sumed. Taking the three dials in connection, the exact amount of cubic feet may thus be ascertained, commencing anew every time 100,000 feet have run through the meter and been consumed.

Now, to ascertain the exact amount of gas which will be consumed during the month of January, inspect the dials of the meter on the 1st of the month; the pointer on the left hand perhaps stands between the figures 6 and 7, indicating 60,000 feet. The pointer on the middle dial stands between 7 and 8, indicating 700 feet. You thus have a total of 65 700 feet of gas previously consumed. Set the figures down, and at the end of the month again inspect the dial. The right hand dial stands, perhaps nearly as before, and still indicates 60,000 feet. The middle one has moved on, and stands between 7 and 8, indicating 7000. The right hand one has made a number of revolutions, and stands between 1 and 2, indicating 100 feet. We then have a total of 67,100 feet. Subtract from this number set down at the beginning of the month, and you have 1400 feet of gas consumed. Multiply this by the price per cubic foot, and you have your gas bill for the month. If housekeepers would take the trouble to do this themselves, they would satisfy themselves and be sure to guard against mistakes.—*Cincinatti Enquirer.*

LIFE IN NEW ORLEANS.

[Correspondence of the New York World.]

Of private reception parties and the like there are enough. Everybody who sets foot in New Orleans becomes infected with the prevailing desire to be lavishly happy. Although our army and its officers be not natives and to the manor born, yet is it "more honored in the breach than in the observance." To live in confiscated houses and to ride in confiscated carriages, drink confiscated (not condemned) wines, is pleasant, natural, and apt to loose the reins of puritanical restraint. Of public assemblages there is nothing like the old times. Of the private entertainments we will not stultify ourselves as to report the manners and tastes of our hosts and hostesses and their company, although such prattle is common enough. It is sufficient to say that the receptions of the season are splendid and quite becoming to a victorious people.

Another sad evidence of the demoralization of the city, not attributable to the war, is the large number of gaudy whisky shops passing under the name of saloons. These, for which the city has always been noted, are of the most spacious and elaborate kind. Sheeted with mirrors, decorated with fresco stucco, and some of them hung thick with Cupids and Venuses, both in canvas and in marble. There is the long range of marble counter, the elegantly dressed boor who hands out the bottles; but no comfort amid so much splendor. In fact, it is rather expected that the customer shall walk up to the bar, pour down his liquor rapidly, and hold on to the counter until he gets beastly drunk, when he is summarily kicked out. From the style of these groggeries and their proprietors, we should suppose drinking to be an exceedingly vulgar practice in New Orleans.

On the boulevards, or the fashionable Canal street, plenty of fashion may be seen. The ladies are gay, and evidently squander pin-money easier than their male friends make it. The stores are crammed with fine merchandize, and the side-walks are thronged every day with a gay concourse of shoppers. The ladies are far ahead of their northern sisters—or far behind, which?—having discarded hoops, and, to confess honestly, look very attractive without them. The milliners must grieve at a habit I perceive of part of the population in going bare-headed, with their hair plaited and otherwise elegantly *coiffee.*

THE RUINED CITIES ON THE MISSISSIPPI.—Further down as you go, stacks of ruined chimnies, burned houses, fields destroyed, tell of the rebellion and its consequences. Groups of contrabands gather together under the banks in the neighbourhood of the gunboats, waiting for employment, while rejoicing in their freedom, being protected by the gunboats from roving bands of guerillas, who seek to destroy and kill them. Vicksburg soon appears, with but little mark of the July bombardment, from the river, but go you into the city, and the terrible marks of the bloody and destructive seige meet you at every point, in dilapidated buildings, houses and stores torn by shot and shell, caves and barricades in the streets, and an immense line of entrenchments of every style of engineering in the rear. The presence of death is visible in the mourning costumes of the women, for almost every family tells you of a vacant chair at the hearthstone. At Grand Gulf you see only a pile of ruins, and a solitary house perched high upon the bluffs among the cedars, yet if you look you will see that it is tenantless, and used only as a habitation for owls and bats. Natchez has escaped the fire and destruction of the war, and so has Bayou Sara, but come you to Baton Rouge and see the monument of Louisiana's justice in her dilapidated State House, whose hollow, blackened and crumbling walls are fit type of secession. See the houses and churches torn with shot and shell, and go with me to the grave yard or cemetery and there see the marks of battle on the broken tombstones and scarred trees, and fences penetrated with bullets which tell of the strife of bloody war. Observe yonder those groups of women, strewing fresh garlands of "immortelles" on the tombs of the loved and lost. Oh, woman, how holy is thy mission—"Last at the cross and earliest at the grave." Donaldsville, the outlet of Bayou La Fourche, the heart of the great sugar region, has only its market house to mark its former site. The hotel is burned, the dwellings are marked by piles of burned brick, charred timbers and half broken chimneys, and this is all that is left of the once pretty village. Napoleonville has shared the same fate, and many of the planters' houses down the bayou have been destroyed. Such are the ruined sites of the Mississippi delta!—*Northern paper.*

ANOTHER CONFEDERATE PRIVATEER IN THE ATLANTIC OCEAN.—In addition to the notorious Confederate cruisers, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, &c., authentic information has been received of the movements of vessels chiefly under sail, cruising in the South Atlantic Ocean—some in the track of the homeward-bound East Indiamen, and others in the direct route of those outward bound on the Southern latitudes. Another addition has been made to those cruising under the "stars and bars" of the Confederate States, and was on the 11th of August spoken off the Brazilian coast. When last she was seen in latitude four south, longitude thirty west, near the Island of Fernando Norhona, and quite in the course of vessels bound for East India, China, or Australian ports.

STITCHES IN A SHIRT.—The following is a singular calculation of stitches in a plain shirt:—Stitching the collar, four rows 3,000; sewing the ends, 500; button-holes, and sewing buttons, 150; sewing the collar and gathering the neck, 1,204; stitching wristbands, 1 228; sewing the ends, 68; button holes, 148; hemming the slits, 264; gathering the sleeves, 840; setting on wristbands, 1,468; stitching on shoulder straps, three rows each, 1889; hemming the bosom 393; sewing the sleeves, 2,534; setting in sleeves and gussets, 3,050; tapping the sleeves, 1,526; sewing the seams, 848; setting side gussets in, 424; hemming the bottom, 1,104. Total number of stitches, 20,649.

The poorer classes of women in England, as late as the beginning of the present century, were employed in many towns in carrying bricks and mortar on their heads to the masons at work on even the highest buildings. Women stripped from shoulder to loins, may even now be seen picking up lumps of coal from the Tyne mud, when the water is low.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FOR THE PUBLIC.

(No. 6.)

"Justum ac tenacem propositi virum,
Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida."—HORAT.

MR. EDITOR:

Laying all this aside, however, there may still be some in our midst who affect to be even yet skeptical as to what the Bishop's actual meaning really was. We have honestly shown that if he only stipulated for secular education as it now exists in our own educational institutions—free from any possible religious sectarian bias, or even from any positive religous influence whatever—he may have asked for nothing in anywise either necessarily improper or even, under all the circumstances of the case, necessarily undesirable, all the pretentious writings of our present sworn Government advocates to the contrary notwithstanding. But there may be some, when they find the ground not necessarily very firm under them in one respect, ready to shift their relative position to another—there may be some ready now to insinuate that the Bishop really meant "a godless education" in the most profane signification which the term can be made to imply. Of course we all know right well that he did not. But for the special benefit of those skeptical folks, and of our Tory friends in general, let us simply suppose he did. And what then? Will this improve their circumstances in the least? No; but if we do not mistake our own basis of argument very much indeed, it will only tend to embarrass them exceedingly, and render the whole course of their subsequent procedure in the case very far more reprehensible and incalculably far less wise than it might have otherwise appeared in the eyes of any civilized, not to speak of enlightened, community. The Bishop's Letter was surely nothing more, under any circumstances or construction which can ever be placed upon it, than the insulated act of a single man. And what was the circumstantial occasion of this act? What was its real primacy, well accredited and distinctively originating cause, which by the way may now have become, through lapse of time, comparatively forgotten by many who yet speak of it in a general way in this Island? Were not the succinct facts of the case precisely these: did not Mr. Stark, the late educational superintendent of this Province, during the term of office last held by the late Liberal Government, of whom Mr. Coles was the acknowledged leader, publish a programme of his own views in relation to the method of practical common school education, which he intended proposing for the adoption of our local Legislature; and did not a certain specifical course of Biblical lessons, which were to be given daily by all teachers who should be licensed by the Board of Education to conduct those schools, enter expressly into the rationale of this proposed system? Was not this, I ask in plain English, the first authentic fact of the case? Most undoubtedly it was; and, if so, was not this clearly contemplating a very great innovation on the old method which had previously obtained from the earliest history of the country in which *the use of the Bible in the school* was altogether an optional element? Most manifestly and most assuredly it was. Well, then, what was the almost necessary and natural result? Did not this place all conscientious Roman Catholics in the entire province in a prospective position, to which, as a body, they could have no natural right to submit? Most self-evidently it did. And what again was the unavoidable result? Did not Bishop McDonald (at the instigation I believe of some of his own friends in Nova Scotia), at once write the celebrated letter to the Board of Education, then existing in this Province, requesting a timely explanation of the proposed scheme of the superintendent, and protesting at the same time, in the name of the whole Catholic population, against any change in the then present system which should in any way compromise the Catholics themselves in a cheerful support of the general or mixed prospective educational interests of the country? Was not this, I repeat, the substantial fact of the event as it then occurred? Most decidedly, and in the briefest verity, such was the unconditional and absolute and unalterable truth of the whole matter. And did Bishop McDonald do anything "worthy of" all the "stripes" which he has since sustained for pursuing the precise course which he then did? Emphatically no! He did nothing more than his duty to his own people imperatively required; and if some of our own clergymen who pride themselves so much on their extreme forwardness in "watching the signs of the times" and forewarning all Protestants to allow no intolerance to be assumed on the part of "Rome," in relation to our civil economy, really presume themselves fairly entitled to any special credit for their extreme vigilance—surely they will not, they cannot, condemn Bishop McDonald for a similar discharge of his duty in a case so simply plain as the one now before us. The Bishop, then, in the letter which he wrote to the Board of Education in the special instance of seeking to discharge his personal duty, to which we here allude, happened, as Mr. Allan has expressed it, unfortunately to say that nothing short of a "godless" system, manifestly meaning, as we have already shown, and as we are all now fully satisfied, "secular" system of education would satisfy the Catholics. We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Allan in this respect by any means. We differ very much with that Rev. gentleman in supposing that this "lapsus linguæ" was in any wise, on the part of the Bishop, "unfortunate." We regard it, on the contrary, as one of the *most fortunate* mistakes which any man ever made in this country. And for why? Simply because it has conspired more than anything else to bring on in its true light the unprincipled disposition of our Tory Hydra of this little Island to the indignant gaze of the universal public. It shows, forever shows, and forever must show the whole world that the Tory conscience of this Colony is an exceedingly perverse and perverting affair. But did the Tories really take advantage of this accidental and to be sure rather clumsy labial slip of the Bishop to foist themselves into power over his devoted head? They did. Some circulars were sent underhandedly round or at least immediately round to the different Protestant Ministers of the Province "to start the ball," and how boisterously and incessantly and ludicrously have they kept shouting and kicking at it ever since, as in its different strategetic revolutions it has now for nearly six years—this mean Tory foot-ball—been rolling around the land, completely crushing, as they vainly imagine, every vestige of liberal sentiment and liberal hope and liberal vitality from the fated scene of its unsalutory depredations! Thus, then, born in dishonesty and deceit, it can never surely end its career in glory. How little reason, in honest truth, the traducers of Bishop McDonald had or even can have for this characteristically unprincipled line of procedure on their own part, may be very easily gathered by all who really want to know, from the fact that no sooner did Mr. Coles write him that the Government had no intention of acting upon Superintendent Stark's suggestions, in so far as the proposed systematic Bible lessons were concerned, than he expressed himself perfectly satisfied. He wished to make no innovation on his own part: he only wished the present free school system to be retained in all its integrity, in so far as promiscuous secular education is concerned, with any alteration or improvement which time might suggest, without any innovation being attempted by any religious sect in the community which might involve the religious principles of any other. Such then was the whole "head and front" of poor Bishop McDonald's crime against the awfully outraged Tory clique of this identical Island! Hapless Bishop! Thine was surely a monstrous transgression! Wilt thou ever obtain pardon for such an offence? The Tories, we know, especially the more honest among them, are now at the eleventh hour, when they are beginning to find that their unprincipled misrepresentations of this thy simple natural action is likely, in the long run, to do themselves much more real harm than thee—beginning to feel a little ashamed of their unjust treatment which thou hast thus sustained. Doubtless, therefore, it is owing to this slight sprinkling of shame that some of them still desire to persist in hinting that thou didst really mean "*a godless education*" in the profane sense of the term. If they could only make this out, they might, of course, inhale as well as exhale "the vital air of heaven" with a much greater amount of "freedom of conscience." It is not pleasant to know that they have persistently accused a fellow man of things and intents of which he was never really guilty. Well, we are willing to meet them on the worst construction which they can ever impose upon thy words. We have already said that thine act, in any sense they can possibly view it, was surely the act of a single man. Well, does not the query now plainly resolve itself into this—Did or did not that isolated act of a single man drive the whole Tory Protestant community of this Island into such a miserable state of cowardly alarm, verging on utter destruction, as to have induced them to storm the local Government of the day with a sudden and preternatural array of premature and dolorous petitions on the subject? and did these hot-house petitions really scare the equally time-serving, impotent and chicken-hearted Government of the day into the eggregious and unprecedented farce of actually attempting to dispose of this special religious difficulty of the moment—this great "*casus belli*" by positive legislative enactment? Was this, we again enquire—and we enquire in all solemnity—was this or was this not the certain fact of the case? For if it was then all we have to say is, "Well done Bishop McDonald! Thou couldst surely work miracles after all: Thou must, at all events, at this rate have been a far greater man than St. Peter himself! For we never find him at any time represent as having achieved any such feat of pure personal romance as this. We are not aware that he ever once overawed, after this fashion, the existing civil Government of even any of those comparatively Pagan States which flourished contemporarily with himself. This is certainly "one chasing a thousand" with a vengeance. Thou couldst thus, O Bishop, with the slightest scratch of thy pen—magic wand—perpetrate one of the most unmitigatedly foolish acts that ever, perhaps, any rational body of civilized men have been guilty of performing! And what renders this thy miracle still more note-worthy is, that thou hast compelled these men to do the very kind of thing which, above all others, they profess the most to abominate. For, notwithstanding their noisy avowal or rather disavowal of all those doctrines more properly peculiar to thy church, we opine that we can unquestionably prove that thou hast, in this case, at least, forced them to perform one of the greatest works of "*supererogation*" which any set of living mortals were ever known to have been goaded into; and if we shall ultimately succeed in making this point clear to the unsophisticated apprehension of the good Tory inhabitants of this Colony, we shall even, if we effect nothing else, have made at least two very pertinent discoveries for their special benefit, viz: the possibility of miracles really having been wrought in some modern instances, and the absolute necessity of works of supererogation being sometimes performed. Are our Conservative friends in this province, then, willing to admit this alternative, that they were thus absolutely driven, as by a universal panic, through the single word—and that word a palpable "*lapsus penade*"—of a single individual to adopt the executive line of conduct which they have pursued in relation to this lamentable religious controversy which they must know they have now, for such a length of time, been the chief instruments in exciting? I trow not. Well, if not, for their own credit never let us hear them again harping about the Bishop's Letter.

But another excuse for the eccentric conduct is brought forward by some of the advocates of Toryism. They affirm that the course which the present Government has pursued, was not instigated by the Bishop's letter at all—but it arose from the fact that the Bible was excluded from the list of text books specified by the Board of Education which held office under Mr. Coles's administration of the Government. Now, if the last excuse was bad—this is pitifully worse. What were the facts? Were they not simply these? The Board of Education which existed under Mr. Coles's administration did specify a list of text books for use in common schools in this Island in which they did not include a direct mention of the Bible. Was not this the simple fact? Most explicitly it was! There was no *exclusion* about it. They never mentioned the Bible one way or another. They just left it where it was and always had been—optional with all parties to use it or not as they pleased—and they did right, most inevitably they did right. Had they done otherwise they would have done wrong. And what is more, we have no hesitation in asserting our positive conviction that had the present party followed their example in this respect, they would have done right also. But this they have not done, and consequently under all the existing circumstances of the case, we say decidedly they have done *wrong*. This we shall, however, esteem it our duty deliberately to prove. We have now terminated the first series of our intended course of letters. They have been, every one must see, concerned principally in throwing up some prominent points, and stating some prominent facts for the general observation of all, which we shortly design to bring to bear on still more important topics of present practical interest, while at the same time we shall take good care to prove, as we go along, all those points themselves as thus already advanced which may seem to require any particular elucidation. All we shall, therefore, add in the meantime is, that we are perfectly assured of all the statements we have now made, and if they can be clearly demonstrated in due season, as we advance, may we not here enquire, pointedly, of those who wrote some months since such articles as "our second great Protestant triumph," &c., whether or not the unbiassed natives of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick may not have very strong reasons to doubt the truth of the assertion that the Liberal Party have ever really attempted "to thrust Popish dogmas upon the whole community" of this Island! We may be wrong, but we certainly are willing to conjecture that our neighbours across the Strait may very justly have, at this moment, some very grave doubts of the true character of some other party with which this Island has a slight acquaintance. We shall see.

W. KEIR.

Malpeque, January, 1864

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

MR. EDITOR:

As I got a little time to-day, I take up my pen to write a few lines to you. Our Jack laughs at the notion of my writing for the paper. He says I ought to learn grammar and to spell before I set up for a letterary character. Now, sur, I don't stick myself up as such no way, I don't want to appear any better than I am. I am a plain man, and what I have to say I want to say in my own way. Bless your heart, if I was to think about spelling and grammar, and them sort of things, I wouldn't be able to write one sentence. If I commenced thinkin about them things, they would drive everything else out of my head, and I'd have to burn my paper, and throw away my pen before I had been to work ten minnits. What makes me talk this way is that I'm going to write about eddication, and I suppose when a man that's got no learnin begins to talk about that, he must make some excuses.

You know that our Government made a new eddication law the last time they set, and a pretty mess they made of it. The Tories was never any great friends to eddication. They did their best to make people sick and tired of the old law, by neglectin' the schools and keepin old Johnny Arbuckle in a place that might be filled by a respectable man, and a man that was willin' and able to do his work. But the people saw the good of a general eddication law that gave the poor man's child as good a chance of getting learnin' as the rich man's, and they would'nt give it up. More than that, if there was'nt money enough to keep it a goin' they was willing to be taxed in a reasonable way to support it. But they thought that the tax should be a fair one, and them that was best able should pay the most. Well, the Tories since they dares'nt do away with the law altogether, went to work to fix it up in a way that would make it almost useless to the people. To raise the money, they taxes the poor man's molasses and the poor man's whiskey, and lets the rich man's land and the rich man's wine go free. They cuts off a third of the teacher's pay, and makes the poor man make it up; and if, owin' to sickness, or a busy time, or bad wether, there isn't a large average kept up, the people's got to make up what's wantin', so the poor is burdened every way. The rich has got their College and their Grammar Schools (I don't say anything against them, they're good things and ought to be kept up) without paying anything extra, but the poor man is forced to let his children grow up without learnin', or else pay, I was going to say, ten times as much as he used to before. Well, I believe that if he has to hire a schoolmaster worth having, what with one thing and another, the sum he'll have to pay won't be much short of that. But I said more than I intended to when I began. I only wanted to show how the law worked. We had last year a real good teacher. He had been with us four or five years. He was an intelligent man, and he understood his business real well. When the new law came out, he comes to me and says: Mr. H. I ain't going to teach under this new law; I got too little already, and when it comes into operation, I'll get much less. With that, I says, "Master, I'm very sorry, I know when you goes we'll not get the likes of you in a hurry. In his off hand way he says some handsome things to me, that there's no use in speakin' here, but to make a long story short, the master left us, and went where he'd be better paid for his work; so the school was vacant for a short time, but we found it would never do to have the children running wild about the country all summer, and we advertised for a teacher. Two or three came along, but as we did'nt like their looks, we let them slide, as the boys say. At last a young chap that looked a little smarter than the rest, came along, and we called a meetin' to hire him. Some liked the man's looks, and some did'nt—some was willing to subscribe to his salary, and some was'nt. One said he was a young chap, and forty pounds was enough for him; another sed that he did'nt know how he would turn out, and he would give him something if he pleased them. When the subscription list came to be added up, we were six pounds short; and every one that could be coaxed had given as much as could be squeezed out of him. When the teacher saw that no more was coming he took ——(it won't do to mention names) a one side and whispered to him —— is a cousin, or uncle or something like that, to the teacher. After they had done —— came forred and put down his name for what was wantin' to make up the 15 pounds. Well, the teacher went to work, but somehow he did'nt do well. The boys did'nt respect him. They said he was'nt fit to hold a candle to the old master. That though he'd been to town, and had passed the Board, he was'nt a better scholar than them. They began to give him impidence, and to call him names, and the poor fellow had a bad time of it. He was forced to get cross, and to beat some of the youngsters pretty bad. With that the old folk gets offended, and keeps their children away. The trustees were called *in to* examine the school, and to put things strate again. We found matters bad enough. Though the new master could do a good many things middling well, yet when he came to hear classes that had been pretty well drilled by a clever man, they saw that he was shallow, and as far as real downright mind work went, that they was better up to it than he was. It *is* wonderful, Mr. Editor, how soon boys can take the weight of a man. You can't deceive them no how. If you're not the right metal its no manner of use to look big, and to put on airs—they see right through them and take you for what you're worth, no more nor no less. So it was with the new master: he wasn't their superior, and they knew it. As I was saying, our orderly school had turned into a very disorderly one, and our civil boys and girls into the most impident set of young vagabonds that was ever licked into civility. What was we to do? We could'nt give brains and knowledge to the teacher, and without them we saw well enough he could never get along with that batch of youngsters. We looked awful serious, and gave the scholars a hearing about their ondutiful conduct, and we threatened to turn a whole grist of them out of school if they did'nt mend their ways. But they did'nt mind for all that, and there was a reg'lar row in the district—some blamed the trustees, more the teacher, and others again the scholars. One or two of us saw what was wrong, but it would'nt mend matters to speak out. As I said before, people grew careless about sending their children to school, and when the Journal for the second quarter came to be made out, it was a long ways short of the lawful averedge. This made matters worse. The trustees was obliged to assess, and there was no end to the grumbling. They said, what was true enough, there was never no want of scholars before, and if things was done right, there would be more now. Folks that was friends all their life began to find fault with each other, and they swore they would not hold such a thankless office any longer. So you see, Mr. Editor, under the new law all hands is worse off. The people has to pay more taxes—they have to pay more to the teacher, and they don't get as much for their money. The teachers get much less than they used to. This makes them leave the bisness as soon as they can; and the people are obliged to put up with fellows that work for a ploughman's wages, and are only fit for a ploughman's work. I don't mean by this to cast any slur on such schoolmasters as are fit for their work. I know some of them, but I know they won't teach one day longer than they can help. What I mean to say is, that the men who teach for fifty pounds a year, or a trifle over, as many do, are much better fitted to clean stables and to chop store wood than to pretend to teach our children what they don't know themselves. But if this law keeps in operation much longer, this is the only sort of teachers that will be left in the country. The Government may think that they are saving a great deal by starving the minds of the children in this way, but they'll find out one of these days that they have been doing what vulgar people like me calls saving at the bung and wasting at the spile. No more at present from

Yours, &c. &c.
HUMPHREY HOMESPUM.

Free Hill Farm, Jan. 12, 1864.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, January 18th, 1864.

MR. GEORGE SUTHERLAND.

MR. George Sutherland—sometimes called the Rev.—does not often cross our path—and perhaps it is well for himself that he does not—but when an ill wind blows him along we feel that we ought to treat him with a little more consideration than is due to an ordinary mortal, on account of the position into which he has forced himself in this community, and the extravagant estimate which he himself sets upon his abilities as a preacher and politician. We have noticed for some time great restlessness on the part of this individual, clearly indicating a desire to get up a row in which he might take a prominent part. When, at the time of the late general elections, there was great excitement in the land—when the No-Popery howl was fresh and vigorous, and when the dirty yellow rag of Orangeism was first stretched to the breeze to catch the gullible and fanatical—George was a mighty power in this little community of ours—his tongue wagged almost incessantly in pulpit and on platform—he proclaimed himself as one of the great champions of Protestantism—W. H. Pope and John Arbuckle were champions in the same cause—and men in office, knowing how hopelessly ignorant the Isle of Skye people are, who were the principal victims of the wiles of Sutherland and Arbuckle—petted the petty preacher of Orangeism, and led him to believe that his opinions were really worth something, and that his talents, piety and learning were such as to command respect in every section of the Island. George was spoiled beyond all hope of recovery. The peacock strut was put on greater than ever. His eyes scarcely ever condescended to rest upon the vulgar ground, and if he honoured any of his passing acquaintances with a nod, it was to be considered as a thing that should be remembered and talked of for months afterwards. The elections over—the excitement allayed—the Jacks in office provided for at the public expense for four years to come—the No-Popery cry completely out of tune—every body sick and tired of hearing it, and the Orange flag struck from its presumptuous heights by the good right hand of the Duke of Newcastle—George fell as flat as a pancake on the surface of that society in which he had the folly to suppose he would be always a leading spirit. The Orange Lodges were and are going to sleep. Some sensible people of the yellowest type don't care to have their names associated with an institution proved to be disloyal, and pronounced by the Queen's Minister as injurious to the peace and welfare of every community which may have the misfortune to harbour it—Mr. S. can no longer arouse any enthusiasm on that subject—his sermons and speeches fall upon listless or disgusted ears; and, in fact, he has just had sense enough to discover, in a quarter where he could hardly expect to acquire the information, that he is about as vulgar and common-place a man as ever thrust himself on the eyes of the public—that he has no paramount influence, and that he is entitled to no extraordinary measure of respect.

We detailed last week the particulars of his attempting to intimidate the Secretary of the Temperance Hall Company into a compliance with his wishes regarding the use of the Hall for the late Catholic Concert. We shewed that he was mean, and spiteful, and narrow-souled enough to try to spoil that Concert, by telling the Secretary that he *must* break faith with the Catholics, and not let them have the Hall on the night for which they engaged it, because he had some Tea Shine of his own with which he wanted to forestall the spare change and the leisure of the public. We pointed out the fact that the Secretary spurned the dishonourable and unmanly proposal; and thereupon Mr. S.—for a moment stunned, no doubt, by a rebuff from such a person as the Deputy Colonial Secretary—scowled with a malignity which a fiend himself might envy upon the presumptuous official, and told him that the situation he held was the fruit, not of the holder's individual claims, but of the great power and influence of the contemptible would-be tyrant who thus menaced the poor Secretary with his displeasure, and who, he boasted, had the same power to displace him that he had to instal him in office. We have since heard that Mr. Morrison declared he would resign his situation if he thought he held it upon such a dishonourable tenure. The resignation of office is a thing that a member of the Tory party is exceedingly slow to come at, and we do not expect to be startled by seeing Mr. Morrison setting an example in that line; but much as we differ from him and his party in our political views, we commisserate him and them if they are obliged to put up with the insolence and over-bearing effrontery of an empty, pretentious upstart like George Sutherland.

And this same Mr. Geo. Sutherland, in a letter to the editor of the *Islander*, on Friday last, asserts that we have published a *tissue of falsehoods* in our statement about his bullying Mr. Deputy Secretary Morrison, and says, moreover, that we have defamed him. Defamed him! Only fancy it, good reader! Black Bill Byers may accuse us of defaming *him* if we say that he is a worthless, useless, dirty remnant of mortality. Defaming an individual necessarily involves a sacrifice of truth, principle, and honour, on the part of the defamer. Mr. S. must still consider himself *great if he thinks* that he is worthy of such a sacrifice; but we hasten to assure him that we make no sacrifice at all, except it be in the way of a small *compromise of our honour* in having even to notice a person of the stamp of George Sutherland. He says our statement is false. Why does he not prove it *so?* *It is easy* for him to do it, if he can. We declare this for a positive fact, that this same George Sutherland attempted to intimidate Mr. Morrison, as the Secretary of the Temperance Hall Company—wanted Mr. Morrison to cancel the engagement in regard to the Catholic Concert; and when he found that Mr. Morrison would not do a dishonourable act, he—George Sutherland—threatened Mr. Morrison that he would bring his *political influence to bear against him*. Will Mr. Sutherland deny this? He may. A man so careless as he is of his integrity will say anything; and knowing that, *we must have some witness to corroborate* his testimony. Let Mr. Morrison, then, be brought to the bar of Public Opinion, and if he will say that Mr Sutherland did not use intimidation and threats in the matter referred to, we shall do ample justice to that individual in the premises.

There could not be a stronger proof of Mr. Sutherland's want of common sense and discretion than is evinced by his short letter in the *Islander*, to which we have already alluded. That letter betrays not the slightest mark of the gentleman or scholar—it is intensely spiteful and malicious; and if we had any ill feeling against the man, we could not wish him a greater injury than that he would write another such letter. He has palmed himself off—or attempted to do it—for a long time, as a Minister of the Gospel of our Redeemer—as an advocate of peace, truth, righteousness and Christian charity. For the sake of his pocket—which is the first consideration with him always—one would suppose that he would try to keep up the deception. But he has thrown down the mask; he has shown that he is untruthful, that he harbours the direst ill will against some of his fellow creatures, that he is venemous as an adder; and we will shew *him* that he may be rendered as impotent as an adder when we take the trouble to put him under our heel.

He says *we* have done much to "disseminate slander and falsehood" on this Island. We are *not going to bandy words with an unscrupulous hypocrite* like George Sutherland. There is no honour in having such a person for an antagonist; but we may say—without the slighest fear of having the assertion disproved—that no man of such a small, mean, vulgar intellect as God, in his inscrutable Providence has given to Mr. Sutherland, has done more, according to his sphere of action, to create strife and uncharitableness, with all their attendant evils of slander and falsehood, than has been accomplished by this clerical charlatan from the time that an evil hour sent him here to exude his mental poison. He reminds us that the time will come when we shall be sent to our last account; and, in the fullness of his condescension, he says, he will leave us to "an awakened conscience and to a just Judge." We want no reminder of our inevitable fate—it awaits George Sutherland as well as us, as well as the meanest worm that crawls—every *hour* is filled with warning: but let us ask is he in a tremendous hurry to see *our* head "beneath the sod" as well as those whom he calls his "foes?" He intimates that our conscience slumbers. From this we must infer that his is wide awake, and transcendently pure. He insinuates that the "just Judge" has great punishment in store for us; and would fain make us believe that he will be regarded as a white headed boy amongst the seraphim, whose place will be on the right hand of the Almighty, to whisper to Him the measure of punishment that should be meted out to such delinquents as we. Our readers may remember the anecdote of the child who asked his Ma whether Grandpa would go to Heaven when he died? "Yes, my dear, I hope he will." "Well then, Ma, I don't want to go there, because Grandpa will say what are children doing here?" Mr. Sutherland having made up his mind that some sort of *heaven* is reserved for him in the next world, we begin to consider whether it is not advisable to make an arrangement with the view of getting into a place where he may not be seen with our immortal eyes, so as to prevent him from asking the querulous question—"What business has the Editor of the *Examiner* here?" Certain we are that if Mr. Sutherland keeps his present frame of mind until he goes to *his* last account, we would not be disposed to envy him the kind of bliss that awaits him in the life to come.

We ought to apologise to our readers—and we do apologise—for giving so much attention to Mr. Sutherland. In our younger days we were fond of foot-ball—a game that is now popular with the Charlottetown boys. We kicked "the ball" with infinite delight, and even now when a stray chance occurs, we love to have a kick at it, in remembrance of old times. Of course we never had any malice against the dirty thing, but we were always desirous of booting it as far as we could. Mr. Sutherland shall be our "foot-ball" in a literary point of view. If he comes in our way again, we will endeavour to "toe the mark" to his satisfaction, and without any more malice than the boys evince in kicking the more harmless and more useful thing that affords them healthful amusement.

The following is the letter which we have favoured with our notice in the preceding article:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ISLANDER.

SIR,—

An editorial article in the last 'Examiner' is devoted to my defamation. You will not be surprised when I say that it is a tissue of falsehood throughout. The poor mortal who edits that paper, and who, during his career on this Island, has done so much to disseminate slander and falsehood, will, by and by, be called to his account. To an awakened conscience, and to a just Judge I leave him. But in this case his assistants are more culpable than he. There are a few well known persons in this City, whose antipathy to the Free Church has always been on the point of running over. Any gust of wind, any breath of prosperity, or any reference to the glorious history on noble self denial of that Church would occasion an immediate overflow of these wells of bitterness. The opportunity was recently given. Suitable channels of communication are never wanting at a certain office, and they have found their natural deposit in the columns of the "Examiner." To those busy, malicious foes who keep running out and in public offices, dropping their slanderous misrepresentations to all who have a taste for such things, we say—keep cool: the Free Church has seen mightier men than you, and men of loftier pretensions, and holding higher offices, go down to the dust, and their envy and their hatred buried in the tomb; and she shall live when your heads are beneath the sod and your lying lips silent in death. The God who has blessed her and prospered her will hold in derision her opponents. Let them know that the Free Church, in Charlottetown, was never so numerous as at this day—at least four times what they represent—and her prospects were never so bright as now. Is this the secret cause of the present rage? If they can quote DRYDEN, we shall quote DAVID:

"Our God who is the Lord of hosts,—
Is still upon our side.
The God of Jacob our refuge
Forever will abide."

All we want is the presence of God with us; and we care not who belie or oppose us. We will prove more than a match for them.

I am, yours, &c.,
Jan. 13, 1864. G. SUTHERLAND.

THE LAND QUESTION.

As is declared by the Land Commissioners, in *their Report*, "the most simple remedy for the evils which actually exists at the present time would seem to be suggested by the operation of the Land Purchase Act." "By this system," they say, "it is apparent that three signal advantages are secured, which are prevented by no other.

"1st. *The proprietors are dispossessed by their own consent.*

"2ndly. The tenants are enabled to purchase their holdings and improvements, not necessarily at a price so high as to represent the rents stipulated to be paid; but at the lowest price which the expenses of management, added to the aggregate cost of the estate, will warrant.

"3rdly. The wild lands are at once rescued from the operation of the leasehold system, and are subjected to the wholesome control of the local Government, to be hereafter disposed of in fee-simple, at moderate prices, as they are in all the other North American Provinces."

Then they (the Land Commissioners) after having stated that they have unanimously agreed to recommend the application to the whole Island of the principles embodied in the Land Purchase Act, proceed to observe:

"It is clear that the Local Government cannot generally apply the principles of the Land Purchase Act without the assistance of the Imperial Government."

What the Commissioners mean "by the assistance of the Imperial Government," is the guaranteeing of a loan of £100,000 to the Island; and this assistance our local Liberal Government was once in a fair way of procuring; and would, indeed, have procured, had not their endeavours to obtain it been defeated by false and secret representations of the financial condition of the Colony. At present, to expect any benefit from the recommendation of the Commissioners on this head, would be folly. As we said, on a former occasion, "the present Government cannot entertain it without the most flagrant betrayal of principles that have ever disgraced a party;" and now, perhaps, it will be better for the future prospects of the people, if that part of the Commissioners' Report in which "the recommendation" is made, should be allowed to remain a dead letter.

We have certainly, as we have before expressed ourselves, been much gratified to find that the Commissioners have so freely admitted the wisdom of the policy pursued by the Liberal Party, when in power, with respect to the Land Question; a policy, be it observed, of which the Tories, when out of power, were *most liberal* in their abuse; but, in their partial adoption of which are to be found the only traces of political wisdom to be discovered in the whole course of their administrative career.

In another part of their Report the Commissioners freely admit "that the original grants were improvident, and ought never to have passed; that the grants were liable to forfeiture for breach of the conditions with respect to settlement, and might have been practically annulled by the enforcement of quit rents;" and so far we fully agree with them; but, at the same time, we as fully dissent from their opinion "that the lands," had the grants been so annulled, "could have been seized and sold by the Crown at various times, without the slightest impeachment of its honour," because "the Crown was the judge in all these cases; and even, though it were admitted that the Sovereign was ill-advised, and that the policy adopted, from time to time, was too lenient and injudicious, still the Sovereign having not only overlooked the laches of the subject; but, in express language, having repeatedly confirmed the original grants, it is impossible to treat the grantees in any other manner than as the lawful possessors of their lands." From this opinion, we say, we totally dissent; and, in doing so, we set against it a declaration, made by the Commissioners in another part of their Report. It is this. "The protesting proprietors of Prince Edward Island have no better titles to their properties than had the Seigneurs of Canada, the owners of the encumbered estates in Ireland, or the slave-holders in the West Indies. They have none so good, because every acre they hold is held by the generous forbearance of the British Government after breach of conditions over and over again." But we go farther. We not only again repeat that this "valuable island, won by the valor and enterprise of British soldiers, and maintained by the taxes of the whole people," ought, from the first, to have been considered as absolutely fixed in the people, and that the grants made of it by the Crown were an unwarranted and direct violation of the people's rights; but we fearlessly add, that, supposing the grants had been practically annulled by the enforcement of quit rents, and that thereon the lands had been seized and sold by the Crown, such act of sale would have been an abuse of the trusteeship vested in the Crown, as unwarrantable and indefensible as that of which the Crown was originally guilty when it inconsiderately granted the whole Island, in a single day, "in huge blocks of 20,000 acres each." On this head, we have the authority of one of the greatest of English lawyers for saying, "the prerogative of the Crown extends not to do any injury; it is created for the benefit of the people, and therefore cannot be exerted to their prejudice."

We are now, however, persuaded that, if any thing like a full measure of justice is to be conceded or awarded to "the tenantry" of Prince Edward Island, the British Parliament must be awakened to a full sense of their responsibility on this head; for they would then see how much it concerns the honor of the British people generously to acquit themselves of that responsibility. We say the *Parliament*, not the Government; because, although the Government might be fully convinced of the truth of all that might be advanced in favour of the demands of the people or tenantry of the Island, yet so long as the question of redress should lie between them and the Colonial Office merely, the experience of the past warrants the conclusion that redress would be withheld.

The question, we admit, is not one concerning evils of a nature so abhorrent, or of a magnitude so fearful, as those of negro slavery; and, therefore, it might not be found quite so easy to enlist the sympathies of philanthropic men in the British Parliament in the interest of the Tenantry of Prince Edward Island, as it was to engage them in behalf of enslaved Africans. We have no doubt, however, that, in the British Parliament, there are men whose minds are so deeply imbued with the love of justice, that were they fully put in possession of the merits of the question, in its different relations, they would—influenced by nothing but their hatred of wrong, and their love of right—willingly undertake to plead the cause of the Tenantry of Prince Edward Island before that august body; and could they (the British Parliament) only once be brought to give their serious attention to the subject, and to deliberate upon it, it could be no difficult undertaking, we think, to lead them to a conclusion respecting the monster grievance of this Colony, similar to that at which the House of Commons of 1833 arrived, touching the slaves and their masters in British Colonies. It could surely be no difficult task to prove to them "that the granting of a whole Colony in a single day, in huge blocks of 20,000 acres each, was," not only "an improvident and unwise exercise of the prerogative of the Crown," but that it was moreover, a positive evasion, or violation, of the rights of the people. Nor would it, we think, be more difficult to prove to them, that "the proprietors," so called, in opposing, as they have invariably done with all their might, the remonstrances, and petitions for redress of grievances, of the people, to the Crown, appear to have forgotten, "that though the rights of property have ever been sacredly guarded by the law, whenever the possession or abuse of property becomes prejudical to the public interests, the rights and prejudices of individuals can be constitutionally controlled for the public good;" and, that, therefore, seeing that those men—the proprietors—notwithstanding the excessive indulgence which has, time after time, indeed, throughout the whole period of their *landlordism*, been extended to them by the Crown, have exercised their power, as landlords, in a manner most oppressive to individuals, and injurious to the public interests; the time is arrived when conciliatory policy must be abandoned, when, forbearance must cease; and when by an exercise of constitutional control, an end must be put to "that vicious system," which, for nearly one hundred years, has been, in its effect, nothing short of a positive curse to the people of this Colony—as having laid the foundation of all the evils by which, in common, they have been affected.

Now, notwithstanding we are thus unsparing in our condemnation of the unwise and improvident manner in which the prerogative of the Crown was first excercised, as respects the territory of this Island, and are as little guarded in our denunciation of proprietary tyranny, under which the Colony has so long groaned, yet the course which we would desire to see pursued for the promoting of its future prosperity, whilst having for its object nothing less than the complete extinction of proprietary claims or rights in this Island, and that too in a manner which would impose no burthen upon the people, would afford to the propietors all the compensation to which, in reason or fairness, they could possibly lay claim. To dispossess the proprietors by escheat, *that is, without compensation*; or altogether to repudiate their claims, after they have, notwithstanding their disregard of the conditions of their grants, *been allowed, for so many years*, under the sanction and by the authority of the British Government, to exercise all the rights of ownership over the estates possessed or claimed by them, would be positive injustice. This we would say, supposing such an act were to be had recourse to by the British Government, or were to be the effect of specific legislation on the part of the British Parliament: but had the private and public evils which have arisen to the people of this Colony, from "the vicious system" of land tenures which has been allowed so long to prevail, been corrected by a Court of Escheat in the Colony, the correction, although it would have deprived the proprietors of every acre of land claimed by them, without awarding to them one farthing as compensation for their loss, would have been, on the part of such Court, a perfectly just, legal, and constitutional proceeding.

Assuming that, on having had the land-tenure grievances of this Colony fairly and fully brought before them; and having fully satisfied themselves that these grievances had their origin in an improvident and unwise exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, and in the subsequent excessive and unjust forbearance extended to proprietors, by successive British Governments, the Imperial Parliament, influenced by considerations precisely similar to those which weighed with their predecessors of 1833, when they so generously and justly provided for the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies, were to vote or award a sum of money for the emancipation of the tenantry or serfs of Prince Edward Island, £100,000 or at the most £120,000 would be quite sufficient to afford the proprietors an ample compensation for the extinguishment of their seigneurial rights or claims, as we shall at once proceed to shew.

In support, then, of this estimation or assertion we shall quote from the Report of the Special Committee of the House of Assembly appointed in the Session of 1842, to report on the value of Property enumerated in the Census Returns, and which was adopted by the House. In this Report, it is stated: "As to the value of the claim to the soil of the Island, maintained by the heirs and assigns of the Grantees, about 1,300,000 acres were granted. Of these 239,000 acres are now held in fee-simple, and this being deducted, leaves 1,061,000 acres claimed by these Grantees, part of which they have leased; but the greater part is unleased; and of both leased and unleased the greater part, or at least nine-tenths, is now reclaimed from the state of nature."

"Now, 5s. *per acre* for wilderness land may be taken as the outside value thereof, and rather exceeds the average value of sales of Government lands in New Brunswick, and this gives the value of this seigneurial claim (*if valid*) at £255,000."

"Taking another view of the matter, and referring to the account published in London, about 1807, by Capt. John Stewart, and to other accounts, it would appear that the average market value of a claim to one of the Townships of this Colony from 1769 to 1830, was about £ which for 67 Townships would give £33,300
Interest on that sum, 141,858
Total, £175,158

"And your Committee, making every deduction, cannot estimate the amount of prices received by the proprietary claimants and their agents, at less than £50,000
And of Rents, at less than £160,000
Total, £210,000

"Nor the amount of Quit Rents, Land Assessment, Road Compensation Assessment, and all other advances, at more than £25,000
Leaving £185,000

"It is submitted by your Committee, that if, in addition to the £185,000, which they, or rather their agents have received, the Imperial Government award them either the above £265,250, or the smaller amount of £175,158, it will award more than can, in equity, be claimed by those who have acted as have the Grantees, and those who succeeded to their territorial claims or demands; and it is also submitted that from the tables and accounts herein referred to, it is beyond the means of the Colony to pay the rents demanded by these individuals."

And respecting Rent paid to the proprietary claimants, the following statement is made in the said Report:

"Of the land occupied, 300,000 acres appear from the Census to be under rent. This, on several Townships, is 1s. 6d. and 2s. sterling, on leases of 42 years—the lessees entering, not on houses and land cleared and fenced, but on wilderness wood-land. On some Townships, the early settlers obtained leases at 6d. per acre for 999 years. In general, the rent is 1s. sterling per acre, per annum, and the duration 999 years;