

Who or what are you, Mr. Prayer, Priest or Layman, Catholic, Protestant or Nondescript? You are an Esquire at least? You start with too much importance to be one of the mere *ignobile vulgus*. You lurk in the dark; all that appears is the simple signature "Peter Prayer."

The *Globe* man, it appears, heavily oppressed in spirit about the school question, had retired to rest, with all this awful load upon his breast. His dreams were frightful. Popery, in all its horrors, stood before him, surrounded with its tremendous *cortege* of Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, Monks and votaries, with the Pope himself at their head. The vision chilled his blood, paralyzed his faculties, and pressed heavily on his breast, with all the pangs and horrors of a nightmare, even to suffocation. It was a night of torture, and the sufferer eagerly longed for the morning light. Scarcely, however, are his eyes opened to the morning dawn, when a friendly visitor enters his chamber, bearing in his hand the decrees of the Council of Quebec. "Here friend *Globe*, is a beautiful thesis: the Bishops of Canada have determined on exacting tythes from their impoverished flocks, in this free and enlightened country." The *Globe* rubs his eyes, claps his hands, snatches the precious document, and exclaims in rapture, delightful and opportune: "Here is a means of diverting the public attention from the question of Common Schools. We have been attacked on our own ground. We can now carry the war into the camp of the enemy."

I may be in error, but to my mind, the letter signed "Peter Prayer," bears all the marks of an ingenious fiction. It is not, it cannot be the production of a Catholic Priest; to his avowed and inveterate enemy such would not address his novel and groundless claim; it is not even the emanation of a Catholic layman. No, Mr. Prayer! you are not a Catholic. Place your hand on that particular part where others recognise a conscience, and tell me, if you were a Catholic, would you deliberately publish that the *Right Rev. John Charles Prince had bribed the Cardinal's lackeys in order to obtain an audience of their Eminences to influence His Holiness Pius IX?* Would you endeavour to excite the faithful both clergy and laity to an open war against their beloved Prelates? Would you, with declamatory violence, warn your co-religionists *not to allow themselves and their clergy to be crushed under Episcopal domination?* Would you accuse the Council of being neither just nor œcumenical? Does it belong to you to pronounce on the composition of a General Council, and on the manner in which its debates should be conducted?

You add, as a sovereign reason, an extenuating and apologetic justification, "*but thank God the Council was not œcumenical.*" What! Mr. "Peter Prayer!" You pretend to be a Catholic; you affect a zeal for the interests of the Church; you presume to speak in the name and on the behalf of the clergy and people, and you would appeal to an œcumenical council. This is the last resort of contumacy—of schism—of heresy; even the apostate monk of Wittemburg did no more. Yes! I repeat it; most pious "Peter," you wish to divert the attention of the public mind from the school question, and to insinuate that your epistle emanates from an ecclesiastic or lay Catholic. No person, however, has been deceived, and all recognize in you nothing more nor less than an habitual hackney of the *Globe*. But be what you will, you cannot be considered worthy of a serious reply until you shall have exhibited your name and standing in an unequivocal and explicit manner. The *nominis umbra* will not answer; whether phantom or pseudo-Catholic, you must come out *in propria persona*, and avow your aim and object before you can be honoured with further attention. If you are simply a Protestant writer for the *Globe*, then I beg to assure you that you have over-shot the mark, and that the snare which you may consider so artfully laid has been too conspicuous to escape detection. You would excite among both Clergy and laity mistrust and hatred against their chief pastors; but this is an old *ruse* of war.

"*Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.*"

The faithful Catholics know well, much better than you can acquaint them, to what use their venerated Prelates apply the money that passes through their hands, and to what source they are indebted for the efficient support of their colleges, convents, schools, and Catholic institutions of every description. I thank you "Peter Prayer"—satellite of the *Globe*—I thank you for the deep interest which you take in the welfare of the secondary clergy, and in the honour of the Catholic people of Canada—that honour which you affirm to be compromised in the estimation of His Holiness on account of the false information given to him by the Council of Quebec.

As for the monks, your errors and ignorance respecting them are equally gross as your misrepresentation of the validity of the Council of Quebec. You would exult in the vile conception of your depraved heart of setting them at variance with the regular clergy, and of consequence with the Catholic laity. Your tactics are well understood. There are no monks in Canada, except such as exist in your own disordered imagination, or in the sickly cranium of the *Globe*. The members of the religious societies, whom you designate under this appellation, are in perfect harmony with the secular priests.

In the days when Ireland enjoyed the blessings of her monks and monasteries, peace, and every comfort overspread the land. These have disappeared together, and a dominant alien Establishment, with pauperism, poor laws, famine and pestilence, have usurped their place. You, "Peter," know this well, and yet you would decry the monks, and their murderers and the despoilers and plunderers of convents may find favour in your sight. I envy not your feelings or your taste, "*intelligenti pauca.*"—
"Enough if you understand aright." Farewell.

ANTIPETROS.