

the Bible—either on the part of those who believe in the version read, or on those who do not believe? What feelings are implanted in the guileless hearts of those who are sent to drink at the strengthening and refreshing fountain of knowledge, and find little but gall and bitterness in the draught? Why, Sir, we should find in every County and Township of the Island a horde of juvenile dogmatists, ready to annoy, and persecute, and worry their schoolmates, about matters which have, for centuries, been a source of contention and bloodshed with children of a larger growth. Reverse the picture—let the school be a mixed one still, as is the case in a majority of districts in this Island, but suppose we find the schoolmaster to be a Catholic, and a majority of the Trustees Catholics, of course they would have the Douay Bible for their Scriptural class book; and there would be just about as much benefit resulting from its use as in the case of the Protestant Bible. [Mr. Whelan then expatiated at considerable length on the impolicy of legislating on such a question as the one under consideration. He contended that it would be far more conducive to the peace and happiness of society to allow the Education Act to remain silent, as heretofore, on the subject of religion. He considered that if the Legislature recognised the use of any particular Bible, that large class of the population—be they either Catholic or Protestant—who conscientiously believed that particular version to be an incorrect one, would only be encouraged to cherish the worst feelings towards that particular denomination whose Bible happened to be put in use against their will; and thus would the whole community be disturbed by sectarian animosity, and religious persecution. Mr. Whelan said he had great respect for the school teachers of this country. As a class he did not think they were inferior to those of any other Colony in America for general intelligence, and for efficiency and zeal in the discharge of the important duties allotted to them; but he was compelled to say that there were very many of them who, from their youth, inexperience, and want of proper intellectual training, were wholly unfit for the office of religious instructor. He wished to be understood as not disparaging the acquirements of a majority of the schoolmasters of this Island, as schoolmasters, but he considered it was not only improper and worse than useless to connect religious with secular training, but that it was beyond the power of schoolmasters generally to attend to both. To expound the Bible well and faithfully was held to be one of the most difficult intellectual pursuits,—the ablest, most learned and most sagacious minds that ever shed their light upon the world, had, in all ages, been devoted to the elucidation of its sacred mysteries; and many of them, after a life time spent in that pursuit, might compare their labours to those of the great philosopher who contrasted his toils in the world of science to the efforts of a child picking pebbles on the sea shore. Shall we then, he said, entrust to the raw youth of eighteen or twenty years of age the performance of a task which has puzzled the wisest intellects? Even the hon. member for Princeton, with the resolution before him which he had that evening submitted, would be slow to believe that there were many parents in this Island disposed to commit the religious training of their children to a large proportion of our country schoolmasters. After several other observations from the hon. member—he having spoken for upwards of an hour—he proceeded to read the resolution which he held in his hand. He said he would not move it then, but lay it on the table for the present. It was not his intention to move it as an amendment to the Bill, but as a record of the views which he entertained, in company with many of his political friends, to be placed upon the Journals of the House—as a faithful statement of the permissive principle with respect to the reading of the Bible in our public schools, as the law then stood—and as a suitable answer to the Petitions before the House. The resolution was then read, and is as follows:—

“Whereas, in consequence of several petitions having been presented to this House, and duly considered, praying that the Holy Scriptures may be authorised by law as a class book in the mixed public schools of this Colony, it appears to the satisfaction of this House, that, according to existing arrangements for the management of our district schools, adopted under the sanction of the Board of Education—no prohibition is made to the free use of the Scriptures, without reference to denominational distinctions; and it is further and very clearly apparent, by various returns from the public schools in this Colony, now before this House, that the Scriptures have been and are used in many of such schools, without prejudice, where the School Trustees and parents of children desire or have desired them to be read. And whereas it has hitherto been found to afford great satisfaction to persons of all denominations, Protestants and Catholics, to leave the use of the Holy Scriptures entirely optional with School Trustees and parents, who are best qualified to determine whether or not the Bible should be used as a class-book in our mixed schools.

“Resolved, therefore, that it is inexpedient to disturb the present arrangements for the regulation of our mixed schools, with regard to the Books that are used therein, by enacting such a clause in the Education Act as would give a religious aspect or colouring to our educational system, and prescribing such new rules in reference to the introduction of the Bible as a class-book, as might, though perhaps not intended, be enforced to the prejudice of a large proportion of our population, and, which, in the opinion of this House, would produce no good result, but, on the contrary, would keep alive religious excitement and animosity; and not only destroy the harmony which has heretofore existed between all classes of Christians, but would, in a great measure, deprive the people, or a very large portion of them, of the benefits of a free education.”

The Hon. the Speaker's amendment was then put and carried on the following division:—

Yeas:—Hons. the Speaker, T. H. Haviland, Palmer, Longworth, Montgomery, Wightman, Whelan and Mooney, Messrs. Macdonald, Yeo, Macintosh, T. Heath Haviland and Laird—13.

Nays:—Hons. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer and Lord, Messrs. Munro, Muirhead, Clark, Cooper—7.

R. LAIRD, Rep.

Hon. the SPEAKER.—The resolution moved by the Hon. member (Mr. Whelan) is out of order, as nothing can be reported from the committee but the Bill and its amendments. When the Speaker is in the chair the hon. member can move his resolution.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—I do not wish to engraft it upon the Act; but to submit it merely as an exposition of my principles on the question.

Hon. the SPEAKER continued, I have given way heretofore; but will now say a few words. It would, perhaps, be a work of supererogation for me to enter into the arguments introduced in support of the views I hold on the question now under consideration, or reiterate the sentiments already expressed with so much power, and supported by so many able arguments. I will, therefore, only say that I believe there will a great deal of mischief arise if any material alteration be made in the present Act. (The hon. Speaker then illustrated his argument by showing that if the Catechism of any creed was by law made a school book it would not for a moment be tolerated, and if a Protestant teacher was compelled to teach a Catholic Catechism, or a Catholic teacher compelled to teach a Protestant Catechism, not by the parents and guardians of his scholars, but by law, it would be an endless source of contention and discontent.) The resolution introduced by Hon. T. H. Haviland, says the Bible shall be read in all the public schools. Now, if this amendment cannot be carried out without opposition, strife and ill-feeling between man and his fellow; without embittering a religious hatred heretofore barely existing; without engendering a feeling the sure precursor of fanaticism,—if, indeed, it cannot be carried out at all—what is the use to legislate for the purpose of creating disorder and discontent? The amendment is unfair in so far as it professes to be merely an exposition of the intentions of the Act, while carries beneath

this guise a coercive spirit. Whether it was intentional or not in the framer of that resolution to give it such a character, is of little importance; it is enough for us to know that if it is adopted it will be the means of working much harm, and it becomes our imperative duty to resist every measure having for its tendency an interference with the religious belief of any and all religious denominations.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—If the amendment proposed by hon. member (Mr. Whelan) was prefixed to the other, by way of preamble, it would be at least an explanatory clause. In 1845, the House went into a committee of the whole to report on several petitions of a similar nature to those lately presented to this House. The result was a report to the following effect:—

“Thursday, March 27, 1845.
“Whereas, to quote the words of the several Petitions now under consideration, relative to the introduction of the Bible, as a class book, into the Central Academy, and other schools throughout the Island receiving grants of public money, ‘to promote the glory of God, and the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, by the early instruction of youth in the principles of the word of God;’ the House of Assembly considers a duty incumbent on every parent and pastor, and is essential to the well-being and social happiness of mankind:

“And whereas this committee deprecates any plan of Education which does not recognize free liberty of conscience, it consequently approves of that system of national instruction established by law, now in progress in the Central Academy—being based upon a due respect for the rights of conscience—which leaves the Institution open to all: And whereas the introduction of the Douay Bible, as a class book, into the Central Academy, would give offence to one portion thereof, whilst the introduction of a different version would be more than condemned by another; so nothing can be more injudicious than to make the reading of the Bible a necessary and indispensable condition of receiving the advantages of secular education; nothing more unjust than to impose a tax upon a large portion of the people for supplying the means of general instruction, and yet, by compulsory regulations as to the use of the holy Scriptures, to exclude them from a participation in its benefits, unless they thought fit to accept it on terms of which they conscientiously disapprove:

“Resolved, that this committee deem it inexpedient to adopt any compulsory measures for the introduction of the Bible, as a class book, into the Central Academy, or the other schools throughout the Island, receiving grants of public money.”

I observe the names of some hon. members, who now support the introduction by law of the Scriptures into the common schools, who then voted for the report of the committee, which I have just read, which, if carried, would have excluded the Scriptures in the Island. I was opposed to the preamble on the ground that it would exclude the Scriptures altogether from the schools; but as the resolution admitted their use where no objections were made by the parents or trustees, I fully agreed with it, and moved that all before the word ‘resolved’ be struck out, which was carried by a majority of one,—10 voting in the affirmative, and 9 in the negative. The hon. member (Mr. Palmer) also moved an amendment to the report to the effect that it was ‘expedient to repeal so much of the Act of the 10th George 4, cap. 3, as prohibits the use of the holy Scriptures, without note or comment, in the Central Academy, by children whose parents or guardians shall not object to the same.’ I voted for this amendment, because I considered it a just enactment; but it was lost on a division of 6 to 13. I think the resolution by Mr. Whelan carries out the one to which I have alluded; and as an experience of twelve years has shown the propriety of such a measure, I can see no reasonable objection to it. There is one point however, which it will be difficult to settle satisfactorily, that is—in a school where one half the children are Roman Catholics, and the other half Protestants, the two versions of the scriptures will have to be taught, which will create confusion. The schoolmaster is asked to read one version by the parents of one portion of his scholars, and the other version by the parents of the other, and what will it lead to? Confusion.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—The act is nothing more than a specious shape of law as it stands. The real question is whether such regulations shall be introduced by the parents or Trustees of any school, or by the Board of Education.

The question on the amendment introduced by Hon. T. H. Haviland, was then put, and it was rejected on the following division:—

Yeas—Hons. T. H. Haviland, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Longworth, Mr. Wightman, Messrs. T. Heath Haviland, Laird and Yeo—8.

Nays—Hons. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer Mr. Whelan, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Lord, the Speaker, Messrs. Clark, Munro, McDonald, Muirhead, McIntosh and Cooper—12.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR.—Having, by a mere accident, seen a copy of the *Islander* of the 17th instant, I observed a communication over the signature of “A Belfaster,” addressed to Donald Munro, Esq., M. P. P. In this communication, which is worded in all the insulting vulgarity peculiar to the character of the writer, an unjustifiable attack is made not only on the conduct of Mr. Munro, as a representative of the people, but also upon the character of the present Government of this Colony, whom “A Belfaster” attempts to stigmatize as a “band of hungry officials,” accusing Mr. Munro, in the very same instance, of “backing them out in every scheme so that they could feed upon the public money for doing nothing.” Then comes the charge against Mr. Munro of betraying the interests of those who sent him to the House of Assembly; and, now, let me tell “A Belfaster,” that Mr. Munro was not sent to the House of Assembly to support the particular views of “A Belfaster,” or of any Belfaster in particular. (You will bear in mind, Mr. Editor, that the good people generally called the Belfasters, are those residing to the southward of Lot 57.) When Mr. Munro was elected in 1854, it was on the unmistakable understanding that he would support the views of the party now in power, and help to deal political death and desolation to the Tory party, who then held power by means of the most flagrant tergiversation, trick and stratagem, that ever disgraced the annals of British Colonial Legislation. Now, Mr. Munro has done this to the entire satisfaction of “the people who sent him” to the House of Assembly, the assertions of “A Belfaster” to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. Munro is next accused of being “the means of appointing a great many magistrates all over the County.” But most unfortunately for himself, he neglected to have “A Belfaster” appointed among the number. This certainly was a very serious error on the part of Mr. Munro, and may be deemed one of the “great many instances” which “A Belfaster” says he “could mention, in which Mr. Munro has gone astray, and with which the majority of his constituents were disgusted.” But of all that Mr. Munro has done “during the past two sessions,” his independent and conscientious vote on the Bible Question, when the re-enactment of the Free Education Act was under consideration in the House of Assembly, seems, in the immaculate opinion of “A Belfaster,” to be his crowning sin. Now it must be quite evident to every person who will take an unprejudiced view of Mr. Munro's conduct on that occasion, that in dealing with that question in the manner he did, and voting as he did on that question, he acted on the broad principle of free and general toleration to all—a principle which embraces the whole range of Christian philanthropy, that is, “to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us.” In the concluding part of his letter, “A Belfaster” gives vent to his feeling or rather his malice, in a strain of unintelligible invective, such as no person—not even “A Belfaster” can possibly make head or tail of, and consequently unworthy of any further notice.

Let us now take a glance at the doings of the Government, or the “band of hungry officials,” as they are elegantly styled by “A Belfaster,” during their administrative management of the public affairs of this Colony; for it is by doing this that it can be shown whether the charge of scheming and doing nothing, &c., can be preferred against them with any show of truth; and whether Mr. Munro, by following and supporting such a “crew,” acted with honour and credit to himself, and with satisfaction and benefit to his constituents.

When the present party came into power some few years since, the public debt of the Colony amounted to something over £30,000. This debt they soon paid off, and in the mean time reduced the interest on all public Bonds, lowered the rate of duty on imported articles of general consumption, and increased the revenue. Next, they established a system of Free Education, such as is not equalled in point of perfection and excellence in any of the British Provinces, or, perhaps, in any part of the British Empire; and in connection with this they have increased the number of public Schools from 120 to 260. They have obtained for the people an extension of the Elective Franchise, almost extending to the principle of universal suffrage, thus securing to the subject a larger amount of liberty than hitherto enjoyed. They have secured the passage of an Act commonly called the “One-Ninth Bill,” by which the tenantry of this Island are protected from the cruel exactions of merciless landlords and their more merciless agents. They have landed, in the face of a formidable opposition, a Land Purchase Act, under the successful operation of which hundreds of persons have already become freeholders. They have incorporated a Banking, Telegraph and Gas Company, &c. They have established a system of Free Trade with the United States and neighbouring Colonies, and opened our ports to the free commerce of the world. They have also established an efficient and effective preventive service to protect the revenue and commerce. They have caused new roads to be opened wherever they were required, and established post offices in all parts of the country where such were wanted. They have, in the session just ended, carried the passage of a Bill to secure the Imperial guarantee for a loan to purchase the proprietary estates, in order that the “bleeding tenantry of P. E. Island” may become happy and independent freeholders; and they are at present negotiating with the Earl of Selkirk with a view of purchasing the Belfast Estate, (and with every prospect of success) in order to convert the unfortunate tenantry of Belfast into honourable and independent freeholders. And to show that Mr. Munro possesses the confidence of the people of Belfast, it may not be out of place here to mention that on the 17th of March last, in the House of Assembly, Mr. Munro presented a petition from “various inhabitants of Lots 57, 58, 59, 60 and 62 and others, inhabitants of Belfast, praying the House to sanction a loan by which the Government may obtain the means of purchasing the Earl of Selkirk's property in this Island, and reselling it to the petitioners.”

There, then, is a faint and imperfect outline of what the Government and their supporters have been, and are still doing. How, then, can it be asserted that Mr. Munro, by following and supporting such a party, (“crew” as they are insultingly styled in “Belfaster's” letter,) did not earn for himself the respect and confidence of all unprejudiced and right-thinking men. Much more might be said in defence of Mr. Munro's conduct in the House of Assembly during the time he held a seat there, but as “A Belfaster” promises “shortly” to visit him with another *bray*, I will, for the present, confine myself to the foregoing, and remain, Yours, very respectfully,

A HIGHLANDER.

Orwell Head, April 27, 1857.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR.—As I wish the enlightenment of some of the speakers at the “great Protestant meeting,” held last February, in the Temperance Hall, and that the public may judge for themselves how far their statements on that occasion are to be relied on, I send you the following extracts, which speak for themselves. I would further beg to refer them to *Living's* “Description of the Morality of Protestant Sweden,” and *Head's* “Account of the Chastity of the Women in Ireland.” Both these gentlemen appear quite as orthodox Protestants, though not quite apparently so ignorant in matters of History, as the spouters at the meeting referred to.

A SUBSCRIBER.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CRIMES IN ENGLAND AND WALES AND IRELAND, AS LAID BY ORDER OF HER MAJESTY BEFORE BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, IN FEBRUARY, 1857.

The population of England and Wales, by the Census of 1851, was 17,922,768. At the same time the population of Ireland was 6,515,794, being very nearly as 13 to 36 in proportion to each other, and hence the crimes in Ireland ought to approximate to those of England as 1 to 3.

	Eng. & Wales.	Ireland.
During the years 1852, 1853 and 1854, inclusive, there were Capital Convictions,	144	44
Murder,	11	4
Attempts to murder, with wounds,	7	0
Sodomy,	15	0
Burglary, with violence to persons,	4	0
Robbery, with wounds,	7	0
Arson of dwellings, persons being therein,	5	0
Shooting at, stabbing, wounding, &c., with intent to maim, &c.,	97	18
Breaking into shops, &c., and stealing therefrom,	106	10
Robbery by persons armed,	21	2
Larceny from the person,	1570	389
Larceny by servants,	2140	44
Simple larceny,	12562	3329
Frauds and attempts to defraud,	676	62
Forgery,	144	4
Uttering and having in possession counterfeit coin,	674	4
Personal violence on women and young girls,	141	35
Bigamy,	72	5

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR.—Since your last issue a somewhat different version has been given of Mr. Heard's interview with the gentleman who preached in the Morrisonian Chapel, Pictou, referred to in my last, from which it appears that a written document was not presented, but a statement made and permission asked to affix his name. It will therefore be necessary to substitute the word “statement” for “document,” in the postscript of my last communication.

By inserting the above, you will oblige yours respectfully,
Ch. Town, May 11, 1857. C. BARKER.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., MAY 11, 1857.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

The tenacity with which the *Islander* clings to the public accounts is only equalled by the audacity and recklessness with which they are misrepresented. The editor is death on figures. Nobody can cast up accounts and strike a balance so cleverly as himself, and the public accounts present so fine a field for display, that a dozen Nos. of the *Islander* will barely suffice to show off his *learning*, to his own satisfaction. He has already flourished through half a dozen issues, and promises us, in his latest, to continue his “herculean efforts” in the same line. The minority in the Assembly must be a singularly stupid set, or Mr. Maclean an extraordinary ingenious fellow. They laboured with becoming zeal for several days, nay weeks, to discover errors, over-charges, or dishonest charges, in the Accounts; but, with the exception of a couple of mare's nests which they happened to turn up, and for the discovery of

which the House enjoyed a considerable share of merriment at their expense—their explorations ended in nothing but ridicule, as will be seen by the fact that they attempted to put no censure on the contingent expenses of the Land Office,—(which we fully explained in this paper of the 27th ult.)—and which was found to be only a mare's nest of somewhat large proportions. The ingenious accountant of the *Islander* office has, however, proved, to his own satisfaction, that his friends and patrons in the minority are hopeless blockheads—that they exhibit nothing but fraud and rascality on the part of the Government—and that this country, which we were all weak and vain enough to believe to be in a prosperous condition, is actually on the verge of bankruptcy and ruin! Is it not a sin and a shame that a rotten borough cannot be found to give this brilliant financier a seat, so that, by the exercise of his marvellous powers as a debater, he might force the Satchels to hide their diminished heads—bring the officials to their narrow-bones—knock the Administration into a cocked hat, and realize expectant Snarlers' hopes of the “good time coming,” by the formation of a Cabinet in which he could figure as Chancellor of the Exchequer?

To illustrate the accuracy and ability of the “coming” Chancellor, we shall briefly notice two or three items in his non-official budget, published in the *Islander* of the 24th ult. He informs us that the Salary of the Normal School Teacher is “£300 per annum.” This is news to us, and to the public. The law allows only £200, and not one penny over that amount is paid. “Then we have,” he says, “£277 paid in ‘four warrants for special grants to teachers.’ Who are ‘the favoured four, and what is the object of the special grant? We have also 5 scholarships charged at £116.” “What does this charge mean? To those queries the Public ‘Accounts afford no answer.’ It would be very queer if they did. But we shall tell Mr. Maclean that if he is anxious for correct information on these points, he will find it in the journal of the House of Assembly, and in the laws relating to Education. The “special grant to teachers” is an annual vote of the Legislature, given on behalf of those Schoolmasters who are not fortunate enough to pass the Board of Education, and who annually petition for public aid. Their petitions are referred to a Select Committee of the House, who set apart such sums for them as the circumstances of their position and their qualifications may appear to demand. These petitions are generally numerous—perhaps not less than thirty or forty,—they are closely investigated by the Select Committee—reported upon at considerable length—their report is every year published in the newspapers as well as in the Journal of the House; and what is more, the Education Law specially provides for this appropriation of the public money; and if we mistake not, the practice of voting it obtained even when Mr. Maclean was in the Legislature, and has continued ever since. With respect to the charge of £116 for five scholarships, our admirably correct financier can ascertain what that means by perusing the Education Act. We shall only tell him, that “the law allows it,” and the Legislature, very properly, every year, “awards it.”

The new candidate for the Chancellorship is desperately puzzled to make out how the carting of coals “from the wharf is charged at twice as much as the freight from Pictou or Sydney.” So he might be; but since he can't be on the floor of the Assembly to hear explanations upon this or other topics of like financial importance—why did he not ask some of his friends of the minority, who did hear the explanation, to make him acquainted with the facts of the case? The explanation given by a member of the Government was quite satisfactory to the House, and will be so to the country. It was to the effect, that the Auditors had charged a large amount to the cost of the coal which should have been charged to the cost of the freight. Although these errors on the part of the candidate for the Chancellorship in the Tory Government, that is to be—the Lord knows when—may seem to be “trifles light as air,” they are not calculated to enlighten the public as to his fitness for the post to which he aspires. He is not more happy in his comparative statement of the public expenses in 1848 and 1856, than he is in reference to other matters of the Public Accounts. Why has he gone back so far as 1848? Or, if he wanted to make the comparison particularly striking, why not have run ten years farther back, and have shown us how small our expenditure was in 1838? or still ten years further? Now, if the *Islander* could be honest enough to furnish a fair statement, he would have taken the year when the Civil List first ceased to be paid by the British Government, or the year previous to the present Administration coming into office. That would not answer his purpose so well. The charge for salaries may well appear to be a heavy one in 1856 in comparison to what it was in 1848,—in the latter year the British Government paid the largest proportion of those salaries; in the former year the Colony has paid them all, except the salary of the Lieut. Governor. And the *Islander* knows very well, that at present the salaries to individual officers of the Government are considerably smaller than they were in 1848. The Treasurer now receives only £300—then he had £500. It is true there is a duty in the office at £150; but the revenue and the duties of the office have enormously increased. Still the salaries of Principal and Deputy are £50 less than the salary of the one was in that model year to which we are referred, when there was no responsibility and little labour to be done. The same remark will apply to the Secretary's office. The receipts of the incumbent of that office from various sources were little less than £1000. The responsibility was nowhere, and the labour was not so arduous but that the gentleman filling the post could find leisure for many important private speculations. The salary of the Collector of Excise cost £260, when the incumbent of the office did scarcely anything during the whole year round—but take his pleasures. The Customs Department cost the British Government an enormous amount,—but the two offices are now united; and with an immense increase of business, the cost for salaries in those two offices is only £400. The decrease in the amount of other salaries, with the increase of business, might be noticed, but want of space forbids.

The *Islander* refers to the grant on behalf of the Agricultural Society, as a piece of extravagance. In 1848 it was only £210. In 1856 it reached the respectable amount of £1,216. But is not this outlay of the public money for the benefit of the public? Have not the agriculturists of the country—who are its mainstay—a very direct interest in seeing an institution like the Agricultural Society liberally encouraged, and have they not already largely profited by its exertions? The appropriation for agriculture in 1848 was as disgraceful to the

Government as the appropriation for agriculture in 1848 was as disgraceful to the