In fact, that system has been adopted by two of the Banks in New Brunswick: the Westmorland, and the Bank of British North America. The reason why our Bank notes did not circulate freely in the neighboring Colonies is to be found in the fact that the balance of trade is so much against the Island. I do not coincide in the opinions expressed by some hon. members that the Bill should, of necessity, be a Government one sure. Any member, in my opinion, is justified in introducing such a Bill without previous reference to the Government, or consultation with its members; and it should be discussed without reference to any political organization. In Great Britain the principle on which the Bill is based has met with the general recognition of the mercantile community, and the principal objection to its adoption has been the inconveniences which its practical adoption would cause. As I said before, the system will, I believe, be ultimately carried into practice in the Island, as being more simple and convenient, and its adoption is only matter of time. The action of the Bill, if it became law to-day, would not depress or enhance the value of our produce in the slightest degree.

Mr. BEER—I think that hon. members do not fully understand the object of the Bill, when they argue about its effect upon existing contracts. As I understood the hon. member who introduced it, it only provides that the public accounts be kept in dollars and cents: and it is expected that the adoption of that plan will gradually induce private individuals to act upon the same system, which is a much more simple and easy method of computation than by pounds, shillings and pence. Although, as in the cases of all important deviations from established usages, the introduction of the proposed system of account would cause inconvenience at first, its superiority over our present method is so great that I have no doubt it will be generally recognized and acted on, before many years. Had the Bank adopted it, and made its notes to represent dollars and cents, that institution and the public at large would have experienced its advantages in the circulation of the notes in the other Colonies.

Mr. SINCLAIR—While I agree with the opinions of the last two speakers as to the comparative superiority of the decimal system, I must vote against the Bill, because I consider that the Island is not yet prepared for the great change it would effect. The time will, I believe, soon arrive when it will be necessary to adopt it, on account of its simplicity, and the facilities for calculation it affords. Any radical change in long continued usages has always encountered the prejudices naturally arising from a departure from the beaten track. It is better that we should wait till the experience of the other Colonies shall have gradually prepared us for its adoption. The people are annually acquiring a practical knowledge of the system from the constantly increasing intercourse with the Americans who frequent our shores, and whose dealings are in dollars and cents. I do not see how the Bill would affect existing contracts by raising our currency to the level of that of Nova Scotia, as stated by the hon. member, Mr. Longworth. The superiority of the decimal system has been already recognised by some of the Banking institutions of New Brunswick, whose notes represent dollars. The Island Bank notes express their value in pounds and shillings respectively. One injurious consequence of this style is that a five shilling note is very liable to be mistaken for a five pound one, and *vice versa*. If their value was expressed in dollars, such mistakes would not occur. The decimal system offers such advantages that its general adoption is but a question of time.

Mr. HOWAT—The country is satisfied with the present system, and I do not believe that the people find any inconvenience in keeping their accounts. The principal inconvenience which they experience is in the difficulty of getting anything to count. The question whether the Bill would alter our currency, admits of no doubt. It would add one-fifth to present contracts, and would consequently raise the rents to that extent. That alone is sufficient to cause its rejection, for if we cannot benefit the tenantry, we ought at least to do them no injury. I agree with the opinions expressed that we should wait and see how the proposed system shall work in other Colonies. No doubt, it may be convenient to merchants to have it established, but the great majority of the population of the Island are not of that class.

Hon. Col. GRAY—I feel convinced that ere many years the decimal mode of computation will be adopted in England and the Colonies, as being at once far more convenient than our present mode of pounds, shillings and pence. No doubt our currency is in a very extraordinary state, and has been subjected to different acts of legislation, which, from time to time, have been productive of confusion. Some 80 years ago it was attempted to keep dollars in the Island by cutting out a piece from the centre, and styling the remaining portion by the old name of dollar. In more recent times the one-ninth Bill occasioned some temporary embarrassment and confusion, and encountered opposition which, I agree with the hon. member, Mr. Sinclair, necessarily attend any innovation on long accustomed usages. I was myself a witness to the strong feelings of opposition to the use of railways which were entertained in England on their first introduction, but such objections are now no longer entertained, and a similar future awaits the system propounded in the Bill before the House. The hon. member will, I hope, see the propriety of withdrawing the measure at present, and biding his time until its advantages will be recognised and its adoption demanded by the people.

Mr. MACNEILL—It appears to be the general impression of the House that the Bill would be beneficial, but it seems that the pressure from without is not yet sufficiently strong to induce hon. members, who admit that they approve of it, to give it their support. I have always considered it the duty of this House, as composed of gentlemen who are the chosen of the people, to lead the way in all matters of acknowledged improvement; and I am particularly surprised at the opposition of that reformer, *par excellence*, the hon. Mr. Coles, who admits the advantages of the system he opposes. So far from causing a higher rate of rents, as has been alleged, the Bill will have an effect directly the reverse, as the augmented circulation of dollars and cents will enable the farmers to sell their produce at more remunerating prices, and this they will be in a position to pay their landlord with less trouble and inconvenience than at present. Although strongly in favor of the Bill, I am not so wedded to it as not to defer to the general opinion of the House, which has been so empathically expressed, and therefore I shall not divide on the amendment of the hon. member, Mr. Coles.

Hon. Mr. Coles's amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, was then put and carried.

Wm. M. Howe, Reporter.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir,—I trust that the majority of our Protestant fellow-colonists have, ere this, clearly perceived the monstrous injustice of the iniquitous policy which some of the party now in power, in this Island, seem desirous to carry out, in order to retain their offices, viz: that of widening and perpetuating the difference now, to some extent, unhappily existing between Catholics and Protestants. There is no virtue more recommended by the Christian religion than Charity. We continually read of its excellence in the Holy Scriptures and thousands of texts might be quoted therefrom to corroborate my assertion. On the contrary, the person who destroys the spirit of charity, and he who causes misunderstandings between neighbours, is exhibited in the pages of Holy Writ as odious and detestable in the sight of God and man. *There are six things*, says the wise man, *that our Lord hates, but his soul has a perfect detestation of the seventh—the sower of discords among brethren.* If, then, it is so hateful in the eyes of the Creator to sow discord among private individuals, how much more heinous a crime is it to sow discord and dissension among all the members of the community? Now, it is evident to the most superficial observer, that it is apparently the desire of certain parties to have recourse, for the furtherance of their own selfish views, to the unjust and unholy device of causing dissensions between Catholics and Protestants. There are no passions or feelings in the human breast stronger or more easily excited than those which arise from a religious belief—be it right or wrong,—and none perhaps have been productive of more lamentable excesses. It appears, therefore, to be the very height of human malice for any person wilfully to excite or fan these feelings for any purpose, much less for political motives; and should he do so, without doubt he shall one day render a strict account to the just Judge for all the evil consequences which may flow from his acts, words or writings.

Is it not better for the welfare of this Island that the inhabitants thereof should be on amicable terms,—and if they cannot be unanimous in their political views, can they not at least be tolerant towards one another with regard to religious matters? And would it not be more in accordance with the sacred doctrines of Christianity for the majority to act towards the minority in the same spirit in which they themselves would wish to be treated were they in their position, and not make their religion an excuse for any measures savouring of proscription? If we take a retrospective view of the state in which the mixed population of this Island lived before the "No Popery" cry was raised, we will find that Protestants and Catholics lived happily together and on the best of terms: they served one another; they assisted one another; in a word, they acted towards one another with that spirit of tolerance, charity and mutual forbearance which Christians should ever exhibit towards each other.

Here it may be asked, are not we, notwithstanding our boasted system of education, retrograding in the scale of civilization? An approximate answer to this question can be obtained by comparing the persons who formerly ruled over us with some of those who now hold the reins of Government, and also the acts of the former with those of the latter, and with the sentiments expressed by the *Islander* in its issue of the 3rd ult. We formerly had the Hodgsons Lanes, Havilands, Breckens, Jarvises, Longworths, Palmers, Smiths, DesBrisays, Stewarts, &c., men who may have been too fond of Family Compacts, but who were, nevertheless, gentlemen, and who would not descend so low as to call Catholics nicknames; nor were they, as far as I am aware in any way inclined to have recourse to the disingenuous expediency of arousing religious prejudice, or of pandering to the spirit of intolerance; nor were they desirous of infringing on the immutable principles of justice and sound policy, by proscribing any portion of the community on account of their religion. But some of our present rulers seem to act as if they considered that the gentlemen above named acted improperly in calling us Catholics, and that the term *Romanists* or *Papists* are more appropriate appellations for us, that an egregious mistake was committed when we were emancipated, for we are now increasing! and, as this is the "age of progress," it behoves all true lovers of their country, and of the sacred cause of liberty, "to sound the alarm."

When I say that the present Government exhibit a spirit of unsound, narrow-minded, prejudiced and illiberal policy towards Catholics, I am not to be understood to include all the members of the Executive; for, I believe that the intolerant and exclusive policy alluded to is abhorrent from the feelings and principles of some of them, both as Christians, men and politicians. I have heard it said that when the present Government was being formed, the Honbles. E. Palmer and J. Yeo, representing to their colleagues the fact that they themselves received support from Catholics at the election, Mr. Yeo to a large extent, and that Messrs. Owen, John Yeo and Ramsay owed their election to Catholic votes; representing also that there were many Conservative Catholics throughout the Island, particularly in the 1st District of King's County, that Catholics formed a large proportion of the population, were obliged to bear the burthens of taxation equally with others, and enjoyed the same privileges as Protestants, maintained that, according to all the principles of distributive justice, impartiality and equity, they—the Catholics—ought to be represented in the Executive. These arguments and representations were refuted and set aside, as I have been informed, by the unanswerable logic, the profound reasoning, and by the gentlemanly expression of the Christian sentiments of a member of the present Executive, when he said:—"I will not sit at the Council Board with any *Papist*." Whether this gentleman laboured under an attack of *hypochondriasis* at this time, I know not, but it appears that his opinion prevailed against the enlightened and statesmanlike views of Messrs. Palmer and Yeo.

I would respectfully call the attention of our Protestant fellow-colonists to the fact that the people of this Island are divided into two principal classes, namely, the tenants and the proprietors or their agents. The proprietary party who are now in office find that the only chance they have of keeping themselves in power is to create a difference between the tenants on religious grounds. By this *ruse*, or political dodge, they intend to throw dust in the eyes of the tenantry, and endeavour to draw their attention off from the principal grievance under which they labor, viz:—the unsettled state of the Land Question. But it is to be hoped that the great majority of the Protestant tenantry will very soon understand the propriety of uniting with their Catholic fellow-colonists in order to have all their grievances redressed. I have no doubt but when the Protestants of this Island will clearly understand the nature of the contest now going on between the proprietors and the tenants they will not suffer themselves any longer to be deceived; they will maintain the principle of all Her Majesty's faithful subjects in this colony enjoying equal privileges; they will not leave it in the power of any future historian to say that of all the possessions of the British Empire, P. E. Island was the only place in which the advantages of the Emancipation of 1829 were, for any considerable time, rendered nugatory by the intolerance of the Protestant majority; and the voice of indignation will be heard, throughout the length and breadth of the land, saying—let the proscriptionists be pilloried to the scorn of centuries.

In my continuing my letters after the editor of the *Islander* withdrew from the contest, let it not be supposed that I have been actuated by the desire of enjoying the malicious pleasure of crushing a fallen foe. My sole object has been to expose the unjust consequences of the policy recommended by the *Islander*, and to refute the unfounded assertions and insinuations, relative to Catholics, made by that journal. On some future occasion, when the press on your columns will not be so great as at present, I may comment on a portion of the offensive article in the *Islander* of the 3rd ult., which has not yet been noticed. In the meantime, I beg, Mr. Editor, to thank you for having already so kindly allowed me to occupy so much of your valuable space.

I remain, yours truly,

LECTOR.

Queen's County, March 14 1860.

"When evil strives the worst have greatest names."

REVEREND Mr. FITZGERALD AND THE YOUNG CHRISTIANS.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir—The admiration which we have for the eloquence of the Athenian and Roman orators becomes more exalted when we remember that its stirring strains often touched the chords of the human heart, especially when uttered by a Demosthenes or a Cicero, whose respective countrymen fully appreciating it gave a willing response—and testifying their warm sympathy in the loudest bursts of acclamation. This sympathy was doubtless expressed by the voice, by the hands, or by some other of those organs best adapted to represent the passions. Some organs of the human body are pre-eminently qualified to express the various emotions of the mind. The capabilities of that most beautiful organ, the eye, are well known, and have been often and lovingly described in the glowing melody of the poet, as well as with the silvery tones of the orator. It has been reserved, however, for the present age of improvement to discover the powers of a certain part, or rather parts of the human body, for expressing the passions, with which the public assemblages of the ancients, and also the polite circles of the old European States, appear to be totally unacquainted. I need scarcely say that the organs to which reference is made are the heels, for in no place are they so much used as at the public meetings held in Charlottetown, nor at any time did they perform such a conspicuous part as on the evenings of Thursday, 1st inst., and Thursday, 8th inst. at the lecture on "William III., his Life and Times," by Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald, before the Young Men's Christian Association. At this lecture the passions which the Rev. gentleman excited—joy, pity, contempt, anger and horror—were elegantly and artistically expressed, not by the voice, the hands, or the eyes, but by the heels of the young Christians, in which harmonious exercise they were assisted by not a few of the elderly and better educated members of the Association. The lecture on William III., like the eloquence which I have named, brought out the warm sympathies of the young Christians, thereby assisting the progress of heel stamping. Although this graceful accomplishment has reached a high state of perfection in the Christian Association, yet it requires considerable improvement, for the stamping is unintelligible on many occasions. Thus at the meeting held on Thursday, 1st inst. an "outside barbarian" entered the room, at which the young Christians immediately commenced stamping their heels, whether in approbation for having the courage to "beard the lion in his den," or in disapprobation for having "commented too freely on the proceedings of the Association," I am unable to determine. Misapprehension could be prevented in future if the gallant President, who has sufficient leisure, would instruct the young gentlemen of the Association to regulate the noise made in stamping their heels according to the feeling which they desire to express. I would suggest to the indefatigable Captain of the *Gulnare*, that the knowledge of music which he has doubtless acquired, from being President of the Sacred Harmonic Society, could be advantageously employed in promoting this object. Thus, by using a few technicalities from that part of music which relates to the force of sound, he could instruct the young Christians to express pleasure by a *Medium* stamp of the heels; pity by *Piano*; contempt by *Pianissimo*; while anger might be performed by a *Forte*; and horror by *Fortissimo*. A few refined persons may feel annoyed and disgusted at the stamping; but while the President encourages it, as he has done formerly, their feelings deserve no consideration. Should they even declare publicly that this stamping is neither useful nor ornamental, and that it makes the institution a braying and kicking *Ass*—ociation, instead of being an Association for the cultivation of polite manners and the promotion of useful information, their faint voices will not be heard, or should they be heard, one fortissimo stamp will silence them forever.

In a homely adage we are told that straws show in which direction the winds blow, so the stamping to which I have adverted will give those who did not hear the lecture on "William III., his Life and Times," an intimation of the manner in which Rev. David Fitzgerald treated the subject. The lecture was evidently borrowed from Macaulay's History of England, consequently the characters which the lecturer drew of James II. and William III. partook of the partiality of that historian. Macaulay's history of these two sovereigns is acknowledged by men of different shades of politics to be partial; he paints James II. in the blackest colours, and William III. in the brightest. He makes them mere ideal pictures, and not as they actually existed. Both the Quarterly and Westminster Reviews have shown Macaulay's disregard to truth when it was at variance with his own principles and prejudices. Indeed, Macaulay's History of England is indebted solely to its splendid style and highly polished rhetoric for the popularity which it at present enjoys. It has been designated the "great Whig pamphlet," and probably will shortly be allowed to rank as the greatest of those evanescent party effusions, or as an accession to the works of the British novelists. History will assume any form which we like to give it, and will appear in any colour which our prejudices may dictate. Now, Macaulay looks at English history with *Whig* spectacles; and I mean no disrespect when I say that the Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald looks at it with *Orange* spectacles, and accordingly only sees the Orange side of the times of William the Third. I think if the Rev. gentleman had the opportunity of reading Lingard's History of England he would have given a fairer lecture. Lingard has written, not as a Catholic, but as a fair, candid, and impartial Englishman. What Niebech did for Roman history, Lingard has done for English history;—their research has given the student facts, and not fables—truth, not fiction. A scholar whose fame will exceed the greatest men of even this enlightened period, and one consequently capable of giving a correct opinion, declared that he knew scarcely anything of English history until he read and studied Lingard.

Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald's lecture contained much truth, but he did not tell the whole truth. It was well written, and embraced many topics; but he omitted some of the events which transpired during the period under consideration, which an impartial lecturer would have narrated. The lecturer made it appear, in his review of the reigns of Charles II. and James II., that the Catholics were continually plotting to destroy the liberties of Protestants, and that they were the supporters of the arbitrary acts of the House of Stuart. Now, the Catholics in the period referred to were a small minority of the kingdom, and had enough to do to save themselves from the persecutions and false accusations to which they were subjected; and every historian shows that Protestants themselves were the warm advocates of the prerogatives claimed by Charles and James. "On the day on which Lord William Russell perished, a martyr to the doctrine of the lawfulness of resistance," says Lingard, vol. VIII., page 105, "the University of Oxford published its celebrated decree in support of passive obedience. 'To the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, the preservation of Catholic truth in the church, and that the king's majesty might be secured both from the attempts of open bloody enemies, and the machinations of treacherous heretics and schismatics,' that learned and orthodox body consigned to everlasting reprobation the following doctrines: that civil authority is originally derived from the people—that there exists any compact, tacit or express, between the prince and his subjects, from the obligation of which, if one party resile, the other is of course discharged,—and that if the sovereign govern not, as by the law of God and man he is bound to govern, he forfeits the right which he previously had to the Government. In addition, they enjoined 'that all and singular the readers, tutors, and catechists should diligently instruct and ground their scholars in that most necessary doctrine, which in a manner is the badge and character of the Church of England, of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, teaching that this submission and obedience is to be clear, absolute and without exception of any state or order of men.' These men were not wicked Jesuits, but sound Church of England men, who showed their consistency to their despotic principles, when five years after, adds Lingard, they felt the inconvenience of their decree, 'the badge and character of the Church of England' were thrown away, and the University made a present of its plate to the invader. To intelligent persons it is unnecessary to give further proof that Catholics were not alone the supportes of the prerogatives claimed by the House of Stuart, but it may be necessary to many who attended Mr. Fitzgerald's lecture. I beg to refer them to Lingard, Hume and Clarendon. The truth is that the Catholics and Non-Conformists supported James II., not because they were admirers of passive obedience, but because they desired liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. This is clearly shown in Lingard, vol. VIII., page 197. In speaking of the struggle which was going on between James II. and the High Church party, he says:—"From the Churchmen, with all their pretensions to loyalty, it was now plain that he could expect no aid. They had displayed, some an open, others a masked, hostility. But let him divest himself of his prejudice against other religionists; let him win their services by employing his dispensing power in their favor; let him establish by proclamation in England, as he had already done in Scotland, universal liberty of conscience. Then Non-Conformists of every class would be eager to display their gratitude; and interest, if not affection, would bind them to support the royal prerogative. He might then call a new Parliament; the friends of religious liberty would rally round the throne; and the repeal of every penal statute would be accomplished without difficulty."

"Under this impression James had addressed a short speech to the Privy Council. During the four last reigns, he said, Law upon law had been passed to enforce uniformity of doctrine; but experience had shown the uselessness of such enactments. Under them, dissent had increased; they had led, in his father's time, to the destruction of the Government in Church and State; they had perpetuated to the present hour division in the nation, and all those evils which necessarily grow out of civil dissension. It was time to put an end to such a state of things. Conscience could not be forced; persecution was incompatible with the doctrines of Christianity; and it was therefore his resolve to grant religious liberty to all his subjects. In a few days the royal proclamation appeared. Though calculated to produce the same effect as the previous declaration in Scotland, it was expressed in very different language. As the English law did not recognize absolute power in the Sovereign, nor give to the head of the Church unlimited authority in ecclesiastical matters, he did not pretend to 'cass, disannul and remove,' as he had done in his other kingdom, but was content 'with suspending the execution of all penal laws for religious offences, and with forbidding the imposition of religious oaths or tests as qualifications for office;' to which he subjoined an intimation, that he had no doubt of the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament in these two measures at their next meeting.

By the different bodies of Non-Conformists the boon was received with feelings of gratitude and exultation. They paused not to consider its legality, or to enquire whether the Prince, who thus suspended at his pleasure the execution of one description of laws, might, on subsequent occasions, with equal right, set aside the execution of others. In the delirium of their joy they crowded round the throne to express their gratitude for the benefit of religious liberty. The example was shown by the Anabaptists; the Quakers followed: then the Independents; next came the Presbyterians; and after them the Catholics, who were careful to attest their satisfaction that the benefit was extended to all Christian sects without exception, and their pride that it had proceeded from a Prince of their own communion. James received those addresses with self-gratulation. He boasted that he had made his subjects an united people—that he had changed those whom persecution had before rendered the most bitter enemies into firm and interested supporters of the throne."

A short extract from Macaulay's History of England will suffice to confirm the foregoing remarks in regard to the non-resistence doctrines of the High Church party. When William had taken the throne of James, and was triumphantly received in England, two large and most influential classes in the state did not follow in his train. Says Macaulay vol. 3, page 3: "It was observed that two important classes took little or no part in the festivities by which all over England the inauguration of the new Government was celebrated. Very seldom could either a priest or a soldier be seen in the assemblages which gathered round the market crosses where the King and Queen were proclaimed. The professional pride both of the clergy and of the army had been deeply wounded. The doctrine of non-resistance had been dear to the Anglican divines. It was their distinguishing badge. It was their favorite theme. If we are to judge by that portion of their oratory which has come down to us, they had preached about the duty of passive obedience at least as often and as zealously as about the Trinity or the Atonement. Their attachment to their political creed had, indeed, been severely tried, and had, during a short time, wavered. But with the tyranny of James the bitter feeling which that tyranny had excited among them had passed away. The parson of a parish was naturally unwilling to join in what was really a triumph over those principles, which, during twenty-eight years, his flock had heard him proclaim on every anniversary of the Martyrdom, and on every anniversary of the Restoration." He adds that at Cinecester a battalion put out the bonfires, huzzaed for King James, and drank confusion to his daughter and his nephew. He has also to admit that the discontent was not confined to the black-coats and the red-coats, although a vehement Whig declared in the House of Commons that "black-coats and red-coats were the curse of the nation."

It would require more time and space than are at present available to notice all the one-sided statements contained in the Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald's Lecture. In reviewing the reign of Charles II. the lecturer narrated every thing which could be found against the Catholics, but never mentioned the persecutions to which they were subjected, nor the falsehoods which were believed concerning them. Why did the lecturer forget to mention the infamous perjurer, Titus Oates, whose falsehoods sent many innocent victims to the scaffold? He was the great "No Popery" man of that age, and though his name was too infamous for the ears of the House of Commons of William III., they voted Oates a pension of three hundred pounds a year! Surely the Rev. David Fitzgerald did not suppose that any one would draw invidious comparisons between himself and the "Doctor of Salamanca." The Rev. Lecturer justified the passing of the Test Act, with the stale argument, "that Catholics were not content with being equals, and were so restless that they would always become masters." The Rev. gentleman, however, did not read the Test Act to his audience, for the reason, I presume, that even in the Christian Association no sophistry or prejudice could conceal its folly and tyranny. As many may not know the meaning of this Act, I will give the substance of it from Lingard, vol. VII, page 347: "Every individual refusing to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, and to receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, should be incapable of public employment, military and civil,' and a Bill was introduced requiring not only that the oaths should be taken, and the sacrament received, but also that a declaration against transubstantiation should be subscribed by all persons holding office, under the penalty of a fine of £500, and of being disabled to sue in any Court of Law or Equity, to be guardian to any child, or executor to any person, or to take any legacy or deed of gift, or to bear any public office." The age which enacted such laws has passed away, but the spirit which engendered them yet remains in a few. In speaking of the opinions urged in favour of passing the Test Act Mr Fitzgerald said that the Catholics in this Island were restless, especially the clergy, and wished to become masters. The lecturer did not attempt to prove this assertion, and will say, I presume, if asked to prove it, with the editor of the *Islander*, that he does not wish to continue the discussion. One would have supposed that the false and dangerous accusations of the *Islander*, against the Catholics of this Island, would not have been repeated after the refutation which they have received from your correspondent "Lector." Some Rev. gentlemen, however, seem to have no desire to allay religious animosities while the editor of the Government organ, like the old scold in *Tam o' Shanter*, is

"Nursing his wrath to keep it warm,"

until the eve of the next General Election, when having studied *Maria Monk*, *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, *The Errors of Popery*, &c., he will again stir up religious prejudices to suit and serve his own purposes. The party of which he is the organ, knowing that they have imposed on the people in placing illiterate men in the Executive,—in failing to retrench the public expenditure, as they promised,—in neglecting to bring forward any of their boasted reforms,—in not having done anything towards settling the Land Question, seem now determined to depart from *Conservatism*, and depend upon religious prejudice in order to preserve their present position. As a Proprietary Government will not settle the only great question which affects the interests of all classes in the Colony—the Land Question—favorably to the tenants, and consequently against their own interests, they, like the man who burnt a house to roast his egg, will strive to set the Island in a religious ferment to keep their own nests warm. The Rev. gentleman, whose lecture is under consideration, being an Irishman, should know that his country has been groaning under two evils: *Absenteeism* and *Religious Bigotry*. We in this Island are cursed with the former, and it seems that before it is removed we will be inflicted with the latter. For what other purposes are those lectures given, whose apparent aim is to irritate and arouse bitter feelings? Why are the lectures on regicides and rebellion not fair and impartial? Why are not the errors of both sides exposed? Have the Stuarts not had some redeeming traits in their characters? Was not Charles I. "elegant minded," and James II. "the kindest of fathers?" Let no one say that Mr. Fitzgerald's lecture was fair or impartial, when I mention the fact that he never alluded to William's sanction of the massacre of the McDonalds at Glencoe, nor to the broken treaty of Limerick, and that he mentioned the Stuarts only in words of hate and scorn.

In noticing Hon. Mr. Haviland's lecture, I "trusted that the paid officers of the crown would pause before they proceeded further in lauding rebellion." I rejoice to note that Commander Orlebar has paused, for at the close of Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald's lecture, the returning spirit of loyalty and social order made him declare that the characters of the Stuarts had been too much blackened by the lecturer; they were made so dark that he felt inclined to defend them, and that the evils of those times were owing more to the "bloody Parliaments,"—these are his words—than to the unfortunate Monarchs. The President should have found this out before he commenced the winter's campaign against royalty and in favor of regicides; but amendment is better late than never. The Rev. lecturer denied, of course, that he blackened the Stuarts, and told the President, when he read more he would find that he did not blacken them enough!

Though I have trespassed too long on your attention, I trust you will allow me to note two instances which occurred at the lecture on William III., which to me do not seem to be in accordance with the professions sometimes made in the Association about the love of liberty, and the desire to hear free discussion. On the evening of the 1st inst. the Rev. Secretary of the Association declared, quite seriously, that Loyola was an agent raised by the devil to counteract Luther—that the Papacy was tottering, and that Popery was the master-work of Satan. Let this pass, but what shall we say when he blesses Napoleon III. for suppressing the *Univers* and the order of Jesuits! I will only remark that the thermometer of religious hate must stand high when the Rev. Secretary indulges in this strain, for the Baptists are a quiet unoffending sect, and the Rev. gentleman who officiates for them in this city is of the same disposition. But the gentleman has a stroke or two of humor—he loves a joke, and the serious members of the Association, having no relish for buffoonery, think that he plays the "Merry Andrew" too often in the meetings of the Association. In order, then, to regain favor, and to run no risk of losing the £12 for writing the dull notices over the signature of the lone star, the Rev. Lecturer thought, and wisely it appears, that the safest and easiest manner in which to accomplish it was to take a good fling at the "Man of Sin." I trust that the Secretary is now in good standing, and that he will not have to dun so often in future to make each individual who attends the lectures "pay one poor copper."

The other instance to which I have referred occurred at the close of Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald's lecture. Dr. Stratton rose and stated some facts in relation to the "glorious, pious and immortal" memory of William III. which the lecturer forgot to mention. He showed the perfidy of that monarch in regard to the "Darien Expedition," after which he narrated, in a manly and truly eloquent manner, the Massacre of Glencoe. Behold! while this gentleman—a "staunch Protestant" well known for his affable manners—the companion of the President and other Gulnare officers, was speaking, the lovers of free discussion tried to stamp him down, and when he finished, after giving expression to sentiments which every intelligent Scotchman must feel, the young bearded Christians hipped, hooted and whistled at him. Comment on this is needless. But from evil comes good. Says Landon, "it is not from the rose that the bee gathers her honey, but often from the most acrid and bitter leaves and petals." May we not hope then that the outrage which I have noted will be the means of making the leaders of the Young Men's Christian Association use their influence for the future, in the noble effort of trying to promote friendly feeling in this community, and by so doing they will command the respect of all good men, for we are told by an authority whom all profess to revere, that it is well for men to dwell together in peace and harmony.

In conclusion, I would respectfully suggest to the Rev. Lecturer and the gallant commander of the *Gulnare* the propriety of perusing and studying the Sermon on the Mount instead of the dark and severe passages of the Old Testament. Should they do this, they would soon find men in the pages of history worthy of being held up to the admiration of the young men of the Christian Association than either the remorseless Cromwell, or—to use the appropriate epithet of the skilful Dr. Stratton—William, "the Nena Sahib of Glencoe."

I remain, yours truly,

March 13, 1850. CONSERVATIVE.

Earthquake in San Salvador.—On the evening of the 8th of December there was a fearful earthquake in San Salvador. It commenced at about a quarter before 9 o'clock, and lasted two minutes and 35 seconds. The shock was felt for a distance of 150 miles, but was severe at Isalco, where the parish church and about 40 of the best houses, and a number of the smaller ones, were destroyed. In several other towns buildings were either wholly or partially destroyed, but so far as known no lives were lost. On the night of the 10th, at 9.30, there were two more severe shocks. On both occasions the nights were very clear, but blowing a heavy norther until a short time before the shocks, when it fell calm, but again rose soon after the shocks.

Holloway's Ointment and Pills.—Pain is the premonitor of death; relieve the pain and you check the disease. The wonderful cures effected by the above remedies have established them as two of the finest preparations ever made known. It is an astonishing fact that they will cure ulcers and sores, even if of twenty years standing, after every other means had proved unsuccessful.

If you wish to increase the size and prominence of your eyes, just keep an account of the money you spend foolishly, and add it up at the end of the year.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, P. E. I., March 20, 1860.

PROSCRIPTION AGAIN—ANOTHER REJECTED CANDIDATE IN FAVOUR.

We observe by the last *Royal Gazette* that the Hon. E. Thornton has been removed from the Commissionership of Highways for the Ninth District of King's County, and Philip Beers, Esqr., has been appointed in his place. There is, of course, no cause assigned for Mr. Thornton's removal; but we have no doubt the circumstance may be easily traced to religious and political grounds. Mr. Thornton is a Roman Catholic, and a member of the Liberal minority of the House of Assembly—two things quite sufficient to condemn him in the sight of the present Government. There is no man in the Colony connected with the difficult service to which he was lately attached who performed the often laborious and fatiguing duties of his office with more zeal and efficiency than the honorable gentleman who has been thus visited with the displeasure of the Government on account of his religious and political views. Indeed, we may safely say, and challenge contradiction, that there is not to be found amongst the whole thirty-three Road Commissioners in the Island another man who is so well able to discharge the duties of the office as Mr. Thornton has done; and we doubt not his removal will be very sincerely regretted by the people of the district over which he has so long presided. When the Liberals came into power in 1851 Mr Thornton held the office of Road Commissioner, which he received from the Conservative Government; and although he was at that time opposed to the Liberals, they never thought of removing *him* to make way for one of their own supporters, because they knew the community would suffer by the loss of his services. Now he *is* removed—not for any direliction of duty, for that reproach can never be directed against *him*—but because he will not prostitute his independence and support the measures of the Government, to which, however, he has never given a factious opposition,

The Government will, no doubt, attempt to justify this arbitrary exercise of authority on the plea that they were pledged to exclude office-holders from the Legislature. If this excuse should be offered—and it is the only one they can make—we should like to know why was not Mr. Thornton displaced last Session, or before the commencement of the present one? Why was he not requested to resign; or why—and this is much more to the purpose—is not the same rule observed in reference to other members of the House of Assembly? Mr. Beer and Mr. Finlay McNeill—both supporters of the Government in the House of Assembly—hold the office of Commissioner of Small Debts, which is undoubtedly an office of emolument. They are continued. If the Government mean to carry out their pet principle in good faith, those gentlemen should at once be recommended to resign, or be removed. If we are told that it is impolitic to remove a judicial functionary without some grave charge can be established against him, we beg to remind the Government that last year they removed Mr. McKinnon, of Lot 16, from the Commission of the Small Debt Court, without any fault having been alleged against him. But the principle of excluding office-holders from the Legislature is a sham so long as Mr. Palmer, the leader of the Government, acts in the capacity of Queen's Counsel—goes the circuit—performs the duties which should be discharged by the Attorney General, and receives, in the course of the year, fees fully equal in amount to the salary of the Solicitor General. Take another instance: Mr. Haviland holds a seat in the Legislature and a place in the Government without office; but his relative and partner in business fills the office of Attorney General. Can any one for a moment suppose that Mr. Haviland is not deeply interested in keeping Mr. Breeken where he is? Take another instance yet: Mr. J. C. Pope is a member of the House of Assembly and of the Government; but while he pretends to be an independent member of the Assembly, he has used his influence to get the office of Colonial Secretary for his brother, Mr. W. H. Pope; and was, no doubt, induced to reconsider his late threat of resigning his seat in the Executive Council because the Secretary might be affected thereby. To say that he had no interest in the disposal of this part of the Government patronage would be a gross delusion. The same remark will apply, with equal force, to Mr. John Longworth and Mr. James Yeo; and it would not be difficult to prove that all the other members of the Government have served the interests of their family connexions, if not their own individual interests, in disposing of the public offices in the manner they have done. The Government have secured "the independence of the Legislature" in a most extraordinary manner; and they have kept their promise that "there shall be no more family compacts" about as faithfully as they have fulfilled *that other promise* to settle the Land Question.

But who is Mr. Philip Beers who takes Mr Thornton's place as Road Commissioner? Why, gentle reader, he is another rejected candidate like Mr. Simpson. It was said to be a monstrous piece of injustice for the late Government to appoint to any public office an individual labouring under the ban of popular displeasure. Taking four rejected candidates into favour during eleven months' tenure of office is a pretty good beginning for the present Government and furnishes an admirable commentary on one of the great outcries which they raised against their predecessors.

THE LAND COMMISSION.

If the members of the Government have one half the trouble which falls to our lot to answer enquiries relative to the appointment of the Land Commission, we shall be glad to take comfort with them in their difficulties, and share with them our most heartfelt commisseration. Mails from every part of the country bring us letters on the subject—some conceived in a spirit of the most joyous anticipation of the halcyon days which are to follow the establishment of the Commission when all the arrears of rent are to be forgiven—others expressing doubt of the sincerity of the Government in propounding the scheme,—and others strongly commenting on the conduct of the Executive in ignoring the basis which they laid down for the operations of the Commission, and leaving the tenantry at the mercy of the proprietors as much as ever they were while they have been cajoled and deceived by the promises conveyed in Col. Gray's resolutions. The late Government were wrongfully accused of creating an agitation on the question of the land tenures; but the party now in power have done more to unsettle the minds of the people on that subject than all the escheators in the Island have done for the last twenty years. The refusal to pay rent—and this is well known to the honorable members for Belfast—can no longer be traced to isolated cases. The practice is now general and systematic, spreading over nearly every estate in the country, and culminating in the very heart of the constituency who returned Col. Gray to propound those celebrated resolutions which recommended a remission of rents.

From among the many letters which we have received on this subject, asking for information, we select the following for publication, because it is short and to the purpose; and an answer to it may serve as an answer to many others:—

Mr Editor—A public meeting has been held in the neighbouring settlement of Cavendish, a few days ago, to consider the Land Question, which the present Government nearly a year ago promised to settle for us on the most favourable terms. I did not attend that meeting, having been busy in the woods at the time; but some of my neighbours and myself thought of getting up a meeting here in New Glasgow to talk about the same thing, and to ask the Government whether they ever mean to fulfil their promise, and when they will do it. In this matter we naturally sought the advice of our member, who seems to us to have become very indifferent about the settlement of the Land Question since he has got into aristocratic company, and sits under the same mahogany with a Proprietary Government; but we were advised to wait—that is several days ago—until the next English Mail would come out, by which despatches were expected, authorising the Lieut. Governor to appoint the celebrated Land Commission, after which the question would be at once settled, and so on. Now, you, who live in the city, must know all the news, and as the English Mail arrived in Charlottetown on Wednesday last—so our schoolmaster says—you must know by this time whether the Duke of Newcastle has sent the Governor any further de-