

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. 13.

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 27, 1847.

CALENDAR.

- MARCH 28—Sunday—Palm Sunday.
 29—Monday—Monday in Holy Week.
 30—Tuesday—Tuesday in Holy Week.
 31—Wednesday—Spy Wednesday.
 APRIL 1—Thursday—Holy Thursday, 1 class.
 2—Friday—Good Friday, 1 class.
 3—Saturday—Holy Saturday, 1 class.

“POPERY AND ITS ORGAN.”

TERTULLIAN—AND THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH.

Under this complimentary title, the *Times* has copied a letter from its *alter ego* the *Standard*, in which an objection is pompously introduced from Tertullian against the Real Presence. We quoted this great scholar, amongst a host of early Christian writers, as an advocate of Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist. The correspondent of the *Times* and *Standard* who subscribes himself a *Layman*! calls upon us to reconcile a passage in Tertullian with our favorite interpretation of the words of Institution, *Hoc est Corpus meum*. Not that a Layman attaches any importance to the opinions of Tertullian, for he says, in a previous part of his letter: “It is of little consequence to me what Augustine or a whole host of fathers or bishops may have taught (what a modest opinion of his own powers!) or what may be the traditions of the Church (does he keep the Sabbath on Sunday, instead of the scriptural day!) my hopes depend upon the words of sacred writ.” We will not stop to ask him now, from whom he has received that sacred writ, or how has he known it to be sacred, or even authentic! though we defy him to answer those questions on his own principles; but we proceed to notice his objection. He says, as we are fond of Latin, he gives us the original. We feel much obliged for his courtesy; but we would be much more thankful if he had given the *whole* of the original passage and not a garbled extract.

“*Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.*”

This is from Tertullian's Fourth Book against Marcion, and we have supplied in capitals, the important portion of the context which has been omitted by the Layman. We hope this mutilation was not wilful, and indeed it is probable enough that he has quoted the passage from some more dishonest writer against Popery. We will, however, give him the full benefit of the original, and any school-boy who understands Latin, will easily comprehend the weakness of this much vaunted objection.

We maintain that the whole passage is clearly in favour of our doctrine—that any seeming objection it contains, is removed by the context itself—that other passages in this very work as well as the object which the writer had in view, corroborate this assertion:—and finally that if there could be any doubt of Tertullian's opinion on the Eucharist, from the peculiar construction of this passage, it vanishes before many other clear testimonies from his various works. Let us now examine the text “That Bread which he received and distributed to his Disciples, *He made His Body*, saying, *This is my Body*.” Does not this first part of the text clearly indicate the doctrine of the Real Presence? Christ, according to Tertullian, *made the Bread* which he took into his hands, and distributed to his disciples, *His Body*. So far there can be no doubt of his meaning.

Now comes the force of the objection. *Id est figura Corporis mei*. That is, the figure of my Body. This does not mean that the Eucharistic Bread was the figure of the Lord's Body, but that that Bread which in the Old Law was a Figure, is now changed into the True Body of Christ. Hence, the words *figura corporis mei* are not to be referred to *corpus meum*, which precede, but to the pronoun *Hoc*, so that the sense would run thus: Having received the Bread he made it his body saying, *This*, that is, the *Bread*, which was formerly the *figure* of my Body, is now my *real Body*. Tertullian is remarkable for similar constructions of his sentences. We shall give a very plain one from the context. In proving that the *Blood* of Christ was formerly prefigured by wine “*vino antiquitus figuratum Christi sanguinem*” he continues in this manner “*Ita et nunc sanguinem suum in vino consecravit, qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuravit.*” So He now (i. e. in the new Testament) consecrat-

ed His Blood in wine, who then (under the Old Law) *prefigured wine in his Blood.*" Is not this an exactly similar passage to the one objected, though it is quite evident that the meaning of Tertullian is, not that our Saviour prefigured wine in his blood, i. e. made his Blood a figure of wine, in the Old Law, but that he made wine under the old dispensation, a Figure of His Blood in the New?

But let us continue to its close, the objected passage which we have quoted at length in the beginning of this article. *Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.* But it (the Bread) would not *have been* a Figure, unless the Body were a true and real Body." Here we have Tertullian's meaning beyond all doubt. His avowed object throughout the Book is to prove against Marcion that Christ did not destroy the old Law, but that all its Figures were truly and really accomplished in him. Hence taking it for granted that *Bread in the Old Law was a Figure of Christ's Body in the New* (as he shews a little after by a quotation from Jeremias) he very properly reasons that unless Christ's Body were now a *True Body*, Bread would not *have been* a Figure of it in the Old Law. For, the figure, sign or resemblance of any thing which had no real existence, would be an absurdity. The very tenses in which the verbs are written *Fuisset*, applied to the Figure, and *Esset* to the Real Body prove clearly that Tertullian referred the words *figura corporis mei* to the Bread in the Old Law, and not to his Eucharistic Body in the New.

This interpretation is still further confirmed by the subsequent passages of the writer in question:

"Cur panem Corpus suum appellat, et non magis peponem, quem Marcion cordis locohabuit, non intelligens veterem fuisse istam figuram Corporis Christi, dicentis per Hieremiam. Venite concijiamus lignum in PANEM JESU, scilicet crucem in Corpus ejus. Itaque illuminator antiquitatum (Christus) quid tunc voluerit significasse panem, satis declaravit, Corpus suum vocans panem. Tertullian here declares that Christ calls his Body, Bread and not a *Cucumber*, or any other sort of food, because Bread was an ancient Figure of Christ's Body, as we read in Jeremias "Come let us cast *wood* of his bread," that is, the *Cross* on His Body, and in calling Bread his Body He the expounder of the ancient law, sufficiently declared what he wished Bread to signify in those days of old." Therefore Christ did not institute in the Eucharist the figure of his Body, but he accomplished the figures of the old law by changing bread into his body. For the bread and wine offered by Melchisedec, the manna, the bread that came down from heaven, as well as the Show Bread in the temple, and the Bread with which Elias was miraculously fed in the wilderness were all figures of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. But, if in this Sacrament Christ has left us only mere Bread, in what would the substance and reality of the New Law, be superior to the figure and shadow of the Old!

For further elucidation, though we hardly think it necessary we add another sentence from the context. Tertullian explaining the prophecy of Jacob (Genes. 49.) writes thus

"Lavabo in vino stolam suam, et in sanguine uxæ pallium suum. *Stolam Carnem* demonstrat, et *Vinum Sanguinem.* At et nunc SANGUINEM suum in vino CONSECRAVIT, qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuravit.

Thus as in Jeremias, Bread prefigured the Body of the Lord, which is the *food* of the faithful, so in the prophecy of Jacob, wine prefigured His blood which is their *drink*. Christ therefore in order to illustrate and accomplish these figures delivered his

Body under the appearance of Bread, and his Blood under the appearance of wine. But if he had not given us his real body and his real blood, he would neither have fulfilled, nor explained, the prophecies and figures, and moreover Tertullian would have failed in his argument against Marcion.

The Centurions of Magdeburg admit that Tertullian is an advocate for the Real Presence, and if the correspondent or the people of the Times who have lately entered into a holy league with the Guardian, have any respect for the opinion or Latin scholarship of Jack of Geneva, we can inform them that Calvin, though the mortal enemy of the Real Presence, admits the grammatical and logical accuracy of the mode in which we have explained the objected passage.

Having said so much in answer to this objection, we now proceed to prove to the Layman and the Times that they cannot claim Tertullian as the champion of a figurative presence in the Eucharist. We will best do this by some quotations on that subject, which, to save time and space, we will give in his own words, as this dry controversy can have little interest for those who are not "fond of" or at least do not understand the Latin language.

In lib. 2 ad Uxorem Tertullian exhorts Catholic females not to marry Pagan husbands, and amongst other arguments deduces one from the Catholic practice of receiving the Eucharist.

"Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes. et si sciverit, panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur." This passage also proves that the Eucharist was received in those days fasting according to the present universal custom of the Catholic Church.

"Calicis, aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram, anxie patimur." Lib de Corona milit.

"Caro abluitur (in Baptismo) ut anima emaculetur; caro inungitur (in confirmation) ut anima consecretur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vestitur (in the Eucharist) ut anima de Deo sanguinetur."

Was ever clearer testimony than this?

In his Book de Idololatria, censuring certain persons who promoted Idol makers to the priesthood or to deaconship, he exclaims.

"Proh scelus! semel Judæi Christo manus intulerant; isti quondam Corpus ejus iacessunt. O manus præcedende!"

In his poetical Book against Marcion, the very objected passage is thus given by Tertullian:

"Acceptum panem pariter vitæque liquorem
Corpus aut sanguisque meus qui funditur hic est
Pro vobis; fieri semper quod postea jussit;
Quæve creatura panem vinumque putat,
Esse suum Corpus cum Sanguine. Lib. v. adv Marc.

In the last chapter of his Book on Prayer he says, "quod statuo solvenda sit accepto Corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini et reserato, utrumque saluum est, et participatio mysterii et excusatio oblii."

One more and we will have done.

"Atque ita exinde *opinate damnuci corporis vocitur*" Lib de Pudicitia.

So far for the objection from Tertullian, which ought certainly to have been considered a *fortiori* hope when it was abandoned by Calvin.

The objector has made some allusion to the Greek Testament which we do not fully understand, though the Catholic doctrine has as little to fear on this ground, as from the Latin of Tertullian. He talks of the *original*. We hope he does not mean to assert that Christ spoke Greek at the last supper. He ought to know before he presumes to meddle with such subjects, that according to the general consent of Biblical scholars, our Saviour spoke in Syro-Chaldaic, and that it was in that language the words of the Institution were pronounced. It is true that many Protestant writers including Adam Clarke, Home, &c., endeavored to elude the force of the words *This is my body*, by asserting that in the Syro-Chaldaic there was no verb signifying *to represent*, and that hence our Lord was obliged to use the verb *is*, for *signifies*, *represents* or *denotes*, and that it is in this

figurative sense alone we are to understand the verb is in the words of Insinuation. But like every other fallacy, this attempt to mystify the plain words of Christ, has been signally refuted by the ablest oriental scholars. For the fact is, that no language in the world contains more verbs which mean to *signify*, to *represent*, or *denote*, than the Syro-Chaldaic. Some authors give a list of forty one, others of forty-five Syro-Chaldaic verbs with this signification, any one of which Christ could and would have used in place of the verb is, if he intended to convey a *figurative* and not a *REAL PRESENCE*.

We have now answered a question or two, and we will take the liberty of putting a few in return to the objector. We are tempted to do so by his pompous declaration of war against tradition and the Holy Fathers, and of profound attachment to the Scriptures. He says: "My hopes depend upon the words of Sacred Writ."

But before his hopes can be grounded "on the words of Sacred Writ" he must be first satisfied that his Bible contains the words of Sacred Writ, and next that his interpretation of these words is a correct one. We humbly maintain that he can do neither of those things, and that consequently he can make no act of Divine Faith either in the Bible, or in any doctrine which he may deduce from it. We command the following queries, which will embody our objections, to the special notice of the Theologians of the Times, the criminal of the Guardian, and every Protestant in the community, and we think they would be much better employed in elucidating them, than in pouring torrents of unmerited abuse and filthy calumnies on their Catholic neighbours.

How do you know that your Bible is the word of God?

Did you ever see the original of the Bible? or would you understand it if you did?

How do you know that the books contained in the Bible were written by those whose names are prefixed to them?

How do you know that the various writers of the Old and New Testament were inspired?

How can you prove their inspiration from their own assertion since even Christ said of himself: "If I give testimony of myself my testimony is not true?"

How can the Bible prove itself to be inspired, or how can any part of the Bible, prove that every other part is inspired?

If the Bible be the only rule of Faith, as Protestants allege, how could the first converted Jews or Pagans receive the Apostles as such, before they saw the Bible, or before any part of the New Testament was written?

How could all those Christians who died in the belief of Christ during the long period between his death and the completion of the New Testament be saved without the Bible?

For fifteen hundred years before the invention of printing when manuscript copies of the Bible were so rare and so costly that it was absolutely impossible for the immense majority of Christians to procure a Bible at all, how could the countless millions of believers attain to the knowledge of the True Faith, without the Bible?

If the Bible alone be the Rule of Faith what will become of all those who cannot read, and who are consequently unable to avail themselves of the Rule?

Why do you admit into the Scriptural Canon the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke who were not Apostles and reject the writings of St. Barnabas who was, and of whom it is said in the Acts, that "he was full of the Holy Ghost and of faith?" (xi. 24.)

Does it not appear from the Bible itself, that many other sacred books have been written, of which we have now no account and which are lost for ever?

In order to form or apply the Rule of Faith, is it necessary to read the whole of the Scripture, or only a part? If the whole is it not impossible to be produced? If a part only, on what authority do you declare any part of the Bible to be sufficient?

Where is the 'book of the Wars' (Numbers xxi. 11) the 'book of the Just' (Joshua x. 13) 2 Kings i. 19) the 'Acts of King David' (1 Chron or Paralip xxix. 29) the 'book of Samuel the Seer,' of 'Nathan the Prophet, of 'Gad the Seer' (Ibid) the 'Acts of Solomon' (2 Chron or Paralip ix 29) the 'Prophecy of Ahijah,' the 'Visions of Addo the Seer' (Ibid) the 'Acts of

Josaphat' (xx 34) the 'Book of Jehu' (Ibid) the remainder of Solomon's 3000 parables, and 1005 poems' (3 Kings iv 32) or his treatise on 'plants and animals?' (v 33)

What has become of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, which was written previously to that now denominated his First, and alluded to in (1 Cor. i. 9) 'I wrote unto you an Epistle, &c' or of his Epistle to the Laodiceans which he commands the Colossians to read? (iv. 16.)

Where are the sentences our Saviour himself wrote twice on the ground? (John vii. 6.)

If these and many other parts of Scripture be irrevocably lost how can you tell but that the best portions were inspired, and also necessary for the integrity of the Rule?

How do you account for the fact that Christ never gave his Apostles any command to read, but assured them to preach and teach the Gospel to all nations and every creature, and also for the singular fact that the only words which he is said to have written himself, have not been preserved, nor handed down to us?

Here are a few preliminary questions to which we shall confine ourselves this week, and which ought to furnish serious matter for reflection to all those who cry out that the Bible alone is the Rule of Faith. Though we never expect to hear one rational or consistent reply to those queries, we will continue them in future numbers for the purpose of shewing our Protestant neighbours, on what uncertain and dangerous quicksands, they are building their faith, and their hopes of salvation.

GREAT PROTESTANT LIES, AND HUGE "PROTESTANT IGNORANCE."

"Quid irascitur est, quam mentes mortalium falsis et mendacibus visis concitare?" Cicero 2 de Divinis. c. b. 2.

Falseness is dangerous and foolish as well as criminal, for when detected it is sure to recoil upon its author. This truth is exemplified every day in the numerous conversions to the Catholic Church. Her doctrines have been calumniated and misrepresented by Protestants with such unblushing audacity that when their honest senses begin to open their eyes, and to discover that what they were taught from their infancy to be Catholic doctrine is a gross caricature of our holy Religion, and a whole tissue of lies and absurdities, they are so indignant at the vile trick played off on their credulity that their first movement is one "in the direction of Rome."

And surely nothing can be more natural. Conceive a member of any of the Protestant Churches, trained up from his infancy in the belief that Catholics hate him, that they would think it no crime to injure him—that they have no respect for the sanctity of an oath—that they can obtain the pardon of any crime for money—that they can get leave to commit any sin they please, by paying a stipulated sum—that with them, the end justifies the means no matter how wicked—that they make a Goddess of the B. Virgin, and worship her as such—that they adore angels and saints and offer them the homage that belongs only to the Deity—that they place their hopes of salvation in their priests, or in prayers, fasting and superstitious practices and not in the merits of Jesus Christ's Passion and Death—that they hate the Bible, and are not permitted to read it, and prefer human traditions before it—that they make idols and images and set up Relics to adore and pray to them as if they were God—that their priests preach to them in unknown tongues, and that they have blotted out or concealed one of the commandments lest the deluded people should see the danger of Idol worship—that the Pope can give them a dispensation to do any thing no matter how wicked provided it be for the good of the Church, that there is a regular list kept in a book at Rome

of the process for every sin, rather for leave to commit it, or for forgiveness and pardon after commission, and in a word that their whole religion is nothing but pomp, and ceremony and outward show, without any adoration in spirit or truth,—conceive, we say, a young Protestant imbued [with these] false notions from his very infancy—sucking them in with his mother's milk; hearing them from his parents, family, and teachers; reading them in his school books; listening to them assiduously from his minister in the pulpit, conceal all this, and how can you be surprised at his strong anti-Catholic prejudices?

But suppose this hapless dipe has been favored with an opportunity of discovering the real tenets of Catholics, either from themselves or from Books—suppose he finds out that all those charges against Catholics which so frequently excite his indignation and horror have no foundation whatsoever; that he has been for a great part of his life treating his innocent neighbours as the vilest of criminals, and imputing to them doctrines which they abhor even more than himself—what wonder is it, if all his indignation should be converted against the wicked authors of this monstrous deception, that he should lose all confidence in their teaching, and be taken to make every reparation in his power to those on whom he had unjustly pronounced a judgment so rash and so unquitting? We have read over the personal history of many a convert to the Catholic Faith, and we have invariably found that the discovery of the imposition thus practised upon them has first produced indignation, then a further spirit of enquiry, and finally a yearning after faith which could never be satisfied until they were incorporated in the True Church.

Hence, we repeat, with confidence, the declaration which we recently made and which seemed to excite so much dissatisfaction and surprise amongst some of our worthy neighbours, viz. that Protestantism and ignorance of all against which it protests are most closely allied, and that the former can rarely exist without the latter.

We do not speak of the libertine who is dead to all sense of religion, and who tries to conceal his own vices by protesting against the creed of others. We do not speak of those cold indifferent, careless Protestants, who are mere "animal men" whose "God is their belly," whose "glory is in their shame, and who minds only the things of the earth." For all such, an ignorance of our doctrine whether real or affected is so convenient that they have no interest in removing it. But, for the serious, the earnest, the sincere, the religiously disposed, the moral portion of our separated brethren, we assert that it is hardly possible for them to continue in opposition to the Catholic Church, if they be rightly informed on the nature of her doctrines. We have been led to make the preceding remarks from a perusal of the various Protestant Journals which have been engaged in this controversy with the Cross. Both the Editors and Correspondents betray the most lamentable ignorance on this vital point. In some we will charitably presume that this ignorance is involuntary; for others it is difficult to invent an apology. The latter seem obstinate in asserting as facts what have been disproved a thousand times, and of imputing us doctrines what we reject with indignation. To reason with such people is but a waste of time. Their "web of sophistry" is untwisted in vain; they are speedily again at the "dirty work." Connect, expose, overpower them, bind them down by the

strongest chains of argument they will continue to escape; detected in one shape, they will assume some other form:

"— Nil addo latens

Elogiet tam in hæc sceleratus vincula Proteus."

We will not therefore abuse the patience of our readers by any attempt at proving the falsehood of imputations which they already know to be untrue. But for the benefit of the well-disposed amongst our separated brethren, we will select from time to time some of the most prominent misrepresentations, and qualify them by their proper names. We will take those charges indiscriminately from the Times, Guardian, Messenger, &c., &c.

* Catholic Priests, commonly of the Jesuitical order appeared in England under the guise of Protestant dissenters during the reign of Elizabeth to carry out insidious designs; &c.†

False; not one instance can be given to sustain this calumny.

* The principles of the Roman Catholics directly lead them to oppose and thwart the action of the fundamental axioms of the British Constitution.

False; the fundamental axioms alluded to were established and maintained whilst all the people of England were Catholics.

* The Irish exile has ungratefully turned on his Benefactors.

False. The Irishman whether abroad or at home, has never been ungrateful even for the smallest act of kindness. Whatever Paddy has gained in Nova Scotia, he owes to his own industry and perseverance. He has not turned round on any benefactor; but he has resented like a man the unprovoked insults of those who have assailed his country, his clergy, and his creed.

* A little junta of clergymen imbued with the worst feelings of their native country seem determined to embroil both Roman Catholics and Protestants.

False. The clergy thus assailed have been always remarkable for a peaceful, quiet disposition, and have lived on amicable terms with their fellow citizens of every communion. Some months ago, after the Times had published some of its early attacks, one of the clergymen alluded to waited on Mr. Andrew Uniacke the City Member, who he supposed had some influence with "the people of the Times," represented to him the disastrous consequences that were likely to ensue if those wanton provocations should be continued, assured him that the feelings of the Catholics of Halifax were deeply wounded by those unchristian assaults and unfounded charges, and conjured him, as he valued the peace of the community, to exert his influence with the people of the Times, to put a stop to this cruel and unprovoked warfare. This occurred long before the Cross made any allusion to the subject; and hence we ask with confidence: Did this conduct on the part of the Priests shew a "determination to embroil both Catholics and Protestants?" We leave an impartial public to answer.

* The doctrine of the Real Presence was not known to our English Forefathers before the beginning of the Eleventh century.

False; Venerable Bede who lived between three and four centuries previously, believed in the Real Presence, and the entire history of the Anglo Saxon Church, proves that such was the belief of England at that early period.

It is insinuated that Erasmus did not believe in the Real Presence.

False; for that eminent scholar never denied it.

* Numbers of Roman Catholics condemn the spirit of the Cross.

False; and our opponents well know its nature, as falsehood. We do not believe there are half a dozen, and these are such lukewarm and suspicious catholicity that we would willingly make a present of them to the people of the Times.

The Times "did not know that the remembrance of the Gun powder Plot was celebrated any where in this colony."

False; for it was morally impossible for the people of the Times to be ignorant of it. And even if they were, their ignorance does not disprove a notorious fact.

Orangeism according to the Times is "not a bad Institution."

False. Its history is written in letters of blood. It conspired for the dethronement of our present Gracious Sovereign, as

was clearly proved before the House of Commons in 1835 by the revelations of Col. Fairman, and by the strongest documentary and other evidence. This treasonable combination was so enormous in its guilt that many of the Orangemen would have been brought to the gallows, but they escaped when it was discovered that some of the highest persons in the kingdom were deeply involved. Orangemen was however put down by a Protestant Government, and the Orangemen of Ireland were called a set of "scoundrels"; Sir Robert Peel himself, the great champion of the people of the Times.

The Catholic Church is thought to believe that the priest has not only authority to hear Confession, but likewise power to absolve him from sin either conditionally or unconditionally.

False—The Catholic Church has no such thing, nor does he believe that the priest or the Pope himself could absolve him from his sins unless on the condition of his being truly penitent for them, which penance includes a hatred and detestation of past sins, and a firm resolution of amendment for the future.

"We know that England has sought to render Justice to Ireland and been thwarted, and feel indignant at the charge of *English Guilt*."

False—The treatment of Ireland by England is unexampled in the history of persecution. The tyranny of England in Ireland has been constant, cruel, and sanguinary. Her penal laws against that country, (which are not yet practically relaxed) seem to have emanated rather from a council of demons, than from a Government calling itself Christian. "England sought to render Justice to Ireland!" The impudent assertion will be indignantly denied by the voices of millions of Irish exiles throughout the world. As for "English guilt" respecting the famine, we request the people of the Times to read the recent articles of its thundering namesake of Printing House Square, and also a recent Letter addressed by the English Archbishop of Dublin to the Protestants of Ireland, and they will find that the Editors of the Cross are not singular in their opinions upon "English guilt." England has driven out millions of Irishmen from the land of their birth, and since the accursed Union she has degraded those who remained into a nation of beggars, and she now taunts her long-suffering victims with the consequences of her own villainy, just as she taunted the Irish people on account of their ignorance, after she had set the price of murderous proscription on the devoted heads of their schoolmasters and their Priests!

"Protestants are not prone to persecution."

False. Look to Geneva, to the Huguenots of France, to the reformers of Germany, to the bloody persecutions of England, to the early presbyterians of America and Scotland, and above all to the three centuries of confiscation, robbery banishment, torture and death in unhappy Ireland.

"The Cross means to threaten Protestants with Priestly vengeance."

False; and well known to be false. The only vengeance ever contemplated was the vengeance of reason, argument and truth against their stupidity and calumny—the vengeance of that Free Press which has been so confidently appealed to by those who make the charge—legitimate vengeance which repels the shafts of calumny, and exposes to public contempt and opprobrium those hardened revilers, whose consciences are seared, and whom God's law cannot influence.

"Take down the Cross good people."

Narrative. Because we are not ashamed of that sacred sign, and we know that we could not combat for Truth under a more appropriate Banner. We leave the 'taking down of the Cross' to the Englishmen, gentlemen and Christians of the Times, and to their 'Protestant people' at Ferguson's Cove who to show their respect for the Emblem of Redemption and their Protestant independence of all spiritual authority, not only cut down the Cross on the Church there, in opposition to the earnest remonstrance of the Bishop, but when the sacred sign fell to the ground after having been hacked and hewn by their sacrilegious hands, rant the air with shouts of exultation not less savage and ferocious, than those which the ignorant Jews raised on Mount Calvary itself! Never speak of the Cross then, 'good Protestant people' or if you do, we will return your advice and

tell you to take down the large gilded Cross from the spire of the Chapel of Ease, for it has no business whatever there. A weathercock would suit much better.

The Tax Book of the Holy Apostolic Chancery containing the prices of Absolution from various sins is an undoubted and authentic document.

False as Hell. No such document was ever undoubted or authentic. No such book was ever printed by any authority in the Catholic Church. No price for absolution from sin, or for leave to commit was sin ever fixed by the Catholic Church. The Court of the Roman Chancery has nothing whatsoever to do with the Pardon or the remission of sin, or the granting absolution from sin, or leave to commit sin. That any such permission was ever given by the Catholic Church is a *calumnious* calumny. The "Tax Book" alluded to was an impudent forgery, condemned as such at Rome, and placed on the Index, and reprobated by every Catholic Divine, and admitted to be spurious by every candid scholar. The writer who parades it, only displays his own ignorance, and we are certain has copied the same from some ignorant Protestant like himself, without any examination. But Catholics are now so accustomed to those *mea non fore* forgeries that they have ceased to excite surprise. Within the last few years we have seen an entire Bull, as if from the late Pope, composed, forged, and published by the Rev. Dr. Todd a fellow of Trinity College Dublin—we have seen Protestant feeling justly excited to a high pitch of indignation at the notorious contents of this supposed Bull; and when the imposture was unmasked by the Catholics, we have seen no apology from the author, but an actual defence of the trick publicly undertaken by a Protestant Minister, the notorious Parson McGhee, who qualified the *forged Bull*, by the mild epithet of AN INGENIOUS device!!! We could relate many other Protestant forgeries as well as the "Tax Book" and "Todd's Bull." But we will let them pass for the present, with many other Irish Protestant Bulls of genuine humour such as the sending over to Ireland a set of English Preachers to harangue the 'wild Irish' in a language of which they knew nothing, which Bull, according to the testimony of Dr. Heylin, a respectable Protestant Historian, was a strange inconsistency in those who accused the Church of Rome for preaching and giving service in unknown tongues!

"Catholics on entering their temples are either moved to merriment or bowed down with gloom."

False in every respect. The demeanour of Catholics in their temples, is marked neither by merriment, nor gloom. We are sure their conduct in the House of God can be favorably contrasted with that of any Protestant sect that ever existed. Catholics are not gloomy, either in or out of Church. They are properly filled with a reverential awe in presence of their creator in his own temple; but this profound reverence is tempered by a holy joy. They don't turn their *unmannerly backs* on God's altar or minister, for they are gladdened by the sight of both. They don't play off any of the fanatical, improper, and sometimes blasphemous exhibitions which take place in Protestant Conventions, at public Baptisms, and Revival and Love Feasts, and Nocturnal Prayer Meetings, and Bunkum Conferences.—No, no; none of your screeching and bawling, and holy fainting fits, and hideous yells, and "hollers after the Saviour" no "running matches to seize on Christ" no mock revelations from hypocritical sinners, no humbug "accounts of the spiritual experiences of backsliders"—no crazy criminals "crying out what shall they do to be saved?"—no "revival spirits kiudling up" into madness—no fearful "relation of the Lord's dealing" with "young sprouts of grace," no, none of these, nor of the thousand other caricatures of true religion, and shocking familiarities with the Devil, are to be seen or heard in a Catholic Church. We appeal to all who have travelled in Catholic countries, whether the people are gloomy or not. Indeed the charge came with an ill grace from those gloomy fanatics who have destroyed the joyful nature of the very sabbath that was mercifully created for man and changed it into a day of gloom and sadness.

"We are not answerable for the errors of our founders."

Yes you are, since those founders undertook to establish a new religion, and to cry down the Church which Christ has founded

Where were the members of the Protestant Church or Churches for fifteen hundred years before those "Founders" appeared? Or was the Church of Christ hidden during all that time? The inference drawn from the comparison made between those "Founders" of Protestantism and Alexander VI., is unfounded, because there is no parity in the cases. Pope Alexander succeeded, perhaps unworthily, to an authority which had been established by Christ on Peter, and which descended through a long and venerable line of martyred, holy, and learned successors. But this Pope made no change in the doctrines of the Holy Church over which he presided. But it is far otherwise with the presumptuous "Founders" of new creeds. The allusion to this subject in the Guardian contains one of the most odious and anti-eccl'astical forestries of the Waldenses.

"Popes are compelled on their accession to take an oath against nepotism, that is undue advancement of their relations (nephews) in nine cases out of ten their children."

False in fact and inference. The Pope is a temporal sovereign as well as head of the Church. The advancement of the Pope's nephews and relatives in former times to secular dignities and titles, gave undue pre-eminence in the state to certain families, and excited jealousies and dissensions during an interregnum. The solemn renunciation of nepotism is therefore more a measure of state than of religion, one of those constitutional safeguards for the violation of which the ancestors of "the people of the Guardian" brought an English monarch to the block. The assertion about the children in nine cases out of ten, we treat with the contempt which such a barefaced falsehood deserves. It is clear that the recent illustrious converts at Romo did not believe a word of it.

"It would be an easy matter to prove that every article (in the Litany of Anathemas) on the denial of which they stake their salvation is part of the Romish Creed."

False; and the Father of Lies never invented a greater falsehood. We claim as Catholics the possession of a more accurate knowledge of the 'Romish Creed' than any Protestant in Halifax. We have published our List of Anathemas before the world. If the doctrines which we condemned so sincerely were 'Romish' it would have been the duty of our clergy, and more especially of our Bishop to call us to order, and to make a public reclamation. But they have been silent, both in the pulpit and the press.—We therefore repeat our former anathemas; but we will not add a well-merited Curse on all those impious Liars who persist in charging us with doctrines which we have disavowed on our oaths, and which, as every Catholic knows, we detest and abhor more than our Protestant calumniators do.

"The crafty Church of Romo has suppressed the second Commandment."

False; Examine our Bibles in every language, and our larger Catechisms and Books of Instruction. Every word of the commandments is to be found in them. The oft-refuted charge which we here brand with falsehood, arose from the fact that in some very small Catechisms intended for young children, only the substantial parts of the Ten Commandments are given, because the insertion of the whole text would perplex the memory of an infant. Thus the words "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other Gods but me," contain the substance of our First, or what the Protestants call the First and Second Commandments. To prove that there is no crafty intention in mutilating the first or second Commandment, we will set down the remainder as they are printed for children:

- 2 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
- 3 Remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day.
- 4 Honor thy father, and thy mother.
- 5 Thou shalt not kill.
- 6 Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- 7 Thou shalt not steal.
- 8 Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
- 9 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.
- 10 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.

The division of the Commandments has nothing to do with their substance. We make one commandment of the two first, according to the Protestant arrangement, because we think that

the words, "I am the Lord thy God, &c., and Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, &c." all have reference to the same precept of adoring God and Him alone. By this arrangement likewise, we are enabled to distribute the other commandments more suitably. Thus by our 6th and 7th commandments the acts of adultery and those are prohibited under distinct precepts—and in like manner the covetousness or desires to commit those acts are separately prohibited in our 9th and 10th. Whereas, Protestants who give separate commandments (their 7th and 8th) against the acts of adultery and robbery, are obliged to jumble into one commandment (their 10th) the prohibition of the desire to commit those distinct crimes. So far for this great Protestant lie, that we suppress the second commandment. We are really ashamed to think that any Protestant amongst us should be so ignorant as to retail this stupid calumny.

Our crowded space this week warns us to draw to a close.—We will continue from time to time our publication of Protestant Lies from the columns of the Halifax Papers, as long as they keep up this savage warfare, and in every instance we will "nail the rap to the counter," and hammer out its Protestant forgeries.

THE THEOLOGIAN'S OF THE TIMES.

"So vast our new Divines, we must confess
Are fathers of the Church, for writing less.
No commentator can more sily pass
O'er a learn'd unintelligible place:
Or, in quotation, shew'd divines leave out
Those words that would against them clear the doubt.
So Luther thought the Pater Noster long
When doom'd to say his beads, and even-song;
But having cast his cowl, and left those laws,
Adds to Christ's Prayer the "Power and Glory"
clause."—Pope.

The last editorial of the *Times* fully proves, if proof were wanted, that its adventurous divines have no confidence either in their own powers, or in the justice of their cause. Indeed their recent Editorials have become so insipid and evasive, so replete with assertion without proof, so remarkable for total ignorance of the subjects which they discuss, that our notices of them in that capacity may be speedily brought to a close. We find that we have been flinging water on drowned rats, and wasting our powder and shot on game so small that they are not worth the trouble of carrying home. To honour such drivellers with a special Editorial, would be to treat them as if they had some pretension to literature; to discuss theology with them, would be to fight a windmill. Alas! poor Church of England, if these be your chosen champions, you are fallen indeed from your high estate.

These helpless creatures in their last No. say that we brought "forward with singular inconsistency the practice of some EPISCOPAL Bishops (!!) to show, &c." This will give our readers a fair sample of their qualifications, not only in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, but also in the vernacular. What a learned linguist we are doomed to cope with in the writer of the above! Who can blame us for addressing him with the Poet:

—"You prove yourself so able,
Pity! you was not Druggerman at Babel
For had they found a linguist half so good,
I make no question but the tower had stood!"

We quoted Prelates of the Church of England against them on the meaning of the Book of Common Prayer, and they tell us we bring forward these EPISCOPAL Bishops with singular inconsistency! The inconsistency is all their own.

Either the doctrine of Absolution and Confession is contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or it is not.

If it be contained there, the "Episcopal Bishops" are right, and the Theologians of the *Times*, and the practice of the Church of England are wrong.

If it be not contained there, the Prayer Book is a treacherous guide speaking one thing, and meaning another—and the "Episcopal Bishops" and Sacerdotal Priests (we thank thee Jew for teaching us the word!) and numerous Divines of the English Church who agreed with the Bishops in their interpreta-

tation, were all ignorant of their own Religion, and were permitted to lead their flocks astray without any rebuke from this Headless Church.

Where is the "singular inconsistency" now?

For the future, or at least until we shall see that the Times is edited by some one who is not a tyro in the English language or in Theology, we will treat the Editors, and their stupid correspondents on a par. We will select from time to time, as we have done elsewhere, some of their more prominent lies, together with the choicest specimens of their ignorance, and briefly demolish them without any Editorial formalities.

They indulge in much foolish and unfounded speculation on the authorship of our articles. But this is *extra rem*: all moonshine. Why don't they attempt to refute our arguments?—Truth is truth, and sound argument is not to be despised, no matter from whom they proceed. We have said nothing in this controversy of which we are ashamed. Nay, we glory in having spoken the Truth, though, perhaps, to an unwilling ear. We were forced to do so, and we think it was an act of charity to disabuse the minds of many on the subject of "Catholic ignorance and error." We Catholics are not so stupid exactly, as our opponents pretend; neither are our doctrines so untenable or so monstrous as they are represented. We believe there are many Protestants in Nova Scotia who now think that a Catholic disputant is a more "tough customer" than they fondly imagined, and if we achieved no other good than this, we are well repaid for our trouble.

Before we proceed to follow out the plan above alluded to, we beg to inform the Editors of the Times that we will next week expose to the satisfaction of the entire community the singular and shameful inconsistency of the Church of England, and that we will do so from her own lips, in the very VI of the XXXIX Articles quoted by the "imes."

We now come to a Big Protestant Bouncer from the Layman who prattles about Tertullian in the Times. Here it is, from his last Letter.

"But Magna Charta too is a Roman Catholic Institution! Well it may be so—(it is so) but I should like to have seen the countenances of one of the bold Barons of Runnymede when the infirmation was communicated to him. What! that he who was opposing the veriest tool of Rome that ever sat on the English throne, (*falsc*) who had wrung from the tyrant John the charter of his liberties by the might of his own strong arm, that he should be the puppet of priest-craft—that his power should be claimed by Ecclesiastics, would have been intelligence, I fancy, not of the most welcome character!"

Did this writer ever hear that the Runnymede Barons were all Catholics, that the Catholic Clergy of that day had as much to complain as the lady of the tyranny of John Lackland, that both Barons and Bishops wrested the liberties of the Church from that fearful monarch, and that one of the first signatures to Magna Charta was that of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England? In reference to this subject we quote with pleasure the following Protestant testimony. The author (History of the Ref. mat. Let. IV 131) is addressing that lying historian Hume, after having given a favourable testimony of the "Olden monks" from the Protestant Bishop Tanner:

"Now then malignant Hume, come up, and face this Protestant Bishop, whose work you have quoted more than two hundred times, and who here gives you the lie direct, to all, and to every part of your description. . . . Instead of that "slavery" which in fifty parts of your history, you assert to have been taught by the monks, we have the freeing of the people from forest laws, and the preservation of the Great Charter of English liberty, and you know, as well as I, that when the Charter was renewed by King John, the renewal, was in fact, the work of Archbishop Langton, who roused the Barons to do and it, he having, as Tanner observes, found the Charter deposited in an Abbey! Back then; down then, malignant liar," and tell the d— that the Protestant Bishop Tanner sent thee.

We have no idea of addressing such an awful command to the Laymen of the Times, out of "fancy" the intelligence we have given him, is "not of the most welcome character."

"Protestants do not comprehend the celebration of the Holy

Winding Sheet of our Lord Jesus Christ! They may thank their ignorance for that. We informed them before that during this holy season Catholics are engaged in frequent meditation, on the various affecting circumstances connected with our Saviour's passion and death. The celebration of the Winding Sheet or fine Linen in which our Saviour's Body was wrapped after the Crucifixion, serves to remind us of the death and burial of our Adorable Redeemer, and is founded on the following passages of Scripture:

"And when it was evening, there came a certain rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate and begged the Body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded that the Body should be delivered. And Joseph taking the Body, wrapped it up in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new monument." Matt. xxvii. 57.

"And Joseph buying fine linen, and taking him down, wrapped him up in the fine linen, and laid him in a sepulchre." Mark xv. 46.

"And taking him down he (Joseph) wrapped him in fine linen, and laid him in a sepulchre." Luke xxiii. 53.

"But Peter rising up, ran to the sepulchre; and stooping down, he saw the linen-cloths laid by themselves," &c. Id. xxiv. 12.

"They took therefore the Body of Jesus, and bound it in linen-cloths with spices, as it is the custom with the Jews to bury." John, xix. 40. See also xx. 5, 6, 7.

Can the Layman now understand why we devoutly commemorate this affecting incident in the History of our Saviour's Passion, or why we apply the epithet Holy to the Winding Sheet in which the Sacred Body of Jesus was wrapped? If he do not, we pity his "Protestant ignorance."

The Times has published "a Chronology shewing the gradual apostacy of the Church of Rome," beginning A.D. 110, and ending in 1791. The Times must have been "very far gone," not "in the mazes of metaphysical abstraction," but in the aberrations of a disordered intellect, to publish such a tissue of falsehoods, and self-convicting absurdities. This "Chronology" alone would furnish us with abundant amusement for the next six months, and we will probably make frequent use of it, for the delight of our readers. Amongst the rest we have, "Holy Water first used A. D. 120." So then, according to the Times the use of Holy Water in the Church, at which he lately scoffed, is 1727 years old! This is certainly a dread admission, and a very ancient usage.

"A. D. 394. Mass first used in Latin!"

The Times does not say *where*; or in *what language* Mass was used before 394. At all events, we have the authority of the Times for saying that the Mass was in use 1440 years ago. How much longer "our deponent saith not." Perhaps the Times imagines that previously to 394, Mass was said at Rome, in Greek or Hebrew.

But we must not anticipate the rich harvest that has been furnished to us by the Chronology of the Times.

We will, whenever we please, give publicity to our opinions, whether favourable or unfavourable of Bishop Inglis or any other "Episcopal Bishop" or Minister of "the people of the Times," even though said people should wax wroth thereat. On the other hand, we assure them that whenever they praise any Catholic Priest or Bishop, they give us unfeigned gratification, especially when we think there is nothing ironical in their eulogy.

JACK THE MAN KILLER.

The Life and Adventures of Poor Jack are unfortunately "crowded out" this week. This is a pity. However his infamous History will "keep" longer than his wretched Body, which was in such a frightful state that one of his Disciples informs us no one would be permitted to look at it, and that it was closed up and hurried to the grave on the day of his death. The Guardian may be certain that if we have not a "cherub" there is at least a Recording Angel "aloft, to keep watch for the Life of Poor Jack!"

ST PATRICK'S DAY.

We had prepared a lengthened report of the manner in which this great national festival was celebrated in Halifax, but for the reasons elsewhere mentioned we are reluctantly compelled to abridge it.

On the night of the feast, great crowds collected in the vicinity of the Parochial School Room. The night was unusually beautiful. At 12 o'clock the Temperance Band marched forth, and played several pieces opposite St. Mary's. They then walked in procession through the town accompanied by a large number of Irishmen, of whom carried torches. In almost every part of the city the first slumbers of the inhabitants were agreeably disturbed by the spirit-stirring airs of Old Ireland, and the houses of several popular favorites were greeted with rounds of applause. Having made the circuit of Halifax the procession returned to St. Mary's, played Garry Owen, Patrick's Day, &c. opposite the Bishop's House, and after having given three deafening cheers for Dr. Walsh and the Clergy, retired to their homes in the most orderly and peaceable manner, to prepare for the celebration of the Day.

In the morning the Charitable Irish Society voted £100 stg. for the relief of Ireland, and afterwards walked in procession to St. Mary's Church headed by Joseph Howe Esq., M. P. P. who is President this year, and by the Officers of the Society. The Cathedral was most tastefully decorated for the occasion. Not only the splendid painting of St. Patrick appeared over the High Altar, but there was also a tasteful altar erected in honor of the Apostle of Ireland, in which was placed a beautiful statue of the Saint in his Episcopal Robes, and some relics of St. Patrick brought from Rome. The Pontifical High Mass was celebrated by the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, assisted by the Vicar General as Master of Ceremonies, and the Reverend Messrs. Melbaac and Daly as Deacon and sub-Deacon. An eloquent and pathetic discourse, suited to the occasion was delivered by the Very Rev. Mr. Conolly, and a collection made.

In the evening one of the very best Public Dinners we ever witnessed took place at the Mason Hall, which was beautifully ornamented for the occasion. His Excellency the Lieut. Governor presided with the Charitable Irish Society with his company at dinner, and was attended by his Suite. The Bishop and Vicar General, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Mayor, several Members of the Assembly, the Office Bearers of the other National Charitable Associations in Halifax were also present. We regret we cannot find room for the very capital speech delivered by the Governor, in which he most happily described from experience, some of the lights and shades of Irish character, and declared that not only is an Irishman "grateful for bare justice, but that if you add a kind word to this, or an expression of sympathy, his gratitude is boundless and everlasting."

On the whole the solemnization of St. Patrick in 1847 was worthy of the day, and worthy of the Irishmen of Halifax, who knew how to honour it. The anticipation of distressing news by the Packet obscured no doubt the joyful brightness of the celebration. But the consoling offices of religion, the consciousness that the Irishmen of Halifax had clearly manifested their feelings in behalf of their brethren at home in the most generous manner, and that they met again under the auspices of religion, to consolidate their glorious Institution and continue the work of charity and mercy for the ensuing year—relieved in some measure the painful emotions with which every true Irish heart was afflicted by the overpowering calamity which has fallen on our beloved Father Land,

IRISH DISTRESS—PUBLIC MEETING.

A meeting of Irishmen, and descendants of Irishmen has been called by a numerous requisition for Monday evening next, at 7 o'clock, in Mason Hall to form an association for the continued relief of our suffering fellow countrymen. We believe it is unnecessary to say one word in recommendation of this noble object. Much, no doubt has been already done by the Irishmen

They had subscribed many hundred pounds to the Relief Fund, besides their numerous private remittances.

of Halifax, but we must not withdraw our charitable assistance whilst the angel of death is hovering over the desolate plains of our beloved country. We have no doubt that many valuable lives may be yet saved by the continued relief which the Irishmen of Halifax are so able and so willing to afford. We have no fears for the result.

CATECHISTICAL SOCIETY.

Halifax, March 25th, 1847.

A Quarterly meeting of St. Mary's Catechistical Society, was held on Sunday evening last, immediately after vespers, in the vestry, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh presiding, assisted by the Very Rev. the Vicar General.

The general routine of business having been gone through, the following returns were made by the committees appointed to provide clothing for the poor children attending Catechism, as also a return from the Committee appointed to superintend the distribution of the fuel stored for the relief of the poor. From those returns the number of children relieved were males 50, and females 60. In addition to which a large number of Poor women received valuable supplies of clothing.

The number of persons who received supplies of fuel during the winter, as per returns were 325.

A motion was made to appropriate from the funds the sum of ten pounds, towards the relief of the existing distress in Ireland which passed, and in addition thereto, a subscription list opened to which his Lordship the Bishop, the Vicar General, and members generally, subscribed, the sum so realized to be transmitted by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh to Most Rev. Dr. Murray.

A very considerable number of new members were proposed and admitted, an adjournment was then moved and carried.

P. J. COMPTON,
Secretary.

RELIEF OF IRISH DISTRESS.

In the report of the proceedings at the Catechistical Meeting it is stated that the sum voted by the Society, as well as all contributions from Members, would be forwarded without delay by Dr. Walsh, to the Archbishop of Dublin. As it is his Lordship's desire to transmit this money by the next Packet, it is requested that all those who wish to subscribe, will do so without delay.

We also take this opportunity of stating that the Clergy at St. Mary's, during the continuance of the famine in Ireland, will be prepared to receive all sums, no matter how small, which the faithful may wish to send to their suffering fellow-countrymen in Ireland, and that the respective amounts will be duly acknowledged, and sent as frequently as possible to His Grace Dr. Murray, with a request to have them forwarded to the most destitute parts of our afflicted and beloved country.

ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH.

The usual monthly meeting of the Collectors was held on the 9th inst., Very Rev. Mr. Conolly in the chair when a sum of between thirty and forty pounds was handed in. A further sum of £33 has been since collected. The persevering zeal of the collectors and the constant liberality of the faithful encourage us to hope that the works at St. Patrick's will be resumed with increased vigour at the opening of the season. The crowded state of our counters for some weeks will account for our silence on this and other local matters of importance, as well as for the non-publication of the Subscriber's List. We hope our readers will agree with us in thinking that our space has been much better occupied in chastising the insolence of those who would, if they could, revive the Penal Laws, and in exposing the ignorance of brazen Journalists, and allowances, and benighted bigots.

BERMUDA.

We are much gratified at being able to announce that the Rev. Mr. Nugent has arrived safely in Bermuda, and that his health had considerably improved during the voyage. Father Haunan will return by the first opportunity.