

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

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

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

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

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

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

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

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

Showthrough/
Transparence

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

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

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

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

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.

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

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

THE CROSS.



NEW

SERIES.

VOL. 3.

No. 11.

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, MARCH 13, 1847.

CALENDAR.

- MARCH 14—Sunday—IV of Lent.
 15—Monday—St. Zachary P. and Conf.
 16—Tuesday—St. Thomas of Aquin Conf. and Doct.
 17—Wednesday—St. Patrick Bishop and Conf., Apostle of Ireland, (1 class Holiday with obligation of hearing Mass.)
 18—Thursday—St. Gabriel, Archangel.
 19—Friday—St. Joseph Conf. Spouse of B. V. M.
 20—Saturday—Most Precious Blood of our Lord J. C.

GATHOLIC IDOLATRY AND SUPERSTITION.

Our ears have been recently stunned by the dissonant chorus and fearful yells of the Protestant Press, against the superstition, idolatry, and soul-dabasing doctrines of the priest-ridden papists: The "criminal" of the Guardian, and the united "Protestant ignorance" of the Times—"Doctor Martin" and his priest-catchling correspondent—Gossip and Coade, and the brawling Paragon of the Round Church—the voracious Post, and its secret scribblers—the Christian Messenger, and the two precious limbs of the law—who dip so deeply in its turbid pages:

—Stiphelumque, Bromumque.
 Antmachumque, Helumumque, securiferumque Pyracmon."
 All have joined in this unchristian outcry against us.
 Now, in order to give full scope to their holy bellowings, we have resolved on publishing the following Litany of Anathemas, and we call upon the entire pack of bigots to prepare their most dismal howls, for the various responses which we subjoin:

LITANY OF ANATHEMAS.

- I. CURSED is he who commits idolatry; who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God.—R. Amen.
 II. Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature; who worships her or puts his trust in her more than God; who believes her above her Son, or that she can in anything command him.—R. Amen.
 III. Cursed is he who believes the Saints in heaven to be his redeemers; who prays to them as such; or who gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever.—R. Amen.

IV. Cursed is he who worships any bidden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine.—R. Amen.

V. Cursed is he who believes that priests can forgive his sins, whether he repent or not; or that there is any power on earth or heaven that can forgive sins, without a hearty repentance, and serious purpose of amendment.—R. Amen.

VI. Cursed is he who believes there is authority in the Pope or any other person, that can give leave to commit sin, or that for a sum of money can forgive him his sins.—R. Amen.

VII. Cursed is he who believes that, independent of the merits and passion of Christ, he can obtain salvation by his own good works, or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins or the pains eternally due to them.—R. Amen.

VIII. Cursed is he who contemns the word of God, or who hides it from the people, in order to keep them from the knowledge of their duty, and to preserve them in ignorance and error.—R. Amen.

IX. Cursed is he who undervalues the word of God, or that forsaking Scripture, chooses rather to follow human traditions than it.—R. Amen.

X. Cursed is he who leaves the commandments of God, to observe the constitutions of men.—R. Amen.

XI. Cursed is he who omits any of the ten commandments, or keeps the people from the knowledge of any one of them, to the end that they may not have occasion of discovering the truth.—R. Amen.

XII. Cursed is he who preaches to the people in unknown tongues, such as they understand not, or uses any other means of keeping them in ignorance.—R. Amen.

XIII. Cursed is he that believes that the Pope can give to any upon any occasion whatsoever, dispensations to lie or swear falsely; or that it is lawful for any, at the last hour, to protest himself innocent, in case he be guilty.—R. Amen.

XIV. Cursed is he who encourages sin, or teaches men to delay for the amendment of their lives on presumption of a death-bed repentance.—R. Amen.

XV. Cursed is he who teaches men that they may be lawfully drunk on a Friday or any other fasting day, though they may not taste the least bit of flesh.—R. Amen.

XVI. Cursed he who places religion in nothing but a pompous show, consisting only, in ceremonies; and which teaches not the people to serve God in spirit and truth.—R. Amen.

XVII. Cursed is he who loves or promotes cruelty; that teaches people to be bloody-minded, and to lay aside the meekness of Jesus Christ.—R. Amen.

XVIII. Cursed is he who teaches it to be lawful to do any wicked thing, though it be for the interest and good of Mother Church; or that any evil action may be done, the good may ensue from it.—R. Amen.

XIX. Cursed are we, if, amongst all those wicked principles and damnable doctrines, commonly laid at our doors, any one of them may be the faith of our church; and cursed are we if we do not as heartily detest all those hellish practices, as they that so vehemently urge them against us.—R. Amen.

XX. Cursed are we, if, in answering or saying Amen to any of these curses, we use any equivocations or mental reservations or do not assent to them in the common and obvious sense of the words.—R. Amen.

Perhaps the above litany to which we most cordially respond may convince some of our honest neighbours of other creeds, that we had good reason for stating that *Protestantism*, and *ignorance* of all against which it protests, are most closely allied.

SAINT CALVIN! AND HIS GUARDIAN ANGEL!!

Assailed in the severest and most insulting language, by men who call themselves Christians, we lately ventured to remonstrate on behalf of the peaceable and unoffending Catholics of Nova Scotia. Everything that we hold most sacred, was exposed to derision by those profane scribblers, and in language which Billingsgate might envy. Some of the descendants of those who drove our priests to the recesses of the forest, and disgraced our Statute Book by the most infamous enactments, fancied that they could still manifest that intolerant spirit which is so much opposed to the meek and blessed character of the peaceful author of the Gospel. We were sorry to discover that there still existed amongst us a remnant of that ancient poison. It rudely disturbed convictions which we had long and sincerely entertained, respecting the pre-eminence of Nova Scotia in religious toleration,—convictions which we have frequently expressed in the pages of this Journal. Our position too was so quiet and unobtrusive, our demands so moderate, our ambition so unpretending, that we could not have been prepared for this combined and sudden onslaught on the poor Catholics of Nova Scotia. Our relations with our Protestant neighbours of all denominations were so pacific and friendly that when this unexpected blow came from their various organs at the press, we felt it to be both treacherous and unchristian. In our social, civil, or political relations, we drew no bigotted line of demarcation. We never voted against any man, either at the hustings or elsewhere, because he was a Protestant. Difference of creed or country never affected our commercial relations, nor lessened the intercourse of business or of friendship. Though numerically the largest religious body in the country we enjoyed few or none of its emoluments or honours, nay we helped to confer many of them on our separated brethren. In a word, we maintain that all manner of practical liberality has been exemplified in our conduct.

However, all this could not protect us from insult, nor save our cherished faith from mockery and derision. And yet, it was that faith which was first preached in our primeval forests by Catholic missionaries. The holy and zealous preachers who first taught the Indian to adore the living God, and to hope for salvation through the blood of Christ his son, were Catholic Apostles; just as the sainted men who converted all our heathen ancestors to the truths of the Gospel, were missionaries from Rome. To treat us then as upstarts in Nova Scotia, is neither generous nor just. More than a century and a half before the first Protestant settler appeared in the deserted harbour of Halifax, had

the august mysteries of our Church been solemnized at Annapolis. On the score of antiquity, therefore, the Catholic religion does not yield to any other in the Province. We shall say nothing at present of the atrocious manner in which the early Catholics were expelled—the men who cleared our forests constructed our roads and bridges, planted our orchards, reclaimed our dykes, and converted our vast plains into smiling meadows, and our hill sides into fields of waving corn.

But we do maintain that an attitude so peaceful as ours did not merit the rude rebuff which we have received. If we had abused our fellow christians, reviled their creeds, or sneered at their various institutions, we should be prepared to expect ungentle treatment. But we did no such thing. We have therefore every reason to complain; and we will complain, and not only complain, but repel with vigour those dastardly assaults. We care not from what quarter an enemy may appear. We will meet him with confidence and courage, and we will show even more clearly than we have hitherto done, that we do not fear the discussion of our tenets, or the examination of our cause.

Of the Guardian as a literary paper we can speak in no other terms than those of sovereign contempt. Its dull pages are not only beneath criticism, but far below mediocrity. Not one single ray of genius illumines the darkness of its bigotry—not one generous sentiment relieves the harshness of its puritanical acerbity. Though we have recently heard that it was edited by a clergyman, we laughed with incredulity at the news. A clergyman is supposed to be a gentleman, at least in education, and we defy the most fervid enthusiast in the conventicle to point out the least trace of the scholar in the drawling, slip-slop pages of the Guardian. The total absence also of good manners and good taste, evinced by the wanton parade before the public of two respected prelates whose difference in religion does not lessen their mutual esteem, nor prevent their social intercourse—is an offence against society and religion which must challenge the reprobation of every honest man. But the occasion it seems was too tempting for the congenial scurrility of the unordained Puritan, and in his jealous rage he could not endure the thought of two Episcopal dignitaries setting an example of mutual forbearance and respect to the narrow minded pitiful sect whose slave he is, and upon whose sufferance he exists.

It is indeed a painful task to wade through the feeble expletives, the sickening common-places and endless tautologies of a rambling writer of this description. We have attempted to follow, and to enliven his tortuous, gloomy track. He complains of our running commentary; but we had no other resource. There was no argument to answer, no theology to refute, no erudition to be tested. It was one dull unmeaning string of helpless inanity, and we appeal to any scholar who has read the Guardian for the truth of this description.

We are bound therefore, to tell him frankly that he is a rash and profane intruder in the temple of literature, that he is totally unfit for the Editorial Chair, that he handles a pen with as much dexterity as a ploughman does a needle, and that if he really believes his cause to be a just one, he ought without delay commit its defence to abler hands.

If the Presbyterians of the Guardian are to continue their abuse of our religion, our clergy, and our sacred institutions, perhaps they could not select more appropriate tools for that purpose than the "aggravated criminal" and the vulgar 'PARASYTICIAN.' But, if they want to conduct a controversy which

would engage the attention of a scholar or a gentleman, they must look for other exponents of those frightful doctrines which we so justly termed suicidal, which make God the author of all evil, which excite their votaries to all the excess of presumption or consign them to all the horrors of despair.

But whilst we entertain conscientious doubts as to the identity of the Editor, we can feel very little, if popular rumour be correct, respecting his stupid ally the *Presbyterian*. Surely our Halifax press must be degraded indeed, when the slame of such a stingless wasp is permitted to defile them. We believe he is known, at least so say the generality of his Catholic neighbours much better than he imagines. In his clumsy attempt the deceitful mask of the conventicle has fallen off, and we recognise him as the genuine descendant of an old priest-hunting bigot, the records of whose brutal intolerance have been carefully transmitted even to the present generation. Better far that he had minded his business, if he have any to mind, than to be employed in raking up from the foul sink of bigotry, his calumnious invectives against Monks and Nuns. And as to Catholic priests or Jesuits, we are certain that if he traced back to no distant period the pedigree of his hybrid race, he would find memorials there which should make him blush to pronounce the name of a Catholic Clergyman at all. Having swept this reptile from our path, we proceed to our "aggravating" friend.

The sympathy of the *Guardian* for the Church of England, would be indeed a novel sign of the times, if its heartless mockery were less transparent. With what singular care this pretended friend has selected and printed in italics, all that portion of our reply to the *Times* which refers to the Established Church, and with what dexterity he has omitted all that related to his own more absurd, and soul destroying doctrines! But he shall not escape us, with all his affected simplicity. We will not suffer him to stray from the real question at issue even if he should "mount on the stilts of transubstantiation" according to a rhetorical figure of the *Times*. In repelling his rude assaults on our Church we assailed the Founder of his own. We called him a tyrant, a hyperite and a monster; and we will sustain the propriety of those harsh appellations. We will prove every one of them to be strictly deserved and though the task is ungracious, the cause of Gospel truth requires that this pretended Reformer of the Church of Christ should be exposed in all his native colours. Undoubtedly the life of a christian may be infamous, and his doctrine true, and no argument can generally be sound which would make purity of morals the inseparable companion of true faith. Considering the weakness of mankind, and the corruption of our fallen nature, "it needs must be that scandals come," and that the tares be mingled with the good grain even in the Church which Christ has founded. An exception however must be made to this rule, in the case of pretended reformers. They are bound to show us their credentials, and to prove their divine mission as the prophets in the old, or the Apostles in the new Law. They set themselves up as the judges and censors of the whole christian world. "They hoisted the standard of rebellion against the Church which had existed for fifteen centuries. They proclaimed that Christ's Church had fallen away, that she was corrupt both in doctrine and in morals, in other words that the Gates of Hell had prevailed against her. They called upon Christendom to abandon the Church of their fathers, and to curse the bones of their ancestors, declaring that "for eight hundred years or

more they had been plunged in gross and damnable idolatry." Have we not a right to ask those men for their heavenly commission to reform the world! Shall we not ask them by what authority they consign to damnation, their forefathers for a thousand years! by what right they attempt to overturn the sacred and venerable edifice which was "built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone?" what proofs they give that they alone were right and all Christendom in error?

The Prophets and Apostles worked miracles to confirm their authority as the legitimate exponents of God's law. The reformers disclaimed the possession of any such power. The Apostles and Prophets announced to the world revelations of the Divine will which were before unknown to mankind. The Reformers never pretended to give any new revelations, nor to publish any additional inspired writings. The Church founded on the Apostles, declared for fifteen hundred years, that she was guided by the Holy Ghost; that she alone possessed saving faith and that all mankind were bound to listen to her voice. The Reformers claimed infallibility, neither for themselves nor for the heterogeneous mass of sects and churches which their incessant wrangling produced. Ordinary mission those Reformers had not, for they were outcasts from the only Church which then existed; and as we have seen, they gave no proofs of an extraordinary jurisdiction to preach to the people of God. They came then, neither working miracles, nor producing new revelations, nor sustained by heavenly witnesses, nor claiming personally nor collectively any freedom from error. Where then are we to look for their authority! On what ground are we to believe their doctrine? Authority they possessed none, unless what attached to their personal character, their morality or their learning. Are we not forced then to examine these, and to try whether the men who consigned the whole world to damnation, were pre-eminently distinguished themselves for holiness and purity of life! Stripped of every jurisdiction and authority, and coming to reform all mankind, they stand upon their own naked merits, and surely their sanctity ought to have been extraordinary and unparalleled, to give any justification for their daring career and their terrible anathemas.

Having premised so much we now come to particulars. Calvin is hailed as the Apostle and Founder of one of those Reformed Churches. He is looked upon with feelings of devotional reverence, as a heaven-born messenger of grace. And yet, if the truth were known concerning his real character, his memory would be held in execration by thousands of those who now revere his name. We spoke of him in contemptuous terms; but we did so, from a knowledge of his disgraceful history, and a full conviction of the infamy of his life. Perhaps our words grated harshly on the ears of many, whose blind reverence for their Apostle, was never displaced by the light of history. But we used the words advisedly, and did so, to excite curiosity on the personal history of this wicked impostor. In our last number we stated briefly some particulars of his life, which we dare say were never heard before by thousands of Presbyterians in Nova Scotia. We will follow up the enquiry for their sakes; as well as to vindicate ourselves; and after having drawn a faithful picture of this blood-thirsty and cruel hypocrite, from his own writings, from the testimony of his contemporary reformers and from the judgement of all impartial historians, we will seriously ask whether God could or would have chosen such an agent as the

Apostle of a new doctrine, or the reformer of an ancient creed. No cunning manœuvre of our assailant in the Guardian, will change our determination for one moment in this respect.—He may abuse in succession all the doctrines of our Church, but we will continue to investigate the infamous character of the great apostle and foundation of his, before we notice his impotent efforts. He has been the aggressor. We have repelled his attack and replied to his arguments. He has not answered our reasoning, and we will now put him upon his defence on behalf of Saint Calvin!

We will generally quote Protestant authorities: "Calvin's adversaries are none others than knaves, lunatics, drunkards and assassins! Sometimes they are characterised by the familiar appellatives of bulls, asses, dogs, cats and hogs! By him Catholic and Lutheran are alike hated. Yet after having given vent to this virulent humour, he frequently boasts of his mildness. When he reads over his writings he tells us that he is astonished at his forbearance; but this he adds is the duty of every christian! at the same time he generally finishes a period with—"Do you hear you dog! Do you hear madman!" D'Israeli. *Curiosities of Lit.* p. 112.

"Beza the disciple of Calvin sometimes imitates the luxuriant abuse of his master." *Ibid.*

A learned prelate of the Church of England speaking of Erasmus says:—"For the other reformers, such as Luther, Calvin and their followers, understood so little in what true christianity consisted, that they carried with them into the reformed Churches that very spirit of persecution which had driven them from the Church of Rome." Warburton's notes on Pope's Essay on criticism.

"The annals of persecution cannot furnish a more atrocious instance of bigotry and cruelty than the burning of Servetus in a Protestant City, and by Protestant priests." The life of this unhappy victim of tyranny was written by Henricus ab Allwoerden, at the instance of the learned Moshem. The execution of Servetus is described in a MS history of him, cited by Allwoerden, 112. "Servetus was placed against a stake fixed in the earth, and with his feet fastened to the ground. Around his head was a crown of straw or leaves, steeped in sulphur. His body was bound to the stake with an iron chain, while a thick rope was twisted four or five times round his neck; his back was tied on to his thigh. He asked the executioner to dispatch him as quickly as possible. When the fire was lighted, he cried out so horribly, that he terrified the whole assemblage, saying piteously, Jesus, Son of God have mercy on me, he expired at mid-day. Calvin who was apprehensive that the death of Servetus might entitle him to the rank of a martyr, thought it necessary to defame his memory by asserting that he had no religion, and inhumanly attributed the expression of his feelings on the approach of his horrible fate to what he calls a *brutal stupidity*."—Calvin's opusc. Genev. 1597. *What Calvin did not scruple to perform*, Melancthon and Bullinger did not hesitate to approve. . . . Such were the sentiments of the mild and candid Melancthon, and such the first fruits of that reformation which professed to assert the rights of private judgment in matters of religion, and to enlighten and humanize mankind!"

Roscoe's Life of Leo X. note p. 244.

"Every one has heard of the burning of Servetus, and on all hands it is confessed to be the greatest stain on Calvin's character. But it was, as we have seen, no isolated act of bigotry; persecution for heresy was a recognized principle of the Church of Geneva, and it has sent many victims to the scaffold and the stake. The judicial murder of Servetus is however entitled to its bad pre-eminence, because the unfortunate man was entrapped by a course of artifice and treachery, forming a mystery of iniquity which has been developed only

by modern researches. Servetus was arrested on the 13th of August, and kept under examination more than a month. The questions put to him were of the most captious kind; they entered not merely into the charge of heresy, but into all the particulars of his private life, and some of them are so indecent that they cannot be repeated. On the 15th September, Servetus wrote to the Senate, demanding that he should be allowed to choose an advocate, complaining also that his clothes were worn out that he was devoured by vermin, and that he had not changed his linen since his arrest. The Senate ordered that he should receive shirts and linens; but Calvin opposed such clemency, and was obeyed. The Protestant historian who records this fact, merely quotes the extract from the Register, declaring that he could not trust himself to make any comment. On the 21st October, Servetus was brought to trial; on the 24th he was condemned to the flames. Calvin has written an exulting tract on the terror exhibited by the wretched man, when the sentence was announced. "At one time," says this advocate of freedom, "he stood stupefied like an idiot, then he heaved profound sighs, and roared like a madman. At length, he became so weak that he ceased not to shout like a Spaniard—*mercy, mercy*." Audin's Life of Calvin.

"Calvin was like Frederick the Great, Robespierre, Napoleon, and many other fatalists, he was reckless of human suffering, and human life, and never considered any expenditure of either of both, too great a price for the attainment of his ends. The chilling effects of Calvin's creed is manifest in his references to the Bible. We see that he loved to dwell with a gloomy satisfaction on the extirpation of the idolatrous nations of Canaan, the hewing of Agag to pieces, the massacre of Baal's priests by the command of Elijah; but he had no sympathy for the lessons of mercy and love contained in the Gospels." *Athenæum*. Nov. 6. 1841.

What man was ever more imperious and positive, and divinely infallible than Calvin, against whom the smallest opposition that man dared to make was always a work of Satan, and a crime deserving of fire!" *Rousseau*

"Calvin, I am aware, is violent and wayward; so much the better, he is the very man to advance our cause." *Wolnar*, Calvin's Professor of Greek, &c.

"Calvin is a true mad dog. The man is wicked, and he judges of people according as he loves or hates them." *Bucer*.

"I admire the modesty of Bucer and Melancthon though I disapproved of their opinions; but I cannot endure Calvin because he has too great a thirst for vengeance and blood *propter immensam vindictæ et sanguinis sitim*." *Burdock* the celebrated lawyer who had at one time been the disciple of Calvin.

"What demon has urged thee O Calvin! to declaim with the Arians against the Son of God? It is that Antichrist of the North that thou hast the impudence to adore, that grammarian Melancthon . . . Beware, Christian reader, above all ye ministers of the word, beware of the books of Calvin. They contain an impious doctrine, the blasphemies of Arianism, as if the spirit of Michael Servetus, had escaped from the executioner, and according to the system of Plato, had transmigrated whole and entire into Calvin." *Stancharus De Med. in Calvin Inst.*

"Servetus having in 1553 published at Vienne in Dauphine, a new treatise called *Christianismi Restitutio*, and escaping from thence, as he vainly hoped, to the Protestant city of Geneva, became a victim to the bigotry of the magistrates, instigated by Calvin who had acquired an immense ascendancy over that Republic . . . Servetus in fact was burned not so much for his heresies, as for some personal offence he had several years before given to Calvin . . . Servetus had in some printed letters charged Calvin with many errors, which seems to have exasperated the Great (!) Reformer, so as to make him resolve on what he afterwards executed . . . The death of Servetus has perhaps as many circumstances of aggravation as any execution for heresy that ever took place. One of these is, that he was not the subject of Geneva, nor domiciled in the city, nor had his book been published there, but at Vienne . . . Thus, in the second period of the Reformation these ominous symptoms which had appeared in its earliest stage, disunion, virulence, bigotry, intolerance, far from yielding to any benignant

* Calvin was no priest.

influence, grow more inveterate and incurable." *Hallam's Hist. of Literature* vol. I. p. 280, 281.

"If Servetus come here (to Geneva) and my authority be considered I will not permit him to escape with his life." CALVIN Letter to the minister Parol.

We will close this week with an important testimony from M. Galiffi a Protestant writer who has been indefatigable in his researches amongst the records of the Genevan consistory under Calvin, and who has ferreted out and given to the public the celebrated "Registers" of the Council of Geneva during the sixteenth century, which were long carefully concealed from the world. M. Galiffi's work was published in 3 vols. in 1831 and 1836. In his introduction to the 3rd he describes the state of morals in Geneva in Calvin's time, in the following language :

"I will show to those who imagine that the Reformer had done nothing that is not good, our "Registers" covered with entries of illegitimate children—with prosecutions hideous for their obscenity—with Wills in which fathers and mothers accuse their own children, not only of errors, but of crimes—with transactions before notaries public between young girls and their paramours, who gave them in presence of their relatives, means of supporting their illegitimate offspring—with multitudes of forced marriages, where the delinquents were conducted from prison to the Church—with mothers who abandoned their infants at the hospital, while they were living in abundance with a second husband—with whole bundles of processes between brothers—with heaps of secret denunciations; and all this in the generation nourished by the mystic manna of Calvin!"

Before this sad picture drawn from life by a Protestant hand we must pause, and seriously ask the Editor of the Guardian, as well as every admirer and disciple of Calvin in the Province :—

Was not Calvin a tyrant, a hypocrite and a cruel monster?

Does he merit the veneration of any Christian?

Could he have been influenced by the Holy Ghost, during his violent, criminal and infamous career?

Is it likely that God would have chosen such an instrument to reform the whole Catholic world, and to become the Founder of a new Church?

We shall, from a sense of duty, return to this disgusting subject, and when we shall have completed the History of Calvin's infamous life, we will, if necessary, describe and refute his hell-horn and soul-destroying doctrines. If the "criminal" of the Guardian should deem this language too severe, let him remember from whom the wanton provocation arose. He and his unholy allies have first assaulted our religion, and then poured out a volley of unmerited and unprovoked abuse on our clergy—on a clergy who had never quarrelled with him or any other Protestant—who had shewn examples of moderation, and exhibited many proofs of their desire to live in peace with their fellow men—on a clergy whose whole time is devoted to laborious duty and the vigilant care of the numerous poor among their flock—on a clergy who had long since proclaimed through the voice of their Bishop an anxious wish to avoid if possible all secular excitement, and to attend exclusively to the peaceful and holy functions of their ministry—on a clergy in a word, who are far above our feeble praise, who must look down with pity on their impotent revilers, but whom at the same time, we will not suffer to be insulted with impunity. If we did so we should be traitors to the Catholics of Halifax whose feelings we represent, and we therefore tell the hoary "criminal" of the Guardian that so long as he continues to insult our creed, our clergy or our country, we will "school him into good manners" hurl back in his teeth his contemptuous epithets, and unmask the canting piety, and deceitful professions of this old political trickster.

THE TIMES.

"As turns a flock* of geese upon the green
Poke out their awkward necks in foolish spleen,
Ridiculous in rage! to hiss not bite,
So war their quills when sons of dulness write."

Never was happier description drawn by poet or painter than the above sketch, and in proceeding to notice the last literary

* Noun of multitude.

abortion of the Times we could not commence the degrading task in more appropriate language. The Editors of the Times with all their lay and clerical friends, have again spent eleven days in the fabrication of a clumsy reply to one article in the Cross, and their last failure has been more signal than the first. Carefully avoiding the real question at issue they have filled their columns with a long Protestant version of the agitation in Newfoundland several years ago, and a scapud commentary on the English Book of Common Prayer by a degraded priest on the coast of Connaught—"The rest is all but leather and prunella" if we may borrow a polite phrase from the Times itself. However, as the Editors have been taunted on the score of delay, and as it is evident that their jaded intellects are distanced in the literary race, they tried to make a show of fight by marshalling several heavy columns. They wrap up the smallest possible grain of sense in a cloud of words and their ponderous articles "drag their slow length along" by the aid of copious extracts from orange periodicals, and partisan journals. When the eleven days' parturition is over, they present the huge bantling to the world, and hope that its size at least will terrify all their opponents. But they are deceived. Our only feeling is one of pity mingled with surprise. We cannot behold unmoved, the agonizing torture of those genuine "sons of dullness," when they are summoned to reply to an article, or to refute an objection. Our astonishment is excited when we see the Church of England entrusted to such a brace of theologians as the Editors of the Times, and we wonder

"How with less reading than makes felons 'scape
Less human genus than God gives an ape."

they have the courage to write for the press, or conduct a public journal.

They began their last article by an affected exhibition of merciful strength, and "pass over a few grammatical inaccuracies" in our "sentences." We would be thankful for this forbearance, if we believed it to be sincere. But from the specimens of grammatical correction which they have given elsewhere, and which only reveal more clearly the profundity of their "Protestant ignorance," we may readily estimate the extent of their kindness in this respect. As they have assumed the task of initiating us into the mysteries of syntax, we must reprint for the benefit of the public the first three sentences of their last Editorial, in order to show how eminently qualified they are to deliver lectures on Lindley Murray :

"We had not time (brains enough?) last week to notice the article in the Cross of the 27th February *ult* (!) otherwise than by a short comment, and that upon its less important passages. We shall now advert to it again, to show not only the fall of premature boasting (no but to make up for their stupid article of the previous week) on the part of the scholars and gentlemen of the Cross, but also the fallacy of their reasoning. If it will learn them caution in jumping at hasty conclusions, &c."

We leave this specimen of their composition and grammar to the judgment of the public, and we are willing to abide by their impartial decision. Most assuredly the past or future corrections of the Editors of the Times will never disturb our equanimity. The truth is, that we have probed them in the tender part, and found them exceedingly sensitive. We have dissected their lifeless composition, and laid bare their hollow pretensions. We have indicted them for murder of the Queen's English, and convicted them on their own testimony

—"Hæret lateri lethalis arundo."

and hence the prattling of the Times about grammar and syntax.

They print our pertinent question of,
"Who began this quarrel?"

and they answer it by a species of legerdemain which we could not expect to hear outside a criminal dock.

"We answer," say they, "the Editors of the Cross that the controversy on our part began not one moment too soon." Is this, we ask, is this a straight forward answer? We did not want to know whether the commencement of the quarrel was well-timed or not, but *by whom* the quarrel was *actually* commenced. This question they have evaded with their usual candour. But we repeat that the whole community *knows* it was begun by the Editors of the Times, and that "the infamous notoriety, the diabolical crime (they are one and the same) rests upon their shoulders" and that they can never, with truth, contradict the assertion.

We have examined their miserable article, to try if they could allege one solid argument which would justify the commencement of this unchristian warfare; but we have examined in vain. Perhaps we should except the following statement of the Times respecting an intention and a fact

"At one time we are given to understand, it was seriously contemplated to have a procession of the *Host* through our streets" and "an effigy of the Duke of Wellington followed by a rabble, and headed by a priest, was paraded through the streets and burnt on the common."

We will deal with these assertions in a summary mode. We totally deny the first, and we maintain that there is a gross misrepresentation in the second. Whosoever gave the Editors of the Times to understand, that it was seriously contemplated to have a procession of the Host through our streets, was a lying knave or a false wit. But it is probable he knew with what voracity such a fiction would be swallowed by the credulous creatures of the Times. No such procession was ever contemplated as far as we know, and we defy the Times to prove the contrary. We do not mean to say that Catholics cannot lawfully hold such processions if they please. They have as good a right to do so as any other religious body, and we know that they annually exercise the right in some parts of the Province.

The story of the burning of the effigy of the Duke of Wellington is as far as the object of the Times is concerned equally untrue.

There is no doubt, that, in the year 1841 when an account reached Halifax of the liberation of the Irish State prisoners by a decision of the House of Lords, and the consequent defeat of the Peel ministry and their unhallowed agents in Ireland in those Monster Trials which were designated by the highest authority of the land, as "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare"—vast numbers of the Irishmen of Halifax indulged in a very natural and pardonable exultation. They walked in procession with a band of music, and made a bonfire on the common, to commemorate the triumph of law and justice over one of the most iniquitous tribunals that ever sat since the days Pontius Pilate. The people of the Times call them "A RABBER," (and the cowardly miscreants must have calculated hugely on the forbearance of the Irishmen of Halifax when they dared to apply such an epithet) and say that they were "headed by a priest." This is not true. They were neither organised, nor headed by a priest. Indeed the suddenness of the whole affair—of the arrival of the unexpected news and the spontaneous manifestation of honest feeling which it produced, clearly showed that there could have been no premeditation. On the arrival of the same news, similar exhibitions of popular feeling took place in almost every part of the globe where Irishmen were to be found. The priest alluded to, and who does not now reside in the Province, was spending the evening with a friend. On hearing the noise they came out of a house in the neighbourhood of Spring Gardens, and met the Procession on its way to the Common. The enthusiasm and numbers were so great that his friend recommended the clergyman to follow them to a certain distance and in doing so was influenced by the most prudential motives. They heard the shouts of the delighted people, they saw a bonfire enkindled, but of an effigy they know nothing, neither did those who took a leading part in the proceedings of the evening. It afterwards appeared that some thoughtless boy of the name

of Power throw into the bonfire a something which he called *Sir Robert Peel*, and that this "as his own act for which no one else was responsible. This we believe is a true version of an occurrence which took place in 1844, and of which the Times would wish to make political capital in 1847, to justify his unprovoked attacks on the Catholic Body. If we wanted to defend this silly act, upon which so much undue stress has been laid, we could inform the people of the Times, that *Sir Robert* has been often burned in effigy before, not by Irish Catholics but by English Protestants, by the No Popery bigots of Oxford and the low Orangemen of the North of Ireland whom Peel afterwards discarded with contempt, and justly called a set of "VAGABONDS." We could also urge the annual burning of the Pope in many parts of this Province, and especially in those where the poor Catholics so wantonly insulted were few in number, and incapable of chastising their dastardly assailants as they deserved. In fine as so much noise has been made about the harmless frolic of an Irish lad, we could tell the Times that the act was innocence itself when contrasted with the conduct of one of its own "people" no less than an Archdeacon of the Church of England who marched up at Rathcoruae to a poor widow's house at the head of a small army, not to make a bonfire or burn any one in effigy, but to slay that widow's only son, and when his mangled corpse lay before her all reeking in gore, to preach to her this beautiful Homily upon the gospel of love.—"Ha! Widow Ryan, will you pay me my tithes now!" We can thus afford to make the Times a present of the whole scene upon the common, and of all the silly history of the burning of the Iron Duke.

The Editors of the Times are modestly designated (by themselves) "Englishmen, Gentlemen, and Protestants." We never heard before of their *English* origin, but they claim it we suppose, in order to establish their right by prescription to kick and cuff any "mere Irishman." As for the term *gentleman* we believe it is as vague an appellation in modern times, as the word *Protestant* has always been. They have quarreled with our definition of the latter, and we must help to enlighten their "Protestant ignorance," by Protestant authority on the meaningless absurdity of this most contemptible cognomen.

"What is Protestantism?"

"A. The abjuration of Popery, and the exclusion of Popists from all power, ecclesiastical or civil."—Catechism by the Protestant Bishop of Durham, Dublin, 1818, p. 12.

We are sure the Times would never quarrel with this significant and christian definition. But we must proceed.

"As to the general term *Protestant*, I AM NOT AT ALL SATISFIED WITH IT, and I have both reason and experience to warrant me in this dislike."—Bishop Loyd, Reform Catechism, London, 1679, p. 3.

"I cannot admit the word *Protestant* as a name whereby to distinguish my Church or profession. I think that if I were asked, *what Church are you of; or what religion do you profess?* and I answered, *I am a Protestant*, this would be a very imperfect account of myself and my faith; and all that could be gathered from such an answer would be, that I were of a *negative religion*, or rather of any, no matter which, so it be not Popery."—Quoted by Barwick in his preface, p. 32, from "True Churchman and Loyal Subject, dedicated to the Clergy, London, 1710, p. 3.

"Now the terms *Protestant* and *Protestantism* by which numerous and important professors of the Gospel are denominated, convey, however, a very indefinite description of those who are comprised under the denomination. *Protestant* is in fact, a *negative*, rather than a *positive term*." Charge of Dr. Mant, Bishop of Down & Connor, Milliken, Dublin, 1836.

What will the Times say to those authorities? Here are three Bishops of the English Church defining *Protestantism* almost in the exact words of the Cross, and objecting to the use of that ridiculous abstraction as an appellation for any Body of Christians. We will not therefore retract one word of what we have written on this subject, and with the High Church Authorities above-mentioned, we *protest* in the name of common sense against this great *Protestant* blunder.

The Editors of the Times have made a most piteous appeal to the Protestants of the country, and have called on them to arise,

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 mind 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 *Gentian* 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

It is our duty as far as in us lies, to convince them of the truth."

With these remarks we proceed to lay before our readers the article itself.

"We observe that all the Tory Press of the capital, have lately combined in a wanton and simultaneous attack upon the Roman Catholic body, in order, evidently, to get up a quarrel between them and the Protestant Liberals, with a view to their own benefit at the approaching election. They have provoked a violent and rather indiscriminate retaliation from the 'Cross,' never was the organ of the Catholic body, since which they have been using the most strenuous efforts to induce weak-minded Liberals to join them, by insinuating horrible surmises as to what the Catholics will do if they get the upper hand. This is a most barefaced attempt to get up the old and thread-bare, but still most mischievous cry of "no Popery,"—to resurrect the raw head and bloody bones which have ever been held up by those who are opposed to the rights of the people, in order to awe them into quiet submission, so that their pockets can be plundered and their liberties subverted, with the least possible resistance.

"We have never been backward, on all proper occasions, in expressing openly, but we trust in a christian spirit, our clear and conscientious dissent from what we believe to be the errors of the Church of Rome; and if the attacks to which we allude were made for the purpose of clearing or diffusing truth, we should be inclined to use every leniency, in dealing with them, and even to overlook some warmth of expression. But their language is too violent to claim any excuse on this ground, and it is levelled far less at the errors of the Romish Church, than the individuals who profess that system of belief. Besides all this, there is a degree of cowardice in pursuing such a course at the present moment, at which our nature revolts. The Irish Catholics in this Province are suffering the keenest mental distress on account of the horrible famine now raging in their fatherland, and many of them must be conscious that their nearest and dearest friends are probably dying of starvation. And yet this is the time which the Tories of Nova Scotia have chosen, by a series of dastardly attacks through the press, to lash into fury the slumbering, and we had hoped almost extinct elements of religious strife and discord in this Province. Is it not enough that while they are suffering all the horrors of famine and disease, they must have fastened on the vitals of their state against their will that intolerable nuisance, the Irish Established Church,—an insult to their pride as men and their faith as Catholics,—but they must needs be characterized by a part of the Protestant press as low bigots,* and every mean insinuation used to create ill-feeling between them and their fellow-christians, and thus prevent the kindly feelings of the latter from coming to the aid of their suffering countrymen in Ireland.

"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 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 it is our duty as far as in us lies, to convince them of the truth. We should show them first by our fruits of long suffering kindness and love, even to our enemies, that we are indeed members of the heavenly vine, and thus we should open their hearts to the admission of that divine truth by which our own conduct in such cases would evidently be influenced. Our example of forbearance and kindness would thus have a two-fold effect. It would not only enforce our precepts and arguments, but it would prepare the way before them by breaking down that wall of division, which ages of tyranny and religious persecution have raised between the Catholics of Ireland and their Protestant brethren.

"It is with extreme regret that we perceive the Tory press resorting to such base means to avert that annihilation as a party which must inevitably come upon them. Not that this manoeuvre can injure our position, or benefit theirs in the slightest degree, for it is too transparent and has been tried too

often, to deceive the most simple, but because it exhibits to us human nature in one of its most hideous attitudes—endeavouring to light the fierce and enduring fires of religious strife, for a selfish and temporary purpose, ready to sacrifice the truth of the Gospel and its blessed fruits of charity and love, at the unholy shrine of personal ambition and political profligacy.

X.

THE REPENTANT "CRIMINAL" OF THE GUARDIAN.

"Our Readers need not be greatly surprised to find us very soon locked in each others arms, and see the Editor of the *Cross* carrying the Editor of the *Guardian*, as if he had already become a Babe of grace, one of the wandering sheep which he had brought home to the true fold on his shoulders."—*Guardian*, March 5.

Here are symptoms of repentance, which in a criminal so "aggravated" we must contemplate with pleasure. Better late, than never. Who knows but this poor prodigal may return to his Father, and this wandering sheep to the true fold! We have no doubt that he will be kindly received, and that this beauteous Babe, this tender lambkin will be carried home as safely as possible to the peaceful fold from which his fathers so unhappily strayed away. But other shoulders than ours must bear this precious burthen. All we, poor sinners, can do, is to *pray* for this erratic sheep. To other, and more sacred hands, whose special duty it is, we leave the task of grasping the pastoral staff, and drawing into the fold 'by hook or by crook' this hapless wanderer. We are sure that if there be any reasonable hopes of catching by the head or tail, 'an old sheep-whistling rogue, and ram tender' of this description, one of the 'hot-headed young men, imported from Ireland' would immediately go in quest of him, notwithstanding all the wanton abuse he has heaped upon them. A very large bottle of 'holy water' would, we should think, be required on the occasion, to exorcise the Rambling spirit that possesses him; and after a copious sprinkling of this, he might be safely carried home to St. Mary's without any danger of accidents on the way. If he could by any means gain admission amongst the 'olden monks at the Glebe' we promise him from what we have heard of the comfortable quarters there, that he might go farther and fare worse.'

Of the five hundred thousand Emigrants who arrived in the United States during the last year, it is computed that three fourths are Catholics.

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

All communications for the Editors of the *Cross* are to be addressed (if by letter post paid) to No. 2, Upper Water street Halifax.

* See Morning Post, 23rd ult.