

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 RABBLE," (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 knew 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 Rathcorua 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,