius in Franco, a Rupert and a Virgilius at Salzburg, an Arbogastus in Strasburgh, an Aidus in Norway, a Kilian and Rumold in Flanders, Palladius in Scotland, a Guthbert in Lindisfarne, a Conon and Macullus in the Isle of Man, a Finian in Wales, a Columba at Iona, a Pusey at Paris with many other illustrious and learned Irishmen, have proclaimed to the whole Christian world, for centuries before the Reformation the genuine characters of the Irish priest, and the Irish Ecclesiastic.

Banish the Irish priests indeed! Ah! English Christians, this would be base ingratitude in you, far, upwards of twelve centuries ago, your English Catholic forefathers flocked to Ireland in search of sacred learning, and the Irish priests received them kindly, and with true Irish hospitality supplied them with books and clothes and necessaries, and an excellent education, without any charge whatsoever. All this we have on the testimony of Venerable Bede, himself an Englishman, who records the fact, so honourable to the Irish priests with a becoming gratitude. Even in modern times Irish Priests have been the best benefactors to thankless England. Irish priests have saved countless millions of money to the English Exchequer. Irish priests have kept the peace in Ireland, and saved the countries from the horrors and expensures of civil war. Irish Priests have, by the powerful influence of religion controlled and regulated the feelings of one of the most sensitive people on earth. But for Irish Priests, Ireland would for many a long year have been the theatre of war, and carnage and plunder and desolation, because no people on earth, much less the Irish, would have patiently endured the maddening, infernal tyranny of English persecution, were it not that the supernatural influences of religion were brought to bear upon them, by that pious, learned, zealous, and indefatigable body of men, the Irish Priests, whose only reward from the Government whom they so loyally served, was insult, contumely, and injustice. The most bigotted English statesmen knew this well, and evidence has been repeatedly given before both Houses of Parliament of the invaluable exertions of the Irish Priests, in maintaining order, and enforcing obedience to the laws. However, it is only very recently that England has begun to comprehend her true policy respecting the Irish Priests. Imprisonment, exile, and death were unable to subdue the Irish Priesthood. Bribes were also repeatedly tried, and spurned by those noble men. England must now try some more rational mode.

And it is the Irish Priests that our contemptible band of bigots here would drive from the shores of Nova Scotia! The vindictive, intolerant wretches! they would banish every Priest in Nova Scotia, if they could! But the priest, no matter of what nation, defies their impotent malice. They have no more control over him than they have over the immortal destinies of the glorious Church to which he belongs. The Irish Priests are in dozens and scores in England itself, striving to reclaim to morality and the gospel the numerous heathens of that bountiful land. The Irish Priest in England is bringing back every year hundreds and thousand of her people to the venerable Faith of a Patriarch and an Augustine. Even in Scotland too, where there are now One Hundred and Five Catholic Priests and Bishops: in Glasgow, and Greenock, and Edinburgh, and Paisley, and Aberdeen, Irish Priests are bringing back to Rome, and to the faith of Bruce and Wallace, the descendants of their Celtic Forefathers. So, gentlemen, when you can succeed in banishing the Irish Priest from England, Scotland, and Wales, from Gibraltar and Malta, from Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, and Delhi, from New South Wales, and Van Dieman's Land, from the Cape of Good Hope, and New Zealand, from Guiana, and the West Indies, from Canada, New Brunswick, Prince Edward's Island, and Newfoundland, it will be quite time enough to think of expelling them from Acadia. What confidence, these English Christians, must have in the innate strength and justice of their cause, when they have recourse to such cowardly

threats! There was a time, when it was all the fashion to despise the Irish Priest for his ignorance. But he has inflicted such summary chastisement on English hypocrites in every part of the globe, as well as his own loved land, that the Irish Priest has now become an object of terror to the quaking heart of every canting Pharisee in the Empire. What a just retribution of Providence!

SELF CONVICTING TESTIMONIES OF OUR PROTESTANT ASSAILANTS.

The last Times and Guardian are full of such evidence. They began this warfare, and in spite of the testimony and dates of their own Journals, they now assert it was commenced by us! The Times had been for several weeks abusing us, before we wrote one word in reply to the Editors. On this point they can deceive no one, not even of their own blind dupes. They pretended to know nothing of Mr. Locke, although he communicated to them some clear notions of Catholic feeling. They persisted in charging the Catholic Clergy with a desire to embroil the community. They pretended a regard for Catholics, whilst they abused their Bishops and Clergy. The former since his arrival in the Provinces had carefully abstained from all parties and religious controversy. By word and example he inculcated peace and good will amongst his fellow citizens of every creed. In social life, in his dealings, in his employment of tradesmen he made no religious distinction. He suffered much of obloquy and reproach, because he was so determinately opposed to all excitement. And what reward has he met with from the hands of some of those Protestant Christians? Let the columns of the Times and Guardian for the last six weeks answer the question. Neither his dignity, nor his silence, nor his long forbearance could save him from their unchristian vituperation. The same can be said of the Clergy. But it was not the Bishop or Clergy that were particularly aimed at. No, it was their flock—it was Catholicity itself—it was the exclusion of Catholics from all place and power by raising the No Popery Cry—it was the perpetuation of Orangeism. This was what the enemies wanted. However, their success hitherto has not been very encouraging. They have not strengthened their own influence. They have not divided the Liberal party. They have not disgraced the Catholics. They have not put down the priests or the Bishop.

No, amongst their political opponents of every religion, there never was such united determination. Among Catholics, whether Scotch, Irish, Novascotians and French, there never was such cordial union. Priest and Bishop, the clergy and laity are all animated with one truly Catholic feeling of disgust at the attacks on their Religion which they more dearly love than their lives, and determination to defend it against every intolerant bigot. For the valuable assistance given by the Times Guardian and Co. in producing this glorious state of things, we have to present them our humble thanks, and we are in such delightful humour at the result, that we can bear with philosophic indifference, and contemptuous pity all the lying assaults of their Protestant ignorance.

Bishop Inglis too has been attacked, cried down as a Puseyite, and a vile attempt made to place himself and the Catholic Bishop in a state of hostility. This wretched scheme has also failed like the rest, and the example of those respected prelates continue to be as practical a rebuke to the intolerant spirit of the 'Criminal' as ever. Said Criminal cannot abide that learned and distinguished Divine Dr. Pusey because he believes in the Real Presence, and in the doctrine of absolution, and teaches that they are supported by the clearest evidence of Scripture, and the unanimous testimony of the early Christian Fathers.

Our dastardly opponents after having given us so much provocation, and received so unexpected and keen a punishment, tried also to screen themselves from further chastisement by the most disreputable means. For this purpose they endeavoured to terrify our Clergy and Bishop by a series of scoundrel assaults, to induce them to put a padlock on our mouths, and prevent us from giving any further exposure of their Protestant ignorance. Even here the catiffs have also failed, and without any 'benefit of clergy' they are enduring the execution of the sentence which we have long since pronounced upon them and

which we will carry into effect until they exhibit some symptoms of contrition and amendment for their past misdeeds. They were the first to dare this contest, and its continuance or discontinuance depends not on us but on themselves.

GREAT BIBLICAL MEETING.

One of the most abstract questions in political economy, which has been of late mooted in the newspapers and never satisfactorily answered is

‘What becomes of all the Pins?’

They are made in countless millions at the time, and yet they all disappear, no one knows where! The Pin-makers however, give themselves very little trouble about the solution of this problem. Of the fate of the pins, for they know this rapid and mysterious disappearance is all for the benefit of trade.

We are beginning to think that the Great Pin question, will be greatly superseded by the Great Bible question, and that every body will begin to ask every other body:

‘What is the name of wonder becomes of all the Bibles!!!!’ When we read the Report of Bible Meetings at home and abroad for the last twenty years—the enormous sums of money subscribed—the huge cargoes of Bibles said to be sent to every part of the globe—the millions and billions of copies said to be distributed among the army, and the navy, the Poor Houses, and Hospitals, the Schools and Colleges, the Mines and Factories, the Cottages and Fields, the black and white, the Mussulman and Hindoo, ‘the heathen,’ the Jew, the ‘wild Irish’ and the ‘far Colonist.’ We are really at a loss to discern what becomes of all the Bibles! The English world at home and abroad has been flooded with them. You meet nothing but Bibles wherever you go. They are quite a drug in the literary market, to be had every where, of all sizes, and at any price, and at no price at all; nay with a snug bonus for accepting one. In fact they are much cheaper than the pins, as a certain number of the latter will cost a copper, whilst you can have any given quantity of Bibles for a shilling at all, with thanks and donecours into the bargain. Go through London or any of the great English towns and you will find all the Bookstalls, and old curiosity shops, and Pawnbrokers stores crammed full with Bibles and Testaments, such places being no doubt general Depositories of Books for the various Bible Societies of England, to be thence transmitted to every part of the Globe.

It would seem, however, that Nova Scotia has been sadly neglected in the general distribution. We thought we had more than a Bible for every family and almost every individual in the Province. But there appears to be a great dearth still, and hence there was a Great Bible Meeting held the other night in the Presbyterian Church, and it was attended by Baptist, and Church of England Clergymen, and by representatives of as great a confusion of creeds as there was of tongues at the Tower of Babel, though not one present could prove that the English copy of the Bible is the pure, unadulterated Word of God, faithfully translated from the original. The Speeches were of the usual character, but the ‘tittle of the whole’ subscribed, amounted to the magnificent sum of Eighteen Pounds, be the same more or less, according to the Report in the Guardian. We confess these Bible exhibitions surpass all reasonable comprehension, and we cannot help asking again and again

‘What becomes of all the Bibles?’

The agents and foreign correspondents of the Bible Societies dont care.

HALIFAX IRISH RELIEF ASSOCIATION.

The Managing Committee of this Christian and patriotic Association have already sent £100 sterling to the Four Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, for distribution amongst their suffering people. At the request of the Committee the money was transmitted by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh to his Grace Dr. Murray. We also understand that the Bishop forwarded £25 sterling to the same distinguished Prelate, being a small token of sympathy from the Catechistical Society at St. Mary’s. The Irish Society too have sent their Hundred Pounds Sterling, (the offering of hearts as sterling as the money), and the general subscription in the City has already exceeded Two Thou-

sand Pounds of our Currency. Halifax, ever foremost in the race of benevolence, has nobly done its duty on this occasion.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received the letter of a mere Irishman, and were much amused at its very clever sketches of some prominent mischief makers in Halifax who have thriven by Catholic custom, and made fortunes by Catholic clients. But the time has not yet arrived for its publication. We were not so much in the dark as our correspondent imagines. We knew almost from the beginning the names, and secret proceedings of the cowardly batch of bigots, who have urged and sustained this wicked warfare against Catholicity and Ireland in the *Times*, *Guardian*, et hoc genus omne, and the entire Catholic community in Halifax and Nova Scotia will know them before long. Some of the most virulent of the pack who have been taken from their obscure dunghills and pushed into the world by the aid of Catholics and the patronage of Catholic Priests, are already beginning to take the alarm. Not that the dark-hearted villains repent of their ingratitude; but they are beginning to tremble for the consequences of exposure. We know our men, and we will bide our time. A few signal examples once made, and the community will be saved for a long time from the horrors of religious strife.

Extract of a letter, dated Rome, 14th January, 1847, and addressed by the Rev. Doctor Cullen, President of the Irish College there, to his Grace Archbishop Murray:—

I write this hurried line to communicate a matter which, I am sure, will be the source of great consolation to your grace; our good and holy pontiff, Pius IX., filled with compassion for the sufferings of the poor in Ireland, has authorized a public subscription to be made in Rome, for their relief, and has commenced the good work by giving, at his own contribution, one thousand dollars (250*l.*) Millions of the poor will, I trust, raise their voices to the Throne of Mercy to implore the choicest blessings of Heaven on so tender-hearted a father, and to pray for the preservation of so great a Pontiff. His charity knows no bounds—it is equal to that of St. Paul. Only a few days ago he had to contribute immense sums to the relief of his own poor subjects, who suffered severely from an inundation of the Tiber. He is now ready to stretch out his hand to alleviate the misery and affliction of our poor countrymen.

All I shall add is, that God may reward with his choicest favours, both here and hereafter, a charity so vast and so fervent.

Cardinal Fransoni, who is a model of every Christian virtue, was the first to propose a subscription for the poor in Ireland. He has not only promised to contribute to the charity himself, but he has kindly undertaken, at the Pope’s request, to receive and to remit to Ireland all the alms which shall be collected from the public.

Your Grace will be happy to learn that the English and Irish here are not looking on with indifference at the distress of our poor. A very respectable meeting was held yesterday, in Piazza di Spagnat, which Colonel Bryan, of Kilkenny, Captain Pakenham, Mr. Whiteside, Rev. Mr. Hutchison, the Protestant resident minister, and several other distinguished Protestants and Catholics attended, to take into consideration the sufferings of the poor in Ireland, and to devise means to relieve them. All were unanimous in determining to exert themselves in the cause of humanity, and all will contribute generously to some of the Irish relief funds. These gentlemen deserve great credit for their zeal and benevolence. I am sure their example will produce a great effect, and be the means of making many think of poor Ireland. I hope, indeed, on this trying occasion, Rome will distinguish herself and the world see that she is not only the centre of faith, but also the soul of charity.

Published by RITCHIE & COMPANY, No. 2, Upper Water Street, Halifax.—Terms—FIVE SHILLINGS IN ADVANCE, exclusive of postage.