

agreed to without amendment. The report of the committee was received and the Act ordered to be engrossed.

Hon. Col. Secretary presented a petition from Lawrence Warren, painter, praying for an Act to naturalize him, and moved that the same be referred to a Special Committee.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—Asked if the petitioner did not reside in Charlottetown? On being answered in the affirmative, he proceeded to say, that it was only last session a petition of a similar nature was presented, when this House passed a bill in accordance with the request of the petitioner; but the petitioner refused to avail himself of the Act so passed, and it might be the same in the case under consideration. He thought, in view of this fact, there was no necessity for such action as the present petitioner prays for. If his memory did not deceive him, a short time ago, at an election held in Charlottetown, the petitioner took an oath that he was qualified to vote under the election franchise. This, he (hon. Mr. Palmer) thought could not be denied; and if Mr. Warren was not then qualified to vote, he had taken a false oath.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—While a resident of New Brunswick, Mr. Warren enjoyed all the privileges of citizenship; but when he came to this Island, a few years ago, he was denied a like privilege. Finding he was refused the right of voting, he has taken this method of becoming a citizen, as he intends to settle in this Colony, and purchase property. In the case of Mr. Mann, alluded to by the hon. member, Mr. Palmer, it is well known that Mr. Mann has, since the passage of the Act in his favor, sold property in this Island. In fact, it seems that any person, a resident here having to comply with all our laws should be considered as entitled to citizenship. While he is a resident of the Island he is a citizen; and if he should go back to the United States he will have to conform to the laws of that country and will be virtually a citizen. It is nothing but just that the prayer of Mr. Warren should be complied with. There have been hints thrown out that it would be well to pass a general naturalization bill; but the propriety of such a measure is questionable. Still it is nothing but an act of justice, when a foreigner lives eight years among us, and sufficiently demonstrates his intention of becoming a citizen, to take his case into consideration, and accede to the prayer of his petition.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—Mr. Warren said he was a native of Nova Scotia, and that his father was a native of Germany. If that be the case, he is not a foreigner, and has no need of a naturalization Act to enable him to become a citizen.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY.—The reason I have for supporting this measure is, that it will assist in removing a doubt that is in the minds of many hon. members about this matter. But the hon. member (Mr. Palmer) thinks, as the petitioner has heretofore exercised the elective franchise without being qualified, he should always persist in doing so. But, sir, two wrongs will not make one right. 'Tis true, Mr. Mann applied to this House for bill of naturalization, and it was granted to him; and if he did not avail himself of the permission the Bill gave him to dispose of his property, he had every right to do so. Therefore, to remove all doubts respecting Mr. Warren, I am prepared to support the measure.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—believed Mr. Warren was born in Nova Scotia; but at an early age, removed with his father to Sweden, of which country, a long residence made him a citizen.

Mr. CLARK.—If I understand the matter rightly, there is a doubt as to his citizenship involved, which Mr. Warren wants to be removed and cleared up.

Mr. YEO.—Would like to know who would bear the expense of the drawing up such a bill. The reason he asked the question was that last year, when Mr. Mann caused a bill of naturalization to be drawn up, he neglected to pay for it. He thought the present petitioner should deposit the money before the House acted upon the matter.

The petition was referred to a special committee. Hons. Col. Secretary and Mr. Whelan were appointed the said committee.

By Mr. Mooney, a petition of Dennis Carroll praying for an allowance as a Teacher at Township 66; referred to committee on teachers petitions.

Adjourned for one hour. T. KIRWAN, Rep.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

Mr. Yeo presented to the House a petition of John McIntosh, Lot 14, Prince County, mail carrier, praying remuneration for extra services performed by him in that capacity, and moved that it be referred to Supply.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—Let this petition be sent to the Government, and let them make inquiries respecting it, and settle about it. When the new post offices, alluded to in the petition, were established, it was understood that no additional expenses would be required; the carrier would leave the mails as he passed along. If the claims of the petition were well founded, and it came before the Government, they would authorize payment to be made.

Mr. YEO.—It makes no difference to the petitioner where his petition is carried to, whether to the Government or to the House of Assembly. He applied to the House last year, and was recompensed for similar services. My hon. colleague, Mr. Perry, and all hon. members from that part of the Island, know that he had to travel a considerable distance farther than was mentioned in his contract.

Mr. COOPER.—The only question appears to be, has the person applied to the proper quarter? The objection to the petition appears to be, that the person should have applied to the Government, as indeed he ought to have done.

Hon. COL. TREASURER.—I wish to make a few remarks on the petition. I know that the carrying of the mails to the Quagmire is more than the petitioner contracted to do, and that the post office at Barrow's mill is out of his way; but I wish myself that some inquiries should be made, because last year after the grant was made, I learned that some of the people there were sorry that it had been made, because he did not perform his duty in carrying the mails to Kildare. I wish inquiries were made, because I know that the Hon. Col. Secretary, as one member of the Government, would not refuse to grant a sum of money to any carrier who was required to perform extra work. I think it would be very well to allow the petition to be on the table, and to inquire if the allegations contained in it are correct, and if not, I would not grant him anything.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—I think that the remedy is elsewhere. A petition of this nature comes to the House; and see the trouble it gives this House to write to the postmaster relating to it; but if sent to the Government they could endeavor to have the matter settled after proper inquiries; whereas here the House is voting away money in the dark. One person applies for the sum of £5, another for £10; and this swells up the items in the public accounts. If this person has performed additional work, let him send his account to the Government for extra service, and then the Postmaster General, who knows that route, would write to the postmaster there and learn the truth of the case; but now the Postmaster General can hardly tell whether the statements made in the petition are correct or not. Such applications for money should come through the proper channel—the Government, who are responsible for the expenditure, and responsible for the payment of the contracts they enter into. If the Government refuse to make those payments, then I have no objection that parties having contracts with the Government, send petitions to the Legislature; but I think the Government would not refuse to pay just demands.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY.—We have had several petitions of this nature before us; and perhaps it would be better to refer this petition, since it has come before us, to the committee on petitions relating to post offices.

Mr. MACINTOSH.—I think the proper course is, that such petitions come through the Government; because when they are presented to the House, which supplies the Government with money to carry on the public service by means of contracts, the members of the House do not know what contracts the Government have made with parties, and so cannot decide on their claims. It is only when the Government refuse to pay them that they should apply to the House of Assembly.

Mr. YEO.—The mail carrier does not know what to do, whether to apply to the Government or to the House of Assembly. He pays 3s. per week to carry the mails in one direction, and also pays a person for performing a like service in another direction, so that he is out of pocket. I think he should be fairly remunerated for the service which he has performed.

Hon. COL. TREASURER.—There is no doubt but additional service has been required of this person. What Mr. Yeo says is pretty correct; for he has to do much more than was required by his original contract. At the time this contract was advanced for, it was only required to take the mails once

a week to Quagmire; but since then they have been carried twice a week instead of once. If, however, this circumstance had been mentioned to the Government, they would, no doubt, have given him a sum sufficient to remunerate him. But the reason I wish an inquiry instituted is, that some of my constituents have complained of his taking a short way, and I wish to know if this is the fact or not.

Mr. YEO.—I believe he did this; but employed some one to deliver the mails at the proper place. The journey is very long, and as the roads have been very bad some times, one horse could scarcely accomplish it.

Mr. COOPER.—The person certainly made a contract with the Government, and not with this House. If he contracted with them, he ought to call upon them to pay him; and if they refuse to do so, then he may come here for redress.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Last year, the Post Office committee recommended something extra to this person, and he is just doing the same as he did then in making his petition. As he petitioned the House last year and his petition was referred to the Post Office committee, let the same be done this year.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY.—It is only wasting the time of the House to discuss the subject in this manner; for it is manifest if application had been made to the Government, there is not a member of it who would have opposed the payment of a just debt. If the petitioner was under the necessity of performing more labor than was expected, the Government would pay him for it. I never heard one member of the Government object to paying a lawful demand; it is time enough for him to come here, when the Government say they will not hear his petition.

Petition referred to the Post Office committee.

By Mr. Douse, a petition of inhabitants of Orwell, Point Prim, Pinette, Newton, Flat River, Wood Islands, and Belle Creek, praying for the transmission of the mails semi-weekly to those Districts; referred to the Post Office Committee.

By Mr. Laird, from inhabitants of Corbett's Woods Settlement, and others, praying aid to improve their road communications; laid on the table.

By Hon. Mr. Mooney, from James Macleod, Township 48, praying for a similar object as the preceding petition; laid on the table.

By Hon. Mr. Wightman, from inhabitants of the interior settlement of Township 64; from inhabitants of Baldwin's Road; from inhabitants of Townships 38 and 51; also from settlers on Brudenel Road and others, all praying aid to improve their road communications, and laid on the table.

By Mr. Muirhead, from inhabitants of Margate and its vicinity, praying aid to improve their road communications; laid on the table.

By Mr. Douse, from inhabitants of Townships 48 and 49, praying a grant in aid of individual subscription towards the erection of a wharf at Burhoe's Island; from inhabitants of Townships 49 and others, praying a grant to extend the wharf at Pownal Bay; also from inhabitants of Township 50 and others, praying a grant for the removal of the wharf at China Point, and for rebuilding it on a better site; all laid on the table.

By Hon. Mr. Whelan, from inhabitants of Township 38; also from inhabitants south side of Grand River; both laid on the table.

By Mr. Munro, from inhabitants of the Fork's Settlement, Township 50; from inhabitants of Beech Hill Township 49, also from inhabitants East side of Township 49 (in aid of individual subscription); all praying aid to improve their road communications, and laid on the table. From inhabitants of Bone Creek Settlement and its vicinity, praying for the opening of a new line of road; referred to a committee on new roads; also from Murdoch Mackenzie, praying an allowance for his services as a teacher at Murray Harbor Road; referred to the committee on teachers petitions.

By Mr. Douse, from Jane Green, praying an allowance for her services as a teacher at Township 37 for a period of one year and seven months; referred to the committee on teachers petitions.

Mr. DOUSE held in his hand several petitions sent to him, one signed by about 400 persons, another by about 600, and another by about 50 persons. It was his duty to present those petitions, and to act in accordance with the wishes of the petitioners. He saw it was a delicate subject, and he regretted that a resolution adopted by the Board of Education relating to the use of the Bible in Schools, had not been published more extensively in the newspapers than it had been. The subject had caused more agitation in the country than he had been aware. The petitions were as follows; viz: from inhabitants of Belfast and contiguous Districts, praying—that as the Education Act is about to expire, especially if it be the intention of the House to frame any new law, or to alter or amend the present Act—that they will direct the Holy Scriptures to be placed on the list of books now in use in the Public Schools, and that they be introduced into the Academy and Normal School, and that the children of those parents who desire or do not object to their use, shall have the privilege of reading a portion of Scripture as the first exercise of the day, after the opening of the School with prayer to Almighty God, and of being taught therein by such Teachers as the parents or guardians approve of; from inhabitants of Township 49; also from Alexander Munro, Minister, and others Protestant inhabitants of Brown's Creek and adjacent Settlements, both praying for a similar object;—all referred to the committee of the whole House on the consideration of the Bill to continue and amend the Free Education Law.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

Hon. Col. Secretary presented to the House the following Message:—

"The Lieutenant Governor transmits the accompanying correspondence for the information of the House of Assembly, and for such careful consideration as he feels assured the very important subject of the more perfect lighting of the coasts of this Island will receive.

He also invites the early attention of the House of Assembly to that portion of the correspondence which has reference to Cape Race Light.

Copies of Despatches from the Secretary of State: No. 26, of the 23rd July, 1856. No. 35, of the 15th October, 1856. No. 42, of the 13th November, 1856.

Copy of Despatch to the Secretary of State, from the Lieutenant Governor. No. 37, of the 23rd August, 1856."

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—It appears by the last Despatch that an Address from the House of Assembly to Her Majesty, praying the levying of a tax for the support of Cape Race Light-house, is all that will be required. I think that will be a preferable course; for we can then bring the subject in reference to establishing Light-houses at the North Cape and East Point of this Island, before Her Majesty's Government and the other Colonies, which is all that should be done, till it is seen what the neighbouring Provinces will do in the matter; and by that time we may see what they will do for Lights in general. The Government applied to the Home Government some years ago in reference to the erection of the Light-houses in question, as well as to the other Provinces; but I believe they declined to contribute towards them; but by this clause in the Shipping Act, they will be obliged to contribute towards them. I, therefore, move that the Despatches be referred to a Special Committee to report thereon by Bill or otherwise.

Committee.—Hons. Messrs. Wightman, Longworth and Montgomery, Messrs. Macdonald, Cooper and Yeo, and Hon. T. H. Haviland.

R. LAIRD, Reporter.

Correspondence.

LETTER FROM THE REV. JAMES McDONALD, P. P., IN REPLY TO THE REV. R. S. PATTERSON, ON THE BIBLE QUESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—Having, by mere accident, seen the Protector containing the letter of the Rev. Mr. Patterson, addressed to me, I beg to make one or two remarks in reference to it. He labours hard but ineffectually to reconcile the practice of his life in teaching school without the Bible, with his prominent position in the present agitation. The defence of his conduct is unsatisfactory in one case or the other, and his logic bad. He now denies having stated that the Catholic Clergy of this Island did not read the Bible. A denial of the statement appears his only resource in his present perplexity. But why did he not deny it when his speech was published? The accusation is withdrawn, and the question of the correctness of his published speech, must be decided

by him and the Reporter. I reject, as wholly unworthy, his perverted and garbled extracts from the rules of the congregation of the Index, produced without date or authority, and his puerile comments thereon. His quotations from Popes, Archbishops and Bishops, are quite irrelevant and beside the question; they relate to "corrupt" and "schismatic" Bibles, and, of course, no Bishop could sanction the distribution of these Bibles in their dioceses, nor could Catholics receive or read them. With what assurance did the Rev. Mr. Patterson come before the public and say that the Catholic Clergy take the Bible from the people, when he knows, and every Catholic knows, that they read it for them and recommend them to read it. And is it not an incontrovertible fact that Catholic Bibles are sold by the hundred and by the thousand by merchants and booksellers, in various sections of the Island, without let or hindrance from Bishop or Priests? But, Sir, read the following beautiful sentence, characteristic of the powerful reasoning of this eminent logician; he says:—"When, therefore, a respectable female informs me that a Roman Catholic woman having received a Bible from a colporteur, stated to her that although she highly prized it, she was compelled by the Priest to burn it." The Rev. gentleman certainly appears to have an overweening predilection for women's tales. But why does he not complete the pleasing little history, and give us the name of the respectable family and the Catholic woman, the colporteur, the Priest, the country and place where the Bible was burnt, and the date of the transaction? He speaks of all his Roman Catholic servants, and has the hardihood to proclaim the intermeddling propensities of his family, in tampering with the religious convictions of servants—of course, females. Since he attempts, oddly enough, to deduce an overwhelming argument in favour of his thesis from the practice of his Catholic servants, he should have stated their exact number, especially as report has it, that he had three in the course of the last ten or fourteen years, one of whom could not read. And I have yet to learn that it is the duty and custom of poor Catholic servants to carry a Bible when they sally out on their lonely mission in search of employment. If the Rev. Mr. Patterson sincerely desires to commence the fulfilment of his long neglected duty of disseminating the Bible among Catholics, I will freely accord him all the assistance in my power for the furtherance of his cherished project. I pledge my word that if he and his friends and admirers, if he has many, procure for me Catholic Bibles which I may select, I will distribute them to every Catholic in my several missions. If he refuse to accept this offer, I hope he will cease for ever to annoy Protestants and Catholics about Priests keeping the Bibles from the people. Will not this slight touch of our "system of cruelty" have the happy effect of inducing the Rev. gentleman to confine himself to truth, at least in public? I now proceed to quote an authoritative document recommending the reading of the Holy Scriptures. It is the letter of Pope Pius the Sixth, to the Archbishop of Florence, and is prefixed to our Bibles:—

"Beloved Son,—Health and Apostolic benediction. "At a time when a vast number of bad books which most grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to every one, to choose from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity, especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus, you have not swerved either from the laws of the congregation of the Index, or from the constitution published on this subject by Benedict 14, that immortal Pope, our predecessor in the Pontificate; and formerly when we held a place near his person, our excellent master in ecclesiastical learning, circumstances which we mention as honourable to us. We therefore applaud your eminent learning, joined with your extraordinary piety, and we return you our due acknowledgments for the book you have transmitted to us, and which, when convenient, we will read over. In the meantime, as a token of our Pontifical benevolence, receive our Apostolic benediction, which, to you, beloved Son, we very affectionately impart. Given at Rome, on the Kalends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate.

"PHILIP BUONAMICI, Latin Secretary."

I now proceed to show that there were almost innumerable versions of the Scriptures, not only in manuscript, but printed, in the short interval between the invention of Printing and the rise of Protestantism, for dissemination, and, of course, for reading among Catholics; and that the opinion that the Scriptures were first translated by the Reformers and Protestants, is altogether erroneous. I transcribe from a lecture of Cardinal Wiseman, delivered in 1836; he says:—

"In Germany, for instance, that author whose name I before quoted, Mr. Horne, speaking of the version of the Scriptures in German, as having begun with Luther, whose version was commenced in 1523, but was not completed till eleven years after. Now, we have in the first place, a copy existing of a printed version so old as not to have a date, because, you should be aware, that the very earliest books printed had no date, and no place or name upon them. In the second place, we have a German Catholic version of the Scriptures, printed by Faust, in 1470, nearly sixty years before the version of Luther. We have a third in 1407, and a fourth in 1473. I speak not of editions but of independent versions. A fifth at Nuremberg, in 1477, which was reprinted three times before Luther's appeared; a sixth in the same year at Augsburg, of which eight editions were printed before Luther's; a seventh by Coburger; a magnificent one published at Kominseck, in 1488, and reprinted in 1488; an eighth at Augsburg; and a new version printed in 1518 and 1824, that is about the time of the Reformation, about the time when Luther was going on with his; and down to the present time they are almost innumerable. Now, I come to other countries—to Spain. A version of the Scriptures was published in 1478, about the same period as others, that is, as soon as printing would allow the publication, and long before Luther's appeared, almost before he was born; and there are, besides, many other versions of particular parts of Scripture. In Italy, a country most particularly under the sway of Popish bigotry, and under the dominion of the tyranny of the See of Rome, in 1741, a version of the Scriptures in the Italian was published by Maleimi at Venice, and this was reprinted seventeen times before the conclusion of the century, that is, twenty-three years before Luther's appeared. Another version of parts of the Scriptures appeared in 1472; another at Rome in 1471; another by Bracciolo, at Venice, in 1532; and a correction of it by Marmochinis, in 1538, just two years after Luther completed his; and every one of these editions remain, not only with the approbation of the authorities, but of the Inquisition, approved by it, and spread as much as possible among the people. In France, as in every other country, it is precisely the same, 1484, and 1534 and 1537; these, however, may be rather called histories of the Bible than the whole of the text. Then, again, there was one at Stockholm in 1512, consequently ten years before Luther's. A Belgic Catholic edition was begun in 1475, of which there were two editions in four years, and a third edition in 1518. A Bohemian Catholic edition appeared in 1488, and was reprinted three times before Lu-

ther's. There are Polish versions and others, printed and published long before the time of Luther. In our own country it is well known that versions were made long before Tyndale's. Sir Thomas More answers the difficulty by observing that it is well known that pious, learned gentlemen read the Scriptures in their own tongue long before Tyndale published his version. It may be said it was not disseminated it could not be; first, because of the want of Printing, and secondly, on account of that which was connected with it, the want of the general diffusion of education."

This, Sir, I presume, is new and startling intelligence for many of your readers. Let those who, while they so unrelentingly assail the Catholic Church, and declaim so furiously against its intolerance in depriving the faithful of the Scriptures, pay some little attention to the foregoing statements, and since these statements are incontrovertible, let them cease to display before the world their profound ignorance of the Catholic Church and her doctrines. It was the Catholic Church that caught up and preserved the scattered fragments of Scripture as they fell from the pens of the inspired writers; it was the Catholic Church that cherished, and collected, and venerated them during long centuries of trial and persecution; it was the Catholic Church that employed hundreds and thousands of men, century after century, in transcribing the Holy Scriptures in letters of gold, and thus was the means, under God, of preserving them, and disseminating them throughout the universe. And yet, forsooth, there are some Protestants, whose religion changes like the hues of the rainbow, who are unscrupulous enough to rob that ancient Church of the honor, which, despite their malice, history will accord, of having preserved the Inspired Writings, for the benefit of all Christians, in the face of most trying vicissitudes and barbarian incursions. With this historical fact in view, we can well afford to smile at the accusation that the Catholic Church hates the Scriptures.

I hope I shall never see another issue of *The Protector*, but if accident should cast one in my way, I will consign its contents to the mild treatment of silent contempt.

I remain Sir, your's very respectfully,  
JAMES McDONALD, P. P.  
Indian River, March 19, 1857.

[FOR THE EXAMINER.]

OBJECTIONS TO THE BIBLE AS A SCHOOL BOOK.

In the course of the present discussion of the expediency of introducing the Bible into all schools attended by any Protestant children, it appears to me that both the Catholic Bishop and the Protestant Ministers have manifested much groundless alarm. The Bishop says that the Catholics will never be satisfied as long as Bibles will be used in any of the mixed schools; and the Ministers insist that they shall be used in all schools attended by Protestant children, though likewise attended by Catholic children. Now, I shall take for granted that the Bishop is fully aware that the Bible, especially the New Testament, has been more commonly used in schools where many Catholic children attended, than any other book; and has the result been the proselyting of such children? If so, I do not wonder at his Lordship's alarm; but if otherwise, where is the ground for alarm, now that Bibles and Testaments have been so generally superseded by our complete series of National School Readers? And why should the Ministers be alarmed because the Bishop insists that the Bible be excluded from mixed schools, when they are aware that, with rare exceptions, it is excluded from such schools now? Do they regard its exclusion from such schools as tantamount to its exclusion from their families, or to their being deprived of its possession altogether? Do they expect their children and their teachers to make a greater exhibition of their religion than themselves? If they will insist on having religious instruction, of a character repugnant to their schoolmates, imparted to their children; if they insist on having a mode of worship in their school, in which some of the pupils cannot conscientiously join, why, for the sake of consistency, do they not impart similar instruction, and introduce their peculiar mode of worship into mixed audiences at lectures, public meetings and the halls of legislation? The reason is obvious. Because they know it cannot be done with unanimity. The inevitable consequence of such a practice would be the instituting of as many places for hearing lectures, speeches, &c. as there would be sects among the audiences; and such will be the inevitable consequence of enforcing the peculiar religious standards or modes of worship of any sect on our mixed schools; as many separate schools will soon be called for as there will be sects in a district. Now, any person capable of the least reflection, may easily foresee that such a course will soon render many a district incapable of supporting any school at all. But probably our clerical advocates of sectarian education, believing that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," and that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," would prefer such a state of things to our present liberal practice. I would recommend to their serious attention the following pertinent remarks from *Le Pays*, a Lower Canada French paper, quoted in the *Montreal Witness* of the 11th June last:—"Our old French Canadian people are very devout, good sons of the Church, and very well instructed in their religion; this no one will deny. Well, they have not learned religion at school, for they never had any; and suppose the people begin now to go to mixed and unsectarian schools, what in the world is to prevent their continuing to learn their religion, as heretofore, without the school?"

Having pointed out the worst consequence of forcing the Bible into our mixed schools, viz: the subdivision of schools, I shall now proceed to point out briefly some objections to its introduction, even into schools that are not mixed.

My first objection is that it is superfluous. The introduction of the ample and comprehensive series of National School Readers has rendered any additional ones quite unnecessary and obstructive. In this connection, I would humbly suggest to the Board of Education, when ordering the next supply of school books, to introduce the remainder of the series, viz:—"Sequel to the Second Book," "History & Geography," and "Elocution."

My second objection is that it is obsolete in style. This, no doubt, has been observed by every critical reader of the English Bible and standard modern authors. To such readers it is scarcely necessary to point out such obsolete terms as "mine" for my, "thine" for thy or your, "which" for who, "let" for hinder, and "conversation" for behavior. This objection should be sufficient to induce every unprejudiced parent to have his children first taught from standard, accurate English books, before they will have acquired an obsolete style from the perusal of antiquated and inaccurate records.

The third objection is that it is utterly deficient in the technical terms so frequently employed in works treating of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, so that a child who has been taught to read the Bible fluently may fail in reading the first newspaper or magazine which he may chance to pick up, or in comprehending the first lecture which he may attend at the Mechanics' or any other Institute.

The last and most serious objection, which I shall offer on this occasion, is, that using the Bible as a school-book is calculated to render children indifferent to its perusal when out of school. This is notoriously their treatment of other school books, and why should school Bibles form an exception? Thus if the object of the Bible-introducers be to render youth interested in the contents of the sacred volume, their course tends to defeat that object; for such an interest is not to be excited, as Mr. Stark observes, "by fingering and thumbing the Bible on their knees, spelling their way from verse to verse." But I may be asked, "would you have no moral or religious instruction imparted to children at school?" I would humbly propose to our mixed schools a similar course to what Mr. Palmer, in his prize essay on education, proposes to the mixed schools of Massachusetts: "That as all parents of all sects are anxious to have good and virtuous children, even when immoral themselves, there should be a list of virtues and vices, accepted as such among mankind generally, hung up in a conspicuous part of the school-room, to be explained and inculcated by the teacher from time to time, somewhat in the following order:

VIRTUES. VICES. DEFINITION OF JUSTICE.—Justice is giving to every one his due, not only by paying all that we owe him, but also giving him full credit for all his good Truth. Lying, &c. qualities and actions, &c.

A PROTESTANT TEACHER.  
Charlottetown, March 21, 1857.