

the rock on which Christ built his Church," because Christ said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," &c. This assumption arises from where Jesus asked his disciples, "Who say ye that I am; and Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ the son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonas, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." This is a longer quotation than I should like to make, but I wish to show that the interpretation which Roman Catholics put on this passage is directly opposed to the opinions of some whom they regard as the most enlightened among the ancient fathers. In their authorized creed the Romanists solemnly profess to receive no interpretations of Scripture, except "according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." (Nisi-juxta unanimen consentum patrum.) Creed of Pope Pius. To prove that in their interpretation of this passage they violate their own rule, I might make many citations from the fathers, but the two following will suffice. The first is from Augustine, the celebrated Bishop of Hippo, (on Matt. 16, 13, &c.) "De verbis Dominu es Petruo," &c. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, upon this which thou hast acknowledged, saying, 'Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, I will build my Church, that is, upon myself the Son of the living God, I will build my Church,' &c. The other is from Hilary, another of the most celebrated Fathers (Can. 16 de fundam Eccles.) "Unum igitur hoc est immobile fundamentum," &c. "This one foundation is immovable, that is that one blessed rock of faith confessed by the mouth of Peter, 'Thou art the son of the living God.' (De Trinit 7, 7.) 'Super hanc confessionis petram ecclesie edificatio est.'" "The building of the Church is upon this rock of confession." And again "Hoc fides," &c. "This faith is the foundation of the Church, this faith hath the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, what this faith shall bind or loose shall be bound or loosed in Heaven."—Let "Catholicus" now consider these assertions of two of the most celebrated fathers and bishops of the Catholic Church, and see how clearly they agree with the opinions of Protestants of the present day, who declare that CHRIST ALONE is the supreme head as well as the foundation of the Church. After this concurrent testimony of Catholic fathers with Protestants, will your correspondent say that he "defies contradiction?"

"Catholicus" says "It is well known that St. Peter was the first Pope of Rome,"—I wonder who knows it so well, or how it came to be known, for as to this supposition there is no authentic historical proof whatever; neither is there any mention made in the New Testament, that Peter ever was at Rome, while it expressly tells us that Paul visited Rome, and that he remained there for "two whole years, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 28, 30, 31.) Now if Pope Peter was also at Rome, and more especially if he was there in character of supreme head of the Church universal, it is not strange that Paul should take no notice of him, and that neither the sacred Scriptures, nor any of the Apostolic fathers say one word in relation to his connection with that Church, while Scaliger, Salmasius, Spamheirn, Adam Clarke, and many other learned writers deny that he ever visited that city.

I have now shown some of the many reasons why St. Peter is said to have never been in Rome, but admitting for a minute that he was even Bishop of that place, (for as to the title of Pope, as it now is termed, there never was one till the year 606, which will be shown hereafter,) it has been proved that he exercised no authority over the other apostles, nor did he assume those blasphemous titles adopted by his supposed successors; he simply styles himself "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ," 2d Peter 1, 1. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder," 1st Peter, 5, 1—while his said-to-be successors use the titles, "God's representative," "Christ's vicegerent," "the most

holy Pontiff," "the vicar of Christ," &c. Here are the titles of the Popes, yet some of their own Bishops and Saints have not hesitated to declare publicly, that their true title is *Antichrist*. This I will show hereafter.

Before closing this article, I may as well state, that when I wrote my first communication I had not the least intention of attacking the Church of Rome as to doctrines or creed, but merely to point out the absurd practice of some of its members in applying titles to their ministers, which are not warranted by Scripture; but since your new Correspondent has declared all Churches, except the Church of Rome, to be heretic, and to which the gracious promises of Christ are not applicable, I thought it necessary to be more explicit, and to show that his assertions are false, which I think I have done to the first or foundation of them; and if circumstances will permit, I think I can do the same with all the rest; but the fact is, it is uncertain when I will be able to attend to this duty, for perhaps when I am in the middle of writing a sentence, there comes a call which takes me away, and there is no saying when I will be able to return to it again; yet I consider it the duty of every Protestant, so far as in his power to give proofs of the falsity of such insolent assertions which, if let pass uncontradicted, might be believed by some who know no better.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.
A PROTESTANT.

Jan. 12, 1853.

The Carleton Sentinel.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1853.

It will be seen by our Telegraph reports that the Derby Administration has been ousted and a mongrel one formed to take its place. It appears that no one party was strong enough just now to break down the old, or to form a new administration, and a combination was resorted to in order to effect that desirable object. If a coalition works no better in England then it did in this Province, their days will be few—indeed we think the Maynooth Question will settle the matter, and pop them out quicker than they popped in. It cannot be expected that a Government composed of Puseyites and Trucklers, supported by Roman Catholics, will oppose the Maynooth grant, but a large majority of the present House of Commons stand pledged on the question, and they dare not give their support to any Government, favorable to continuing the grant. So an end to the Maynooth grant on the Coalition, perhaps both, may be hourly looked for.

The Liverpool Mail writing on the subject says: "Yesterday morning the House of Commons rejected the Financial scheme of Her Majesty's ministers, by a majority of nineteen in a House of nearly 600 members. A more factious vote was never recorded. The Whigs, the Peelites, the ultra radicals, with the Irish papists, united in the grand exploit of embarrassing the Government."

We call it factious, because almost every member constituting the majority had expressed an opinion favorable to some point or other in the Budget. It was universally characterized, as a bold, honest, fair and comprehensive movement in the right direction. Why, then was it not entertained, and an opportunity afforded to consider modifications in committee? Simply because it was resolved to gain by all or any means, a temporary and vexatious triumph over the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What ministers mean to do, we have of cause no ground even for a conjecture. If the representatives of the people deem it their duty to throw obstacles in the progress of the national prosperity—beat down the funds—check the value of railway shares—and disturb trade and commerce, then their conduct is not obnoxious to censure. But we have a very different opinion of their duty, and the great mass of the people will be found to cherish sentiments widely different from their representatives.

But what is to be done? Will ministers tender their resignation? We hope they will.—They ought not to be dragged into disgrace by any combination. The House of Commons ought to be called upon to reverse their vote, as they have often done before, or ministers should retire. The income tax expires in April next. The fund-holder must therefore look to himself.

We have not been able to get in as much of the proceedings of the Council this week as we wished; our time has been all taken up at the Court House, but we will enlarge next week. Owing to our great hurry, errors in the speeches will doubtless be found, but we will correct these if pointed out. The proceedings of the Council will doubtless be interesting to our readers in other parts of the Province, as well as in this, as they will naturally be anxious to know how the Municipal Act is working here. Some improvements are yet required, but so far as the law can be carried out, it has given satisfaction. A large amount of business has been got through with at this sitting, and much more remains to be done. Some important resolutions have been passed, which will appear in due time.

Further English news in our next.

We are requested to state that after Thursday the 20th inst., all cows and hogs found running at large, between Lane's Creek and Upham's Bridge, will be impounded, without exception.

Carleton County Council.

Woodstock, Jan. 11, 1853.

The Council met in the Court House, this morning at 11 o'clock. Present, L. R. Harding, Amos Gallop, H. E. Dibblee, Wm. Lindsay, Geo. Clowse, John Shea, Samuel Dickinson, Charles Lloyd, James Jones, Charles Upton, Robert Kerr, Edward Barrett, Jonas Fitzherbert, and Murphy Giberson, Esquires. Secretary Treasurer in the chair.

Certificates of qualification having been handed in by each Councillor, the Board proceeded to elect a Warden, and on opening the ballot box, the numbers were found to be as follows:—Samuel Dickinson, (the old Warden,) 9, Geo. Clowse 3, and L. R. Harding 2; whereupon S. Dickinson, Esq., was declared duly elected for the ensuing year. H. H. Beardsley, Esq., was re-appointed Secretary Treasurer, and Mr. Richard Dibblee, Auditor.

Proceedings of last meeting of Council read and confirmed. Mr. Gallop presented a petition from Joseph Connell, against the return of H. E. Dibblee and Wm. Lindsay, Councillors for Woodstock; setting forth that he Mr. Connell had lost his election in consequence of illegal proceedings. That the Collector had not made his return to the Parish Clerk ten days previous to the election as by law directed—that persons whose names were entered in the books by the Assessors as liable to pay a poll tax only, were allowed by the Collector to pay a further sum and they were returned as Rate Payers and voted accordingly—that the Collector had taken money from persons whose names were not on the Assessors list, and had entered their names, (many of them being transient persons,) as Rate Payers, they voting accordingly.

Mr. Dibblee was quite willing to enter into any enquiry on this or any other subject that might come before the Board, but he would prefer having the original protest before them as taken down by the Clerk at the time.

Mr. Clowse thought if the Council intended to take the question up, they should do so in a proper manner, and allow evidence to come before them, if any, from both sides.

Mr. Lindsay would like to know where they would get their law from to act in this matter. There was no bye-law to govern them, but he thought one should be made, he did not think they could make a bye-law to affect what had passed, but disputed elections might come before them, and they should be prepared with a law to meet them.

Mr. Harding would move that the petition be first received and then the question would be fairly before the Board.

Mr. Gallop moved that the petition be received and lay over until the next meeting of the Council.

Mr. Dibblee would like to say a few words before the question was taken. He would rather the matter should be settled at once.—There was no charge against the Councillors, but a bye-law should be framed to meet contested elections, at present there was nothing of the kind, but Councillors should not be answerable for what was done by others, unless

it could be shown that they were in some way concerned; if they were to be accountable for improper conduct in others it would be a difficult matter for any one to obtain a seat, but proper guards should be set and if a Councillor should be convicted of obtaining a seat by illegal or improper means, he should be forever disqualified from holding any office in the County, and a heavy fine should be inflicted upon any Collector, or any other officer who would act illegally at Parish elections.

Petition ordered to lay over until next meeting of Council.

Mr. Kerr moved that a Committee be appointed to make enquiries as to the amount of taxes due from non-resident land-holds in the County; he had been authorized to pay the two last year's rates on the (so called) Campbell property, in the Parish of Wicklow, and he was prepared to do so provided all were treated alike, justice should be done in this as well as all other cases, it was not fair to make one man pay and not another, he was prepared to pay last year and would pay now, provided the Council made every one else do so.

Mr. Lindsay thought this matter had been settled at their last meeting, it was then decided that an attempt should be made to collect these taxes, and if the law was not sufficient to enable them to collect, it should be amended, but he thought proceedings had been commenced already and they had better wait their decision before any other parties were sued.

Mr. Kerr said he did not want any suing in the matter so far as he was concerned, if the Council would let him know what amount they required of him he would pay it, and would expect that all other non-residents would be compelled to pay also.

On motion of Mr. Harding, Resolved, that the sum of ten pounds be received in full of all demands for rates against the (so called) Campbell property in the Parish of Wicklow, for the years 1851-52. The £10 was paid accordingly.

Mr. Harding thought a Committee of the whole Board should be appointed to obtain information as to the amount of money in the hands of Magistrates, belonging to the County, and to report all defaulters to the Government. He would also ask the Secretary Treasurer if he had attended to the duties enjoined upon him at the last meeting of the Council.

Secretary Treasurer said he had sent circulars to the Magistrates as directed, but had received answers from three only, viz:—A. B. Sharp, Esq., who had no County money in his hands, John Dibblee, Esq., who had paid over all monies collected by him for the County, as would appear on reference to the Auditor's accounts, and A. N. Garden, Esq., who had promised to attend to the matter in a few days.

Mr. Harding would call on the Auditor for a statement of all amounts due the County.

The Auditor said he could not give full returns as he had nothing to give them from, all that he had been able to obtain were as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Name and Amount. B. Beveridge, Esq., £8 9 0; H. Baird, Esq., 4 9 0; A. C. Hammond, Esq., 13 1 11.

These sums were for accounts placed in the hands of the parties before the division of the County, and as they were now residents in the County of Victoria, he had been two or three times directed by the Court to write to them requesting that returns might be made forthwith; from the two first he had not received any answer, but after a long time Mr. Hammond had written stating that he had settled with the Collector, and requested that he might not be any further troubled in the matter.

Table with 2 columns: Name and Amount. B. Noble, Esq., £1 4 11; R. S. Demille, Esq., 27 3 0; A. N. Garden, Esq., 18 15 6; G. W. Cleary, Esq., 7 7 7; W. Hallet, Esq., 14 0 0; Asa Upton, Esq., 7 15 10; S. Estabrooks, Esq., 3 15 10.

All he could say was that these sums stood on the books as due the County, but whether they were or not he could not say.

The Secretary Treasurer said a circumstance had come to his knowledge which he felt