

"The very term *Protestant*, as applied to a religious believer" say these worthies "is an exponent of ignorance, an empty sound, an unmeaning title! (! title,) a mere negation, an idea without point or substance, a common noun (we wonder it is that much in their estimation) which may signify any thing or thing, which can be applied to *ourselves* (oh! certainly, just as Protestants may use the term *Catholic*, a designation which applied to the Editors of *The Cross*, and the Romish creed, is false in fact and inference) as well as the Editors (! What Editors,) for we too are staunch Protestants." Here is more enlightenment of our ignorance, coupled with illustrations in *Lindlay Murray*, a Jesuitical enlightenment, which shows how apt the *Cross* people are to take either side of an argument, the right or the wrong, which is likeliest to serve their purpose. If our Protestant ignorance did not come to our relief, we should really be smothered under the mystification. We have always believed, with all due deference to the *Protestants of The Cross* that the term as regards the religious world, was used to signify a denial of the Church of Rome, and a disbelief of its gross and idolatrous superstitions.

We have not time now to comment at length upon the repeated absurdities of the Editors of *The Cross*—we shall perhaps touch upon a few next week. They accuse us of writing bad grammar, and certainly it would be a fitter task for them to correct our syntax than to be employed to their lasting disgrace in sowing the seeds of religious strife. But these Editors are not such proficients in English Grammar, as the discovery of a small mistake, which perhaps after all ought not to be laid to our charge, might lead people to suppose. We need not go far into their own Editorial to convict them of gross inaccuracy in this particular. The very next sentence to that they condemn is full of blunders. "We fear" say they, "that the Protestant ignorance of *The Times* has put its 'foot' in it altogether, and we must recommend *them*! to take a few lessons in *Lindlay Murray*" (do they mean *English Grammar*?) from the "aggravated criminal" of the Guardian." Surely after this we need not fear to put our Protestant ignorance against the critical accuracy of Maynooth and St. Mary's to boot.

On looking over the *Times* more carefully, we discerned the following allusion to the *Cross*, which we also publish as an additional specimen of the refined taste, and high mental culture of those accomplished writers. Had we seen it at first, we might have reprinted the above Editorial, as the "people of the *Times*" publish their Bibles—"without note or comment." Here it is!

"To Correspondents.—We are much obliged for the loan of the *Ashl* Herald. We shall make it leather* the writers in the *Cross* next week!" We are positively quaking with fear. What will become of us?

*To leather v. a. To beat; to lash as with a thong of leather. A low expression." Dr. Johnson's Dictionary.

"You may say what you please

There is nothing like *Leather*." Universal Spelling Book.

JUSTICE TO CAPE BRETON.

We are glad to hear that the Solicitor General has made a move at length, in favour of the deeply injured people of Cape Breton. We hope it will not turn out to have been a mere flash in the pan, like so many former allusions to the same subject.—We perceive from the distribution of the Road money, that the seventy thousand inhabitants of Cape Breton get £1,260 for public improvements, whilst Nova Scotia Proper will receive nearly twenty six thousand Pounds. Is this justice?

Mr. Dodd gave some faint hope of renewing the discussion on this question before the close of the present Session. What can prevent him from doing so? Certainly no subject of greater, or even equal importance. But if his memory should prove treacherous, we expect that the other members from Cape Breton will give him what the Lawyers call a *Refresher*. "Now's the day, and now's the hour" to introduce this question, and to test by a division the genuine sentiments of those members who are so soon to give an account of their stewardship to the constituencies whom they represent, or misrepresent, as the case

may be. We therefore rely on the Hon. Speaker, Mr. Mo-Keagney, Mr. Martell, and Mr. Brymer, for the faithful discharge of their duty in this respect, to the unrepresented thousands of Cape Breton.

Our "aggravated" friend of the Guardian has become all at once as gentle as a sucking dove, and as innocent as a playful kid. Any thing to equal the infantine simplicity of his last effusion we have never seen. The child's bargain too, of "let me alone and I'll let you alone" is introduced with the most touching and resistless effect, and forms an appropriate finale to his graceful essay. It is evident that his friends have been about him, and that they have recommended him to rescue "his soul and his bones" as speedily as possible out of the profane hands of those "olden Monks" of the *Cross* whose "stabs in the dark" have put his ally the *Presbyterian* in such fear for his life. We humbly opine that the advice was a sound one, and that none but a "caput insanabile tribus Antyciris" would hesitate for a moment in adopting it. There is one announcement made by the innocent Editor of the Guardian, which will relieve the anxiety of his distant admirers, and proclaim to the world his cool and undaunted bravery in the midst of so fierce a struggle. Alluding to a former Editorial of the *Cross* he writes:

"It has not disarranged one feature of our countenance" (We would not for the world be guilty of impairing the effect of such attractive beauty, and thereby depriving the Convent's doves of their wonted salutations) "it has not singed one hair of our heads" (Does he mean his own and the *Presbyterian's*? or are we to look upon the Editor as a *Janus Bifrons*? And yet how can this be, if he has but one "countenance"? At all events we may safely conclude with the proverb that "two heads are better than one.") "It has not amputated one limb of our body" (What a blessed escape! He could have much better afforded the loss of one of the *Heads*) "or even drawn one drop of blood from our veins!" This is certainly a most consoling assurance to the nervous friends of the Guardian, though it must be no small mortification to the "Olden Monks" whose pons are so pointless as to be unable to penetrate his *thin* and tender *skin*.

We cannot conclude this brief notice without expressing our admiration of the incidental and skilful defence of that "lamb of a man" so happily described by our friend P. Power. The Editors" (of the *Cross*) "commenced a furious assault not only upon us, but a wanton attack also upon a peaceable and unsuspecting brother, who had given them some *supposed offence*! several years ago."

Therefore, the fact which we stated cannot be denied. Probatum est. And this being the case we cannot help thinking that a judicious silence would have been a more graceful homage to public opinion, and a better defence for this "peaceable and unsuspecting brother."

ECONOMY—All to whom want is terrible, upon whatever principle, ought to think themselves obliged to learn the same maxims of our parasitinous ancestors, and attain the salutary arts of contracting expense; for without economy none can be rich, and with it few can be poor. The mere power of saving what is already in our hands must be of easy acquisition to every mind; and as the example of Lord Bacon may show that the highest intellect cannot safely neglect it, a thousand instances, every day prove that the humblest may may practice it with success.—*Rambler*.