The Examiner.

on the score of interest to be paid on Government securities, for, without any law to warrant their proceedings, they gave 10 per cent to a Halifax merchant to cash debentures. The Government were accountable to the House for their action with the Bank

Mr. COOPER—No doubt Warrants had been subjected to heavy rates of discount, which operated very injuriously to those whose necessities compelled them to submit to the deductions, but now that a recognized arrangement was to be entered into between the Bank and the Government, it was but fair that the Bill should specify not only the rate of interest, but also the length of time necessary to entitle a deposit to bear interest, otherwise it might be that all the interest payable might not be more than sufficient to pay for the trouble of receiving and paying out the moneys.

The Bill was then read a second time and committed—Mr. Owen in the Chair.

Hon Mr. COLES repeated his objection that the Bill did not specify the rate of interest. It was due to the House that full particulars of the contemplated arrangement should be given. The Hon. Col. Gray had eulogized the liberality and courtesy of the Bank Directory; but that was an institution for the lending of money, and he supposed that it would always act courteously to private individuals as well as to officials who might have occasion to confer with them on business. He himself had always experienced cuorteous treatment at their hands. He was satisfied with the arrangement, but did not consider that the Bank had paid a very great compliment to the Government by entering into it. The Government asked £10,000. No doubt it was required; and the Bank would, by charging 6 per cent until it was repaid, do better than they would by advancing small loans to individuals, for it may be outstanding six or twelve months. The Liberals had made a better bargain when they circulated Debentures bearing only 5 per cent interest. As to the argument of greater confidence in the prdsen Government, urged by the hon member, Mr. Beer, there was not much foundation for his opinion, for he should recollect that during the time to which reference had been made, the Bank, so far from being in a position to make advances, had applied to the then Government for an extension of the time limited for the suspension of specie payments. The Bank was now in a be ter pos t on. The country had been favoured with good crops, trade was reviving, and greater confidence was felt in the stability of business of all kinds. If the late Government had applied to a gentleman from Halifax to purchase warrants, it should be remembered that such application was intended to enable the Road Correspondent to carry on the business of his department. At that time the road vote was £11,000, far more than thrice the amount of last year for the same purpose; so there was a greater necessity for the course of the late Government.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH—The arrangement would cause no gain to the Bank, which can, at present, invest all their available means at 7½ per cent, and can find ample employment for it at that rate. Interest would not be charged as on a loan, but on the balance of the account. It was not a permanent Act. It could be revised next year, when the operation of it could be carefully scrutinized. Where a loan was contracted for a number of years it would be necessary that the terms between both parties should be specified; but the object of the Bill was only to authorize the opening of an account which would enable the public creditor to get the money which he had earned. It was provided that the transactions under the Bill should be submitted and reviewed by the House next year. A Bill similar in its object to the one before the committee worked well in Nova Scotia, but that Bill did afford equal security to the public creditor with the present, which gives him a prior claim on the Bank whose demands on the Government would not ensue till the warrants had been paid.

Hon. Mr. POPE was glad to see that the Bank had come into the arrangement. A short time ago warrants were at a discount of 10, 15 or 20 per cent discount. As to the £11,000 road money voted by the last Government in the year when the hon. leader of the opposition gave ten per cent to the gentleman from Halifax, if that was the rate of discount on the whole amount the public must have lost eleven hundred pounds. Such a sum would have paid a good many teachers. When the Government changed hands, warrants were at a discount; now they were at par, and was this the time to object to the poor hard-working men employed on the roads and bridges; and in the public getting the full amount of their earnings? Every public creditor should get what he had earned, and the recent condition of the public credit under the late Government was so disgraceful that he hoped never to see it in such state again.

The Bill was then agreed to without amendment.

WM. M. HOWE, Reporter.

ELECTION BILL.

SATURDAY, March 3.

The order of the day for the second reading of the Bill having been read,—

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND, in moving that the House go into the order of the day, said—I may state, that the object of the Bill is simply to protect the privilege of electors. The law, as it now stands, is not sufficiently explicit, the consequence of which is, that parties who have no right to vote are frequently allowed to come forward and exercise the privilege, to the injustice of those who possess the requisite qualification. At the last general election much trouble arose out of this obscurity in certain parts of the Act. This Bill, in particular, defines much more clearly the qualification of electors voting under the elective franchise clause. If called upon by the returning officer, or any candidate or his representative, they are required to produce a certificate from the road overseer, in whose precinct they may have performed statute labor, or paid commutation money, testifying to that effect, which, provided they are of age, shall be considered sufficient evidence of their right to vote. Several forms of oaths have also been annexed to the Bill. In the present law there is only one form given, consequently, the returning officer has to use a sort of sliding oath for the different kinds of electors; hence, if any dispute should arise, the person taking such an oath could not be found guilty of perjury. Another clause in the Bill has been introduced, on account of a remarkable case that lately occurred in Britain, which gave rise to an alteration in the election law *there*, and also in Canada, from which latter this clause is copied. The case was that of a returned member, whose election was contested, having accepted an office, and thus rendered another election necessary, when it became a question whether the election could be proceeded with. The clause provides, that if a scrutiny be demanded by an unsuccessful candidate, and while the question is still pending, the person, whose election is contested, shall accept an office, or his seat be otherwise declared vacant, and another election be held, this subsequent election shall not in any manner affect the person who demanded the scrutiny; but, if the committee appointed to investigate the case report in his favor, he shall take his seat as though no subsequent election had taken place.

Hon. Mr. COLES,—There may be some necessity for amending the Election Law, but as regards the clause mentioned by the hon. member, I do not see it is of much importance. The person who protests cannot prevent the other from again running his election. Sometimes scrutinies are demanded on very frivolous pretexts, and a protest may be entered merely to prevent a member from taking office I admit that an alteration in the oath may be required, as it is not very explicit. But the main feature of the Bill is one respecting which the House should be very cautious. The intention of the present law is to confer universal suffrage, but this Bill throws an encumberance in the way, by saying that a certificate must be produced that statute labor has been performed or commutation money paid. A refractory overseer, at the time of an election, might refuse to give the certificates. I think the law in this particular is well enough, for a person cannot vote unless he has been 12 months in the district; besides, it is a great inconvenience for a man to be compelled to produce a receipt. He would almost require to have it framed in order to prevent it from being lost. There need not be any partisanship displayed in reference to this provision, because it will affect both parties alike. I have no objection to amend the law; it should be as explicit as possible.

Mr. McAULAY.—I am glad to hear that the hon. member has no objection that the law be amended. It is quite necessary, I consider, that electors should have certificates, because it will prevent them from voting in different places. The Bill, it is evident, has not been introduced for party purposes, for it will, as has been said, affect both parties alike. As I believe it will prove a general benefit, it shall have my support.

Mr. COOPER—I understand that the Statute Labor Act is to be amended this Session; if so, a clause may be introduced into it to meet the requirement of this Bill, otherwise it will be impossible to carry it into effect, for overseers at present are not bound to furnish certificates. However, though this provision be made, I am of opinion that the method proposed will be very cumbersome, and will thus cripple the free exercise of the elective privilege.

Mr. CONROY.—I am opposed to that part of the Bill which relates to road certificates, as that service is very irregularly attended to. The overseers are generally careless, and some of them unable to write, yet this Bill contemplates placing the franchise in their hands. An overseer, when asked for a certificate, might put the person off, by saying there would be no election this year, and still one might occur; in what position would the elective franchise then be I think this provision will deprive one-third of the electors of their votes.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—The Bill is not a party measure, but one calculated to benefit electors of every shade of opinion. It is well known that persons have frequently come forward and exercised the elective privilege, who did not possess the requisite qualification; and that others have sometimes voted at two or three different polling divisions. The object of the Bill is to guard the interests of the people—to prevent designing men from imposing on the rights of honest and independent electors; and I would like to ask hon. members on the other side of the House, if this object can be better attained in any other manner than by the method proposed! It is not intended to cramp the elective privilege, but to give those who have a right to vote a well-defined qualification. The form of oath in the present act, as has been said, is very imperfect, the returning officer having to supply words to make it suit the different classes of voters; in which case it is difficult to prove perjury, because the precise words employed cannot be recollected. The hon. members, Mr. Coles and Mr. Conroy, object to the Bill, on the ground that it will place the franchise in the power of road overseers. But a Bill to amend the Road Act, which is now in the hands of the Law Clerk, makes provision for this, by requiring the overseers, under stringent regulations, to furnish certificates; and if some few cannot write—though I am not aware that the commissioners are in the habit of appointing such—they may have them written in their presence. Another object of the bill is to divide the main clause of the Act, in which the several qualifications are jumbled up together, into three or four sections; thus one will define the property qualifications of electors for the towns, and another of those for country districts, and another the qualification of those voting under the universal suffrage provision.

Hon. Mr. Haviland's motion was then agreed to, and the Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House,—Mr. J. Yeo in the chair.

On the first clause being read, which specifies the sections of the Act to be repealed,—

Hon. Mr. COLES said, he wished to ask the introducer of the Bill why the 80th section was included among the number!

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—The reason for repealing this section is, that as it provides that any member of this House who holds an office, may resign it and accept another, without vacating his seat, it concedes too much. As the law at present stands, an hon. member who holds an office, though only that of Road Commissioner, may be appointed to one of the highest offices in the Colony, without being under the necessity of vacating his seat.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—The principle involved in this clause may extend too far. It was copied from the Nova Scotia Act, and was intended to provide that a member might exchange one departmental office for another, without going back to his constituents. If this section is to be repealed, another of the same nature should be substituted in its place.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—The principle should not be carried further than that one departmental office may be exchanged for another.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—We must ignore the principle altogether, as it is opposed to the system of government now established in the Colony.

Hon. Mr. Coles then moved that so much of the clause as referred to the 80th section of the act be struck out, which was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS —Hon. Messrs. Coles, Wightman, Kelly, Whelan; Messrs. Knight, Sutherland, Sinclair.—7.

NAYS —Hons. Speaker, Pope, Col. Gray, Longworth, Haviland, Laird; Messrs. Ramsay, Montgomery, Beer, Howat, Holm, Davies, Owen.—13.

The clause which specifies the property qualification of the electors of Towns and Royalties was then read.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—As we are informed that the Bill is not a party measure, I hope I may be allowed to suggest an amendment to this clause, which I consider objectionable, because it confers the privilege of voting upon every owner of a town lot irrespective of its value. It is certainly unjust that persons who hold town lots of no value should have a right to vote; some protection ought to be afforded to resident electors. The clause confers upon certain individuals the privilege of buying up land to divide among their friends to give them votes. In the country districts a person cannot vote on property of less than the yearly value of 40s.; why then should not the same rule be extended to the owners of town lots and common lots. If the clause were thus amended it would require these lots to be improved, before they could be held as a qualification to vote.

The hon. the SPEAKER—The hon. member who has just sat down might almost as well have moved to disfranchise Princetown altogether. The people there have in a great measure been deprived of the privileges which were intended to be granted them when the place was laid off for a town. Had the Jail and Court House been built at Princetown, it would no doubt have been in a more flourishing condition. The electors of that place are compelled to pay as heavy taxes as the owners of lots in Charlottetown and Georgetown, still they possess no greater privilege as regards public grants than the people residing in country districts; certainly then it would be unfair to deprive them of the right to vote though the land held in some cases may not at present be of the yearly value of 40s.

Hon. Col. GRAY—Did I understand the hon. member opposite, for Princetown, to say that there are town lots in that place of no value?

Mr. SINCLAIR—Yes, or at most worth only 1s 6d. or 2s. The hon. the Speaker has stated that I desire to deprive the people of Princetown of their privileges; but the amendment which I have suggested would have quite an opposite effect It would secure their privileges by preventing others from coming in to interfere with their rights. But if the clause were amended as I desire, Princetown would *not* be the only place benefited, for I suppose there are likewise lots in Georgetown of little or no value. I contend that it is unfair to allow persons to come from other districts to vote in Princetown on land which is only worth a few shillings.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH—I am surprised to hear an hon. member advocating the disfranchisement of his constituents. Does he mean to say that a privilege which has been a long time conceded, should be no longer exercised? His object is very apparent, it is to uphold his own interests which are probably in danger. To adopt the amendment which he has suggested would be a species of class legislation, and its result would be to prevent people from purchasing property in Princetown. The hon. member should have stood up and advocated the very contrary to what he has proposed.

Hon. Mr. COLES—I think quite the reverse. The hon. member for Princetown does not desire to disfranchise a single elector; but only to see the property improved. The very object in granting these town lots was that houses might be built on them; and if those who hold the land were thus to improve their property, they would still retain the right to vote though the amendment suggested be agreed to. Until the last few years the lots of Princetown were considered of no value, when they began to be bought up for the purpose of obtaining the privilege of voting. In any other district non-residents are not allowed to vote unless they possess property in it worth 40s a year; and this is the provision that the hon. member wishes to have extended to Princetown. He deserves credit for proposing the amendment, as his desire is to improve the place. I suppose, however, if he gains his object, I will lose my own franchise there, but if I consider it of any value, I will probably improve the property. But I believe there is a *feeling rising up in Princetown* against the Government because that County is not represented in the Legislative Council; and I dare say they will make themselves heard. If only a few men were to turn there, it would change an election.

Mr. MACAULAY—The last speaker seems to have a peculiar sympathy for the hon. member from Princetown. He has been endeavoring to help him out of a difficulty, but I dare say if he (Mr. Sinclair) were opposed to him, he would be allowed to struggle for himself. The argument of the hon. member for Princetown is rather *novel*. He appears to think that a person who has property of no value, and yet has to pay taxes on it, should not be allowed to vote, while we know that those who hold no property at all are permitted to exercise this privilege. The hon. member made some allusion to Georgetown the place which I have the honor to represent, but I can assure him that no valueless property is to be found there.

Hon. Mr. POPE—Last year, in this House, I hinted that the hon. member Mr. Sinclair would sometime attempt to disfranchise Princetown, and it appears my words are coming true, for certainly he has made an effort of this kind. Probably some day I will lend him my assistance to disfranchise it, and give the privilege to Sommerside and St. Eleanor's. I believe there is not a lot in Princetown worth 40s. a year, excepting perhaps one owned by Mr. McNutt, who occasionally resides there. A number of the lots is bog land, of little or no value.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—Is your own property there bog land.

Hon. Mr. POPE—No, the land which I hold there is good; it is not bogs. To amend the clause as proposed by Mr. Sinclair, would in my opinion cause a great deal of false swearing respecting the value of property, consequently I think it will be better to leave it as it is for the present; besides, I do not consider it would be proper to deprive the electors of Princetown of their franchise, while they are compelled to pay heavy taxes I am glad to hear that the late Colonial Secretary is taking such an interest in the people of Prince County; but I can assure him he now possesses very little influence in that part of the country.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—The hon. member who has just sat down, should exercise a little modesty, since he has not yet carried off very many laurels. He has been equivocating with respect to the value of lots in Princetown.

Hon. Col. GRAY—I rise to order, the hon. member has employed insulting language.

Here considerable altercation ensued.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN proceeded.—The hon. member Mr. Pope, stated that the land which he himself holds in Princetown is good and not bogs, and that the only property there of any value is that owned by Mr. McNutt. Such language appears to me to be something like equivocating. For my own part I have always thought it improper that persons who happen to own propertyin Princetown, worth perhaps only a few shillings, should enjoy the same privilege as others. I myself secured one of these town lots for the trifling sum of 18s., and can now vote there on land which I never saw, and never wish to see.

The Hon. the SPEAKER—It is astonishing to hear the opinions which several hon. members seem to entertain. They once maintained that every person who pays taxes should have the right to vote; but now they say that those who hold property in Princetown, though they have to pay taxes—heavy taxes—ought to be denied this privilege. Some who have spoken appear to think that place will never become a town, but I am of a different opinion. It possesses one of the finest harbors in the Island, which is also convenient to the best fishing ground on our coasts. This harbor is much resorted to by American fishermen; and I think it highly probable that at no distant day there will be a town where it was originally intended one should be built. Only last summer, I understand, some Americans were examining land there, with the view of making a purchase for building purposes.

Progress was reported, and the House adjourned.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.

THURSDAY, March 22.

On motion of Mr. McAulay, it was resolved that there be a call of the House on Monday next, to take into consideration the several petitions lying on the table.

Mr. Beer, from the Special Committee appointed to examine the petition of John Shannon, reported, that as it referred to matters of a local and private nature, its prayer could not be entertained by the House. The report was received.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Coles, a call of the House was ordered for Tuesday next, on the Despatches relative to the appointment of a Land Commission.

Hon. Mr. Longworth presented a Bill to alter the Statute Labor Act, which was read a first time. It provides that keeping the Main Post Roads in a state of repair shall be let by contract for a certain number of years, and contemplates the reduction of Commutation Money for a single person from 4s. to 3s. a year. It also requires overseers to furnish certificates to those who may commute or perform their statute labor, in order to meet a provision in the new Election Bill respecting the qualifications of persons voting under the elective franchise.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Mr. Beer moved the House into Committee on the Memorial of the Mayor and Common Council, and the petition of divers inhabitants of Charlottetown, on the subject of the proposed new Market House.

The Memorial asked a grant for purchase of a site for the Market House; whilst the petition prayed that the House would not sanction its erection elsewhere than on Queen Square, and that a Bill might pass authorising the transfer to the city of a site on the west side of the Square. After a very long discussion, Hon. Mr. Pope moved a resolution, adopting the prayer of the petition. To this Mr. Perry moved an amendment, that the Speaker take the chair. The amendment was lost, and Mr. Pope's carried to the House, when, the question being put, Hon. Mr. Haviland moved that the report be received this day 3 months.—Lost.

Yeas—Messrs. Haviland, Gray, Coles, Whelan, Thornton, M'Aulay, Kelly, McNeill, Longworth, John Yeo, and Perry—11.

Nays—Messrs. Yeo, Douse, Beer, Ramsay, Laird, Pope, Cooper, Holm, Howat, Sinclair, Doyle, Conroy, Owen, Sutherland, Montgomery—15.

Mr. Pope's resolution was carried by the same division —the relative position of the above names being changed.

FRIDAY, March 23.

On motion of Mr. Beer, a Committee was appointed to bring in a Bill in accordance with the resolution passed yesterday in reference to the site of a new Market House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Haviland, it was resolved that the House to-morrow do go into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. Beer moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill to amend the Act relating to the City of Charlottetown. It contemplated to extend the power of the Mayor's Court to try for debts contracted in the City by persons residing in the Country; and also to try cases of slander. After some discussion in regard to the Bill, the principle of which was objected to by country members generally, Hon. Mr. Perry moved in amendment that it be committed this day three months. Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Haviland laid on the table the Estimates for 1860.

The Bill to amend the Land Purchase Act was read a third time and passed, Mr. Cooper only voting against it; also the Bill to amend the Act relating to Township Boundary Lines.

Hon. Mr. Longworth having moved that the time for receiving petitions be extended, presented one from Robert Mooney, praying for the sum of £10, taken from his salary as Register of Deeds on account of unfinished work in that office at the time of his resignation.—Read and laid on the table.

The Bill to protect the rights of married women was read a third time and passed.

SATURDAY, March 24.

Mr. Sinclair presented a petition from inhabitants of Lot 18, praying the enactment of a Bankrupt Law.

Hon. Mr. Haviland laid on the table the vouchers for the past year—referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Hon. Col. Gray presented to the House a document which had been laid before the Executive Council by the Postmaster General, recommending an increase of salary to the second Assistant in the Post Office at Charlottetown, and to the Postmaster at Cascumpec, Tignish, and Souris.

Then House then resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, Mr. McNeill in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Haviland moved that £5,000 be granted for the Road service, including special grants; £500 for contingencies, and £100 for new roads. The discussion on this motion occupied the remainder of the forenoon.

MONDAY, March 26.

Call of the House—absent, Hon. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Knight. Mr. Kelly afterwards coming in, his apology was accepted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Thornton the order of the day for the consideration of petitions was taken up.

The petition of inhabitants of Lots 34 and 35, praying a grant for an additional block to wharf at Apple Tree Farm, was referred to the members of the District.

The petition from Cascumpec praying a grant for the extension of the Elective Telegraph to that part of the Island, was then taken up. After considerable discussion it was referred to a Special Committee to report next session, generally, on telegraphic communication throughout the Island.

An amendment of the Legislative Council to the Salmon Fishery Bill was then agreed to, viz.: that the penalty for violating the law instead of being £5, be not greater than £5 nor less than £1.

Hon. Col. Gray, by command, presented a Despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reference to Australia.

D. LAIRD, Reporter.

Correspondence.

THE *ISLANDER* ON CATHOLIC PROSCRIPTION.

"*Come, let us wisely oppress them, lest they multiply.*"—*Exodus.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—The editor of the *Islander* indignantly asks:—"Does he (LECTOR) imagine that we are silly enough to use *nicknames* when speaking of those who profess a faith which has existed for eighteen centuries—which is held by hundreds of millions of the human family, including the larger portion of the inhabitants of civilized Europe—which was the religion of *Erasmus, St. Vincent de Paul* and of *Bossuet*, and which is now the religion of the fearless, independent and liberty-loving *Montalembert?*" Notwithstanding his indignation and his knowledge of the antiquity of Catholicity, the fact that "offensive epithets" or *nicknames* appeared in the *Islander*, remains incontrovertible; but enough has already been written on this point. I certainly did think that the reputed editor of the *Islander* possessed a good deal of knowledge respecting the Catholic religion; but this knowledge renders him more inexcusable for the very disreputable part which he has recently taken against Catholics. If it were some ignorant bigot who was "silly" enough to believe that Catholics were really plotting and scheming for the ascendancy, in order to deprive Protestants of their rights, subject the Island to the Pope, and all that sort of nonsense—if it were such a person, I say, who betook himself to "sound the alarm," he would not be so much to blame, although he would richly deserve our pity and contempt. But when a person who knows that Catholicity is "the religion of those who are illustrious for their rank, their christian virtues and their noble independence," departs so far from the path of independence and impartiality as to descend nearly to the level of a Titus Oates, in order to "sound the alarm," and who, for the purpose of subserving some selfish or political end, panders to the prejudice of ignorant bigots for whom, in all probability, he entertains a sovereign contempt—when a person does this, I confess that words fail to describe the manner in which he should be regarded by every "fearless, independent and liberty-loving" British subject.

The *Islander* says: "LECTOR well knows that there is not a country in the universe more free than this Island." Yes, we are free *to aim at the acquisition of power*, but it would appear that we are not free to *possess power*. It would appear according to the *Islander* that our rights and privileges are—to use the shrewd remarks of a friend—"good in theory but not in practice, and were made for show and not for use." We make use of our privileges to elect Protestant members to support the Government, and then when we complain of injustice, our representations are treated with disdain, and we are coolly told that we should have elected Catholics to support the Government, that the majority of Catholics is adverse to the ruling party, and that the "alarm" must be sounded that we are increasing. We know that sounding the "alarm" at the increase of people, is nothing new in the history of persecution. More than three thousand years ago Pharao, King of Egypt, finding that the Israelites were increasing, appears to have said to himself: "It behoves us to sound the alarm in time;" for we read the following in the Bible: "In the meantime there arose a new King over Egypt, that knew not Joseph: And he said to his people: Behold, the people of the children of Israel are numerous and stronger than we. Come, let us wisely oppress them lest they multiply, and if any war shall rise against us, join with our enemies, and having overcome us, depart out of the land. Therefore he set over them masters of the works, to afflict them with burdens." *Exodus* 1st chap. It is unnecessary to say that there is a very striking resemblance between the policy of the tyrant Pharao and that which the *Islander* recommends to some of his supporters. We are told by the apologist of proscription that we are free, but incontrovertible facts are of more avail than mere sophistry.

I will now content myself by noting a single instance of the flagrant injustice with which Catholics are treated. The Board of Education is composed of seven members—*no fewer than six of whom are Protestants:* and of these six, *four are Ministers!* viz. Revds. D. Fitzgerald, S. Patterson, T. Duncan and G. Sutherland, several of whom have made themselves notorious by their envenomed hatred of every thing Catholic. The teacher of the Normal School is a Protestant, so also is the Inspector of Public Schools. Now all this is a "grievance" which is *not* "consistent with the morality of the Bible," and is undoubtedly "opposed to the principles of justice and honesty." There is nothing of more paramount importance to our rising generation than the manner in which they are educated,—for on this may depend, in a great measure, their temporal and eternal happiness. Catholics pay a large amount towards the funds appropriated for Education—they take a deep interest in the manner in which their children may be educated; and they have an indubitable right to be duly represented at the Board of Education. If the Executive were not lost to all sense of decency, impartiality and justice, that Board would not be constituted as it now is; and the fact would not be apparent to the world—a fact which will bring well-merited odium and reproach on the Government—that they have placed under the absolute control of the bitterest enemies of our faith an Institution which exercises a very great influence in our system of education. If there were three or four Catholic Priests members of the Board of Education, what a Titus Oates cry of *Papal aggression* would be raised "by demagogues and mob-orators" throughout the length and breadth of the land! If Catholics numbered 39,000, and Protestants 32,000, would the latter be satisfied to be represented at the Board of Education by *one layman* when the former would be represented thereat by *four clergymen* and *two laymen*? I opine not. Well, will our holy Bible readers endeavour to put in practice the word of God, and *do unto others as they themselves would wish others to do unto them?*

We are aware that the *Islander* was not the first journal to stir up religious prejudice on the Island. On the contrary, that paper maintained a noble independence when the *Protector*, of infamous memory, was grossly attacking Catholics, stirring up sectarian hate and sowing the seeds of puritanical despotism in this Colony. The then editor of the *Islander* was not pandering to the worst of passions, nor was he sounding the "alarm" against Catholics. The *Islander* shortly before the death of its late editor said: "He incurs a fearful responsibility who induces an elector to abuse his privilege for alleged reasons, having no foundation in fact. To introduce religious, or rather sectarian, squabbles into the management of our temporal affairs, is to produce discord among the electors, instead of that unanimity upon which the improvement of the Colony depends." In order to give an instance of the noble, disinterested, independent and spirited manner in which Mr. McLean was accustomed to treat the bigots to whom the present editor has been for some time "truckling," I subjoin an extract taken from the *Islander* of the 6th of August, 1858, which is well worthy of perusal:—

"We are obliged to the *Examiner* for the following 'elegant extract,' quoted from the P. E. Island correspondent of the *Witness:*—

'The *Islander* is a most injurious and unprincipled journal. *Its politics may not be bad*, but its tone with regard to things religious is absolutely dangerous. It also truckles to Popery, and aims at bringing about a coalition between the Papists and Conservatives of P. E. Island, such as now disgraces Nova Scotia.'

"We do not know who the correspondent of the *Witness* is; but whoever he is, he has not the common sense to see that he is blasting his own character if he have one, by slanderous assertions regarding this journal, which its every reader knows to be absolutely false. But the stupidity of the paragraph is not less remarkable than its falsity. How can our politics be good and at the same time disgraceful? With regard to our religious "tone," we are not aware that we have done more than defend the Bible, and successfully, too, against the undisguised infidel attacks of the editors of the *Protector*. If the correspondent of the *Witness* be one of those editors, and modestly reckon *himself* amongst "things religious," we are proud to believe that our "tone" has been "absolutely dangerous" to his cloven foot. If "truckling to Popery" consist in permitting every man to worship God according to his conscience, without detriment to his civil and political rights, firstly, from the immutable principles of everlasting justice; and secondly, from the expediency of promoting christian charity, good will and friendship with our Catholic fellow citizens, then are we "truckling to Popery," but in no other sense. The truth is, the real fault of the correspondent of the *Witness* with us is that we do not "truckle" to the policy of the Rev. Editors and Correspondents of the *Protector*, some of whose writings, we are sorry to say, savour much more of the worst class of Spanish Inquisitors in the dark ages, than of Protestant Ministers in the middle of the nineteenth century."

About the time that the above was written the *Islander* possessed great influence, and was respected by friends and foes; but alas! how much has its character since fallen in more than one sense in the estimation of the public! Mr. McLean endeavoured to promote "christian charity, good will and friendship" with Catholics; the present editor prefers "to sound the alarm." The conduct of the former was "consistent with the morality of the Bible;" that of the latter may be characterized—to use the expression of Montalembert when speaking of the part taken by England in the crusade against the Pope—as *ignoble*.

I now come to the *Islander's* "much ado about nothing." I mean his "homily" on the Land Question, in which I am very unfairly misrepresented, and in which the editor appears to be intent upon misleading and deceiving the reader, and bringing odium on LECTOR for his alleged assertions and inconsistency. Such conduct, however, although it may be varnished over by a display of his knowledge of the Land Question, is not calculated to win credit with the discerning reader; and if there is anything in the dispute between us "opposite to the principles of justice and honesty," an intelligent and impartial public will know to whom it is to be ascribed.

In my communication published in the *Examiner* of the 20th inst., deprecating the differences at present existing between Catholics and Protestants, I recommended them to act towards one another with a spirit of tolerance, charity and mutual forbearance; and calling the attention of the latter to the fact that the inhabitants of this Colony were divided into two classes—the tenantry and the proprietors, or their agents—I intimated the propriety of tenants uniting in order that they might the better be enabled to have redressed by lawful and just means, the grievances under which they may labor. It appears that my remarks have "called forth the ire" of the editor of the *Islander*. I am not much surprised thereat, seeing that it has been, for some time, his apparent policy to keep the people disunited by his endeavours to prejudice Protestants against Catholics; and certainly his conduct in misrepresenting what I said will not tend much to remove this imputation.

When I recommended unity amongst the tenantry, it was not my intention to incite them to commit acts against the law in any way, or to avoid their contracts with their landlords, or to unjustly deprive them of their lands, or to redress their grievances "themselves;" but my intention was rather to induce them to endeavour to get the Land Question settled by constitutional, just and equitable means, and to lay aside the spirit of religious animosity and hate. Saying that the unsettled state of the Land Question is the principal grievance under which the tenantry labour, does not necessarily imply that *the exaction of the rent constitutes the grievance*. I think that there are very few people on the Island who would not say with me, that the *unsettled state* of the Land Question *is* a grievance. If that question were *settled*, people would be more contented, and would apply themselves more to the improvement of their farms,—and those who would, in justice, be bound to pay rent would do so more willingly than they do at present; and they would know to whom to pay it. If this question were finally settled I presume that it would not be necessary for some of the tenantry, after occupying their farms for twenty, thirty or perhaps forty years, and paying their rent, to get new "two guinea leases"—which of itself looks something like a grievance. If the *unsettled state* of the Land Question were not a grievance, I presume that it would have been unnecessary for the majority of the present House of Assembly to petition Her Gracious Majesty to appoint a Commission to *settle* the question; and if the tenantry were not expecting something or other from this much talked of Commission, I dare say that we would not be told that the petition or address, praying for its appointment, was "graciously received."

The passage in my letter which has given such offence runs thus:—"But it is to be hoped that the great majority of the Protestant tenantry will very soon understand the propriety of uniting with their Catholic fellow-colonists in order to have all their grievances redressed." Now, let the reader judge whether or not the editor of the *Islander* is able to misrepresent expressions. After a long preamble concerning the validity of the claims of the proprietors, he thus proceeds:—"Yet LECTOR, *who* we believe to be a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church, after enlightening us as to our duty to our neighbour, calls the attention of the tenantry of the Island to the "unsettled state of the Land Question, as being the principal grievance under which they labour, and tells them *that they can "redress" them themselves.*" After another long preamble he asks:—"How then is LECTOR justified in telling the Protestant tenantry that, if they "unite with their Catholic fellow-subjects," *they will have all their grievances redressed?*" The italics are our own, except those of redress." Again he proceeds:—"After LECTOR's declaration of *passive obedience*, which, in a former letter, he told us influenced or governed the conduct of members of his Church, and after his denunciation of the Liberal Catholics of Italy, for demanding Responsible Government—the right to have a voice in the Government of their native country—we scarcely expected to hear him inviting the subjects of Her Majesty in this Island to unite for the purpose of redressing what he is pleased to call their "principal grievances." The tenantry of this Island, in opposing themselves to their landlords, are right—they are justified, it would appear, in avoiding their contracts, and in endeavouring to deprive the proprietors of their lands,—but the Catholics of Italy, in asking for a redress of their grievances, are wrong—they are *cut-throats* and *villians*, because they do not wish to remain under the *temporal rule* of him who claims to be the Vicar of that Christ who declared that His "Kingdom was not of this World." In order that the reader may form a just estimate of this last tissue of "unscrupulous" misrepresentations, let him compare therewith my letter in the *Examiner* of the 13th inst.

I will not say that the misrepresentations in the above extracts are wilful, unjust, dishonorable and malicious—no, *ex ore tuo, te judico*, I will let the public form their own opinion, after having read the following extract from the editor's prefatory remarks to his Land Question "homily." "We do not wish to imply that LECTOR would, knowingly, advocate an unjust or a dishonest couse, we do not think he would."

Does the editor of the *Islander* suppose that the intelects of his readers are so obtuse that they are not able to detect the very obvious sophism which he has had recourse to, when he attributed sentiments to me which I do not hold, and then came out with his philippic against me as if I were the abettor of robbery and open rebellion? He should know before this that the consequences, which are daawn, however justly, from false premises, are absolutely worthless. The fallacy which he has used is called by some logicians, *ignorantia elenchi*, by others, the *fallacy of irrelevant conclusion*, and is frequently used by "demagogues and mob-orators." I dare say then, that he will not feel a little mortified when he will learn that his disquisition on the rights of the landlords is perfectly irrelevant and useless, so far as regards the "controversy" between himself and LECTOR; and probably he will be sorely disappointed when he will perceive that his *ruse* will not succeed either in drawing LECTOR out on the titles of the proprietors, or in inducing him to defend *Escheat a la Cooper*.

The editor of the *Islander* writes as if I denounced "the Liberal Catholics of Italy for demanding Responsible Government!" I denounced the rebels the assassins of Italy, for whom he appears to have a very warm sympathy, and whom he calls "Liberal Catholics." In order that the reader may form an approximate estimate of the character of the editor's Italian friends I will give an extract from a speech recently delivered by Lord Viscount Fielding:—

"Infidelity raises up its hideous form and sows its accursed seed broadcast throughout the land. Men's minds are poisoned; the very sources of moral and social good are sapped and undermined. As before, it uses as its watchword, its stalking horse, the name of Liberty. Alas! poor Liberty: alas! that thy name should be the watchword held forth to justify such foul proceedings. It is, however, too true that many Englishmen, proud of the liberal institutions of their country, are led astray by this word "liberty," and are found to sympathize with those who are mis-using it We are told that the Italians are groaning under tyranny, and we are called on to sympathize with them. Now we know no good fruit can come from a bad tree. (Hear, hear.) I will not enter into the historical facts of the case, for I think it will suffice to mention one case which came under my own notice, being narrated to me by the individual himself, who was a witness. A gentleman who, it will be seen from his conduct, was a most devoted servant of the Pope, hearing that there was to be a meeting of conspirators in a certain house, determined to be present. He made his arrangements, and concealed himself in the room. He well knew at the time that his life would be sacrificed if he was discovered, but he nevertheless had the courage and devotion to conceal himself in a cupboard which had a glass door, and to remain a witness and auditor of the proceedings. He heard the most diabolical sentiments uttered, and, as the wolf desires to get rid of the watch dogs that guard the flock, so the first proposal of the conspirators was to cut the throats of all the clergy. He said it made his blood run cold to hear them talk of tearing out the hearts of the clergy and eating them. Yet these are the patriots you are called on to admire. They then arranged a most diabolical plan by which to assassinate the Holy Father at the very moment he was giving his benediction from the balcony of St. Peter to the city of Rome, and to the whole world. Fifty of his own soldiers were to be found who were to load their muskets with ball, and when the troops were drawn up to receive the benediction, a disturbance was to be got up, and these fifty men were to fire on the balcony. (Great sensation.) This plan was arranged, and if the gentleman to whom I allude had not devoted himself as he did, and become an auditor of the plan, it might have been put into execution, and God knows what would have been the consequences; but by the mercy of God it was frustrated. (Loud cheering.) This took place only about four years ago, and the same seed had since been sown, and again these persons had occasioned like disturbances in Italy."

These are the "patriots" "who,"—in the words of the illustrious Montalembert,—"at Rome drowned in the blood of M. Rossi, basely assassinated at the foot of the constitutional tribune, all the guarantees given by Pius IX. to the people of Rome, and all the sympathies felt for it by Christian Europe." These are the kind of "Liberal Catholics" whom bigotry and infidelity. "demagogues and mob-orators," are applauding in their impious course; these are the persons whom the editor of the *Islander* would lead his readers to suppose are "demanding Responsible Government," who are contending for what they call nationality, liberty! these are the revolutionary miscreants for whose success pious old ladies are praying, and upon whose endeavours Rev. and zealous Secretaries of Young Men's Christian Associations, with uplifted hands and eyes, call down the blessings of Heaven; these are the worthies whose high mission is to liberate their country, put an end to the Papacy, and hasten the advent of the Millennium! These be thy gods, O Israel! These thy guides, O Italy!!

I intended to have offered other observations suggested by the remarks in the *Islander*, but will reserve them for another letter.

Yours, &c.,

Queen's County, March 29, 1860. LECTOR.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

MR. WHELAN,—The editor of the *Islander*, stung by the severe but gentlemanly castigations of his master "Lector,"—unable to hide his acute sense of discomfiture in the literary conflict—worsted, beaten and driven to the wall—steps aside in his reply to "Lector," on the 23rd inst., and makes a treacherous fling at our late estimable Lieutenant Governor. The unsullied editor, "the mark and model of the times," following the vein of his most *excellent* disposition, visits that gentleman with choice selections from his elegant vocabulary, and treats him to an eruption of personal abuse. This is the most *amiable* editor's forte—it is as natural to him as it is for a duck to swim. The man is recognised in the manner of abuse and the measure of falsehood which he employs. An Ass is known by his bray, and a practised defamer by his tongue or pen. But of what consequence or weight is the accomplished editor's notice of a gentleman, who, in all particulars, and in every phase of life, and honorable conduct and character, is immeasurably beyond the petty malice, and the mean range of his, the poor editor's unhallowed pen? It were absurd to suppose that a person of the editor's moral calibre could, by his vicious writings, affect the character of a gentleman, unblemished in private life, and a tried, and proved, faithful, upright, and talented administrator of the government of this Colony. No, it would be silly to assume that the editor has, or possesses any such influence or power.

The amusing cause of the overflowing ire of the sweet editor—the outpourings of his harmless bile, and floodings of his barbless spleen,—nay, his *pious* hatred of the late Lieutenant Governor—is simply this—Sir Dominick positively refused to appoint him Provincial Secretary after the late Government retired from office; and although the present Executive pressed the Lieutenant Governor on his behalf, Sir Dominick, actuated by highly honorable principles—having due regard for his position and respect for the people whom he governed—would not and did not appoint to the highest departmental office in this Colony an individual upon whom there appeared some discredit in a matter