

ments came up, we all marched out, drove the insurgents out of the city, took possession of it, and the station, where we have remained ever since in the Collector's house—about 20 of us; others are in the punka (brick-built) houses that were not burnt; and the Fusiliers and 89th (Queen's) in the church. Every day we have had expeditions to burn and destroy disaffected villages, and we have taken our revenge. I have been appointed chief of a commission for the trial of all natives charged with offences against Government and persons; day by day we have strung up eight and ten men. We have the power of life and death in our hands, and I assure you we spare not. A very summary trial is all that takes place; the condemned culprit is placed under a tree with a rope round his neck on the top of a carriage, and when it is pulled away off he swings. All is now well and quiet, but where smiling houses once existed are now only blackened walls and desolation. My old house is in ruins—it had just been repaired for me—and my little house into which I had moved for a season is in the same state. I have lost nearly everything, though my servants behaved splendidly, and saved all they could. Two tables, a few chairs, three beds, a few odd volumes of my dear old books and my silver, is all I have in the world; however, my life has been mercifully spared, thank God! My horses I have saved; I sent them to poor Alexander for safety and for use before the fearful night of the 6th, when his Sowars rode two of them, and Old Snuggler saved Harward's life. When he ran up to his camp he mounted him, and he dashed through the Sepoys like an old trump, as he is. I have the good old beast under me everywhere, carrying on the work of retribution. Now that we have plenty of men a force is to be moved up to Calcutta to relieve the post fellows there, who are hard pressed, being entrenched in a kind of made-up fort.

LETTER FROM A CLERGYMAN—HORRIBLE CRUELITIES.

BANGALORE, JULY 4.—I began writing you an account by the last mail of this terrible outbreak in the Bengal Presidency, and I have determined to give you a brief outline of what further has been perpetrated, as Englishmen ought to be in possession of facts, lest there should be any squeamishness about the punishment in store for the brutal and diabolical mutineers. We have had an awful time of it, I can assure you, though we ourselves have been mercifully kept from alarm or danger. No words can express the feeling of horror which pervades society in India, we hear so many private accounts of the tragedy which are too sickening to repeat. The cruelties committed by the wretches exceed all belief. They took 48 females, most of them girls of from 10 to 14, many delicately nurtured ladies,—violated them, and kept them for the base purposes of the heads of the insurrection for a whole week. At the end of that time they made them strip themselves, and gave them up to the lowest of the people, to abuse in broad daylight in the streets of Delhi. They then commenced the work of torturing them to death, cutting off their breasts, fingers and noses, and leaving them to die. One lady was three days dying. They flayed the face of another lady and made her walk naked through the streets. Poor Mrs. —, the wife of an officer of the — Regiment, at Meerut, was soon expecting her confinement. They violated her, then ripped her up, and, taking from her the unborn child, cast it and her into the flames. No European man, woman, or child has had the slightest mercy shown them. I do not believe that the world ever witnessed more hellish torments than have been inflicted on our poor fellow-countrywomen. At Allahabad they have rivalled the atrocities of Delhi. I really cannot tell you the fearful cruelties these demons have been guilty of—cutting off the fingers and toes of little children, joint by joint, in sight of their parents, who were reserved for similar treatment afterwards. I told you how gallantly our Madras Fusiliers—poor J —'s regiment—has behaved; 100 men of them, under Colonel Neil, killed 650 mutineers. I saw a letter from one of the officers yesterday. He says that no imagination can depict the scenes he witnessed when he arrived at Benares. All the troops were in a state of revolt. They saved Benares. The whole of the Bengal officers were paralyzed with terror and astonishment; so Colonel Neil assumed command and proceeded to the most summary measures, cutting off whole regiments. All the ladies were crowded into one room, with wounded and dying men, and from the window the sight that greeted his eye was a row of gallows, on which the energetic colonel was hanging mutineer after mutineer, as they were brought in. After restoring some little order at Benares, on went the gallant Fusiliers towards Allahabad; thermometer above 100 deg; 30 and even 40 miles marching; no supplies to be had; living on flour and water. On reaching Allahabad at night the whole cantonment was in a blaze. The regiments had already mutinied, and slaughtered their officers with unheeded cruelty. The Sikhs had not actually mutinied, but they assisted the rebel regiments in pillaging the houses of the Europeans. This Sikh regiment pined the fatigued Fusiliers with liquor, and the scene of dirt, drunkenness, and wretchedness baffled all description. The officers of the Fusiliers went to the Sikh lines and bought up all the liquor they could, to prevent the men from getting it, and they bought chests of champagne, beer, &c., at four and eight annas (6d and 1s) a-bottle. Now I hear the indefatigable Colonel Neil is beginning to bring about some degree of order, and is hanging scores and scores of prisoners. But we get very little official tidings yet. I am longing to hear more, for I do not hesitate to affirm that each day of delay places all our lives in some jeopardy. I know from the very best authority that the Mahomedans are plotting at this place, but whether they dare rise will depend on how things go on in other places. The events of the next three weeks will be the most momentous. At Madras the panic has been intense. I believe, too, that the fears are reasonable. We have at Bangalore a strong force, and the Madras Sepoys have hitherto proved loyal. There is one circumstance in our favour. We allow all our regiments to have their women and children with them in their lines, whereas in Bengal the Sepoy leaves his wife in his village, and is allowed to visit her for a certain period every year. Our system, doubtless, is a great check on the Sepoys, as they know that, in the event of their rising, their families are in our power, but the Bengal soldiers can roam at will.

DISARMING THE MUTINEERS.

CAMP SEETABULDER, JULY 5.—There is a lull here just now, and everything in the city of Nagpore is quiet, and at Kamptee, though everybody is in great fright—I mean the civilians. We have disarmed the Rissillah of Irregular Cavalry who mutinied. They were ordered to parade, and my troop and two squadrons of Regular Cavalry, with half an infantry regiment from Kamptee, parade with them. They were brought in front of my guns, which were prepared for action, and loaded with two rounds of canister shot (a canister shot is a tin case filled with iron balls, and is murderous at a short range) in each piece. They were then ordered to give up their arms, which, luckily for them, they did, or they would have been blown to atoms, for I had orders to fire on them if they hesitated a second. My men had their matches lighted, and, as they are all highly exasperated at the fearful atrocities that have been committed everywhere, they would not have spared a soul. We have taken all their arms, and also their saddles, so that they are now comparatively harmless—their teeth are drawn. We have arrested the principal ringleaders both amongst the Sepoys and also the city people. We have hanged three of the native officers, men of the highest family, and the trials are now going on. A great many more will be hanged; but it is difficult to get evidence, as all are so much implicated. It certainly was a most providential escape for the residents at this station on Saturday night, the 13th ult. The whole plan of the mutiny in the Rissillah and the insurrection in the city is now on record, and it is fearful to think what a loss of life might have taken place had it not been for the timely discovery, and for the success from Kamptee; for had it not been for our arrival on Sunday morning, it was their intention still to attempt a rising. The spies that we employ in the city say that the people are dreadfully afraid of our troops and our guns. We certainly could read them a lesson that they would not forget in a hurry. I have had very hard work since I have been out here. I have not been one whole night in bed. There are constant alarms. I have to get under arms frequently during the night with my whole troop, wet through to the skin, my tent like a sieve, for the rain is so heavy. It rained on the 24th and 25th incessantly for thirty-six hours, and ten inches fell. My camp was like a large lake, and the whole of the horses were up to their knees in mud and water; everybody drenched

and no dry clothes. I was consoling my men the other day, by saying that we have a good hot sun, when it does come out, to warm us and dry our clothes on our backs, whereas in the Crimea the men's clothes were frozen on their backs, and they had no fires after to thaw them! I wish to goodness we could have a good fight. I hate all this dilly-dallying. Here all is suspicion, and after what has taken place, no dependence can be placed on any one except our countrymen. Our poor countrywomen have suffered most, and death was a blessing to many of them. The whole is a mystery, and to most it appears like a dream. Colonel Cumberledge, who commands the cavalry here, has just heard of the murder of his son-in-law and daughter, and two children, at Jhansi. The mutineers left the house after murdering the father, mother, and eldest child, but, hearing the baby crying, went back and killed it also. At a place called Shah Jehanpore they waited till all the English were assembled in church, and then went, and shutting the doors, murdered all. We have very imperfect information—the communication with the north-west is quite cut off. I hope the home government will send troops overland, or they may be too late. I fancy the British empire in the East has never been in such jeopardy as it is at present. If the Sikhs or Afghans were to turn against us, the whole north is gone. We may hold the south, but only so long as our troops are true. We have only one European regiment in the Madras presidency at the present moment, instead of eight.

Correspondence.

"It is substantially a repetition of a calumny uttered in the hearing of several members of the House of Assembly, by no less a personage than the Honorable James Warburton, Colonial Treasurer, who also knew the same to be false!"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—The above quotation from the leading article in the *Monitor* of the 17th inst., having reference to certain statements alleged to have been made by me on the floor of the House of Assembly last winter, renders it necessary that I should state the facts of the case with reference to Mr. Cooper, and I shall do so without any comment, premising only that my informant was no other person than Mrs. Cullen, mother of the individual who has accused me of a deliberate falsehood. A few years ago, I think in 1852, I happened to be at the house of the lady in question. She told me that during a severe fit of illness, her son, J. B. Cooper, persuaded her that her property—on which there was a debt of £150—would be sold to pay off the incumbrance, unless it was satisfied within a certain time; and that if she made it over to him he would secure her from loss, and become responsible for the payment of the interest as it became due. Unfortunately she acceded to the proposal, thinking, as she told me, that she was perfectly safe in her son's hands. Mrs. Cullen recovered from her illness, and shortly afterwards a person of the name of Webster offered her £450 for the property. It was, of course, necessary to have her son's consent to the sale; this she absolutely refused to give. The consequence was, she was unable to dispose of it for the sum of £300 over and above the amount of the debt. Subsequently Mr. George Cooper, brother to J. B. Cooper, wished me to hand over to his brother the title deeds of some property which I had promised to give him on Lot II. I refused to do this; and wrote to Mr. G. Cooper to the effect, that I thought his property was much safer in my hands than in the possession of a man who had deprived his mother of her small means of support. Mr. G. Cooper, who knew nothing of the former transaction, wrote to his mother for an explanation. Mr. J. B. Cooper got possession of the letter, I believe, at the Post Office; read it, and called on me, at the Secretary's Office, to know if I had written such a letter to his brother. I told him I had done so, and that I believed I had stated nothing but the truth. He then entered into an explanation, which fully convinced me of the above fact; stated that, under the law of this Island, he would be compelled to support his mother should she be likely to become a burden to the public. I remarked, that depriving her of her property was rather a strange way of providing for her; and suggested to him the propriety of his purchasing an annuity for her with the £300 she was offered for her property over and above the amount of the debt with which it was charged. Mr. J. B. Cooper told me he had not thought of that expedient, and left the office. I am not aware that he has acted upon it up to the present moment. Mr. Editor, I regret very much troubling you with this statement, but I do not wish to let Mr. Cooper's assertions go uncontradicted, although they can have but little weight in this community. I am, sir, yours, &c.,

JAMES WARBURTON.

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ISLANDER.

SIR,—In the *Islander* of the 1st inst., under the heading of "DANCING AN OLD BEAR ON A HOT GRIDDLE," you say, "If Mr. Cooper feel aggrieved, why does he not, as we suggested, procure a testimonial from Messrs. Laird and McIntosh, that he never said a word to the effect, that he consulted his own interest in voting for the £100,000 sterling swindle, and we will give it every publicity. We never spoke to either of those representatives on the subject, and the rumour may or may not have a foundation." If I could see that it was either necessary or proper for me to elicit a truth to serve any good purpose, I would willingly follow such suggestions. You admit that the gentlemen above named are the only persons in possession of the fact, as to whether or not I was to receive some consideration for my vote in favour of the Loan Bill. Therefore you knew where to find the truth, but never enquired for it; consequently you created and publish a report without any foundation, that I was bribed for my vote in favour of the Loan Bill, which for my own reputation I would have to take notice of; and this would give you an opportunity to apply scurrilous epithets and to ask impertinent and insulting questions. I am not aware that the freedom of the press allows the editor of a newspaper to publish a defamatory rumour against any person, without some foundation; or that the editor should call upon the party he has implicated to give up private conversation for publication, under the penalty of the defamation being continued in circulation. And until I am better informed in such matters, I could not ask for the testimony you desire, lest I should set a bad example. Your remarks on the way I did vote on the Loan Bill, and the way which you say I ought to have voted, is to mislead the people and explain the defamation. In my letter of the 28th July, I explained that the only constitutional remedy to dispossess usurers, who are wrongfully in possession of the public land, was to have their titles investigated in a Court of Escheats and Forfeitures, and that any other method of settling such matters depended on the will of parties. Therefore, if I desired the settlement of the Land Question by compromise, I must either have expected the Government to agree with my proposal, or I must have made up my mind to accept of any reasonable proposal from the Government. My proposal for the ministers to purchase the land and sell to the tenantry, has been before the Government, first and last, sixteen years—a time sufficient to convince me that for some reason the Government could not agree to it. And as you say I ought to have stuck to my own proposal, that is as much as to say that I should not agree to any settlement, but allow the usurers to swindle the tenantry out of £20,000 a year—a sum sufficient to defray the Civil List of the Colony, or the salaries of Government officers four times over.

The proposal for the ministers to purchase the land and sell to the tenantry, it would be well to find out why the ministry objected to it, and agreed to lend money instead, for the Colonial Government to make the purchase. But as they keep their reasons secret, we can only infer from their actions and the position in which they are placed. The ministers could not ask Parliament for money to purchase the land without exposing the parties whose misconduct brought such a debt upon the Government, and that exposure would bring the Colonial Office and all parties concerned into disgrace with the British public. But a minister could ask Parliament to guarantee a Loan for our Government to purchase the land without any such exposure, especially when it was made to appear by the Loan Bill that the money would be returned with interest. Thus if the ministers had asked for money for themselves to purchase, the blame would have fallen on the Colonial Office and the English landholders; but under the Loan Bill, if the land will not yield the money, a minister has only to say in Parliament that the Colony is too poor to pay. For if a minister were to demand returns according to the letter of the Loan Bill, it would then be time to bring the whole matter before Parliament, and show that the Loan Bill was passed to save the Colonial Office from disgrace, and that we ought not to pay for the delinquency of ministers.

My objections to the Loan Bill have been before the public already. It was not one of those straightforward transactions fit to pass a Legislature, if it could have been avoided, because it is open to mischievous persons to abuse the public mind with misrepresentations. But it is my belief that if the Loan Bill had been made as beneficial to this Colony as if the ministers had purchased the land according to my proposal, AND IT IS EQUALLY MY BELIEF THAT IT CAN BE GREATLY ABUSED. Consequently, if you can succeed by scurrilous and defamation to get the management of it into the hands of men who agree with you, you can then make your prophecy come true, and make a swindling concern of the Loan Bill; but that shall not be through any fault of

WILLIAM COOPER.

Sailor's Hope, Sept. 15, 1857.

REVIEW OF THE ISLANDER ON "RURAL MUNICIPALITIES."

BY CANADIENNE.

In the *Islander* of the 4th inst., the editor terms "the authority conceded to the Governor and Council by the Municipal Bill of last session, of interfering in the business and management of the Municipalities, a most improper authority." "No satisfactory reason whatever," says the positive editor, "can be given why the Executive should have the power of setting aside the verdict of the Municipality; and it should be a *sine qua non* that the elected Councillors should not be interfered with during their year of service. If any Councillors pass a By-Law disagreeable to the people of their Municipality, they have the remedy in their own hands, by electing Councillors next year to repeal it." You might with as much reason, Mr. Maclean, term the authority conceded to her Majesty of disallowing any Law passed by any of the numerous Legislatures in her extensive dominions, "a most improper authority." One "satisfactory reason why the Executive should have the authority of setting aside the verdict of the Municipality" is when they find it conflict with the "verdict" of the Legislature. A precedent: The first Municipal Bill for Canada provided no remuneration for Councillors for their official services. Subsequently the Council for the Eastern District of Canada West passed a By-law providing the sum of 6s. 3d. to each Councillor for every day he would be employed about the affairs of the Municipality. That By-Law being submitted to the Governor and Council was disallowed, because its provisions were not warranted by the Municipal Act. That "the Councillors should not be interfered with during their year of service," is tantamount to perpetual exemption from interference, rendering them more independent than any elected body of men that has ever existed.

The remedy of "electing Councillors next year to repeal a disagreeable By-Law" is analogous to "locking the stable door when the steed is stolen." It would be the height of folly to apply a remedy after the disease had proved fatal. If "executive interference" be so objectionable a feature, why does the sagacious editor wink at the same defect in his model Canadian Municipal Act? The present editor goes on to predict, "Only let the principles of the present Bill pass into a law, and a short supplementary Act will enable the Councils to raise the assessment to any rate that may please the Governor and Council." O sapient seer of New London! what oracle hath inspired thee to predict that such a supplementary Act will be passed? And if it should, what occasion of astonishment would it be? Is not every Act liable to alterations and amendments? Then why should the Municipal Act form an exception? But, pray what pleasure could it afford to "the Governor and Council to raise the rate of an assessment" every farthing of which was intended to be applied in the Municipality in which it were levied?

But hearken once more to this prophetic scribe. "If the objectionable provisions which the Bill contains be once established, the people need not expect the present majority, nor any other majority to amend them." Do the antecedents of "the present majority" bear thee out in that presumptuous prediction, O sage seer of New London? Have they never condescended to amend any defective Bill? And, alas! art thou sure that no "other majority" will amend none either? Then what comfort could the return of a Tory majority afford thee? O seer, what a dull, unprogressive future dost thou predict for us! Art thou sure, sage diviner, that it was no false oracle which inspired thee to predict that "we shall yet have to pay £50 taxation for every 100 acres of land?" Admitting that we shall, we too venture to predict that it will yield us at least 100 per cent. in the form of local improvements. But O short-sighted seer! thou constrainest us to lose faith in thy predictions when we find thy vision so much misfitted between this and Canada, that the five Councillors who compose the Council of each Township appear to thee amalgamated into three, and the two and three Townships which compose some Municipalities, seem to thy failing vision only one. Instances: Townships of Longueil and Alfred—1 Municipality; Clarence, Cumberland and Russel, in the County of Russel—1 do., and many more such instances might be given, where Townships are but sparsely inhabited. Again, O seer! thine oracle deceiveth thee in persuading thee that each County Council is composed of twelve Councillors, whereas some are composed of more and some of fewer than that number, in proportion to the number of Township Councils in each County, the Reeves or Chairmen of which compose the County Councils. Instances: In the United Municipality of Glengarry, Dundas and Stormont, twelve Councillors; but in the adjoining one of Prescott and Russel only eight. Here thou mayest observe, if thy failing vision still enables thee to see so far, that instead of each County in Canada having a Council of twelve, in many instances two or three Counties are united to form one Municipality. Again thine oracle hath misled thee when it "led thee to understand that the County Councils are elected by the Township Councils from among themselves," whereas the Reeves or Chairmen of the several Township Councils in a County *ex officio* constitute the County Councils, thus precluding all necessity of being elected.

It is true that "sometimes only a part of the money raised in a Township is appropriated to its use;" but in that case it is the interest of that Township to allow the greatest part of the money to be appropriated in an adjoining Township; as when a new road traversing two or more adjoining Townships

is to be opened by the joint funds of such Townships, requiring more money to complete it in one Township than another, or when a costly bridge, Court House or Town Hall is to be built, to accommodate the Municipality generally; then, of course, the most of the money must be appropriated where the labor is performed.

We agree that "the size of the Municipalities should be an objection—that they should be reduced to no more than a single Township," except in the case of Townships that are thinly inhabited. But in the event of such small Municipalities being established, in our opinion there should be also County Councils established, to review, revise, receive appeals, and confer about general improvements.

We further agree that authorizing "the Governor and Council to dissolve any Council when elected," is virtually to take the Municipal elections out of the hands of the people and throw them into those of the Government. This appears to us in the light of a glaring mockery of self-government.

Should this article appear in print, I intend in my next point out some of the benefits that may accrue from Municipal Institutions.

Bedeque, September 14, 1857.

THE PROTECTOR vs. SYNTAX.

"No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you." Job. "Orthodox! orthodox! who believe in John Knox, Let me sound an alarm to your conscience, There's a heretic blast has been blown in the west, That what is no sense must be nonsense."—BURNS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—In my present letter I purpose to administer the ex-tigation, which I announced in my last, to the literary charlatans who conduct the editorial department of the *Protector*, and to expose their inability to write sensibly or grammatically. The public must bear in mind that it is not the immediate writer of each article alone who is to be held responsible for all the ridiculous nonsense and bad grammar which may from time to time appear in the columns of the *Protector*, but also the whole editorial committee, whose duty it is to supervise each article before it is published. No doubt it will be considered grossly presumptuous for a layman, who obtained all his knowledge of English grammar and general literature by reading to the light of a pitch-pine torch by his father's fire-side, to find fault with the composition of college-trained gentlemen, who

"can speak Greek As naturally as pigs squeak."

An ignorant old fogey of the clergy told myself in discussion, a few days ago, that he considered it the height of presumption in me to think I could criticise the productions of men who were good classical scholars—that they were not to be considered subject to our common rules of grammar, &c. Strange, indeed, if a knowledge of classics can become a substitute for common sense and correct writing! The readers of the *Protector* will remember that when I charged the reverend editors with incompetency, they never once denied the truth of my assertion, but rather acknowledged it by giving their motive for writing bad grammar, viz: that it "enraged the enemy of all good," and "did injury to his kingdom." Well, if his sable majesty is possessed of very delicate synthetical sensibilities, they must indeed suffer inconceivable torture every time the *Protector* is issued. But if we are to believe one of the most distinguished of Protestant writers, Satan has his time of rejoicing also, for he says that "such are the disgraceful contentions" amongst the clergy of the church to which he belonged, that "no doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year about the time of the meeting of the general assembly." Satan will have his day of rejoicing shortly.

I shall take, as the subject of my present critique, an article which appeared in the *Protector* a few weeks ago, on "Improvement," not because it contains a greater number of absurdities than many others which I have seen in the same paper, but because it is the only one that I have at hand just now. It is a rather lengthy article, and yet I do not believe that it contains a single sentence of correct English. Let us look at the very first sentence: "To how many things does this refer, and of how many things does it refer to?" Is it not an absolute nonsense. The last part of the sentence is so obscure and so much lower than ordinary incorrect writing, that no rule in syntax can be applied to it. The second sentence is too long to be inserted whole, as it would occupy nearly half a column of the paper, and contains so much "practical" nonsense, that any school-boy who, after a few months' practice in English composition, would write such intolerable trash, richly deserved to have his ears boxed. In enumerating all things that needed improvement, the writer begins with the human mind, and apparently struggling beneath the burden of his "thick-come brains," by a sublime and beautiful climax which none but college-trained gentlemen can fully appreciate, without halting even to take breath, he progresses upward, upward, upward, till he arrives at—the lighting and sweeping of streets. He begins by suggesting improvement to the chief Artificer in nature's workshop—to the Almighty. He says that improvement is needed "in the formation and growth of the human mind." The inhabitants in portions of Lots 22, 23 and 67 have cause to regret that the *Protectors* had not existed before their part of the country was created, then it would not have been so stony and hilly. Judging from the mental calibre of some of the reverend gentlemen themselves, we would be led to conclude that

"Nature's journeyman had made These bunglers when their mistress left off trade."

The only loop-hole that is left for the rev. committee to escape a charge of blasphemy, is to plead extreme ignorance; it is to be hoped they will do so, to save at least their character for piety. The writer states that improvement is needed "in the strengthening of man's social habits." His habits are to be strengthened whether they have a tendency to good or evil. If he is virtuously inclined, let him improve till he become as sanctified as—as—the *Protector*. On the other hand, if he has a proclivity to cheating or pilfering, let him become a bold rogue or thief at once; if he is a tippler, let him become a confirmed, degraded drunkard; if he is somewhat loose in his ideas of the moral relations of the sexes, let him become a thorough libertine! Well done ye pious *Protectors* of public morals! You are likely to be the originators of a system of moral philosophy so well suited to the popular taste, that Paley and all former writers on the subject will shortly be entombed amid the vast and cumbersome tones of theological literature which the modern improvements in Christianity have rendered unreadable, there to lie "unwept, unhonoured and unused." "In all these things," continues the writer, "and much more," (i.e., much more things), "there is need as well as room for improvement." "Need for improvement" hardly suits my taste. "The Creator has placed us here below that we might advance from one stage of moral excellence to another, and that we might progress from step to step and improve," &c. More outrageous tautology I never saw. What is "advancing from one stage to another," but "progressing from step to step," and what is "progressing from step to step" but "improving?" Passing over about a score of grammatical blunders (indeed we have ceased to expect good grammar from the *Protector*), we come to the following: "Go where we will, we will find other places in a variety of particulars going ahead of us." Could any more appropriate word than "particulars" be placed here, and how classic the expression "going ahead of us?" "Are we then," he asks, "forever to stand still in the onward march of improvement; forever to go on in the same jog-trot that our fathers were satisfied with; forever to be behind our neighbours; forever to keep back the Island." (Where does it want to go?) "and give it not full and unfettered scope" (i.e., plenty of sea-room) "for the exercise of its numberless resources, either through our indifference of a better state of things, or because of our petty squabbles among ourselves?" I doubt whether ever any writer succeeded so well before in compressing so much nonsense into such a small compass. Overlooking, again, about half a dozen grammatical inaccuracies in the above sentence, and looking only to the sense of it, I would, with all deference to the college-training of the writer, and a consciousness of my own comparative ignorance, ask him—How can we stand still and at the same time go on in a jog-trot? Perhaps he can explain it on some mathematical hypothesis of which I am ignorant. Where can our squabbles be but among ourselves? In the meantime I fully concur in the opinion that if this Island desires to move out of this stormy Gulf of St. Lawrence, it is very wrong, say tyrannical, to keep it back! "If we pass