

The Government are evidently determined that, if they can help it, there shall not be peace and harmony at the Charlottetown School Board, and the official organ has received instructions from headquarters to endeavour to stir up ill-feeling among the members. The attack commences by a most ill-natured letter, signed "Vix," in this morning's "Patriot," bearing strong internal evidence of having been written by Mr. John Harper, the Principal of the Normal School. The "great imaginative author" has filled his letter with the outpourings of his fervent imagination. He "can fancy," he tells us, "a new and stately ship outward bound on her first voyage to some Southern port, gliding smoothly, steadily, &c., &c., &c. and then we are treated to a soliloquy by the owner of the "new and stately ship" on her return, which results in a determination to place her in a dry dock. He puts her there, and then we are asked to imagine what it is that "meets" the owner's astonished "gaze." We would have been utterly unable to guess what it was, unless the historian had told us, and we will give the vision in his own words: "Her bottom is quite perforated, and the barnacles are there." Wonderful barnacles to perforate a ship's bottom! But the owner of the "new and stately" is equal to the occasion. Through his vigorous endeavors her bottom is fully rid of these pests, and she is again the same ship as at first, but with one important exception. We wonder if our readers could ever guess what the exception is? We doubt it. It is "the holes formed by the obstructions" in the City School Board—still remains!!

"Vix" admits that the gentlemen nominated to the School Board "are worthy men in their place," but of all the accomplishments we ever heard credited to them, we never yet knew of them boaring holes in the bottom of imaginary vessels. The writer has not resided sufficiently long on the Island to know accurately the names of the Common Councillors and the Wards of the city. For his information we tell him that Councillor Smith seconded the city appointments, and that he represents Ward No. 5.

The Patriot of this morning publishes a letter of Premier McKenzie written to the Reformers of Ontario. The document contains a great deal of self-glorification, and is a species of general order, despatched from the headquarters of the Commander-in-Chief, for the day of battle. One of the paragraphs runs as follows:—

The wicked attempts which have been made in various quarters to start religious strife and disunion, particularly in the Province of Quebec, have, I am glad to say, entirely failed. It is the duty of Reformers, while giving fair play to all, to frown down attempts to introduce religious strife in political contests. It has always been our policy to secure entire equality to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, and if they now enjoy the rights which are inherent in theirs, it is because of the zealous efforts of the Liberal party in that behalf.

We could have wished that Mr. McKenzie had been a little more explicit as to the authors of "those wicked attempts to start religious strife and disunion." He leaves it to be inferred however, and we suppose it is readily inferred that these disturbers belonged to the ranks of the Opposition. This is a most arrogant piece of hypocrisy. Does Mr. McKenzie forget the malignant attempt of his present Postmaster, Mr. Huntington, to inflame the electors against what he was pleased to call "ultramontanism"? Mr. Huntington was bent on playing the same role in Canada that Gladstone was at the time enacting in England. The enterprise did not succeed, but its failure was in no respect due to a lack of animosity on the part of Mr. McKenzie's subaltern. The Catholic press at the time was indignant at the insults offered to priests and bishops, and the attempt made to stir up against Catholics a bitter persecution.

Again: Compare Mr. McKenzie's ostentatious display of liberality in words with his acts in the conduct of the Emigration Office. Under him and his agents Canada was a land where no Catholic needed to apply. Presbyterians were the chosen people of Mr. McKenzie, and if their Presbyterianism should happen to be deeply tinged with Orangeism, so much the more acceptable would they be as emigrants to Canada.

Finally, how did Mr. McKenzie treat the appeal made to him on behalf of the French schools of this Island? Did he protect the French in the rights which they undoubtedly possessed? By no means. Mr. McKenzie gave his approval to an Act which deprived our French schools of some of their most valued privileges, and advised the Governor General not to disallow it. Not only this, but the Patriot, in support of Mr. McKenzie's policy, poured out the vilest abuse on the French, designating them as an unlettered race, who were hardly worth minding.

Looking back at all these things, very little importance is to be attached to Mr. McKenzie's liberality. We do not believe there is a particle of religious toleration in his composition. It was not he or his party who carried the School Bill of Ontario. He opposed it most strenuously. Now, however, it suits his purpose to decry religious strife, and assume a tone of liberality. His sincerity will be believed only by those who are completely ignorant of his antecedents.

An entertainment will be given by the members of the St. Patrick's T. A. Society in St. Patrick's Hall, this evening, in aid of the poor. Judging by the present programme and from the entertainments heretofore given by this Society, there is every reason to believe that a good time may be expected.

The communication of "Custos," in answer to Mr. Henry Coombs, is crowded out and will appear to-morrow. The letter of "Custos" will also appear to-morrow.

Supreme Court.

We give a mere outline of Mr. Palmer's speech to the Jury in the case of the Orange riot:—

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY.—I shall not attempt by flights of oratory to convince you of the innocence of the traverser at the Bar, but shall endeavor to confine my remarks to the evidence before you and the Court. I do not think it will be a difficult matter to prove to you from this evidence that the charges which have been made against Martin Carroll are not based upon truth. You are aware that it requires a great deal of labor to take down the evidence. The fact that I have been engaged in that precludes the possibility of my thoroughly weighing the evidence of the last witness, so I shall leave it for consideration farther on. Whatever your verdict may be, averse or favorable to my client, I am bound to state at the outset, that it seems to be opposed to law and reason that Orangemen,—men who are bound by a solemn oath to protect the interests of the society to which they belong,—should sit as jurymen and try a Roman Catholic who is accused of assisting in a riot and attacking an Orange hall. I have been informed by my client that several Orangemen sit in that box, and I am pained, I am embarrassed, when I remember that I am addressing you on behalf of my client, who are forbidden by a solemn oath to show justice to a Roman Catholic when the interests of Orangemen are involved. My learned friend the Attorney General has changed his tactics in this trial, and has shown a different front from that which he assumed in the case of Collins. In the present trial it appears that Orangemen alone are interested, and not the law-abiding citizens, in the maintenance of law and order, as I had assumed. Whether my client, Martin Carroll, is implicated in the quarrel which took place on the 12th of July last, or not, there is one thing certain it was an Orange quarrel.

In view, then, of the disturbance being caused by an Orange procession, I here solemnly protest against the injustice of permitting Orangemen to form part of the jury in this case. In ordinary cases the fact of a man being an Orangeman should not disqualify him as a juror. This is not an ordinary case, but one in which a Roman Catholic is being tried, not by his peers, but by Orangemen. It was apparent, when the witnesses were Orangemen, that the strong binding oath which they had taken in secret, and for life, was more respected than the truthful statements of facts which go to exonerate a Roman Catholic. If your verdict be against my client, in all probability this case will come up again in June; then the question will be argued whether Orangemen shall be permitted to try the case; or if we cannot obtain the justice which we seek we shall go to a higher Court, the Supreme Court of Canada, and if we fail there, we may go higher still, and see whether Her Majesty will concur in a conviction of a man because that man holds a certain creed. Her Majesty does not discriminate between class or creed. Throughout the wide domain of the British Empire upon which it is said the sun never sets, or in which the beat of her regimental drums never ceases, justice, even-handed justice, is supposed to be dealt out to every man, be he Roman Catholic or the strictest Protestant. The Legislature of this Island does not permit any preference to be shown in favor of a religious society, although some one was weak enough to introduce an Orange Bill into the House, yet it met with the disapproval of Her Majesty, and a lesson has been taught our legislators which they will remember. In 1830 the Acts declaring a Roman Catholic ineligible or incapable of holding office were repealed, and now all are on an equal footing. When these Acts were repealed every disability was removed. I cannot help feeling indignant when the learned Attorney General excluded every Catholic from that jury box by peremptorily ordering them to "stand aside." Why, gentlemen, what have Catholics done? Is it because they worship God, according to their own conscientious convictions, and which are not in accord with Orangeism, that they have been proscribed in this Court by the Attorney General, and are not considered competent to deal with this case on its merits? Now, gentlemen, how do we stand? It is said that a riot occurred. Call it a riot or what you like, one thing is certain,—the Roman Catholics of this place were aggravated by a banner being flaunted in their faces which was intended to recall the memory of cruel oppression and bitter wrongs which was their forefathers' portion in years gone by. Protestants know nothing of the aggravating nature of having a flag waved over their heads in defiance, or as a reminder of a victory over them in by-gone days. The Attorney General, in his former address, loudly called upon Orange boys never to allow any one to interfere with the flag that floated over them. He rang the charges upon this most vociferously. If he had meant the old red, white and blue Union Jack, then his advice would be worthy the attention of all British subjects. If men insulted that flag they deserved to be punished. If they brought disgrace upon it, I would be the last man to defend anyone for such an act. But the old flag that has "braved the battle and the breeze for over a thousand years" never stirs up turmoil and disunion among Englishmen, Irishmen or Scotchmen. It was never intended that the emblem of any secret religious society should disgrace its folds. As if there is not already enough animosity within the breasts of his particular friends that have figured in Court, the Attorney General calls upon them to "remember the deeds of their forefathers," and to take for their motto, "Never surrender." Supposing that his advice is considered worthy of notice, then the Orangemen must continuously taunt the Catholics with the remembrance of defeat, oppression and wrong, with the recollection that they have been trampled upon, and bowed to the dust, as the conquered are but seldom oppressed. Oh, gentlemen, treat the sophistry of the learned Attorney General and his inflammatory utterances as to the interference with the Orange banner, as they deserve. There is one argument which has just occurred to me, and I will state it just here. It is this: Suppose the Roman Catholics rose in a body, formed a procession, and carried a flag with the image of Luther in effigy, and the Protestants created a quarrel about it, and if the rioters were arraigned, the Attorney General, to be consistent with his practices in this case, would have none but Catholics upon the jury, and would steadily order each Protestant, as he came to the box to be sworn, to "stand aside." Would that be fair play? Would it not be a burlesque upon justice?

The traverser at the bar, we must conclude from the evidence, went to the scene of the disturbance with no intention to do any evil. He may have carried a few pipes at the time, but there is nothing in the evidence to prove him guilty of an attempt to violate the laws of the land. If there were threats to cut the halliards of the Orange flag or threaten to throw stones at a wagon passing, there is no proof that these acts were committed by him. The first principle that I lay down is, that shots were fired before stones were thrown. The aggravating shots fired from the door of the Lodge Room, were the cause of the stone throwing. The ball was set in motion by those who were armed, and if stones were thrown in return by an exasperated crowd, who objected to stand in the gutter to be shot down like dogs, then the originators of the quarrel must take the consequences of broken windows. Broken windows is the only charge which is made by the Crown officers. Those men who carried fire-arms did so contrary to the laws of the Dominion, and are culpable to the highest degree. And what do we find—the time of the Court taken up by going through every case of the traversers, because the Attorney General is hounded on by those Orangemen, who have, themselves, broken the laws of the land by discharging fire-arms, and seek, by this de laud, to shield their brothers in infamy. What do we find in the evidence for the defence? Shots were fired before stones were thrown. Unless you believe an Orangeman's secret oath before the oath of a Roman Catholic placed upon the stand in this court, you must conclude that the provocation to throw stones, came from those men who stood armed at the door of the Lodge Room and fired at the crowd or into the air. It may be said, and it has been said, that the shots were fired into the air. It matters not: the possession of arms on that occasion was a clear violation of the statutes of the Dominion. I will first take the evidence of Sergeant Allen, a great leader among the Orangemen, and a witness for the prosecution. He states that "shots were fired and stones were thrown" and that "the shots were fired first." They had no right to draw revolvers unless pursued and deeds of violence were likely to be perpetrated upon them. It has been stated that the man McKenzie was attacked by Gerard Sweeney. If he was attacked by Sweeney or interfered with, he could procure his arrest. Nothing justified the drawing of unlawful weapons. Thomas Lourie heard shots from the windows that were fired before the stones were thrown. Richard Keating gives similar evidence. Policeman Campbell saw shots fired from the platform in front of the Lodge-room, and then the stones followed. Now, I shall take the statements of defendant's witnesses. The first is William Brennan, an exceedingly honorable and upright young man, with traits stamped upon his countenance. And I hope you will not take the advice of the Crown officers and strike off his evidence because he is a Catholic, and allow the evidence of the great Sergeant Allen and his first lieutenant Campbell, or second lieutenant John Scott, to weigh with you against him. The Attorney General, with all the money of the Government and a strong combination of Orangemen at his back, was unable to call a single witness to break down the evidence of William Brennan. He held all the terrors of a dozen witnesses over him to prove that his testimony was untruthful. William Brennan stamped the evidence of John Scott as false. Who is John Scott? A reprobate, who comes here with a damnable oath in his mouth, to swear conviction upon an innocent man. He seems to be at the head of this prosecution. I will show you, gentlemen, by respectable witnesses, that his evidence is unreliable. Mr. McLoughlin, an informing schemer, comes here to sustain Mr. Scott. And this Mr. Scott is the bosom friend of McConnell, the man who fired the first shot. I am, gentlemen, notwithstanding the efforts to rebut the evidence of William Brennan, it stands unshaken. He states that he made no threats, and also that shots were fired before the stones were thrown. And who can blame the men for throwing stones? Must they stay and be shot down like dogs? Are they such arrant cowards? They fought because they were attacked in a base and cowardly manner, and because they cried out to haul down that yellow flag under which the base cowards, hiding themselves behind brick walls, fired upon them, we are told they are disloyal. Catholics, my friends! Then I have not read history aright. Upon the battlefield they have shown equal bravery with Protestants. At Talavera and Waterloo the tartan of the Highlanders, the scarlet of the Anglo-Saxon and the green of the Irish Catholic waved side by side. The blood of these gallant soldiers stained the same heather and their bodies rested in the same grave. They fought side by side for the honor of Britain, and in death they were not divided. Their names appear upon the page of history side by side, and we cherish their memories, because of their deeds of valor. I cannot contain my indignation when I see such an attempt as has been made to impeach the evidence of our witnesses, because they are Roman Catholics and of the same religion as the traverser at the bar. The next witness is John Griffin, a man of stainless character,—I have yet to hear of one blot upon his reputation. He states that he saw John Scott fire a pistol from the window. But the Council for the Crown brings Daniel Stewart to rebut this evidence, and he, with the Attorney General says, "our Johnny did not fire." "We have his own word for it, and he is an Orangeman. He did fire, gentlemen, and others fired, too; and because they did so, I do not hesitate, here, before the Court, before you, to brand them as a pack of cowards. Was there one single man in that crowd, except Orangemen with a pistol. But the prosecution in their desperation, insinuate what they dare not state; and they made the attempt most venomously. There was, they say, a great booming of guns or cannon from Quirk's yard. Is there a man believes it? Smith is the next witness. The Attorney General made an attempt to exclude his evidence. And what in Heaven's name do you think was the reason? Because he came from Antigonish! I thought he was more liberal-minded than that, but I am bound to say I am not surprised, for it is in keeping with the whole proceedings in this case. He proves that disturbance between McKenzie and Sweeney ceased, and then a cowardly set of fellows fired pistol shots. These men he saw fired into the crowd. Not only do we find that men were flying a flag insulting to Roman Catholics, but they must stand and be fired at by the same men. Our lives, our families, citizens walking on the streets are endangered by the cowardly acts of the men who use fire arms on the streets. Only where no law exists do we find the use of fire-arms. If you give a verdict against the traverser you legalize the use of fire-arms. Thomas Murphy states that Martin Carroll did not arrive till the Stipendiary Magistrate appeared on the grounds. Then we have the testimony of James Landrigan, who states that McLean fired from the window. No wonder that a ladder was procured to climb up and disarm the cowardly assailants. I would have done the same thing myself. Were they to stand and be shot down like dogs? The Stipendiary Magistrate or the policemen will find it impossible to maintain law and order if fire-arms are to be used in the manner which we have proved was done on the 12th of July last in this city. Now then, gentlemen, I come to the testimony of Mr. Henry Hughes, and I place his words above the whole batch of Orangemen who have appeared before you. He is a young man well known in this community, and much respected for his integrity. He states that pistol shots were fired before an attack was made upon the building in which the Orange Lodge was held. This evidence must prove to you conclusively that provocation was given by the Orangemen. We will give the conclusion of Mr. Palmer's address in to-morrow's issue.

Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions or statements of Correspondents.

To the Editor of the Examiner:

SIR,—I observe that the young man who does the police reporting for the "Patriot" talks of the "great unwashed" in attendance at the Court. This youth only lately got washed himself, and crept into new clothes, and he should speak with greater tenderness of a "society" of which he was so long a prominent member. SOAP.

Information Wanted.

To the Editor of the Examiner:

SIR,—I was left a "Poll-tax" bill, purporting to be from the City Collector, demanding a dollar. I am "iron-grey" in the business of teaching, and never before was I taxed to make up my own little salary. I returned the neat little bill, stating that I never did pay a school tax, nor intended to do so, until I saw a cause why. Under all former School Laws and every other law, the clergy and teachers were exempt. I have yet to learn that the teachers of the Charlottetown School District have to be taxed to make up their own salary. If such a law exists, it is a very childish one. I have sometimes heard one child say to another "Give me a dollar and I'll give you one." This is reciprocity in its mildest form. That is, if the teacher puts his money into the Treasury, it will be given back to him in payment for his services. Now that's kind. The XIX section of the School Act says, in speaking of the Poll-tax, "Every male person (except he be a clergyman, &c.) shall pay a sum of one dollar poll-tax, &c." In this section the teachers are not included. In fact, they are ignored throughout the whole of the provisions made for the Poll-tax. The information I want from you, Mr. Editor, is, ought I to give the City Collector a dollar to make up my own salary, when I can find no law enjoining upon me to do so? An answer from you or any other more learned in the law, will greatly gratify a grey-headed TEACHER.

February 14, 1878.

ON SALE.

Oil. 30 Casks best American Oil, at 36 cents. 200 bbls. Castor Oil and Sweet Oil. HENRY COOMBS.

Fish. 40 Quintals good Codfish, 500 boxes fresh Smoked Herring, Labrador Herring. Good and cheap. HENRY COOMBS.

Fruit. 90 Boxes Raisins, at from 9 to 12 cts. per lb; 700 lbs Dates, 7 cts. per lb; Oranges, Peanuts, Cocoanuts, Figs; 500 lbs. Dried Apples, Cranberries, Canned Peaches, Plums and Cherries. HENRY COOMBS.

Beans. Good American Beans and Split Peas. HENRY COOMBS.

Blueing. 9 Gross Bartlett's best, 15 Gross Pickstone's Washing Crystal, at low prices; 3 Casks Soda, Whitening. HENRY COOMBS.

Acid. 10 lbs. Citric Acid, Senna, Salts, and Magnesia. HENRY COOMBS.

Corks. 50 Gross, from 40 cts. to 60 cts. HENRY COOMBS.

Matches. 50 Gross Byram's best. HENRY COOMBS.

Corn. Cracked Corn, Cheese, Onions, Brooms and Brushes, from 8 to 30 cents. HENRY COOMBS.

Casks. Empty Casks, Kegs, Bottles, Demijohns and Oil Drums on sale. Repairs attended to. Cooper Shop on premises. HENRY COOMBS.

Drinks. 10 gallons Lime Juice, Lemon Syrup, Raspberry Vinegar. HENRY COOMBS.

Ch'town, Feb. 13—3taw

To Dorsey & Jost's Debtors!

TO ALL PERSONS INDEBTED TO US, we hereby give notice that after the Tenth Day of March next they will be liable to law expenses for the collection of their accounts. We would rather not adopt the above course, but we have payments to make, and must positively collect our outstanding accounts. DORSEY & JOST. Ch'town, Feb. 12, 1878.—3taw ne ar till mar. 10

FOR SALE,

SCHOONER "PHENIX," 42 tons, 4 years old, now lying between Steam Navigation Co's Wharf and Peake's No. 3 Wharf in Charlottetown. For particulars and terms apply to A. A. McLEAN, Esq., Attorney-at-Law, Charlottetown, or to the Subscriber. MALCOLM NICHOLSON. Eldon, Lot 57, Feb. 12, 1878.

New Advertisements.

Citizens' Skating Rink CARNIVAL!

The Carnival for 1878 will take place, (ice permitting),

Thursday Evening, Feb. 28th.

It is the intention of the Directors to use every effort to make this CARNIVAL SUPERIOR to any of the previous ones. Feb. 13, 1878—pro & j li. semwklly pat 2i

MERCHANTS

Marine Insurance Co'y

OF P. E. ISLAND.

NOTICE.

THE Annual General Meeting of the Shareholders of the above Company will be held in the Young Men's Christian Association Hall, Charlottetown, on

Wednesday, the 13th March,

AT THREE O'CLOCK,

for the election of Directors for the ensuing year and the transaction of other business.

FENTON T. NEWBERY,

Manager.

Feb. 9, 1878—pat law till meeting

GRAND CONCERT

ON THE

14th February,

Under the Patronage of his Lordship the Bishop of Charlottetown.

IN AID OF THE POOR.

THE MEMBERS OF

St. Patrick's T. A. Society

respectfully announce to the public that a

GRAND CONCERT!

OF

Vocal & Instrumental Music

WILL BE GIVEN IN

ST. PATRICK'S HALL,

On Thursday Ev'g, Feb. 14,

At which some of the best talent of the City will assist. From the success which has attended former Concerts of this Society, the public may rely upon the Committee of Management leaving nothing undone, on their part, to make the forthcoming Concert worthy of their patronage. Tickets of admission, 25 cents; reserved seats, 40 cents. Doors open at 7 o'clock; Concert to commence at 8 o'clock. THOMAS FLYNN, Sec'y to Com. February 12 1878—2i

TENDERS.

MAYOR'S OFFICE, Charlottetown, Feb. 8th, 1878.

TENDERS for PRINTING & BINDING 300 Copies of "The City Bye-Laws" will be received at the Mayor's Office until noon of FRIDAY, 15th inst. Samples of paper, type, and binding can be seen at this Office.

WM. B. MORRISON, City Clerk.

Feb. 8—5i

Clothes Cleaning Depot,

(Above Mr. D. Farquharson's Store),

CORNER OF QUEEN & DORCHESTER STREETS.

Renovating and Repairing Clothes.

MR. PATTERSON guarantees that no matter how badly faded or stained garments may be, he will restore them to their original color. JOHN PATTERSON.

Feb. 9—

NORTH STAR COFFEE AND LUNCH ROOMS

—AND—

OYSTER SALOON.

MRS. E. COOMBS,

SUCCESSOR TO

J. CARROL.

MEALS served at all hours of the day and evening, at reduced rates.

OYSTERS sent to all parts of the City at the very low price of

30 CENTS PER QUART!

Also for sale by the Barrel, Bushel, or Peck to suit purchasers. Ch'town, Jan. 14, 1878—2 aw

BUY THE DAILY EXAMINER for the latest news—local and telegraphic