LAND COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

CHARLOTTETOWN, Thursday, 20th Sept., 1860.

Evidence of the Hon. Heath Haviland, M. P. P. and M. E. Council.

The Hon. HEATH HAVILAND, M. P. P. and M. E. C., as agent for Sir Graham Montgomery, Baronet, next came forward, for the purpose, as he said, of laying before the Honorable Court an abstract of Sir Graham's title to his property in this Island. Sir Graham Montgomery, he said, was one of the proprietors who had given, by his signature, his written consent to the establishment of the Land Commission, and who would, therefore, be bound by their award. The Lots partly owned by him were Nos. 34, 51 and 59, and Boughton, and Rustico Island. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to read the abstract of title; and, having done so, he observed that, as regarded the question of the settlement of Lots 34 and 59, that was conclusively answered in the affirmative by a Resolution come to by the House of Assembly in Committee of the whole on the State of the Colony, 22nd July, 1797. It was then complained that in consequence of the non-settlement of many of the Townships the progress of the Colony was greatly impeded. The Resolution, however, amongst other things, stated that Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 56, and 59 were settled agreeably to the conditions of the original grants; and that, although Nos. 7 and 12, half of Lot 30, and Lot 50, were not settled, the proprietor thereof, Chief Baron Montgomery, had expended large sums of money in the settlement of others. As to Lot 51, every blade of grass is let—the whole is settled—there is no wilderness land upon it. Mr. Douse was agent for another of the Montgomery family. He (Mr. Haviland) represented 10,500 acres on Lot 34, the rent of which, and of Rustico Island, was £590. The average annual receipts for several years had been £630, and the arrears were daily becoming less. On Lot 59 he represented 7,000 acres, the rental of which was £309, and the average annual receipts £150. On Lot 51 he represented 8,750 acres, the rental of which was £362 5s. 4d., and the average annual receipts £160. Boughton Island comprised 600 acres, of which 541 acres were leased: the rental was £30 2s. 0d., and the average annual receipts amounted to £25. The condition of the tenantry on those properties was decidedly improving. Some years ago, in King's County, on Lots 51 and 59, very few or hardly any rents at all were collected. The chief cause of their improvement was doubtless the relinquishment of arrears of rent to the amount of between £2000 and £3000. The freedom which that boon bestowed upon them was an incentive to greater exertions, which, coupled with advanced prices for their produce of almost every kind, have placed them in a state of comparative prosperity and independence. In some cases, to give them a fresh start, new leases were granted on the original terms of 6d. per acre, per annum, at a gradual advance until the farms should attain to the full rent. In some others, in which the lands were bad, the rents were permanently fixed at 6d. or 9d. per acre, per annum. The better prices which, in consequence of the reciprocity treaty with the United States, the tenantry had been enabled to procure for their produce, had been, in a manner, the salvation of the Island—our free commercial intercourse with those States being, from our proximity to them, of much greater value to us than our similar intercourse with Great Britain. On Lot 34 were Stanhope and Covehead, two of the finest settlements in the Island. According to the Census returns of 1854, there were on this Lot 14,432 acres of arable land, and the crops were very large. The other day Mr. James Robertson, one of a Deputation from the Lot, told their Excellencies that, supposing the proprietor's title to be good, (and he did not dispute it,) he considered his farm to be worth 20 years' purchase. One of the Leases was also the other day produced in Court for the purpose of shewing that the tenants were not at liberty to cut timber upon their own farms except for certain purposes specified in their leases. It was true that the leases contained such a restrictive clause, but it was altogether a dead letter, and had never been acted upon or enforced. The Montgomeries lease all their lands, including the fishery reserves, and receive rent for them. On Lot 34, in the first grant the reserve was in the Crown; but in the second it is reserving to Her Majesty's subjects the right to erect stages, &c. for the purpose of carrying on the fisheries—the right to the soil or fee simple being therefore in the proprietor of the Lot. In the grant of Lot 51, there is a reserve, but no water; a fact which shewed what an extraordinary knowledge the British Government must have had of the nature of the reserves which they were making. On Lot 59, the reserve is also that of a free fishery to all Her Majesty's subjects; that is, the fee simple of the soil is in the propoictor: and the case is also the same with the reserves both on Boughton Island and on Rustico Island. As to Lot 34, he was certain the Montgomeries could sell every acre they owned of it for 20s. The leases were all for 999 years. He had had, within the last three or four years, many applications made to him for the purchase of farms on the property of the Montgomeries; but he had not been able to accept the offers of the parties applying, for the proprietors objected to sell isolated farms, as, if they did so the best would be selected by purchasers, and the worst would be left. He, however, believed they would be willing to sell the whole of their lands at once, on fair and reasonable terms. On Lot 51, some 30 years ago, they sold a large tract in a wilderness state at (as he had been informed on good authority) 10s. an acre. That tract was then called the Big Woods, but is now called New Perth; and is, perhaps, the finest district in the Island. They had not sold any of their lands for the last six or seven years. On Lot 34 they did sell a few farms; one of 72½ acres for £89 15s., which was at a rate of more than £1 per acre. Every settler on that part of the Lot, 10,000 acres, which he represented, was independent. Of that part of the Lot which Mr. Douse represented he knew nothing except that some of the tenants were very poor. He knew that some of them were as much as £30 in arrears, and would willingly sell their leaseholds and their improvements for the amount of their arrears and a small sum of money besides. On Lot 34 there were tenants who, not many years ago, had not individually a sixpence in their pockets; but who now were each worth hundreds of pounds: they had fine farms, and money besides vested on interest. He believed every man would like to be a freeholder; and he would like to see every one a freeholder. If he had had leave to do so, he could have sold most of the land belonging to the Montgomeries, which is under his management, at 20s. an acre. On Lots 50 and 51 some of the tenants are in good circumstances, but a large majority of them are very poor. In some settlements they found it very difficult to make both ends meet; but if an opportunity were allowed them to purchase the fee simple of their farms, they were willing, he believed, to pay as much as 10s. per acre for them. One cause of the indifferent circumstances of some of the settlers, particularly of the Scotch and Irish, was that when they came out to this country they were middle aged men with large families, and had settled in the woods. They were not out of difficulties yet; but they were getting more land cleared, and would be free from embarrassment in time. On Lot 59 the settlers were both Scotch and Irish. On Lot 51 they are Irish. In the way, however, of such settlers purchasing the fee simple of their farms, he saw great difficulty. If he had the books he could shew that some who, a few years ago, had their arrears wiped off, and who were allowed to begin anew at 6d. an acre, were now two or three years in arrears. He could not tell how it had so happened. Some of themselves would explain it by saying they had what they call *weak* families. However, he would say, wait a few years, and even these would have got over their difficulties. When questioned by COUN. THOMSON, Mr. Haviland admitted that he had issued some four or five Writs on account of arrears of rent due on Lot 34. He had done so because they had not had the politeness to call upon him at his office to make any settlement with him on account of their arrears, although he had been four years in the agency, and had given them easy terms. He had writted six; but four of the six could have bought out their farms at 20s. an acre. On the subject of the remitting of rents to absentee proprietors, Mr. Haviland said common sense would say the more of the money collected on account of rents that can be retained and spent in the Island, the better it will be for the Island in general; the country would certainly be more wealthy if the rents were spent in it. When questioned by COUN. THOMSON respecting the payment of taxes, Mr. Haviland said all the taxes were paid by the tenants. If there be any arrears of quit rent due on Lot 34, and payment of them be enforced, the tenants will have to pay them out of their own pockets. Such a mode of collecting them has been legalized by an Act of the Island Legislature. COUN. THOMSON. Then, out of the rents received by Sir Graham Montgomery and other absentee proprietors—these rents being sent out of the country—they contribute not one farthing towards the Island revenue? HON. MR. HAVILAND. If a proprietor has no wilderness lands upon his estate he pays no taxes. When questioned by COUN. THOMSON respecting the Bill by means of which it was proposed to impose a Rent Roll Tax upon the proprietors, Mr. Haviland said the scheme was most iniquitous, inasmuch as the contemplated tax was to be imposed upon the Rent Roll, and not upon the amount of Rent received by a proprietor. COUN. THOMSON. If you thought the scheme iniquitous because it imposed a tax upon the Rent Roll, and not upon the amount of Rent received, and as you were a member of the House of Assembly at the time the proposed measure was under the consideration of that Branch of the Legislature, why did you not propose an amendment for the rectification of the iniquity? Mr. HAVILAND. I was a member of the opposition; and, as such, my policy was not to assist the Government to which I was opposed. COUN. THOMSON. You say that, even were an opportunity offered the tenantry over whom you act as proprietary agent, to purchase the fee simple of their farms, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for many of them to do so. Mr. HAVILAND. I said so only with respect to a portion of the tenantry on Lots 51 and 59, a majorty of whom are in indifferent, though improving circumstances.

COUN. PALMER. You discovered by a Journal of the House of Assembly that Lot 51 was not settled in 1797, according to the conditions of the grant? Mr. HAVILAND. Yes. COUN. PALMER. Are you prepared to give it up on that account?

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND. The title to it is as good as that to any other Lot in the Colony.

COUN. HALLIBURTON. Do you believe, from the present state of the Colony, that it is now easier for tenants to pay their rents than it was some years ago?

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND. As a general rule it is easier, although to many it is still a matter of great difficulty to pay any rent at all.

Just before the evidence and examination of Mr. Haviland was concluded, COUN. THOMSON observed that, although the drain upon the finances of the country, occasioned by the remitting of rents to absentee proprietors did not invalidate, or in any way injuriously affect their titles to their estates in the Island, it afforded an undeniable proof of the evils of the proprietary and leasehold system.

(*To be continued*)

Correspondence.

EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—Few persons will deny that our system of education is, in many points, unjust and defective, and loudly calls for reform. Considering our resources, we pay an immense amount annually for educational purposes, but without receiving corresponding benefits. To corroborate what I have said, I will select the Normal School. This Institution has been in operation some four or five years, and I would now ask its warmest supporters and friends of what use has it been to the Colony? It has absorbed a very large share of the public revenue, and has not been, as far as I can see of the least possible utility to the general cause of Education. It is a huge piece of imposition on a poor people, and I will be astonished if the inhabitants of this Island will continue to pay hundreds of pounds yearly for the support of an establishment which has been, in the opinion of many persons, the cause of more harm than good since it was opened. Do the inhabitants of this Colony generally know who and what are taught in the Normal School? Do they not think that it was established for the special purpose of preparing teachers for our District Schools? But what will be their astonishment when they learn that the teacher of the said school is almost wholly occupied in teaching little children, belonging to Charlottetown, the mere rudiments of English Grammar, Spelling, &c., and showing them how to march and countermarch through the school room! It is a very well known fact that a great number of the candidates for the teachership, after spending their five months at the Normal School, listening to little urchins bellowing, yelling and tramping, are obliged to go to some other school in the City to get themselves qualified to pass the Board. Are those who are paying so dearly for a Normal School aware that a large number of our district teachers, upward of one hundred, perhaps, are actually indebted to Mr. Edward Roche's tuition for enabling them to pass their examination before the Board? This would not have been the case had we what we might call a Normal School. I may observe, *en passant*, that I think the public are under an obligation to Mr. Roche for the zeal and assiduity which he has exhibited in preparing candidates to pass their examination, and he is undoubtedly very justly entitled to a good share of the money which is now paid for teaching senseless marching in what is called the Normal School. Mr. Webster, the teacher of this school, is, I believe, a civil gentleman,—but, if I have not been misinformed, he is neither capable himself to pass the Board, nor is he able to qualify others to do so. I have no desire to injure Mr. Webster in any respect, but I regard the Normal School as public property, and its teacher a public man. It is my humble opinion that the teacher of a Normal School requires some qualification more than the recommendation of the Rev. G. Sutherland, or his friends, or of any individual who may be unchristian and fanatical enough to defend publicly Orange processions, and "the wretched frippery and frowzy finery of the Lodges," and the "barbarous Orange horde" "who had the satisfaction of having done their best to insult the British Crown."

The object of a Normal School should be to give a thorough literary and moral training to those who desire to embrace the important profession of a teacher. It is the very height of absurdity to imagine for one moment that the Institution in Charlottetown called the Normal School, has ever or will ever effect this purpose. The pupils of a Normal School, worthy of the name, should all board in the same house, and should go through a regular course of discipline; which would accustom them to habits of industry and regularity. But our Normal School, instead of training up young persons in learning and morality, is, I fear, only a snare that is highly calculated to be a stumbling block to the morals of the young persons of both sexes who frequent it. A young man comes in to Charlottetown, to spend five months at the Normal School, according to the requirements of the law. He was scarcely ever in the City before, and was in happy ignorance of its many vices. In a few weeks he is quite a changed person. He wears his cap on the side of his head—uses an unusual quantity of hair oil, sports a white handkerchief, smokes cigars, spends half of the night in gambling, and warming the inner man with an occasional draught of alcoholic poison. After a month or two he may be seen perambulating the streets, arm in arm, with more than doubtful characters—he comes home to his lodgings at a late hour, and gets into bed more like a beast then like a Christian young man attending a Normal School; he sleeps till eight or nine in the morning, and gets up only in time to hurry off to the Normal School, to witness Mr. Webster putting his little urchins through their evolutions.

I understand, also, that young men and young women attend together at the Normal School. If this is true, and if it is also true that not very long since a teacher was accused of publicly reading and explaining before a school, composed of males and females, some of the latter being grown up, passages of the Bible, something like that about Lot and his daughters, and this from sheer lubricity, in the name of everything that is decent, chaste and Christian, how can we expect to have either moral or efficient teachers? The whole affair appears to me to be a public nuisance, a disgusting abomination, to which an immediate remedy should be applied. I understand that the public is fast losing confidence in the Normal School, and indeed it is no wonder. If we must have a Normal School, let us have one worthy of the name. It is too much to expect that decent parents will, in the present state of thiags, send their children to the Normal School in Charlottetown, where they are almost certain to learn all kinds of vice and rascality.

Moral instruction should constitute a large portion of Normal School training; but in the Charlottetown Normal School this very essential portion of educational training is almost entirely neglected. I believe that a portion of the Bible is daily read therein without any explanation. Every person of understanding will very easily perceive that this teaching is quite inadequate. Even if the Protestant part of the community were satisfied with it, Catholics are not. On the contrary they consider themselves treated very unjustly in the whole matter, and as far as I am aware they have no confidence at all in the Normal School, or in the system upon which it is based. At present they are obliged to send their sons and daughters to Charlottetown, where they must keep them for several months on heavy expenses, and where many strangers from the country run the risk of having their moral character contaminated with vice,—and after keeping them at the Normal School, for which they are heavily taxed, the time required by law, they must again send them to Mr. Roche, or some other Teacher, to prepare them to pass the Board; and, moreover, when these candidates are qualified to pass, they run the evident risk of being rejected by Orangemen. Catholics pay their quota for a Normal Teacher, who is unable to teach them anything regarding their religious and moral duties, from the fact of his being of a different religion himself, and thus are they most unjustly deprived of, or refused the most important portion of their education. They very justly regard this as a great grievance, and they will not, I presume, tamely submit to be thus very materially wronged of their rights.

Another great absurdity and manifest injustice to Catholics connected with our system of Education, is the fact that should a student of Saint Dunstan's College desire to teach a District School for a while, he must first, if you please, go to the Normal School for five months, although, at the same time, he might be able to teach the Master thereof for five years. The same may be said of the pupils of the Convent. Does Mr. Edward Palmer or his Government imagine that Catholics will allow themselves to be thus wantonly insulted. Does he consider that street walking, and seeing the master of the Normal School drilling a lot of little children, constitute a training which can, in any point of view, be compared to that which Catholic young men and women receive in the College and Convent respectively, in which they not only receive a literary education far superior to that which is given in the Normal School, but also their moral and religious training is regarded as an integral, an indispensable part of their daily instruction? Is there any person, be his religion what it may, so stolidly ighorant as to say that persons trained in the Normal School will make teachers as efficient, as moral and as honest in the discharge of their important duties as persons educated in the Catholic Institutions already named? I believe not. Catholics consider themselves treated with great injustice,—they have been too long silent, and the Government need not be surprised if they find them determined not to be imposed on much longer. They trust also that their Protestant fellow citizens are not so utterly devoid of every sense of justice as to refuse them fair play.

In my remarks on the Normal School it has not been my intention to insinuate anything against the moral character of Mr. Webster.

A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

November 23

FOR THE EXAMINER.

TO THE TENANTS ON THE SELKIRK ESTATE.

GENTLEMEN—As proposed in my last communication, I am now to exhibit and prove to you by facts and figures that the prices exacted by the Government scheme for the lands of the Selkirk Estate are extravagant and indefensibly high, and that the scale propounded by myself is more than ample to meet every contingency of the purchase and sale.

The Estate contains 60,000 to 64,000 acres, but taking the mean number, I have a certainty of 62,000 acres, which cost the Government £7000 sterling, or £10,500 this Island currency. These facts established, I submit to you—

Sales of lands by Government scale of price, allowing six years for the disposal of the Estate:

5,250	acres @ 10s.	£2,625	0	0
5,250	" @ 9s.	2,362	10	0
15,750	" @ 8s.	6,300	0	0
15,750	" @ 7s. 6d.	5,906	5	0
15,000	" @ 6s.	4,500	0	0
5,000	" @ 6s. 6d.	1,625	0	0
62,000	acres. Gross amount of sales,	£23,318	15	0

Cost of Estate, &c., viz:

62,000 to 64,000 acres cost £7000 sterling, or—	£10,500	0 0	Currency.
Average amount of interest and working expenses for 6 years at £350 per annum,	3,300	0 0	
Average loss of land tax for 6 years at £75 per annum,	450	0 0	
Allowance for bad or unavailable lands about 4000 acres at 6s.,	1200	0 0	
		£15,450	
Net profit on sales,		£7,868	15 0

Here, gentlemen, it must be evident to you, that, dealing liberally with the Government in providing largely for charges and contingencies against the Estate—allowing six years to dispose of it, and casting away as barren and unavailable 4000 acres of land, the sum of £7868 15s. beyond all cost's and charges would be unnecessarily, unfairly and cruelly drawn from the sweat and toil of your labor, and pocketed by the Government.

I shall now, gentlemen, proceed to lay before you the result of the scheme for the disposal of the Estate which, in part, I propounded in my last; but differing from the above table in prices, and assuming five years instead of six years for the final accomplishment of the sale, which assumption the prices warrant.

Sales of lands by my scale of prices:

5,250	acres @ 7s. 6d.	£1,968	15	0
5,250	" @ 6s. 6d.	1,706	5	0
15,750	" @ 6s.	4,725	0	0
15,750	" @ 5s. 6d.	4,326	5	0
15,750	" @ 5s.	3,937	10	0
5000	" @ 4s. 6d.	1125	0	0
62,000	acres. Gross amount of sales,	£17,788	15	0

Cost of Estate, &c., viz:

62,000 to 64,000 acres cost £7000 sterling, or—	£10,500	0 0	currency.
Average amount of interest and working expenses for 5 years, at £550 per annum,	2,750	0 0	
Average loss of land tax for 5 yrs., at £75 per annum,	375	0 0	
Allowance for bad or unavailable lands, about 4000 acres, at 6s.	1,200	0 0	
	£14,825	0	0
Net profit on sales,	£2,963	15	0

The Government, under this scale, gentlemen, would gain and wrest from you £2963, or looking upon it from another point of view, the Executive would have £2963 to meet any further possible contingency that might accrue, and this fact establishes beyond all doubt, that the Government would be perfectly secured against any possibility of loss in disposing of the Estate at the prices set forth in my scale.

I have now succinctly placed before you, gentlemen, statements which I believe are more liberal towards the Government than the facts warrant; but I have done so with the desire that the Executive should have the entire benefit of that liberality, even at your cost, and thereby guard and secure the Colony against loss.

If, on sifting my statements, you should find my figures based on truth and justice, and carried out with integrity to yourselves and to the country, you must concur with me in condemning the Government scheme as unfair, indefensible and oppressive; and you must see reason and justice in determining amongst yourselves, as one man, to reject it altogether, and adopt my scheme, as the fair and more equitable scale, based upon public integrity and tenant's rights; but if the Government should obstinately adhere to *their scheme*, fold your arms, gentlemen, and close your pockets against their fingers, and resist their iniquitous demand with that determination, coolness and composure which must eventuate in your end being obtained. The Government is disjointed, and notwithstanding the reckless assertion of a wild, rude writer in the *Monitor*, styling himself "A Caledonian," that the *Executive are not divided*, I bid you, gentlemen, be not deceived. I tell you but a fact, an insurmountable truth, that the Executive Government is in a state of disruption. I tell you that all its members are at issue among themselves on questions of public policy, one among the number being the prices of the Selkirk Estate lands; and another the retaining in or dismissing the *tenants foe*, Mr. Pope, from the Office of Colonial Secretary. These and other questions of dispute have been unceremoniously breathed by some of their own body, and are true. I tell you, gentlemen, that the germ of their political death is spreading its cancerous ramifications steadily, and surely sapping their vitality—the hour of the Proprietary Government's dissolution draws towards culmination,—the coming session of the Legislature may probably witness its fall, and see a vigorous and popular administration formed, to which you, gentlemen, and the Colony may with confidence look for that sympathy and justice which your own and their wrongs excite, and your several positions demand; and I say to you, in a common but emphatic phrase, "Bide your time," and escape the imposition of the present Government. Finally, gentlemen, it is a matter to you of no vital import who the writer of these letters is; and although "A Caledonian" in the *Monitor*, wise in his own opinion, attributes the authorship, yet with his cute surmise you have little to do; but I ask you to consult the matter contained in my letters—try my premises in the crucible of your unbiased judgment—and if you find in them the golden gems of reason, truth, and honesty, give them your confidence and adhesion, whatever be the name, occupation and circumstances of

TENANTS' FRIEND.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

MR. EDITOR—Reduction of rent and other kindness to the tenants are so inimical to the feelings and personal interests of the Editor of the *Islander*, Mr. W. H. Pope, and his proprietary compeers, that we find in the last issue of that paper he Mr. P., grudgingly permits Lady Fane to wear the honor of her noble behest to the tenants on her Estates, in the reducement of rents to sixpence per acre, and quittance from arrears of rent; but he in toto tacitly denudes her ladyship of the justice and credit of furnishing leases free of charge. This latter, however, is a sore subject for her agent, Mr. Pope, who was opportunely arrested in his *benignant* attempt to extract from her tenants two pounds each for leases which he stringently endeavoured to force upon them, under the *mild influences* of *writs* of *ejectment*, if they would not comply and put money in his purse.

The straight intentioned Mr. Pope, in one line of his editorials, denies the statement of "Veritas," but in the next line, having the fear of Lady Fane before him, he admits that her Ladyship did, on Lot 53, and in some cases on Lot 29, reduce the rent to sixpence per acre, and forgave the back rents. Now, this is just the substance of what "Veritas" wrote—nothing more and nothing less; yet Mr. Pope charges him with false statement, and contradicts himself in the course of his own paragraph.

I would now add to the facts given in my first letter, that Mr. Pope knows that Lady Fane was anxious to relieve incapable tenants of rent altogether; and was desirous that all tenants on her Estates, unable to pay one shilling per acre, should be charged sixpence only. This, Mr. Editor, was her Ladyship's lofty humanity—her sublimated feeling; and if her wish and desire be not carried out in the spirit and letter of their conception, then Lady Fane's Agent, Mr. Pope, must bear the blame, descredit and inhumanity, of thwarting her Ladyship's benign pleasure, and of rivetting oppressive burdens upon her tenants.

VERITAS.

POLITICO-CLERICO CONSISTENCY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—

Having recently formed one of the audience of a certain peripatetic preacher, the following politico-theologico remarks were inflicted on my dissentient ears;

"My beloved hearers, I wish to draw your special attention to Thanksgiving Day, which is to be on Thursday, the 22nd inst. I trust that you will strictly observe that day as a holiday. You feel some surprise at my recommending to you so urgently to observe Thanksgiving this year, because I used to pay so little attention to similar festivals a few years ago. My reason for my change of conduct this year is that I believe the Government which has appointed the day to be itself a God-appointed Government. They have put us in possession of a Free Bible. They have caused as many copies of it as were required to be placed in the chief Institution of learning in our Colony, the Central Academy, whence it had been excluded by their predecessors. Any one might have easily observed that the blessing of God descended on our Island almost as soon as this God-appointed Government was introduced; so that I feel bound to respect its appointments and submit to them."

I felt constrained, Sir, from the above address to infer that the preacher did not believe that the Government which had preceeed the present were appointed by God. How can such a belief be reconciled with the declaration of that inspired volume, from which the preacher pretends to have learned his Creed! The inspired Apostle, St. Paul, writing to the Christians in Rome, affirms that the Government which then and there existed, though Pagan, was appointed of God, and urges on the Christians to be submissive to it: Rom. 13: 1. But our would-be-wiser modern itinerant cannot feel the obligation of submitting to a *Christian* Government, even when requesting of him to perform an act of devotion, after his own mode. Exemplary conduct in the leader of the devotions of a Christian community, very! But can you inform me, Mr. Editor, when was the Bible *not* free among us? And if such a time cannot be pointed out, why thank the present Government for a boon which we had already in our possession? The only prohibition of its use in the Central Academy, or any other school which ever existed, viz: that it should not be used by the children of parents who disapproved of such use, is as actually in force as ever. In any instance where it was not used by the children of parents who wished it to be used, the fault should be ascribed to their own negligence, and not to the Government or School Acts and Regulations.

Let me now turn a few pages back in the sermons of our political Parson, where we may find a delightful illustration of his consistency! A little more than three years ago he declared from the pulpit, in my hearing: "I do not approve of the Scriptures being taught by the Schoolmasters, and as far as my influence can go, I will oppose such a course. For, granting that both teacher and parents are Protestants, yet should the teacher be a Calvinist, and the parents Arminians, the business would soon be found impracticable, in consequence of the religious instructions imparted by the teacher conflicting with those given by the parents. The case would be just as bad where the teacher would be a Methodist and the parents Presbyterians; and still worse were the teacher a Unitarian or Universalist and the parents Presbyterians or Methodists. But where the teacher is a Roman Catholic, and the parents Protestants, it seems to me utterly unjust and tyrannical to request him to teach from a version which he believes to be incorrect. From these, among other considerations, I am opposed to all human enactments respecting God's Book. If the Bible be God's word, He will take charge of it, and protect it. We ought not to be afraid to trust it to His protection, and let it stand or fall by its own peculiar or divine influence."

The above remarks seemed to me perfectly just, rational and appropriate; but it appears that since they were uttered a deplorable change has come o'er the spirit of the Parson's dream!

Dear Mr. Editor, what can be done to undeceive the thousands of the deluded priest-ridden hearers of Political Parsons? Do your travelling Agents canvass every family on their route for the *Examiner*? Or can not some liberal Protestant publish a paper that will fearlessly disseminate political truth, since the *Examiner* is regarded by many Protestants as an organ for the Catholics? It is lamentable to meet so many, who, with their eyes open, believe a lie, while a few moments' research would suffice to discover the actual condition of our local affairs!

CANDOR.

Queen's County, Nov. 22nd, 1860.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,

I trust you can afford me space to contradict an erroneous statement which I accidently observed under the head of "Land Commissioner's Court, Georgetown, 20th Sept., 1860," in your paper of the 19th instant, where a Mr. Bartholomew Lelacheur is reported to have "detailed at some length the "circumstances under which his father and his family had "been induced to emigrate to this country from the island of "Guernsey. He said his father was decluded by a proprietor "at home, John Cambridge's father, who promised him that "he should have lands bordering on the Elliot River within 5 "miles of Charlottetown; but that when he came out he found "the location appointed him was in the interior of the "woods." Now, Sir, this statement is incorrect in several very important particulars, which I will proceed to shew. As the late John Cambridge, of Bristol, my grandfather, is the person named, I will first observe that *his father* never owned any land on this Island, and was dead long before the good people of Guernsey ever thought of coming to it; but John Cambridge, himself, was at one time possessed of much property here, now chiefly held by Sir Samuel Cunard, on part of which some of the Guernsey settlers were once located. It is rather too bad, when a man has been dead nearly thirty years, and when most of those who could have vindicated his character have also sunk into the grave, that his memory should be thus assailed by false and slanderous assertions, as was the case in several instances while the Land Commissioners were sitting. In this matter, however, the charge is easily refuted, as the history of the Guernsey settlers is yet fresh in the memories of many, and I beg leave to submit a few extracts from letters which appeared in the "Colonial Herald," a Newspaper formerly published here, one of which letters is signed by "John Windsor Lelacheur," brother to the said Bartholomew, who is reported as making the charge. These may now be read with some slight interest by the public, and perhaps to the edification of the descendants of the respective parties concerned:—

"In the Autumn of 1805, the people of Guernsey, above alluded to, owing to a depression of trade, were induced to think of emigrating to some other country, when a Mrs. Burns came to Guernsey, and posted up a number of very flattering handbills; the people, on seeing these, flocked to her, at her lodgings, where she had a Map of the Island, shewing that the principal river thereof ran through her land; pointed out the facility with which the settlers, by this means, could transport their produce to the Charlottetown market; that those who purchased land from her might choose their portions on the banks of the river; and that each person should have one-fifth part of his purchase clear land fit for the plough; that the land was free from all kinds of taxation, having bought the Quit Rent from Government; with many other flattering inducements, equally false, that can be fully substantiated. By these means, she obtained from different people, for purchases, as below, at 20s. sterling, per acre, viz,

From J. Le Lacheur	£640	0	0
Hilery Roberts	50	0	0
Daniel Machon	25	0	0
Charles Phillips	50	0	0
Mrs Jamanon	10	0	0
Thomas P. Richards	4	0	0
Henry Brehaut	70	0	0
Thomas De Jersey	25	0	0
John De Codvil	100	0	0
Mrs. Hide (Widow)	70	0	0
Miss M. Phillips	10	0	0
Total	£1054	0	0

* * * \