

purchased with the Estate. What has become of it? There is no sign of it in the accounts produced; it is in fact studiously kept out of sight. It has been said that the Government have given it up to the parties, and it certainly seems to be the case. Now, sir, I am by no means concerned to think that some Tenants have honestly got clear of their arrears of rent; but I think it my duty to protest against that bounty being extended to them at the expense of the rest of the Tenants who have paid, and have been obliged to pay, their arrears by the sweat of their brow. This I consider a tax on honest industry, and a bounty on inertness and servility. Of course there is nothing in this that savours of manoeuvring or intrigue! Now, sir, I say, I object to this Bill, because it will be class legislation, and we have no right to impose upon the people of this Island the tax that will be necessary in order to make this Bill operate. There is a very old saying that the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it; and the proof of the effect of this Bill is the working of the one which is at present the law of the land. I shall not go into the full particulars of the Worrel Estate accounts; that has been done in a lucid and unanswerable manner by Hon. T. H. Haviland on my right; and without any disparagement to him, I shall take the accounts given in by the Commissioner of Lands, who has prepared them, and has had a long time to do it. What are they? Here are facts that cannot be denied, if we take as facts those figures and statements which that officer has placed before us. He states,—to paid vendors £18,000; interest paid treasurer—£1,760; salaries, &c., less 1/2 Lot 11 £1,081 5s. Yes, sir, they work this one estate for no less than £1,081 5s. I confess it would gratify the curiosity of the public, if the consideration the country derives for those salaries was brought before them, and the parties pointed out who received pay up to last January, for two years working of the Bill. Altogether the Commissioner states the whole sum amounts to £20,841 5s. for this Worrel estate. Well, now, run your eyes over the whole accounts, and you cannot mention any more received than £3,622 14s. 4d. exclusive of expenses. We hear also of lands unsold; but I have heard of a maxim of an experienced old widow lady giving advice about the uncertainty of pecuniary engagements to her grand child, "my good child," she said, "never calculate the benefit of any money coming to you until you get it into the palm of your hand." The state of the Land Commissioner's accounts now before us has certainly brought the old lady's maxim very vividly to my recollection. Here then we see by the Commissioner's own account that £20,841 5s. of the people's money has already been paid away; that is certain and undeniable; on the other side of the account we see that no more than £3,622 14s. 4d. have been paid back, that is equally certain: Thus there remains £17,218 10s. 8d. yet to be repaid to the country. Now, we are told, that to meet this balance there is a balance due from the purchasers of the lands sold by the Commissioner, amounting to £10,348 4s. 10d.; and that the further sum of £1400 is due on bonds given by some of the Tenants to Mr. Worrel's Trustees and transferred to the Government. Well, should these two sums be received by the Government, the balance against the country would thereby be reduced to £5470 5s. 9d. Now, the recovery of these two sums, I contend is very uncertain. With respect to the balance due from the purchasers, reports are abroad that the purchasers say, they have paid one instalment which they think is quite enough, and being in possession of their lands they do not intend to pay any more; that Government ought to have charged them no more than the five shillings an acre. Should coercive measures be necessary, they must be enforced by the Government of the day, whose existence depends perhaps in no small degree upon the breath of these very people, delays and excuses would likely follow, and the expenses of recovering the balance due on a hundred acres would equal nearly the balance itself so, that in the end I fear the Government would net but very little of that sum. And with reference to the sum of £1400 for bonds, why if Mr. Worrel's agents and his astute lawyer unfettered by political policy, could not manage to recover this amount with the advantages of the bonds, I fear the Government are very unlikely to be more successful. Now, let us suppose that the whole of the balance alleged to be due from the Government purchasers, that is £10,348 4s. 10d. is credited to the country, in cash as if actually received, then, take from the balance I have just mentioned, of £17,218 10s. 8d. there would be against the Colony, £6870 5s. 10d. Now add to this the balance yet due to Pope & Company being £5100 two years, interest therein £610. Loss of land tax £300. Interest on debentures £900. And we have actually a sum of £14,780 5s. 10d. already sunk to the Colony, by the purchase of the Worrel Estate. Continuing however to follow up the account as the Commissioner has rendered it, and supposing for the elucidation of the subject, that there existed no uncertainty about the recovery of the two large sums I have been remarking upon, the Commissioner's own balance of £5470 5s. 9d. as he makes it out against the country, he says, will be met by the lands still unsold and amounting to 44,984 acres, or to make round number, call it 45,000. Now what is to be realized out of this land? It is very astonishing that with all this valuable land lying on hand, the Government party are so anxious to get more. But I begin to suspect, Sir, the rumours about swamps, bogs, and blueberry barrens in that vicinity are not without good foundation. Why, if it were good land, or saleable land, there would surely be numerous applications to purchase it. We were told, if I mistake not, that there would be a rush to obtain land; but the steam was soon blown off; the choice lands indeed found ready customers; but the refuse, of course, is left to enrich the Government. The Hon. Col. Secretary has stated that there is to be a reduction of some 10,000 acres of the Worrel Estate as deficiency in the quantity sold; this, however, is mere assertion. The Government bought by boundaries well known and defined, and with their eyes open, and it does not lie with them to deduct such parts of the given area as they please and call them by some other name than land. I do not think the Hon. Col. Secretary has stated one word here to demonstrate that there are 10,000 acres short of the complement sold to the Government. Now, Sir, I have just as much right to use the assertion of those persons who have sold that estate, and that they say, there is no such deficiency; not one half of that quantity short. I think it is not out of place here to say that the Hon. Col. Secretary used a very unfortunate assertion when he stated that there was "trickery" on the part of those gentlemen by receiving money after the estate had been sold [Hon. Col. Secretary—I proved it.] We see no proof of it. I have heard it, and have just as good a right to assert it as the Hon. Col. Secretary, that when this property was sold to the Government a day was fixed as is usual in similar transactions from which the purchaser was to become entitled to the rents and issues of the estate; the 14th August, 1855, was named for this purpose, being the time the estate, was purchased from Mr. Worrel, by Mr. Pope, the parties who sold the property were entitled to the rents and profits of the estate. The agents were still in possession of the estate, and the accounts were unsettled, as we have the best evidence of knowing. Mr. Desbrisay, who was agent for the estate was willing to continue to receive the rents, and receipt them, and pay over to the Government the amount that came into his hands, as accrued between those periods. [Hon. Col. Secretary—I deny that he received a copper.] Mr. Desbrisay states that he always acknowledged himself accountable for whatever came into his hands from August 14th up to December 23rd, and has repeatedly stated it to the Commissioner of Public Lands. He has also positively denied, and has demonstrated to me, that there has been no money received by him for which he has denied to charge himself

against the Government. [Hon. Col. Secretary—I rise to order, the £300 was not in the books.] The hon. member has repeated over and over again, that Mr. Desbrisay had received several hundred pounds for payments made between those periods now I find it fixed down to £300. Well now, he has assisted me by raising a particular sum at last. Mr. Desbrisay has not received £300, or one-sixth part of it. What has been received was some few pounds that were paid into the hands of other persons on the estate, who had been previously authorized to receive moneys; but had not charge of the books, and Mr. Desbrisay supplied the entries in the books for these credits, but the moneys did not come into his hands. And thus it is that the entries appear to have been made after the 14th August, tho' for moneys paid or credits earned long before that period. I am sorry to have to travel out of my way in this manner. Then, Sir, when they charge the vendors of this estate with manoeuvring and trickery, they had better look a little at home. Well, I take £6,100 and interest upon it for a year £305. With respect to this £6,100, the Hon. Col. Secretary says it was left in the hands of the Government merely to cover any deficiency which might turn out in the estate; and he says there is a deficiency of 10,000 acres. Well, that would not absorb the £6,100; but it would leave yet £3,000. Now, I ask when they charge those persons with trickery, &c., why do they hold that £3,100 in their hands? Let them answer that question. If they have arrived at the conclusion that there are 10,000 acres deficient on the estate, let them say, here are your £3,000. Who are to be accused of trickery now? Why, this is a transaction that as a Government they ought to be ashamed of; it is conduct that a private individual would be ashamed of. The Hon. Col. Secretary says the Commissioner tendered the deed; but will he say they tendered the debentures along with the deed. We know that when money is to be paid, it must appear with the deed. The money was never offered them either before or since. They said if the money was paid down and the deed signed, and executed by all parties, then the matter might have been closed; but there was another hitch in the way, they found out that the deed could not be given, there was some small irregularity in it. [Hon. Col. Secretary—The deed was delivered.] I have sufficient information to say, that it was not delivered. The deed was merely allowed to be put into their hands for the purpose of being returned on that day following. The Commissioner of Crown Lands himself reminded them that that deed was only permitted to be handed to them, for perusal before entering on the contract, to be returned to them again. They took delivery of that deed, they would have been the greatest fools in existence if they had taken it, for it would not give them the least title. Fools indeed they would have been; and I dare say the Hon. Col. Secretary and others would have been the first to turn around and laugh at them. Well, then, where are the Government of Prince Edward Island now? who are the persons that performed the honorable part? Here the Government acknowledge that those gentlemen are to get a debt of about £3,100, and yet they want give it to them, and at the same time tried to force a worthless deed upon them. Now, sir, hon. members may vote for this bill if they please; yet I conceive that in the state in which these accounts of the Commissioner of Public Lands are now existing, they would see a signal failure of the prospects and expectations of the public being realized, that is, if they can only see those accounts as they really stand. I say we are not wise in passing this bill without an investigation of those accounts. The House, however, have said, that investigation shall not take place. That resolution was put, and I thought it would have passed the House; but no, sir. The majority say those accounts were before the House a fortnight; but now it is found out, that they have been only been five or six days. They say, there is no occasion for taking up the time of the House in investigating them, and they negatived it. I have no doubt that they will, perhaps, have an act to register them as an example of sterling worth and veracity to the country, and to our children hereafter. Now, whether they investigate them or not, there is sufficient in those accounts to show, that the Land Purchase Bill, instead of being self-sustaining, is sinking the Colony in debt. There is good reason to know that vast numbers will not reap any advantage from this Bill; and that many look upon it as mere nothing to pay £5 a year for a hundred acres of land; but I may say this of them, these are the men whom we are going to tax without giving them any advantage in return. Now when going to do that, I want to see that I do so upon good and solid grounds—those in which the country will bear me out. If we were to ask every person we meet, if it is right and proper that this Bill should pass, there would be seven in every ten who would say, let people who want free land pay for it, we do not want to be called upon to pay those accounts. Upon this ground I take my stand in advocating against this Bill. Now, sir, I ask in what position would the majority feel themselves, should a committee after investigating these accounts, report them incorrect and that the Government were sinking money. I shall conclude by saying that these are the grounds upon which I will rest my act in voting decidedly against the report.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

TESTIMONIAL TO A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN.

TO THE REV. MR. ALLAIRE, &c., &c.

REV. DEAR SIR,—We, the Church Wardens and other Parishioners of St. Andrew's Parish, having learned with much regret that it is your intention to leave us shortly, in order to return to your own happy home—beg leave most respectfully to approach you with our best wishes for your happiness here and hereafter. And as this may be the last opportunity we will have the pleasure of meeting you, we hope you will be pleased to permit us to offer you this token of our sincere friendship and esteem, which, although small in its intrinsic value, may testify to your high estimation and gratitude for the valuable service so kindly rendered by you during your sojourn amongst us.

In conclusion, we heartily wish you a pleasant voyage and safe return to your dear Canada; and as we can never forget you, we humbly ask you to remember us occasionally in your prayers.

Signed on behalf of the Church Wardens and other Parishioners of St. Andrew's.
JOSEPH MACVARISH, J. P.
St. Andrew's, June 11, 1857.

TO THE CHURCH WARDENS AND OTHER PARISHIONERS OF ST. ANDREW'S.

GENTLEMEN,—I receive your kind address and your handsome memento with thankfulness, but with some surprise; for my humble efforts to make my sojourn in your Parish useful are appreciated and rewarded more than any foreign motive of mine could aspire to. Yet finding my health improving, I could not delay in thanking Providence, who, in his bountiful mercy, has enabled me to devote some time in the fulfilment of a holy duty, tending to promote His greater honor and glory; and next to his all-merciful aid, I have to thank my friends, on your hospitable shore, for an apparent restoration of health, which induced me to lend my humble assistance in doing the service that you are pleased to notice, but which I fear your friendship overrates. I shall always look back to my stay in Prince Edward Island with pleasure; and in thanking you for your kind wishes, I beg to assure you that the fleeting wings of time will not easily erase my happy recollections of you, and that my prayers will be offered for each and all of you.

I remain, Gentlemen, your well-wisher,

P. O. ALLAIRE, Ptre.

St. Andrew's, June 11, 1857.

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ISLANDER.

Sir,—I have been favoured with your notice in the *Islander* of the 9th instant. You say I have been changing sides like the wind—that part of my last letter is not true; and to ascertain my motives and narrow your objections to a point, you ask, did I not extenuate my conduct to Messrs. McIntosh and Laird for the way I voted on the Loan Bill? and did I not say that the proprietary party never did any thing for me? but I had better expectations from the Government. The questions are improper, but I will answer them. I never said that I desired or expected an office or favour from any party in the Island; but I have frequently said that the country could expect no good from the proprietary party; but the present Government have done a great deal of good, although they have not done as much as I expected; and it was my duty to support them, and take the best terms I could get, until the people knew how and where to choose a better; but although I have not desired an office, I think it is the duty of any man, whatever talent he may have, to accept office when the will of the people and the interest of the country require his services; but not to seek office for his own benefit only. There are many men of clear perceptions and sound judgment *fit to give counsel*, who could not perform the practical duties of an office. It was to prepare the way to have discreet men from the country to take a seat in the Executive Council, that I voted for an increase of salary to keep the office assistants in their place, so as to have trustworthy men in the Council to guard the rights of the people, and efficient men to do the routine business in the offices. Men from the country could not attend Council, and maintain a respectable appearance in the city, without a suitable salary. But men in Council, from the country, who understood the wants and promoted the welfare of the people, would benefit the country far more than the value of their salary. Under the responsible system, the people have it in their power to choose such men for their government; but it requires as much consideration to choose guardians for the rights of the people as a dying father would use to choose guardians for his children.

If the men of the country think they are unfit to choose their own government, they may take your advice, and choose men who will promise that they will not take office, which will be a *proof they are unfit for any thing* but to be led in a halter, and leave it to the proprietary party to form a Government to suit themselves, with men whose only care for working people is to form plans and pass laws to get their property from them. Such men will not be ashamed to take office and pay, and I have no doubt that many of them know how to manage an office, but the danger is, *they know too well*. They could get clerks for a mere pittance to do their work, while, at the same time, they could lord it over the House of Assembly, and drag the property from the working people; and a House of Assembly composed of men who were unfit and who had promised they would not take office, could be no check upon such a Government, and therefore the people would be better without representatives.

Your quotation from my letter, which you say is not true, is only part of a sentence, and to be better understood, I have inserted the sentence, that my meaning may appear, and marked the part which you left out, in italics, as follows:—*"But as you have said the Executive must obey the Governor, I must infer from that, that in the settlement of the land question the Governor is bound to follow instructions from the Colonial Minister, and the Executive to obey the Governor, or otherwise to resign the Government to the proprietary party, and therefore the Liberals have not been permitted to take the lawful course to settle the land question, which would have been to investigate the titles; but have only been allowed to reduce the price of land from thirty shillings to ten or twelve shillings an acre for the tenantry to pay, and to reduce the remainder of the 'booty,' which is nearly a million sterling to an eighth or ninth of the demand."* The latter part of the sentence is an inference from the premises you left out. Now, I thought it unnecessary to repeat what was well known, that the tenants on the Worrel Estate bought their land from Government at from ten to twelve shillings, for which Worrel demanded from thirty shillings to three pounds an acre; and in Mr. Palmer's *most effective and telling speech* we were told that the proprietors would not sell their land to Government for less than a sovereign an acre. Then again, in opposition to that, Mr. Coles said, the Government would give no such price; but if the proprietors were backward to offer their land, the Government would find a way to compel them. Therefore I think my statement is true. Some short questions require long answers, and to answer your objections more fully, I must go further back and take in a wider scope.

In a case where defaulters have been allowed by successive ministers, for nearly a century, to lease and sell forfeited land, so as to swindle the labouring people out of their property, and the present minister being ashamed to bring such a long train of iniquitous transactions before Parliament for adjustment; but instead of that, they urge upon the Colonial Government to make the tenantry pay for the delinquency of ministers, governors and swindlers; and poor simple-minded people are easily deceived, and as frequently choose their enemies as their friends to represent them, and do and undo, according to their changeable minds; and under such circumstances the Executive had to undertake to settle the land question as they were ordered, or give up the Government to the swindlers; and as the Council are sworn to secrecy, they cannot explain or justify their conduct, and therefore it is uncertain whether they are any, or how far they are to blame for accepting office upon such terms. I have frequently felt at a loss whether I ought to support or oppose them; and it is no wonder that they have to keep office-holders in the House (who ought not to be there), and insist upon their vote.

In 1851 Earl Gray admitted that the unsettled state of the land tenures affected the political and social well-being of the community; and he was particularly anxious that some satisfactory arrangement should take place, but that the rights of parties could not be altered but by that of an equitable adjustment. I have read some of your remarks about this bloody despatch, and that there would be no escheat, but I have not seen any proposal from you for an equitable adjustment of a question which affected the well-being of the whole community, and therefore, when I saw no better proposal, I approved of the Purchase Act; and as that Act required the titles to be investigated, I thought it was preparatory to an equitable adjustment; but when I saw the job which was made of the Worrel Estate, I opposed the Government with all my might, for it did not occur to me until you brought it to my mind, that on the *land question* the Executive must obey the Colonial Minister; but now, when I find the ministers are willing to guarantee the loan under such circumstances, I think the Government did right to avail themselves of the loan. It will be far easier for the Government to deal with the Colonial Minister for the re-payment of the debt than it is for the tenantry to deal with the land agents; and if the land will not pay for the debt and interest, I think no ministers will expect any part of our revenue to pay for the delinquency of their predecessors.

Now, that you may see my reasons for supporting the Government more at one time than at others, I recapitulate, that I thought the Executive had a discretionary power in all matters; but being reminded by you so often that they must obey their superiors, it brought me to reconsider the matter, and I find that in a case where the interest and honour of the Crown is so deeply involved, we must submit to the dictation of the Colonial Minister, or go to the Imperial Parliament. To go with such a case to Parliament would no

doubt make a noise in England; but it is a question whether the tenantry would fare better than they are likely to do now, as I understand the Government intend to settle them; and I am not ashamed or afraid to meet my constituents, and explain my reasons for any vote I have given.

I have no intention to censure Mr. Whelan or to offend you. You have called my motives in question, and it is but fair that my vindication should go before the public, who are as much interested as I am. I have therefore sent a copy of this to the *Examiner* for general information; and as I have always sent him the rough draft and you the clean copy, I have to request that he will excuse it and take more pains, as I find the *Islander* prints more from the *Examiner* than from my manuscript.
WM. COOPER.

Sailor's Hope, June 16th, 1857.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir,—Permit me, through your columns, to reply to an editorial in the last issue of the *Protector*. You will thereby subserve the interests of truth.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

C. BARKER.

Sir,—The editorial in question professes to be a passing notice of a resolution passed at the late Annual District Meeting of the Bible Christian denomination on this Island, which resolution has been published in each of the Island papers, except the "*Protector* and *Christian Witness*." The conductors of the latter, while refusing to give their readers the resolution, don't hesitate to comment thereon in their own style, endeavouring to make an impression, if not contrary to the truth, far from being in harmony with it. Sir, in the second sentence of their passing notice they say, "the first of these resolutions brings a serious charge against the Protestant Ministers of this City." It does no such thing, unless the Protestant Ministers of this City are the "*we*" of the *Protector*. The resolution reads inasmuch as the *Protector* newspaper has assailed, &c. &c.

"We should like to know what parties attended," &c. All the ministers on the Island, and lay representatives from the several quarterly meetings, from the West Cape to Murray Harbour. "How many were present?" All who were authorised to attend the said District Meeting. "Whether with or without?" &c. Without. Every man voting in favour thereof. "And chiefly how much in a pecuniary way Mr. Barker had power over votes." Chiefly, I judge this is the language of some marketable animal, ready at all times to sell himself to the highest bidder, or it may be, he is some tyrant, or some poor serf who only dares to move as his money-lord will allow him. The Bible Christians have not yet begun to worship Mammon, or to dance around the Golden Calf manufactured by would-be modern Aarons. Mr. Barker's influence among his brethren is moral and religious, not pecuniary.

"It is not true, as insinuated, that the opposition of the majority at the afternoon meeting," &c. This is *Protector* like; the resolution reads—"That whereas at the request of a Committee of Protestant gentlemen, Mr. C. Barker attended a public meeting in Charlottetown, called the great Protestant Meeting, at which, as well as at an afternoon meeting," &c. One of the ministers present at the afternoon meeting told me, in the presence of a witness, that he saw I had done for myself when I made certain remarks bearing on this question of state interference.

"From that moment he rendered himself odious, perfectly odious." Odious! Mr. Craig gives the following as the meaning of odious, viz: hateful, detestful, abominable, offensive to the senses, causing hate, invidious; exposed to hatred. If I rendered myself perfectly hateful, detestful, &c., by my short address, pray how came it to pass that one of the Episcopalian and two of the Scotch Ministers spoke approvingly of it, the one said—"I thank you for your speech," the others said—"we are much obliged for your speech"—how came it to pass, that before leaving the hall that night, I was requested to be one of the Committee, and upon my consenting, was asked to name my layman. If, by that speech, I rendered myself perfectly hateful, &c., to an indignant Protestant community, how came it to pass that one of the said Committee consented to take the chair at the delivery of my lecture? (What prevented him?) If I rendered myself so perfectly hateful, detestful, &c., how was it, that when upon the reconstruction of the said Committee, my name was omitted? The true reason was not assigned to the layman who called at the school-room when said Committee was sitting. Why was he told that my name was omitted because I was not a settled minister? Again, what was I to gather from the following note?

MY DEAR SIR;

MONDAY MR.

I have been directed to inform you that your name was not omitted, on the reconstruction of the Committee, for the reason stated in your letter; but that, being a deputation to this Island for a specific purpose, and being about to return to the Old Country in the spring, you could not be regarded in the light of a settled pastor, whose influence over a stated congregation would be necessary in carrying out the object contemplated.

Yours truly,

D. FITZGERALD.

Mr. C. Barker.

Nothing about having rendered myself perfectly hateful, detestful, abominable, &c., in this note. I could produce other notes, written in a similar spirit, from the parties who now say, that from that moment I rendered myself perfectly hateful, detestful, abominable, by my address at the great meeting. "Treating in a burlesque manner what they esteemed so sacred." What did I treat in a burlesque manner? Their fears! What did they esteem so sacred? Their fears! "Leaving them to understand," &c. I am thankful that at length the Committee of the *Protector* do understand what I meant; and it is come to this, that because I made light of the fears possessing these gentlemen, treating their most sacred fears with ridicule, I am hateful, detestful, abominable, &c. Reader, I have more faith in the Bible and in its Author than to fear a bishop's letter, or an Act of the House of Assembly, or of the British Parliament, in reference thereto. "The Lord reigneth," and if Protestants and Catholics would really have faith in the truth they profess, and cease harrassing the civil authorities touching the right or wrong of their religious views, have a living faith in truth—a faith that would provide for its universal propagation without making State paupers of its ministers and teachers,—a brighter, yea a glorious day would soon dawn upon the Church and the world. "Not the slightest hostility against the Bible Christian denomination." The Bible Christians do not believe this. Has not Mr. Barker been denounced from three different pulpits (not in the City)? Did not a City Minister threaten a certain tradesman with loss of work, if he continued to attend the Hall to hear Mr. Barker? Did not another City Minister, in no very measured terms, censure certain persons for having occasionally had Mr. B. to dine with them? Of course there is no hostility in all this, "not the slightest"? The fact is, said a City Minister, he has no business in the town; there is plenty of work in the country parts. Depend upon it, hostility or no hostility, the Bible Christians will not turn image-worshippers. It is to be supposed that the image-makers, in the reign of Henry VIII., Defender of the Faith, had the "slightest hostility" against the Church of which one John Houghton was a member? Not "the slightest." Nevertheless John Houghton, Prior of the Charter House, London, refused to worship to the new image then set up; for which he was taken to Tyburn, and was scarcely suspended when the rope was cut, and he fell alive to the ground. His clothes were then stripped off; his bowels were ripped up; his heart and entrails were torn from his body; the body was divided into quarters and par-boiled; the quarters were then subdivided, and hung up in different parts of the city; and one arm was nailed to the wall over the entrance to the monastery. I am thankful that Henry VIII. is not the reigning monarch, or rather that we are living in the last half of the 19th century, else there might be some ground to fear that, in the absence of the "slightest hostility to the Bible Christian denomination," one of their ministers who is detestful, abominable, &c., &c., might share