be the judges what books are to be used in school, and that children should there use whatever books their parents think proper. Well, sir, what a hodge-podge it would be with the matter; every boy bringing his catechism, &c., to school. I, as a member of the Church of England, would as soon prefer having my children taught in the Church of England catechism as in the Bible. I think, therefore, that the principal argument of the hon. member on this point cannot be carried out, though he may now see the necessity of having religious combined with secular education. Though much has been said on education since I had a seat in the House with him, yet there has not been much on religious instruction; but I think it would be a blessing in this country if people obtained a secular education for their children without a religious one. I contend, however, that there is religious education to a great extent in this country; the schools are opened and closed with prayer, and some catechisms and other religious books are used in them; thus religious instruction to a great extent is carried out. I contend, further, that the Education Act has worked very well so far; and it is much better to let well enough alone. I shall vote against the Hon. the Speaker's amendment, and shall give my reason for doing so; which is, as I said before, that I would not like that a teacher be bound to teach both versions of the Scriptures, if the parents did not wish it.

Mr. T. H. HAVILAND.—In reply to a few observations made by the Hon. Col. Secretary, who wishes to know how it is that I was not an advocate for the use of the Bible in school when the Act formerly passed, I answer, it was that I was never aware till this winter that the Bible was intended to be excluded from school. I always thought that the Bible was there, and my reason for acting in the matter now, is in consequence of the Roman Catholic Bishop's letter; because he there stated that he was opposed to having the Bible in school for any party, and that he would be satisfied with nothing but a godless system of education. That is the reason why I wish now to have the Bible in school. I wish equal privileges in religion, and equal privileges in political matters.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—I presume he understood that the Bible was not permitted by Act of Parliament. But the hon. member has put it in this light, that he wishes the same freedom in religion as in politics. Well, Sir, I contend that the amendment proposed does not allow that. If you pass that amendment, you drive a portion of the children from school.

Mr. COOPER said the Education Bill had been passed before he came into the House of Assembly, and he had heard no objections to it till lately. A party now wished to introduce changes into the Act, and a party wished it to remain as it was. With regard to religion, he believed there was not much religious impression made in school; the first impressions on religion were made upon the child at its mother's knees. Some of the ablest men had mentioned having such impressions made on them, which had never been effaced. He would not support any of the amendments proposed.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—As I understand the amendment offered by the hon. member for Princetown (Hon. T. H. Haviland), it admits the Scriptures to be read in all the schools in this Island deriving public aid, wherein the parents or guardians of children there, wish, seek, or ask for it. Now, that is plain, sir, and unequivocal, and the amendment proposed by the hon. Speaker, adding both versions, by no means defeats it in my mind; but I will accord with that amendment, and to both I will give my support. From the observations made by the Hon. Col. Secretary, who has taken the lead in the opposition to this amendment, I distinctly understood him to say that he goes for the total exclusion of the Scriptures from the schools, [No, No! by Hon. Col. Secretary] that no version would be there read at any time. Very well, he has advanced opinions to that effect. I understood him to say, it was impossible to introduce a version of the Scriptures with the wish of one party, without giving offence to the other party, and that it was the duty of the state to give attention to secular education and not to religious education. Still, if the hon. member has changed his opinions from anything he heard from this side of the House, I am so much the more proud of those with whom I associate. Well, sir, I think the present state of the law calls for an amendment such as that you now hold in your hand, Mr. Chairman. I am one of those who think that it is the duty of the representatives of the people to attend not only to the secular instruction, but also to the religious instructien of the people. I quite agree with the hon. member for Georgetown (Mr. T. Heath Haviland) that education to be useful and safe to the people, should be based upon the christian religion. For proof of this position, we need only look at the state of Great Britain at the present day. Look at her statesmen, philosophers, and philanthropists, searching out the cause of crime &c. What are the conclusions at which the generality of those persons have arrived, who are devoting their time and attention to the subject? It is, that there is a defect in the religious education of the youth of the kingdom. That is what they attribute it to; and they are watching the best means of curing that evil. Now, sir, I think that as a Legislature we should not trust that very important and sacred duty merely to the parents of the youth who are sent to school; for tho' there may be a very laudable and proper desire in the minds of parents to bring up their children to the practice of the religion to which they belong, yet it may be wholly out of the power of many of those parents to attend to their religious instruction. We know there are many who have not the means of sending their children to private schools, nor have such opportunities of imparting religious instruction as those who, from their education, and from the time at their command, can devote as many hours of the day and week as they please to the religious instruction of their children. But this is the case with too few. Look at the poor man who does not know the letters of the Bible. What means has that poor man to give religious instruction to his children? Look again at the vast body of men whose time is employed at hard labor during the whole day, and who cannot sit down to impart religious instruction to their children. From what source are they to expect that their religious education is to be derived? They expect it from that institution where their children are sent to have a good education, and for which the tax—money is dragged out of their pockets to pay. If we are more advanced in education, than formerly, we are still as far behind in education and intelligence as any of Her Majesty's Colonies at least. It would be deplorable to exclude from our common schools religious instruction to the vast body of the children of the Island. But that instruction is what those persons are desiring whose petitions are here to-day. I say it would be unjustifiable in us if we were to turn a deaf ear to their request and say, you shall get religious instruction where you may, and pay for it whether or not. No, sir, that is a very improper view to take of the case. Now, the objection that is urged against such a law is, its going into operation so very unfairly; but there is very little weight in that. The petitioners may sound their requests in the ears of those who are not disposed to give them due consideration; yet I conceive religious instruction, or the use of the Bible in school, might be given without offence or trouble to either party. I am very sensible that a large body of persons, the Roman Catholics, have an objection to placing the inspired volume in the hands of laymen; and I find no fault with them for that. They hold it as a sacred principle that it shall not be expounded by any but those admitted to be qualified for that purpose. But that is not the opinion of all christians. Many hold quite a different opinion; they conceive that any person who is capable of reading the Scriptures, may do so, and judge for himself, without the aid of a clergyman. Now, sir, I do not see any necessity that a large body of scholars should be turned out in the days alluded to; stormy days do not last all the year round, and if they did there is no occasion for adopting such a course. I think in the first place, that where the large majority of the scholars are of the Catholic denomination, I may say it would be very unlikly that the parents of half a dozen Protestant children would press upon the others the necessity of remaining there and hearing the Scriptures read. But to take even an extreme view, I can see no objections to one class being set apart in one part of a school for a scripture lesson, while the others are going on with their task. Now, I think it is drawing too nice a distinction to suppose that while that class is reading a lesson in one part of the school, that the other class should be at all affected in their religious principles at hearing lessons on a subject they were told they need not attend to. No, sir, they are supposed to have religious teachers, if not at school, at least at their Chapels, and so are not entirely without their religious instruction. I can suppose a Catholic Teacher presiding over a Catholic School, which is the case in many parts of the Island,—and I am proud that there are some very excellent Catholic teachers in the Island; and in such circumstances we may expect harmony to prevail; because I can very readily imagine that where a Catholic Teacher presides over the school, the Protestant parents would rather put up with it, and would make efforts otherwise to have their children taught in the Bible, than to disturb the harmony of a valuable and popular school. If, however, they thought proper to entrust it to the Teacher, to give a few lessons from the Scriptures in school, I would leave all to the good sense of the people under the circumstances. There is something in the people, when they meet to discuss these matters, that lead them to yield to one another's convenience; and I am sure we ought to have that reliance on the good sense of the people that they would not raise up a difference between two parties in school where the majority largely predominates hence we might allow a clause such as you have before you to go into operation, and which does not at all force religious instruction upon the people as the Hon. Col. Secretary says it does. With respect to the manner in which the act operates upon the Normal School, I think there is great reason for the Normal School being named now. We cannot have forgotten the solicitude exhibited in the time of Sir Alexander Bannerman to introduce the Normal system into this Colony. We know that Governor entered into a correspondence with Mr. Stow, the originator of this celebrated and wide spread system, in order to assist him in having it established in this Island; and I think if the correspondence that took place between Governor Bannerman and Mr. Stow were produced—and which perhaps is followed up by the present Governor—we would there see that it was uniformly the wish of the Government and their very great desire to have that system established in the Colony. And upon what is that system based? The most uninformed person knows that it is entirely based upon scriptural education; and that is the reason why it is so much approved of in many countries, and in Scotland where it originated. The people of the Island are told that this system shall be introduced in the Island; they import a gentleman from the very city—the hot-bed of the system, and set him forth in this Island; he is inaugurated in a very formal and celebrated manner, and by a great soiree that was given here, and made a very celebrated—an important day in the annals of Prince Edward Island, as must be in the minds of hon. members. The people were congratulated on the benefits that they were about to receive by that system, and that it was set agoing at last. Individuals who were so zealous on the education of the Colony, were congratulating one another that the happy day had arrived on which that system was to be put in operation. I can conceive the walls of the building echoing with the applause of persons praising the system, and looking upon it as one of the happiest days of their lives. Well, sir, the system was commenced,—the Bible was introduced in the School,—the School was opened with prayer,—afterwards the Government take a new view of things, and they conceive that it must not be Stow's system at all now—that the Bible must be excluded from the School. I think under this new state of affairs, it must be regulated by statue,—that it must not be dependent on the breath of the Government of this Colony or the Board of Education either, but on something more than a mere arbitrary rule of that Board. Thus, I think there is a necessity for introducing the words "Normal School" in the clause now before you. Many observations have been made by hon. members, and no less by the Hon. Col. Secretary throwing out accusations against certain parties to whom he attributes a desire of raising unnecessary complaints and religious feelings, and making political capital of them; and that those parties have been invited also to the discussions of the other Provinces. Now, I do not know that he is warranted in making an assertion of that kind [Hon. Col. Socretary,—I did not say that; I said no such thing. What I said was that in the other Province, they had called upon &c.] Very well, sir, it is not by the entreaties of members on this side of the House that is done; and certainly I have very little authority for saying that there have not been such invitations; for no person perhaps has had less communication with them and know their intentions less than I do. But I am prepared to stand up and defend those rights I profess to claim; yet I am not desirious of waking up sectarian differences between the people of this community, but I only stand here to defend that large body of this Colony who have petitioned that their rights may be protected; and I think we would leave our duty undone, if we gave a denial to that very tolerant measure which is now asked in the resolution before the Committee.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—I am sorry to trouble you, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. and learned member endeavoured to make an impression, which was not intended for your ears, but for those of the constituents of P. E. Island, namely—that the Colonial Secretary was opposed to the Scriptures being used in the schools altogether. Now, I made no such statement; I was in favour of the Scriptures being used in the schools, but not to be compulsory. I stated the reasons that they should not be used in some schools. He says it should be compulsory. I shall shew that his reasons show it must be compulsory. I said the Bible should not be used in schools in many parts of the Island, without leaving it in the hands of the Board of Education to settle disputes; because if in the school, it is better to leave it in their hands, and it is bettter to insert nothing in the Act which would convey such an impression as that it will be compulsory. Alluding to the Normal School, he says the Scriptures were there. He does not know enough about this Normal. Not one of his party were at the opening of it, though invited. No, Sir, they would not give their countenance to that School. He says the Scriptures were there, and excluded; and hence the necessity of putting it in this clause of the Act. What is the use of putting it there if not compulsory? But the argument of the hon. member was, that because they had excluded the Bible from the Normal School, it was necessary to have that school mentioned in this clause. If that was not the intention of it, I do not understand what reasoning is. The hon. member also laid a great deal of stress on this, that the new educational system was to be on Mr. Stow's system. Well, so it is to be on his system, but not on his religious system; by that is understood that the Bible was not to be a class-book in the system. That is the system of teaching that is intended to be adopted; and the hon. member is quite astray when he says it was perfectly understood it was to be a religious system of education. When Mr. Stark was sent out to this Colony, he quite understood that the Scriptures would not be introduced into the schools, as he states in his answer to the Bishop's letter, that he found only sixty-three public schools where the Scriptures were read, showing very well that Mr. Stark knew quite well that the Scriptures were not to be introduced into the public schools of the Colony. The hon. member proceeds further to say, that this gentleman, the Teacher of the Normal School, was got out from Mr. Stow's school for the express purpose of imparting religious instruction. No such thing, Sir; and there is the question. There has never been any intention either to prohibit the reading of the Bible, or that its use was to be enforced in any of the schools of the Island. The hon. and learned member may take up Mr. Stark's case now, but when the consideration of that gentleman's salary was before the House last session, he and his party opposed the grant for his salary. They have been pleased to say, in their last number of the *Protector*, that he has been harshly treated. In that number there is an article on politics, though they disclaimed any intention of interfering in politics, comparing him with Mr. Condon of Halifax, and making it appear that he has suffered harsh treatment. Every hon. member knows what a debate we had last session on the salary of the School Visitor, and the minority, to a man, voted against the amount named; and the Royal Agricultural Society wished to have that portion of his salary derived from their funds withdrawn; but the Government felt that they were under an engagement to give him that sum for the term for which he was engaged. The Government then, at the end of the year, informed Mr. Stark, that after the next quarter, he could not expect more than the law allowed; and what is it construed into now? Why, that the Government have done it to drive him from the Colony! I am surprised that such gentlemen, called "sanctified," should say such things. But it came to the ears of the Government that he had not visited some schools for sixteen months, and they would not pay him till the Board of Education made inquiries and gave him a certificate, in accordance with the Act. Now, the law required him to visit the schools twice in the year; and when it turned out that he had not been in some of the schools for sixteen months, the Government thought perhaps he might have had some reason for that neglect, which they desired to know before paying him; but now, because they had to comply with the request of the Royal Agricultural Society and with this House, for some hon. members would vote against the grant, who voted for it last year—I think, therefore, there is no reason to say such things as those in the article alluded to. What is the state of affairs now? We find Mr. Stark's work unfinished. He has been engaged visiting the schools during the year, and we find fifty schools not visited at all; and I think it is high time there were some inquiries made into the matter. The Government relieved him of his duties only five or six days before the time that he gave in his report last year. He was in town on Saturday, and as he would not travel on Sunday, only three or four days of his time remained, so that he could not visit all the schools unvisited; but it is a very poor excuse that the schools should not be visited, because the Government had relieved him of his duties. Now, too, it is said he is dismissed; but the Government thought it better to relieve him at once, when he tendered his resignation; yet there was no desire on the part of the Government to treat him harshly, for it would be a poor Government that would require to take means to get rid of a gentleman in that way. Again, the hon. member for Charlottetown has said, that religious instruction is now the scheme of education approved by parties in all countries. But what is the conclusion of Lord Palmerston? That public religious education cannot be carried out. Then the hon. member goes on with a great deal of feeling for the poor man's children. What! is he to pay and cannot have his children taught the Bible? In the case of a person that cannot read, of course he is a liberal minded man, and will, perhaps, get a person to read for him; and if we teach his children, he would be able to get a little instruction from the children at home. But remember in this case there is not a word about clergymen there. He (Hon. Mr. Palmer) forgot that there are Sunday Schools in this Island. But he goes on a little further and then says, the Catholic children are not to be turned out in the snow; but if they wanted religious instruction, they could go to Chapel on a Sunday, but does not seem to think that the Protestant children could do the same. Now, it is the duty of the clergyman, in my opinion, to assist a little in religious instruction, as it cannot be given in school without raising strong feelings; and if the proposed amendment is carried out, I am satisfied it will cause a great deal of disturbance; but if left to the good sense of the people, this House may rest satisfied that they would make arrangements to suit themselves. Well, that is what he (the mover of the amendment) wanted to do; he did not want to have it forced by law, but left to the good sense of the people, which he is willing to do, even if he should carry that amendment. Well, sir, let us leave it to them altogether. I am not opposed to the Bible in school; I have made a motion on a former occasion, to have it there; but I am opposed to introduce it in a manner that would give offence to the country. But he must get something to say, that Coles is opposed to Bible instruction in the schools of the Island; but, sir, I do not dread the hon. member's statements at all. As to his allusion to the great show at the opening of the Normal School, it is hardly worth noticing. The country are well satisfied with it; and hon. members who have visited it are very well satisfied with it, and think the money laid out for it the best expended money in the country.

(To be continued.)

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

THE SANCTIFIED PRESS.

AN APPEAL TO THE FAITHFUL.

Long clouded has been this fair Isle of the Sea,
Too long have its sons to the Pope bent the knee—
Arise, fellow bondmen! we will soon get redress;
A Deliverer has come! 'tis the Sanctified Press.

What's the use thus in living forever at peace,
While our wealth and our power are on the decrease?
Let us rally like men in the days of Queen Bess,
Our watchword—The Bible and Sanctified Press.

Our commander has mastered the science of *Kant;*
Our captains are skilled in *Assertion* and *Rant;*
Our army's well drilled, and we likewise possess
That terror to Papists—a Sanctified Press.

We don't want your money—O no, on my word;
And as for your votes—why, the thought is absurd;
'Tis your souls, so long bound by a cruel duress,
That we seek to set free with our Sanctified Press.

We seek not for place, nor sigh we for power—
They are vanities all—the mere toys of an hour—
But ye who *do* wish them, and hope for success,
Ought at once to subscribe to the Sanctified Press.

Its columns are filled with the choicest tit-bits,
And weekly it gives the Pope's myrmidons *Fitz!*
O Davy's the boy all their sore spots to dress,
With his new Tory plaster—the Sanctified Press.

And Thomas and George, too—both *established* and *free*—
Flay "*Cat*holics" weekly with gusto and glee;
While from Patterson's *pool* ('twould not do to say *cess*)
Flows a stream that enriches the Sanctified Press.

"Speech was given to man his real thoughts to conceal,"
Said the sage Talleyrand; 'tis a truth which we *feel*,
And, acting upon it, have donned both the dress
And the sanctified whine of a Sanctified Press.

But to you, my dear friends, the whole truth will I speak—
'Tis bodies, not souls, we so urgently seek;
But the Tory frown 's laughed at, and spurned the caress—
What remained for us then but a Sanctified Press?

Dear brethren assist us. Let each man give his mite
Of cash, scandal and lies, to help onward the fight;
And soon shall Pope, Snatchers, and all who transgress,
Fall—crushed by the *weight* of the Sanctified Press.

April 30, 1857. D. FITZFOOZLE.

Correspondence.

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

BYRON AND "THE PROTECTOR."

At the head of a certain article which was published in the last *Protector*, appeared the following amongst other editorial remarks:—

"And we do it" (i. e., publish the article) "the more es-"pecially because one of the characters," (Byron), "spoken "of here in terms of disapprobation, has been held up to "approbation by a public lecturer in this City, and in one of "our public papers."

This refers, of course, to my lecture on Byron, delivered before the Mechanics' Institute. Now I may state, as a preliminary remark, that his being "here spoken of in terms of disapprobation," does not affect his character any more than my speaking of him in terms of approbation. I am well aware that many of a certain class of men have spoken of him in terms of disapprobation, but that proves nothing against him beyond the fact of his being an object of dislike to them. Men like him who have dared to think for themselves, and have, in consequence, deviated a little from the beaten track, have always been subjected to persecution from those who can boast of no originality of thought themselves—who have no ideas beyond those crammed into them in schools and colleges—"who get all their opinions in religion and philosophy as they get their real estate—by inheritance. For the one they never labored, and for the other they never thought." (I quote, from memory, the emphatic language of Dr. Dods.)

I can hardly believe that any respectable clergyman would be so unfair as to pen the above, after having read the notice of my lecture published in the papers. There the writer distinctly stated that I had "admitted the weak points of Byron's character." I never intended to hold him up as a paragon of morality or piety. I *did* and *will* maintain that he had many noble traits of character, although their lustre was partially obscured by many bad ones; and if the writer in the *Protector* deny this, I am ready to discuss the matter with him, and I hope I will be able to convince him of the utter untenableness of his position.

My object in choosing the subject I did, was to awaken an interest in the *works* of the most distinguished poet of the 19th century. There is, in my opinion, nothing in which our young men are more generally deficient than a literary taste and an acquaintance with the classic writers of the English language. Were their works more generally read and studied, low punning and quibbles would not pass current amongst us for wit; infantile cavilling at words would not pass for solid criticism; silly, vulgar ballads without rhyme or grammar, would not be sung with such *eclat* at our convivial parties; inflated bombast without either sense or sentiment or mere prosaic rhyme, would not satisfy the popular taste, instead of good poetry; nor would the bulk of our public writing be the poor, marrowless, wishy-washy stuff that it is.

New Glasgow, April 29, 1857. JOSIAH McLEOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—I observe in the Supplement to the *Islander* of Monday last, an intended reply to a letter which previously appeared in the *Examiner*, signed "Cephas Barker." Had the writer confined his remarks to that gentleman and the question at issue, I should have left him to Mr. Barker, from a conviction that he is in good hands, and will be tolerably well cared for; but as he has seen fit to introduce extraneous matter, I have to solicit from you the favor of inserting the following remarks:—

In the first place, the writer, who is no less a personage than Mr. Wm. Heard, manifests some anxiety for the enlightenment of the public, as to who this Mr. Barker is, and then sets him down as public property. In what sense he intends to make it appear that such is the case, I am at a loss to know. Surely the sage must have been dreaming of some joint stock concern, and awoke imagining he had a share in this particular property. Has he outrivalled the Slave States of America? they only claim the right to buy, sell or hold as property, the negro population; but Mr. Heard seems disposed to go further, and I doubt not (admitting his philosophy to be sound), but that if the other shareholders were agreeable, he would soon be found making arrangements to sell by auction or otherwise this very valuable portion of the stock, and sending him down south, as he seems anxious to rid the Colony of such a pest as soon as possible. Hold on, sir, the other shareholders are not of the same mind, and think he is not sufficiently used up yet, don't forget the five years to begin with. Then, sir, as regards his doings, he has done just what the Conference and Committee commissioned him to do. He has dared to exercise every Englishman's birthright—that of thinking for himself and acting accordingly—an offence of an unpardonable character, judging from the treatment he has received since the large gathering at the Temperance Hall a short time since. Another thing he has done, and which seems equally offensive is, the formation of a society in this City, in connection with Bible Christianism. Had he been content to labor in the poor and remote parts of this Island, as Mr. H. calls it, he undoubtedly would have shared bountifully in the soft soap so liberally bestowed on Mr. Metheral and his colleagues. Mr. H. speaks of temperance, and immediately carries off his vituperation in a most intemperate manner, (Oh! consistency, whither art thou fled!) It has been reserved, says Mr. H., for Mr. B. to break those hallowed ties, &c., a most unwarrantable assertion, and bears a striking resemblance to a fabrication; and first I challenge Mr. H. to produce logical evidence in support of his assertions, and then repel the charge, (if such really existed.)

Then, Sir, as regards the dimensions, &c., this part of the work is done so sophistically, and savours so much of vindictiveness, that one scarcely likes to stoop so low as to pass a remark on it; certainly it goes to prove to all discerning readers the barrenness of the writer's mind, and to what shifts the poor fellow was driven to collect sufficient rubbish to fill his paper. But, Sir, first look at the position he has taken; does he not imagine the readers of the journals of this Island to be an ignorant class of persons? and very kindly attempts to instruct them. Mark with what a dignified air he assumes the seat of instructor general, and proceeds to define the term deputation, which, in effect, amounts to this:—Just listen to me, ye men of ordinary minds—I can tell you what it means, (just as though no one else knew its meaning,) and what Mr. B. ought to have done. I am Mr. Heard, of the Queen's Square House, and understand all such matters as these. And yet taunts Mr. B. about dimensions. Just try to take Mr. H.'s dimensions—now he seems rather large, does he not? Really, Sir, it reminds one of the old story of the frog, which, in attempting to swell to the dimensions of the ox, happened to burst, and, as a matter of course, allowed his ambition to bring on him premature death. I hope this aspirant will take timely warning, and avoid the consequences attendant on such an occurrence. Sir, there is so much confusion, that one grows sick vnd tired of following out this wiseacre. Mr. Barker, he says, must have disobeyed his instructions, or the Bible Christians must have adopted a new course, &c. Does the Bible Christian Conference stand in need of his assistance? I trow not. If, however, it should so happen, he will have timely notice, and be expected to set them perfectly right. After some further remarks, to which I shall not now refer, he speaks of the memorable Bible meeting, and says many left said meeting convinced that the story of his g andmother frightening him with old Bogie, formed no inconsiderable portion of his early education. (Doubtful.) If it be true that Mr. Heard was educated for the ministry, and was not worthy to discharge the sacred functions connected therewith, and Mr. Barker, without academical assistance, discharges the duties of that office alike honorable to God and to man, I ask where is the strong ground for Mr. Heard's boasting on the one hand, or his sarcasm on the other? Let the public decide that matter. I would inform Mr. H. that the treat of old Bogie has lost its effect on Mr. B. long since; and if the B. at the Queen Square House intends to frighten him in the present instance, he will be disappointed. Mr. Heard has manifested, for some time past, a desire for notoriety, but has not reached the altitude to which his ambition aspires as yet. Perhaps his object will soon be accomplished; and then, for aught I know, he will be as happy as the man alluded to in his very inappropriate quotation—"I am monarch of all I survey." Now, Sir, can any man even imagine what could induce him to quote from such a publication, (which has no bearing whatever on the subject,) unless he is familiar with such trash, and was not so ready in quoting from someting more to the point. One would have thought, as a teacher of a Bible class, he would have quoted from that best of volumes; but no, Sir, that would not do, the man would not be in his own element. Had he made Mr. Barker say—"I am a stranger and sojourner with you"—had he been influenced by that charity "which thinketh no evil," &c., and paid proper regard to the truth—he might (having a taste for poetry), as a member of that body, have given a quotation from the Wesleyan hymn-book, much more appropriate and truthful:—

"No foot of land do I possess,
No cottage in the wilderness,