Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir—I will now proceed to fulfil my promise with regard to "Good Queen Bess." "A Normal School Student" says:—"Let us now hear what is said of Mary's successor, Elizabeth, popularly known among the people of England as good Queen Bess. At page 190, I find that "without any of the causes which induced the severity spoken of in Mary's reign, she commenced a systematic and cruel persecution of her Catholic subjects." "Of the private character of Elizabeth nothing favorable," we are informed, page 192, "can be said." "Insincere, treacherous, cruel and tyrannical, she appeared destitute of every gentle quality which adorns her sex."

This is all true, and ten times more, as I shall show from the most respectable Protestant authorities. But why did not the writer give some favourable extracts from the "Outlines of History." At page 191 Grace says:—"The reign of Elizabeth is one of the most striking and prosperous in the history of England. She was a woman possessed of masculine powers of mind and singular abilities as a sovereign; and the splendid though despotic course which marked her policy, elevated England to a more brilliant position than it had ever before attained. She grouped around her throne some of the brightest intellects that England ever claimed. Among these may be mentioned Bacon, Burleigh, and Walsingham, as statesmen; Sir Francis Drake, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Robert, Earl of Essex, as commanders; and Spenser and William Shakspeare, as poets."

I call the special attention of the *Scotch* of Belfast, New Glasgow, Lot 67, Murray Harbour Road, &c., to the following extract which the writer in the *Monitor* considered it very prudent not to give. "Circumstances of the most tragical and distressing character, having driven the beautiful and accomplished Queen of Scots from her own kingdom, she—relying upon the plausible professions of the Queen of England—sought a refuge from her persecutors at the hands of Elizabeth. The asylum she found was a prison. The stern and cruel Queen of England had dissembled, but had never forgotten her fear and resentment. After a cruel captivity of eighteen years, the ill-fated Queen of Scotland was brought to a trial, which was a mere mockery, condemned upon base and slanderous charges, and was beheaded by order of Elizabeth, A. C. 1587. This atrocious act has stamped a stain of infamy on the character of Elizabeth, which will descend with her name to the latest posterity."

That person who would say that Grace's character of Elizabeth is partial to Catholics, treasonable or disloyal, must be grovelling in deplorable ignorance regarding English History. Let us listen to what Protestant authors of undeniable authority say of "Good Queen Bess."

Wade, her own countryman, says of Elizabeth:—"Her amiability and morality must be at once given up. She had no feminine graces. Like her person, her mind, passions and even accomplishments were masculine. The execution of the unfortunate Scottish Queen, though deemed necessary by her ministers, is an ineffaceable blot on her memory. Amongst the legislative and judicial machinery she used, her absoluteness was ever the guiding principle.

"First was the Court of *Star Chamber*, whose members held their places during the pleasure of the crown, and might *fine, imprison, and punish corporally, by whipping, branding, slitting the nostrils and ears.* The Queen, if present, was sole judge; and the jurisdiction of the court extended to all sorts of offences, contempts and disorders, that lay out of the reach of the common law.

The Court of High Commission was a still more arbitrary jurisdiction. Its vengeance was directed against heresy, *which was defined as a difference of opinion on religion and morals with the Queen.*"

"Martial law was first introduced by her. In suspicious times, the jails were full of prisoners, who were thrown into dungeons loaded with irons, and frequently tortured to extract confessions. Not unfrequently in the agony of their tortures, the unhappy sufferers wrongly accused others or themselves. Against these enormities the subject had no redress; neither judge nor jury dared to acquit *when the crown was bent on conviction.* The Queen, by special warrants, claimed the right to interfere to stop the course of justice. There are many records of special warrants granted by the Queen to save malefactors from death; these warrants were neither to be canvassed, disputed, nor examined."

One of the kinds of torture alluded to in the above extract was called the "Scavenger's daughter," which has been described as "a broad hoop of iron, consisting of two parts, fastened by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. Then the executioner, kneeling on his shoulders, and having introduced the hoop under his legs, compressed the victim close together, till he was able to *fasten the feet and hands together over the small of the back.* The time allotted to this kind of torture was an hour and a half, during which time the blood gushed from the nostrils, and sometimes from the hands and feet." The *Rack* was another instrument of torture. "This was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back on the floor. His wrists and ankles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame: these were moved by levers in opposite directions, till the body rose to a level with the frame. Questions were then put, and if the answers did not prove satisfactory, the sufferer was *stretched more and more, till the bones started from their sockets.*"

The Court of Elizabeth was notorious for dissoluteness. A writer of the time describes it as a place "where was little godliness and exercise of religion, but where all enormities reigned in the highest degree," (Ellis's Original Letters); another, as a place "where there was no love but that of the lusty god of gallantry, Asmodeus." Another writer says: "The only discontent I have is to live where there is so little godliness and exercise of religion, so dissolute manners and corrupt conversation generally, which I find to be worse than when I knew the place first. (August 1, 1582. Birch, 1 25). Another writer says of her:—"At all times her discours was sprinkled with oaths: in the sallies of her anger it abounded with imprecations and abuse. Nor did she content herself with words: not only the ladies about her person, but her courtiers and the highest officers in the state felt the weight of her hands. She collared Hatton, she gave a blow on the ear to the Earl Marshal, and she spat on Sir Matthew ———, with the foppery of whose dress she was offended." (Nugæ Ant. 167, 176.)

Whitaker, a Protestant Clergyman of the Church of England, speaking of "Good Queen Bess," the "*Virgin* Queen," says:—"Her life was stained with *gross licentiousness*, and she had many *gallants* while she called herself a *maiden* queen." I wonder if this Protestant historian was accused of "treason," or received a "gold medal" from the Pope for having given to Elizabeth such a disgusting character.

William Cobbet, the Protestant historian, in his article on Elizabeth, says:—"Her *virgin* propensity led her to prefer that sort of intercourse with men which I need not more particularly allude to. Her amours with Leicester, of whom we shall see enough by-and-by, were open and notorious, and have been most amply detailed by many Protestant historians, some of whom have been clergymen of the Church of England. It is, moreover, well known that these amours became the subject of *a play*, acted in the reign of Charles II. She had in the 13th year of her reign assented to an Act that was passed, which secured the crown to her "*natural issue*," by which any *bastard* that she might have by *anybody* became heir to the throne; and it was by the same Act made *high treason* to deny that such issue was heir to it. This Act, which is still in the Statute Book, 13 Eliz., chap. 1, S 2, is a proof of the most hardened profligacy that ever was witnessed in woman; and it is surprising that such a mark of apparent national abjectness and infamy should have been suffered to remain in black and white to this day. Her ministers and the nation, who saw all the dangers of such a match (with Anjou) to the independence of their country, protested against it most vehemently, and finally deterred her from it; but a gentleman of Lincoln's Inn, who had written and published a pamphlet against the marriage, was persecuted, and had *his right hand chopped off* for his public spirited effort in assisting to save England from the ruin about to be brought upon it, for the mere gratification of the appetite of a gross, libidinous, nasty, shameless old woman. It was said of her monster of a father that "he spared no man in his anger, and no woman in his lust:" the very same, in substance, with a little change of the terms, might be said of this his monster of a daughter." At No. 316 the same historian says:—"To enumerate, barely to enumerate, all, or one half of the acts of hypocrisy, perfidy, meanness, and barbarity that "*good* Bess" practised against this unfortunate Queen (Mary Queen of Scots), who was little more than twenty-five years of age when she was inveigled within the reach of her harpy claws; barely to enumerate these would require a space exceeding that of this whole Number. While she affected to disapprove of Murray, she instigated him to accuse his Queen and sister; while she pretended to assert the inviolability of sovereigns, she appointed a commission to *try* Mary for her conduct in Scotland; while she was vowing vengeance against the Scotch traitors for their rebellious acts against her cousin, she received as presents from them a large part of the jewels which Mary had received from her first husband, the King of France; and when at last she was compelled to declare Mary innocent of having consented to the murder, she not only refused to restore her, agreeably to her solemn promise repeatedly made, but refused also to give her her liberty, and, moreover, made her imprisonment more close, rigorous and painful than ever. Murray, her associate in perfidy, was killed in 1570 by a man whose estate he had unjustly confiscated; but traitor after traitor succeeded him, every traitor in her pay, and Scotland bleeding all the while at every pore, because her cruel policy taught her that it was necessary to her own security. Whitaker produces a crowd of authorities to prove that she endeavoured to get Mary's infant son *into her hands*, and that having failed in that, she endeavoured to cause him to be *taken off by poison*! At last, in 1587, the tigress brought her long-suffering victim to the block! The sentence of death was pronounced in October. For four months the savage "good Queen Bess" was employed in devising plans for causing her victim to be *assassinated*, in order to avoid the odium of being herself the murderer! This is proved by Whitaker beyond all possibility of doubt." At page 170 this historian continues thus:—"Detestably base as was the conduct of "*good* Queen Bess" in the act of murdering her unfortunate cousin, her subsequent hypocrisy was still more detestable. She affected the deepest *sorrow* for the act that had been committed, pretended that it had been done against her wish, and had the superlative injustice and baseness to *imprison* her Secretary, Davison, for having despatched the warrant for the execution, though she, observe, had *signed* that warrant, and though, as Whitaker has fully proved, she had reviled Davison for not having despatched it, after she had, in vain, used all the means in her power to induce him to employ assassins to do the deed. She had by a series of perfidies and cruelties, wholly without a parallel, brought her hopeless victim to the block, in that very country to which she had invited her to seek safety; she had, in the last sad and awful moments of that victim, had the barbarity to refuse her the consolations of a divine of her own communion; she had pursued her with hatred and malice that remained unglutted even when she saw her prostrate under the common hangman; and when she saw the blood gushing from her severed neck—unsated with the destruction of her body, she, Satan-like, had sought the everlasting destruction of her soul: and yet the deed being done, she had the more than Satan-like hypocrisy to affect to *weep* for the untimely end of her "*dear cousin*;" and which was still more diabolical, to make use of her despotic power to crush her humane Secretary, under pretence that he had been the cause of the sad catastrophe! All expressions of detestation and horror fall short of our feelings, and our only consolation is, that we are to see her own end ten thousand times more to be dreaded than that of her victim."

The "Encyclopædia Perthensis," in the article on England, has the following:—"This pacification was soon followed by an irreconcileable quarrel with Mary, Queen of Scotland; which was not extinguished but by the death of the Scottish princess; and that with such circumstances of ACCUMULATED TREACHERY, HYPOCRISY, and DISSIMULATION, as have stamped an INDELIBLE DISGRACE on the MEMORY of ELIZABETH."

Whitaker makes the following remarks on the murder of the Scotch Queen:—"The legal murder of Mary of Scotland took place on the 8th February, 1587, a day of *everlasting infamy to the memory of the English Queen*, who had no sensibility of tenderness, and no sentiments of generosity, who looked not forward to the awful verdict of history, and who shuddered not at the infinitely more awful doom of God. I blush, *as an Englishman*, to think that this was done by an English Queen, and one whose name *I was taught* to lisp in my infancy, as the honor of her sex and the glory of our isle."

I presume all these Protestant authors had not floating over their heads every week "a large flag with the motto, "IN HOC SIGNO VINCES," surmounted with a cross!"

The "London Encyclopædia" has the following:—"While the nation was thus artfully prepared for the destruction of Mary, Elizabeth ordered Secretary Davison to bring to her the warrant for her death. Having perused it, she observed that it was expressed in proper terms, and annexed her subscription. Though she earnestly desired the death of Mary, she was yet terrified to encounter its infamy. She was solicitous to accomplish this base transaction by some method which would conceal her consent to it. After intimating to Davison an anxious wish that its blame should be removed from her, she counselled him to join with Walsingham in addressing a letter to Sir Amias Paulet and Sir Drue Drury, recommending it to them to manifest their love to her by *shedding privately the blood of her adversary.* The unlawfulness of this deed affected Davison, and he objected to it. She repeated absolutely her injunctions, and he departed to deliver them. A letter under his name and that of Walsingham was despatched to Mary's keepers, communicating to them her purpose. *Corrupted by her passions, and lost to the sensibilities of virtue*, Elizabeth had now reached the last extremity of this wickedness. Though a sovereign princess, and entrusted with the cares of a great nation, she blushed not to charge her ministers to enjoin a *murder—a murder connected with every circumstance that could make it most frightful and horrid.* The victim for whose blood she thirsted was a woman, a queen, a relation, splendid in beauty, eminent in ability, magnanimous under misfortunes, and who had fled to her for refuge from her enemies. *A wild Arab would have spared his enemy on this principle alone.* Sir Amias Paulet and Sir Drue Drury, though the slaves of religious prejudices, felt an elevation of mind which reflected the *greatest disgrace on the sovereign.* They considered themselves grossly insulted by the proposal; and they assured Walsingham that the queen might command their lives and their property, but that they would never consent to part with their honor, and to stain themselves and their posterity with the guilt of ASSASSINATION. When Davison carried their dispatch to her she broke out into anger. Their scrupulous delicacy, she said, was an infringement of their oath of association; and they were nice, precise, and perjured traitors. *She then recommended one Wingfield to strike the blow.* The astonished Secretary exclaimed with warmth against a mode of proceeding so unwarrantable. He protested that if she should take upon herself the blame of this deed, it would pollute her with the blackest dishonor."

I thought to enter into particulars regarding Elizabeth's "*scourging of Ireland*, which unhappy country still bears the marks of her scorpion lash," and her cruel persecution, not only of Catholics, but also of those Protestants who dared to differ from herself; but the fear of taking up too much of your valuable space compels me to confine myself to the following extracts from the Protestant historian Cobbet, who, in his younger days, had written against Catholics.

"When one looks at the deeds of this foul tyrant, when one sees what abject slavery she had reduced the nation to, and especially when one views this *Commission*, it is impossible for us not to reflect with shame on what we have so long been saying against the Spanish Inquisition, which from its first establishment to the present hour, has not committed so much cruelty as this ferocious Protestant apostate committed in any one single year of the forty-three years of her reign. And, observe again, and never forget, that Catholics, where they inflicted punishments, inflicted them on the ground that the offenders had *departed* from the faith in which they had been bred, and which they had professed; whereas the Protestant punishments have been inflicted on men because they *refused to depart* from the faith in which they had been bred, and which they professed all their lives. And in the particular case of this brutal hypocrite, they were punished, and that, too, in the most barbarous manner, for adhering to that very religion which she had openly professed for many years of her life, and to which she, even at her coronation, had *sworn* that she belonged! It is hardly necessary to attempt to describe the sufferings that the Catholics had to endure during this murderous reign. No tongue, no pen is adequate to the task. To hear mass, to harbour a priest, to admit the supremacy of the Pope, to deny this horrid virago's spiritual supremacy, and many other things which an honorable Catholic could scarcely avoid, consigned them to the scaffold and to the bowel-ripping knife. But the most cruel of her acts, even more cruel than her butcheries, because of far more extensive effect, and far more productive of suffering in the end, were the penal laws inflicting *fines* for *recusancy*, that is to say, for not going to her new-fangled Protestant Church. And was there ever tyranny equal to this? Not only were men to be punished for not confessing that the new religion was the true one: not only for continuing to practise the religion in which they and their fathers and children had been born and bred; but *also punished* for not actually going to the new assemblages, and there performing what they must, if they were sincere, necessarily deem an act of open apostacy and blasphemy. Now, in the whole world, was there heard of before tyranny equal to this?"

"The fines were so heavy, and were exacted with such unrelenting rigour, and for the offence of *recusancy* alone the sums were so enormous, that the whole of the conscientious Catholics were menaced with utter ruin. The priests who had never been out of England, and who were priests before the reign of this horrible woman, were, by the 20th year of her reign, few in number; for the law forbade the making of any new ones on pain of death; and, indeed, none could be made in England where there was no clerical authority to ordain them, the surviving Catholic Bishops being forbidden to do it on pain of *death*. Then she harassed the remainder of the old priests in such a way that they were, by the 20th year of her reign, nearly exterminated; and as it was *death* for a priest to come from abroad, *death* to harbour him, *death* for him to perform his functions in England, death to confess to him, there appeared to be an impossibility of preventing her from extirpating, totally extirpating from the land, that religion under which England had been so great and so happy for ages—that religion of charity and hospitality—that religion which made the name of pauper unknown—that religion which had built the Churches and Cathedrals, which had planted and reared the Universities whose professors had made Magna Charta and the Common Law, and who had performed all those glorious deeds in legislation and in arms which had made England *really* the envy of surrounding nations, and the admiration of the world."

"To *say* mass, to *hear* mass, to *make* confession, to *hear* confession, to *teach* the Catholic religion, to be *taught* it, to *keep from her Church service*—these were all *great crimes*, and all punished with a greater or less degree of severity; so that the gallowses, and gibbets, and racks were in constant use, and the gaols and dungeons choking with the victims. The punishment for keeping away from her Church was £20 *a lunar month*, which, of money of the present day, was about £250. Thousands upon thousands refused to go to her church; and thus she sacked their thousands upon thousands of estates; for, observe, here was in money of this day, a fine of £3,550 a year. And now, sensible and just reader, look at the barbarity of this. See a gentleman of, perhaps, sixty years of age or more—see him born and bred a Catholic, compelled to make himself and his children beggars, actual beggars, or to commit what he deemed an act of apostacy and blasphemy. Imagine, if you can, barbarity equal to this; and yet even this is not seen in its most horrible light, unless we take into view that the tyrant who committed it had for many years of her life openly professed the Catholic religion, and had at her coronation sworn that she firmly believed in that religion."

"As to the poor conscientious '*recusants*,' that is to say, keepers away from the tyrant's Church, they who had no money to pay fines with, were crammed into prison until the gaols could—which was very soon—hold no more, and until the counties petitioned to be relieved from the charge of keeping them. They were then discharged, being first *publickly whipped*, or having their *ears bored with a hot iron.* This, not answering the purpose, an act was passed to compel all '*recusants*,' not worth twenty marks a year, to *quit the country* in three months after conviction, and to punish them with *death* in case of their return. The old '*good Bess*' defeated herself here, for it was found impossible to cause the law to be executed, in spite of all her menaces against the Justices and Sheriffs, who could not be brought up to her standard of ferociousness; and they, therefore, in order to punish the poor Catholics, levied sums on them at their pleasure, as a composition for the crime of abstaining from apostacy and profanation." Her life, as Whitaker observes, "was a life of '*mischief and of misery*,' and in her death she did all the mischief that it remained in her power to do by sulkily refusing to name her successor, and thus leaving to a people, whom she had been pillaging and scourging for forty-five years, a probable civil war, as '*a legacy of mischief* after her death.' Historians have been divided in opinion as to which was the *worst* man that England ever produced, her father, or Cranmer; but all mankind must agree that this was the *worst woman* that ever existed in England, or in the whole world, JEZABEL herself no excepted." These extracts require no comment; they speak for themselves.

These authorities whom I have quoted were not of the 'faithful,' neither were their works printed by Dunigan and Brother; nor did they themselves receive from the Pope 'a gold medal', for their services in making known some of the filthy abominations of '*Good* Queen Bess,' the '*Virgin* Queen,' the 'Bright Occidental Star'!!! 'A Normal School Student' in his 'simplicity and ignorance' may think that it has a 'bad tendency to exhibit to the world the villainy, immorality and perfidy of a tyrant; but people of common sense will be of opinion that it is better to teach truth than to hug to one's breast the ignorance and prejudice in which a person may be nurtured, or to endeavour to injure his neighbour by propagating slander and calumny regarding him, by garbling history, ridiculing his religion, and by gratifying the most malignant intentions of which human depravity can be guilty. He may consider it admirable sport to accuse Mr. Roche of disloyalty and treason, and do his best to arouse against him the prejudices of the ignorant, because he teaches his pupils that Elizabeth was 'treacherous and tyrannical;' but when the reading public shall become acquainted with the real merits of the matter, they can entertain for the writer in the *Monitor* no other feelings than those of unqualified scorn and contempt for his 'base' attempts at defamation; and they cannot regard a journal which contains weekly the most vile and scurrilous abuse of Catholics and their Clergy otherwise than a most 'infamous publication.' It would be well that the Board of Education would see what history is taught in the Normal School, so that the youth of this Colony may not be taught, as the writer in the *Monitor* has been, to call that monster 'Good Queen Bess'' whom the most respectable Protestant historians represent to have been 'AS GREAT A TYRANT AS EVER LIVED'; whose 'DISGUSTING AMOURS WERE NOTORIOUS'; whose 'LIFE WAS STAINED WITH GROSS LICENTIOUSNESS''; who was a 'GROSS, LIBIDINOUS, NASTY, SHAMELESS OLD WOMAN'; a 'TYGRESS' who procured the legal murder of the Queen of Scotland, when a 'WILD ARAB' would have spared her, and 'UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES OF ACCUMULATED TREACHERY, HYPOCRISY, AND DISSIMULATION AS HAVE STAMPED AN INDELIBLE DISGRACE' of 'EVERLASTING INFAMY' on her memory; a fiend in human shape, who wished to ASSASSINATE her cousin in cold blood!!!

Hoping that 'Diabolus' shall not seize the '*Monitor* man,' or 'A Normal School Student' by the nose with a red-hot tongs, and hurry him 'down unfathomable depths,' before I shall have further shown him what an act of consummate folly he has committed in exposing to the public his stupid 'simplicity and ignorance,' I remain yours sincerely,

Jan'y. 9th, 1861. A TEACHER.

For the Examiner.

TO GEORGE DUNDAS, ESQ., LIEUT. GOVERNOR AND COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF, &c., &c.

Sir—Clad in the constitutional armour of the subject, I again respectfully and publicly use my privilege to address your Excellency.

This paper will be confined to the gist matter of a a correspondence between your Excellency's Secretary, W. H. Pope, Esqr., and the Hon. Mr. Haviland, which appeared in the *Islander* of the 4th inst., and with which, I assume, your Excellency is acquainted.

That correspondence is issued obviously as a successful remover of the public impression of dishonorable dealing imputed to your Secretary in certain transactions with the President and Directors of the Prince Edward Island Banking Company, and related in my first communication to your Excellency, as having obtained credence in the public mind during Sir Dominick Daly's administration of the Government of this Colony, and which influenced Sir Dominick to the exclusion of Mr. Pope from office under his Government.

Reverting to the correspondence in the *Islander*, but more particularly and immediately to Mr. Haviland's response to Mr. Pope's communication, seeking certificate of good name, your Excellency will probably, with myself, observe that Mr H's letter in its entirety merely is a belief simply announced, and a naked assertion made in vindication of the honor of your Secretary, Mr Pope.

Mr. Haviland expresses his belief that in the transaction with the Bank, Mr Pope endorsed certain Bills, purely "to oblige the drawer," and he asserts that the charge preferred against Mr. Pope in the *Examiner* has not the least foundation in truth." When the Hon. Mr. Haviland came to the rescue of his friend, he should have spared me the trouble of correcting him in his statement of 'charge preferred, &c." I made, as your Excellency is aware, and Mr. Haviland must be sensible, no *charge* against Mr. Pope. I merely related certain public impressions of damaging conduct which had obtained against him in his dealing at the Bank. Having set Mr. Haviland right, I would now take leave to observe, your Excellency, that when Mr. Haviland used the expression "to oblige the drawer," he appeared to hold in light esteem the obligation which devolves upon an endorser who guarantees the payment of any paper at maturity. Would Mr Haviland gravely venture to own that when an individual makes his endorsement on Bills representing cash to be paid at any stated period, that by such endorsement he does *not* incur a deeply personal responsibility for the payment of that paper upon its becoming matured; or that *he*, the endorser, is *not* morally bound to protect against loss, by all lawful and proper means within his power, the holder of that paper, irrespectively of any private understanding or pecuniary consideration, or matter of obligation, existing between himself and the drawer, whose guarantee he voluntarily became, and on whose credit the paper was negotiated? Would Mr. Haviland think it the act of an honorable man, with a show of property in his own right, grounded upon which his pecuniary ability rests, to lend his name to "oblige the drawer," and thereby effect the sale or negotiation of Exchange or other Bills; but upon the stamp of dishonor being impressed upon the Exchange or Bills which he had endorsed, conveys away his property, real and personal, beyond the reach of the law, and sets his creditors at defiance? Would Mr. Haviland, I again ask, hold or esteem such an individual, either honorable, honest or trustworthy, or a respectable member of society? Could Mr. Haviland think much of that man's morality or decency who could deceive, dupe, and inflict severe pecuniary loss upon, for example, any Banking Company; and after having victimised the Company, could openly abuse, caricature and defame its President and Directors; and in the most coarse manner, broadly glory in the deception he had practised, and rejoice in the wrong he had inflicted? Surely Mr. Haviland could not or should not countenance such ingrate conduct; or sanction any of those dishonorable acts. I do not say that he has favored such depravity; nor do I allege that Mr. Pope has been guilty of any of those abominations; but your Excellency will perceive I have merely propounded questions.

Again, turning to Mr. Haviland, your Excellency will permit me to observe that he writes thus: "the *charge*," as he erroneously styles it, "in the *Examiner* is without the least foundation in truth." I hope the public impression referred to is without foundation, both as regards the sustentation of Mr. Haviland's veracity, and the honor of Mr. Pope; but, your Excellency, the naked assertion of Mr. Haviland may be insufficient to the aimed at end, and his vindication of Mr. Pope prove futile.

Directing your Excellency's attention to Mr. Haviland's triumphal burst, in which his pen appears to glow with "the Bank-exonerated Mr. Pope from all liability," I have to remark, it is true, your Excellency; but why did Mr. Haviland neglect to state the circumstances under which that exoneration culminated. Perhaps it might be unpleasant and inconvenient to do so; or mayhap, his Christian charity, overwhelmed with virtue, might lean from virtue's side, and he feared to trust himself.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Haviland has appeared in defence, and such a defence of his friend, Mr. Pope. "Cunning of fence" as these tactitian gentlemen are, I opine that a wrong move was made in placing the Hon. Mr. Haviland in the foreground, which should have been occupied by Ralph Brecken, Esqr., the late President of the Bank. If Mr. Pope's dealing with the Bank was of the honorable character which Mr. Haviland asserts it was, no injury to Mr Pope's honor and integrity could accrue, if Mr. Brecken, who was President of the Bank at the time of the Bills transaction, had been asked to give his certificate in the case. That palpably proper course not having been adopted, I am constrained, your Excellency, to think it "passing strange" that Mr. Haviland, who, at the time of the dealing in question, was sojourning in Europe, far from the scene of our Bank's victimisation, and who could not be fully acquainted with the whole minutia of the transaction, is sought for, and comes forward and publishes the blemishless honor of Mr. Pope. The public, however, must naturally be of opinion that the late President, Mr Brecken, intimately acquainted with Mr. Pope's dealing by daily observation, was and is *the* gentleman to give *the* certificate. Yes, your Excellency, Mr. Brecken was the fitter—the proper gentleman to give evidence of the integrity of Mr. Pope; Mr. Brecken's moral attitude is as high as that of Mr. Haviland; his veracity as reliable—his word as good—his judgment as clear and unbiassed; and his knowledge of the facts sounder than Mr Haviland's; but passing by the fountain, Mr. Pope appears at the pool, obtains his semi-*carte blanche* from Mr. Haviland, and wears the frail ingenious thing upon his downcast brow.

Should your Excellency's Secretary, Mr. Pope, be able to obtain from the late President Mr. Brecken, a paper with his name affixed thereto, exonerating Mr. Pope from dishonorable dealing, and announce therein to the public that Mr. Pope's conduct towards the Bank, in the case referred to, was marked by honor and integrity; then, your Excellency, the stain of dishonor and the spotted integrity imputed, with what truth I know not to your Secretary, would be wiped away, and his name would be freshened with a new odor in this community.

I am,
Your Excellency's ob'dt. Servant,
NOM DE PLUME.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir,—Our Government appear to be fast hastening their destruction by their incapacity, stupidity, inconsistency, and their aristocratic and high-Tory predilections. Was ever people imposed on as our Proprietary Government wish to impose on the people of P. E. Island? Our sapient rulers have been speaking for the last two years about the wonderful things they would do, in order to *perfect* our system of education; but as yet they have done nothing towards this end. It is all down hill work with them, and they appear to be fairly bewildered with regard to the new College. They have been nearly a whole year engaged in converting the Academy into the College; and yet this building is now a perfect disgrace to the Colony. It is fitter for a Cow-house than for a College. Professor Ingles cannot entertain a very high opinion of those who sent for him, and praised this place up to the skies. When he was delivering his inaugural address the other day the Government should have blushed with shame at the exceedingly shabby appearance of their College, the study room of which resembles a Smoke-House, for its ceiling is as black and dirty as smoke can make it. The whole building, with its smoky ceiling, broken plaster, &c., presents a most wretched and dilapidated appearance. Our wonderfully wise rulers closed the Academy last summer, and thereby deprived many young men of the opportunity of prosecuting their studies. They have shown a specimen of their inimitable economy by having a Professor for several months, at a high salary, and doing nothing! They neglected to get a second Professor, and have been obliged to appoint as Teacher in the College Mr. Monk, whom they themselves dismissed from the Normal School. This is consistency with a vengeance! The people thought that when the College would be opened they could send their sons to it for a very low sum; they thought that it was quite enough for them to pay £600 per annum to the Professors; but alas! how sadly have they been disappointed! They now find that the tuition fee for one pupil is the extraordinary, the unreasonable sum of *ten pounds!* The Government do not wish the poor man's son to go to the College; they do not want the tradesman's son to go to it; the Prince of Wales' College is to be only for the young gentry of Charlottetown and vicinity—for the young Havilands, Orlebars, Hancocks, Longworths, DeBloises, &c. The poor honest man's son must not presume to go to the same school as these high-born persons—these scions of our aristocracy! The tuition fee for pupils from the country should be *nil*; it is difficult enough for them to pay forty or fifty pounds for their board. The fee for City pupils should be such as to allow the poorest man to send his son to the College. The action of the Government with regard to the new College will have the effect, I trust, of opening the eyes of the people to see the base manner in which their dearest interests are being unscrupulously sacrificed by an unprincipled, Tory, Proprietary faction. The people of P. E. Island will not soon forget the TEN POUND fee of the new College.

Jan'y 11, 1861. A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

THE PRINCE'S BOUNTY.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir—It appears that the *Monitor* has become the organ of the Government, for it states, "by authority," in answer to my enquiry respecting the money left by the Prince of Wales for the benefit of the poor—that it will be made known at some future day how the money has been spent. I regret that Her Majesty's Representative has been compelled to make use of such a disreputable character as the "Monitor Man" to give this or any other announcement respecting public affairs. But the information in this case is by no means satisfactory. I am informed that the amount left by the Prince for charitable purposes was £150 Island currency; and this has been distributed amongst a few favourites to be doled out in such pittances, and at such times as they may see fit, leaving the poor recipients in doubt or ignorance as to who their generous donor may be. There are several Charitable Societies in the City, and surely either or all of them might have been, with great propriety, entrusted with the distribution of the Prince's bounty.

It has been said that a portion of this money has been given to a certain individual to finish a half-built house. Will the new Government organ state, "by authority," whether this is the case or not?

January 5, 1861. ENQUIRER.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir.—In the report of my evidence before the Land Commissioners, contained in your last issue, I notice the following errors, which I presume are typographical, viz:—"The average price of sales of land per acre on Lot 14," should be, "the average price of sales of land per acre on Lot 24." "Has been agent for Mr. Melville," should read—'Has been agent for Mr Winsloe." "The lands reserved" should be, "The rents reserved." "They prefer paying 10s. an acre as rent," should be, "They prefer paying 1s. an acre as rent" "On Sir S. Cunard's property the tenants have had the opportunity of purchasing at 10s. per acre," should be, "On Sir S. Cunard's property the tenants have had the opportunity of purchasing at 20s. per acre." H. J. CUNDALL.

VERY COMMENDABLE.

On the 1st inst., a Committee of the Bay Fortune section of the Rev. Henry Crawford's congregation waited on their pastor, and presented to him the following Address, and a very excellent sleigh and set of silver plated harness. The sleigh was bought at the shop of Mr. Kellow, in Georgetown, and cost £12; and the harness at the shop of Mr. William Smardon, in this City, and cost £12 10s. Both are superior articles, and on account of their workmanship reflect great credit on the parties by whom they have been prepared. It is worthy of notice, too, that when Mr. Smardon was informed of the purpose for which the harness was bought he generously deducted £1 10s. from the price, as a donation from himself towards the praiseworthy object.

ADDRESS

To the Rev. Henry Crawford, Pastor of the Presbyterian Congregation of East St. Peter's, Bay Fortune, &c.:

We, a Committee appointed by the Bay Fortune, Souris, and Grand River section of your congregation, have come to wish you *a happy New Year*, and to express to you our gratitude for your faithful and acceptable pastoral labours among us. Eight years have now nearly elapsed since you first visited this congregation, and more than seven since you first became our pastor. During this time the most cordial affection has sprung up in the hearts of your people toward you. You have visited our houses, catechized our young, enlivened our wedding parties, comforted our sick, consoled our dying, led our funeral processions, baptized our children, broken to us the bread of life, and dispensed to us the bread and wine that points the faith to the broken body and shed blood of our Saviour. By each of these services the happy impressions produced by your first visits seem to have been constantly deepened, and the ties of affection that bind the hearts of your congregation to you have been greatly strengthened. Our family circles have been cheered, our youth have been instructed, our church building has been repaired, our communicants have been more than doubled, and our congregation in general has been greatly encouraged.

Desiring to give you such tangible evidence of our gratitude as might help to render comfortable your labours in your wide spread charge, we have procured for you this Sleigh and Harness, which we beg you to accept as a small token of the affectionate respect and esteem which we entertain for your person, character, and ministerial usefulness.

You will please to convey to your amiable partner our best wishes for her health and happiness, and for that of your children. Be assured our earnest prayer is that you may be spared to witness many returning and happy New Years—that we may long enjoy your pastoral labours—that the uninterrupted harmony that has hitherto prevailed in our intercourse with you may long continue—that the doctrines you proclaim may be the means of bringing many to righteousness; and that at last you may be among those who shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever.

William C. McKie,
David Morrow,
Daniel H. Dingwell,
Joseph Dingwell,
Alex. Leslie, junr.,
John Robertson,
John A. Dingwell,

On behalf of the congregation of Bay Fortune, Souris, and Grand River.

Bay Fortune, Jan. 1, 1861.

REPLY.

To Messrs. William Craig McKie, David Morrow, Daniel Henry Dingwell, Joseph Dingwell, Alexander Leslie, Jr., John Robertson and John Alexander Dingwell.

Gentlemen—I thank you heartily for your very affectionate address, and to you and through you to that section of this congregation by whom you have been appointed, I would return your seasonable salutation, and wish you all a Happy New Year. The eight years that have nearly elapsed since I first came to labor among you, though they have been to me years of unceasing mental and physical toil, have nevertheless passed almost imperceptibly; and it is only on reflection that I can realize that so large a portion of time has glided past. Thus are we reminded of the speedy flight of time, and that death must soon overtake us all. "Our days on the earth are as a shadow."

To you and through you to the section of the Congregation whom you represent, I would convey my warmest thanks for these valuable presents. I cheerfully and most gratefully accept them, as an appropriate expression of your affection and esteem, such as reflects credit alike on your good taste and generosity. While laboring in this Congregation, I have sometimes been cheered by pleasing evidences of success; but more frequently I have experienced a degree of painful anxiety lest my labors should be in vain; and under this sense of despondency, I have been ready to say with the Prophet: "Who hath believed our report?" This manifestation of your affection, however, tends for the present to dispel all such feelings, and induces me to hope that, though I have gone forth weeping, bearing precious seed, I shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing sheaves with me.

The flattering sentiments of your address, which are to be attributed to the partiality of your sympathies, shall be cherished among my most pleasing reminiscences, and these suitable gifts will greatly increase my comfort. While journeying from settlement to settlement, through this widely scattered Congregation, I sit in that beautiful Sleigh, and cast my eyes on that elegant Harness, my earnest prayer will go up to heaven for the generous donors, that, as they have ministered to me in temporal things, I may be enabled successfully to minister to them in spiritual things.

I shall be most happy to convey to Mrs. Crawford your kind wishes; and I can even now assure you that they are cordially reciprocated. Our united prayer for you is that our merciful Heavenly Father would preserve you all in safety through the whole course of your pilgrimage on earth, and at last to receive you into his Heavenly Kingdom.

Your affectionate Pastor,
HENRY CRAWFORD.

Bay Fortune, Jan. 1, 1861.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, P. E. I., January 14, 1861.

THE LOAN BILL.

We read of the once notorious John Dennis, the contemporary and opponent of Pope, that having devised some particular method of producing the sound of thunder on the stage, he on one occasion astonished the audience of a theatre, by exclaiming in the middle of the performance of a play—"By G—d, that is my thunder." We will not imitate the irreverent and unseemly violence of the robbed inventor of histrionic sound; but we respectfully suggest to the editor of the *Islander* (who is also a Pope), that in preparing the minds of his readers for the adoption of the report of the Land Commission he should, in common decency, admit that the idea of a Loan Bill, which he now advocates, originated with the late Government, and was scouted by himself and his party with all the impudence and malignity which a sense of political defeat could engraft on personal antipathy.

The people of the Colony well recollect the violence with which the Opposition of the day encountered the Loan Bill introduced by the Leader of the then Government, the extreme exertions they made to prevent it becoming law—the gross and unparalelled abuse to which Her Majesty's representative was subjected by Mr W. H. Pope and his friends; yet we are amused to see the manner in which the editor of the *Islander* now swallows the leek, and, his employers having given the orders, approves of the very measure he and they so strenuously opposed, when the Hon. Mr. Coles introduced it a few years since. While we have no desire to increase the mortification which the *Islander* people must feel in being compelled to fondle the bantling they once rejected, we must congratulate the members of the late Government on the testimony which has been borne by the Royal Commissioners to the practical statesmanship which proposed the much abused Loan Bill.

We hope that no unseemly exultations of their opponents will be allowed to grate harshly upon the feelings of the Government and their supporters in the Legislature, while they shall be painfully employed in eating humble pie, by carrying into effect the measure introduced by the Liberals, and nullified by the present rulers of the Island.

MEETING OF THE DELEGATES.

The Delegates, appointed on behalf of the Tenantry to represent their opinions before the Land Commission, met, according to announcement, at the Temperance Hall, on Thursday last, at 2 p. m. Shortly after that hour the meeting was convened by John McKaig, Esq., of West River, having been chosen Chairman. There were not more than about eighty persons present, nearly all of whom were Delegates; but the great storm which prevailed during the day, and the very heavy and difficult travelling for several days previous—prevented the attendance of those Delegates who reside at any considerable distance from Charlottetown. The interests of the Tenantry were, however, ably and energetically represented. Several of the Delegates from the country spoke in very strong terms in reference to arbitrary proceedings taken by certain Proprietors and Agents to recover arrears of rent, from persons who had even offered to pay one year's rent, contrary to the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners; and several cases of extreme hardship, thereby entailed, were brought to the notice of the meeting. We have not space at present to enter into particulars; but as a report of the speeches was taken, we trust that all the facts disclosed on this occasion, in reference to the evils and oppressions of the proprietary system, will soon be communicated to the public. The following resolutions were adopted, at the close of the meeting, without a dissenting voice;—

Proposed by Mr. W. S. McNeill, Cavendish, seconded by Mr. Patrick Wynne, West River—

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed, consisting of Delegates, empowered to correspond with their brother Delegates in various parts of the Colony, in order to obtain such information as will enable the said Committee to judge how far the proprietors and their Agents have adopted the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners with respect to