Mr. C. At the time the conditions were not fulfilled the lands ought to have been escheated, and not now after the lapse of so many years and change of owners.

Discharge from arrears of rent. On the Cunards' property he could name many cases in which tenants in arrears had received personal acquittances, and dozens of cases where receipts had been given for a proportion of these arrears, on account of misfortune or poverty. It was no use pushing a man when he had nothing.

Hon. Mr. Coles. Are you not aware that, at Rustico, tenants in arrears have been obliged to give up their improvements, and go back into the green woods? Was not one individual ejected not only once, but five or six times?

Mr. Cundall. Not during my time: prior to that I do not know. On the Cunards' property, no individual, being lawfully in possession, was ever turned off, or deprived of his improvements.

(*To be continued.*)

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir—A writer in the *Monitor*, signing himself "A Normal School Student," has been for several weeks attacking Mr. E. Roche in a manner which appears as mean as it is malicious. One of your correspondents, in writing against the Normal School, incidently mentioned that many of our teachers were prepared by Mr. Roche to pass the Board, and the writer in the *Monitor* considered this sufficient grounds for abusing this gentleman in anything but becoming terms. Mr. Roche is a teacher who has been on this Island about fourteen years, during which period he has not been without a school fourteen days. He has been considered by all parties one of the most efficient teachers in the Colony; besides, he has been always sober and attentive to his business, and has given ample satisfaction to his employers by the creditable manner in which he has discharged the duties of his profession. Our School Visitors in their Reports speak of him in honorable terms. It therefore ill becomes an anonymous scribbler to attempt to injure his character in the estimation of the public. Although Mr. Roche is a Catholic, and although the writer in the *Monitor* endeavours to bring odium on him for his being one of the "faithful," yet he is esteemed and respected by every moderate Protestant who is acquainted with him.

The writer in the *Monitor* insinuated in his first letter, that Mr. Roche taught in his school a history which contained disloyal and treasonable sentiments; and in support of his malicious charge, he has, in his second letter, given some extracts from the history in question, viz: "Outlines of History" by Grace. Although many are of opinion that it would be a loss of time to reply to any of the violent scurrility and low personal abuse which appears in the *Monitor*, yet I think that in this case it would not be improper to make some observations on the extracts above mentioned; and as I have read the history in question, I will undertake to expose to the public the gross ignorance of this Normal School Student, and to show them that the expressions of Protestants on those subjects, to which the extracts relate, are ten times as strong as those of Grace. I doubt not but before I shall have finished my remarks, "A Normal School Student" will rue the day that he penned his last letter, which is little else than a mere compost of maligality, imbecility, falsehood, fatuity and the very dregs and lies of ignorance itself. I shall endeavour, by Protestant authors, to teach the editor of the *Monitor* and his correspondents some very unpalatable truths regarding "Bloody Mary," "Good Queen Bess," and the galling tyranny which the Irish have suffered for many ages from the despotism and cruelty of the heartless and despotic proprietors of Ireland; and if they writhe and wince at the sight of the awful truths which shall be made known to them, let them blame their own indiscretion and silly impulence. I will now proceed with my task.

The writer in the *Monitor* says:—"The Outlines of History" is published by Edward Dunigan and Brother, of New York. It is essentially a Roman Catholic work." In proof of its being a Catholic work, he states that Dunigan and Brother are the publishers of a large variety of Catholic books, and that they have received a medal from the Pope. The object of the writer in alluding to the publishers of this work, is most evidently to raise an undue prejudice against Mr. Roche and the history. The book in question should be judged by its own merits, without any reference to the publishers, or the medal from the Pope; for it is very bad logic to judge of a book by its publisher. I have now before me a copy of Butler's Catechism, printed by Mr. Haszard; and nobody but a fool or a knave would attempt to make the public believe that because the publisher thereof is a Protestant, and sells many anti-Catholic works, therefore Butler's Catechism must be a very *anti-papistical* book.

This erudite Student then proceeds:—"At page 189, of the "Outlines of History," speaking of the reign of Queen Mary, commonly called Bloody Mary, I find the following:

"The severe enactments, however, that were directed against the Protestant subjects, many of which must have been passed without her knowledge, while she was confined to a sick bed, were dictated by her counsellors through motives of state policy. The constant intrigues of the Protestants to subvert her authority, and the revolts and disturbances they created, occasioned, and—though the causes cannot justify—they at least in a great measure extenuate the rigor which was exercised." The character of Mary is described as that of a "pious, clement, compassionate and liberal" woman. We are also told that "she had always remained a firm and devoted Catholic"—that she was "free from a vindictive or implacable spirit."

Why has the writer in the *Monitor* been so dishonest as to garble the extracts which he has given? The "Outlines of History" immediately before the first extract given above says:—"Mary, who had always remained a firm and devoted Catholic, immediately after her accession re-established the Catholic religion in England; but in doing so, suffered her zeal to degenerate into a spirit of intolerance," and immediately after it, proceeds:—"The age was one in which religious intolerance had been evoked by the fierce strifes and divisions that accompanied the Reformation, and its dark and implacable spirit operated in many cases upon Catholics as well as Protestants. Notwithstanding the reproach which must be charged upon her public acts, Mary is represented as a person free from a vindictive or implacable spirit; and in private life, as pious, clement, compassionate and liberal." There is dishonesty in writing as well as in other things; and when the public will perceive the dishonorable baseness with which the writer in the *Monitor* garbled his extracts, they can entertain for him no other sentiment than that of pity and contempt.

I confess that I am at a loss to discover anything in these extracts which savours of disloyalty. Does the defamatory scribbler in the *Monitor* suppose that it is treason not to call Mary "Bloody Mary," as she has been called in the Normal School? It is probable that many readers of the *Monitor* will see these lines; I would therefore recommend them to take particular notice of what Protestant writers say of this Queen.

Camden, in apporat. 23, speaking of Mary says:—"*A princess never to be sufficiently praised on account of her great purity of morals, clemency towards the poor, and liberality towards nobles and ecclesiastics.*" *Godwin*, 123, says of her:—"*A woman truly pious, clement, of the purest morals and very much to be praised, if you do not regard the error of religion.*" Agnes Strickland, a Protestant authoress, and one of the best writers of the century, in the 5th Vol. of "The Queens of England," speaking of Mary, says:—"*If her parliaments had been as honest as herself, her reign would have been the pride of her country, instead of its reproach;* because if they had done their duty, in guarding their fellow-creatures from bloody penal laws regarding religion, the Queen, by her first regal act, in restoring the ancient free constitution of the great Plantagenets, had put it out of the power of her government to take furtive vengeance on *any* individual who opposed it. She had exerted all the energy of her great eloquence to impress on the minds of her judges that they were to sit as "indifferent umpires between herself and her people." She had no standing army to awe parliaments—no rich civil list to bribe them. By restoring the great estates of the Howard, the Percy and many of the victims of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.'s reign; by giving back the revenues of the plundered bishoprics, the Church lands, possessed by the crown, she had [illegible] poverty, as complete as the most enthusiast could desire.

[illegible] Mary almost abstained from the creation [illegible] ancient custom of annual parliaments composing the Houses of [illegible] *honest, indifferent to all religions* [illegible] *so that they might retain their grasp on the accursed thing with which their very souls were corrupted—for corrupted they were, though not by the unfortunate Queen. The Church lands, with which Henry VIII. had bribed his aristocracy, tilled and untilled, into co-operation with his enormities, both personal and political had induced national depravity.*

"Yet, all ought not to be included in one sweeping censure: a noble minority of good men, disgusted at the detestable penal laws which lighted the torturing fires for the Protestants, seceded bodily from the House of Commons, after vainly opposing them. This glorious band, for the honor of human nature, was composed of Catholics as well as Protestants; it was headed by the great legalist, Sergeant Plowden, a Catholic so firm as to refuse the Chancellorship, when persuaded to take it by Queen Elizabeth, because he would not change his religion.

"So much ridicule has been cast on the mistake made in the Queen's situation, that no person has asked the obvious question of—Who governed England during the time which embraced the commencement of the Protestant persecution, and her violent illness? How violent that illness was may be learned from the testimony of the Venetian Ambassador, Michele. "From the time of her first affliction she was a prey to the severest headaches, her head being frightfully swelled; she was likewise subject to perpetual attacks of hysteria, which other women exhale by tears and piercing cries." From this notice may be implied that the wretched Queen still retained sufficient command of herself to suppress all audible plaints, as unbecoming her royal station. *Who can, however, believe that a woman in this state of mortal suffering was capable of governing a Kingdom, or that she was accountable for anything done in it?*"

"Although every generous feeling is naturally roused against the horrid cruelties perpetrated in her name, yet it is *unjust* and *ungrateful* to mention her maiden name with unqualified abhorrence, for if the tyrannical laws instituted by her father had remained a few years more in force, the *representative Government of England would gradually have withered under the terrors of imprisonments and executions without impartial trial. "This change arose from the Queen's own ideas of rectitude."* "Many wholesome laws were made or reviewed by her." "Queen Mary is commended for the merciful provision she made for the poor."

"Thus it is certain, that the sick Queen's signature was not appended to these tyrannical instruments of the cruel inquisition that performed the enormities in Mary's reign after her marriage." "Burnet expressly says, neither Mary nor Cardinal Pole were ever at these Councils; and that in the midst of the persecutions seldom more than three sat in consultation." "However fatally mistaken either Mary or her ministers were in the principles of religious government, her last testament proves that she was not insensible to the prosperity of her country." "With this sentence concludes a biography which presented a task, at once the most difficult and dangerous that could fall to the lot of any Englishwoman to perform. It was difficult, because almost the whole of the rich mass of documents lately edited by our great historical antiquaries, Madden and Tytler, *are in direct opposition to the popular ideas of the character of our first queen-regnant;* and dangerous, because the desire of recording truth may be mistaken for a wish to extenuate cruelty in religious and civil government."

The foregoing extracts are taken from Miss Strickland's work *passim*, and they will speak for themselves. A great many more of the same nature might be given from this writer, but I fear that by giving them I would occupy too much of your valuable space. Some persons may think that I have already said quite enough about Mary, but, Sir, as the question is an important one, and as we will confer no small benefit on the community at large if we succeed in removing a portion of that huge mass of prejudice which exists even in respectable circles, I will give the testimonies of some other Protestant historians.

Fuller says:—"She had been a worthy princess if as little cruelty had been done under her as *by* her. She hated to equivocate, and always was what she was, without dissembling her judgment or conduct for fear or flattery."

The contemporary biography of Fox calls Queen Mary, "*a woman every way excellent, while she followed her own inclination.*"

We now come to the important testimony of William Cobbett, M. P., an honest Protestant historian, who appears indignant at the manner in which he had been deceived in his early days regarding Mary and Elizabeth. This evidence will, I hope, open the eyes of many. The historian, in his "History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland," New York edition, at pages 116 and following, says:—

"We are now entering upon that reign, the punishments inflicted during which have furnished such a handle to the calumniators of the Catholic Church, who have left no art untried to exaggerate those punishments in the first place; and in the second place, to ascribe them to the Catholic *Religion*, keeping out of sight, all the while, the thousand times greater mass of cruelty occasioned by Protestants in this kingdom. Of *all cruelties* I disapprove—I disapprove also of all corporal and pecuniary *punishments*, on the score of religion. Far be it from me, therefore, to defend all the punishments inflicted, on this score, in the reign of Queen Mary; but, it will be my duty to show, *first*, that the mass of punishment then inflicted, on this account, has been monstrously exaggerated; *second*, that the circumstances under which they were inflicted found more apology for the severity than the circumstances under which the Protestant punishments were inflicted; *thirdly*, that they, were in amount as a single gram of wheat is to a bushel, compared with the mass of punishment under the Protestant church, "as by law established;" *lastly*, that, be they what they might, it is a base perversion of reason to ascribe them to the principles of the Catholic *religion*; and that, as to the Queen herself, she was one of the most virtuous of human beings, and was rendered miserable, not by her own disposition or misdeeds, but by the misfortune and misery entailed on her by her two immediate predecessors, who had uprooted the institutions of the country, who had plunged the kingdom into confusion, and who had left no choice but that of making severe examples, or, of being an encourager of, and a participator in, heresy, plunder and sacrilege. Her reign our deceivers have taught us to call the reign of "Bloody Queen Mary;" while they have taught us to call that of her sister the "Golden Days of Good Queen Bess." They have taken good care never to tell us that for every drop of blood that Mary shed, Elizabeth shed a pint; that the former gave up every fragment of the plunder of which the deeds of her predecessors had put in her possession, and the latter resumed this plunder again, and took from the poor every pittance which had, by onslaught, been left them—that the former never changed her religion, and that the latter changed from Catholic to Protestant, then to Catholic again, and then back again to Protestant; that the former punished people for *departing* from that religion in which she and they and their fathers had been born, and to which she had always adhered; and that the latter punished people for *not departing* from the religion of her and their fathers, and which religion, too, she herself professed, and openly lived in, even at the time of her coronation. Yet, we have been taught to call the former "*bloody*" and the latter "*good!*" How have we been deceived? And is it not time, then, that this deception, so injurious to our Catholic fellow-subjects, and so debasing to ourselves, should cease? It is, perhaps, too much to hope that I shall be able to make it cease; but, towards accomplishing this great and most desirable object, I shall do something, at any rate, by a plain and true account of the principal transactions of the reign of Mary."

"Mary began her reign by acts the most just and beneficent. Generously disregarding herself, her ease, and her means of splendour, she abolished the debased currency which her father had introduced, and her brother had still made worse; she paid the debts due by the crown; and she largely remitted taxes at the same time. But that which she had most at heart was the restoration of that religion under the influence of which the kingdom had been so happy and so great for many ages, and since the abolition of which it had known nothing but discord, disgrace and misery. There were in her way great obstacles; for though the pernicious principles of the German and Dutch and Swiss reformers had not, even yet, made such progress among the people, except in London, which was the grand scene of the operations of those hungry and fanatical adventurers, these were the *plunderers* to deal with; and these plunderers had *power*."

"At page 123, he says:—"In Nov. 1555, she gave up to the Church the *tenths* and *first-fruits* which, together with the *tithes* which her two immediate predecessors had seized on and kept, were worth about £63,000 a year in money of that day, were equal to about *a million a year* of our present money. Have we ever heard of any *other Sovereign doing* the like? "Good Queen Bess" we shal find taking them back again to herself; and though we should find Queen Ann giving them up to the Church, we are to bear in mind that in Mary's days, the Crown and its officers, ambassadors, judges, pensioners, and all employed by it, were supported *out of the landed estate of the Crown itself*, the remains of which estate we now see in the pitiful rest of "Crown Lands." *Taxes* were never, in these days, called for, but for *wars*, and other really *national* imposed on her people a single farthing of tax in any shape whatever! So that this act of surrendering the tenths and first-fruits was the effect of her generosity and piety; and of *hers alone* too; for it was done against the remonstrances of her council, and it was not without great opposition that the bill passed in parliament where it was naturally feared that this just act of the Queen would awaken the people's hatred of the plunderers. But the Queen persevered, saying that she would be "Defender of the Faith" in reality, and not merely in name. This was the woman whom we have been taught to call "the *Bloody* Queen Mary"!

At page 128 the Protestant historian says:—"When *another Mary*, a *Protestant* Mary, was brought to the throne, did the Parliament take care to keep the administration wholly in her, and to give her husband the mere *title* of King? Did they take care then that no *foreigners should hold* offices in England? Oh, no! That foreign, that Dutch husband, had the administration vested *in him;* and he brought over whole crowds of foreigners, put them into the highest *offices*, gave them the highest titles, and heaped upon them large parcels of what was left of the Crown estate, descending to that crown, in part at least, from the days of Alfred himself! And this *transaction* is called "*glorious*;" and that too by the very men who talk of the "*inglorious*" reign of Mary. What, then, are sense and truth never to reign in England? Are we to be duped unto all generations! And if we come down to our own dear Protestant days, do we find the Prince of Saxe Coburg, the heir to *mighty dominions?* Did he bring into the country, as Philip did, twenty nine chests of *bullion, loading to the Tower* 22 *carts and* 99 *pack horses?* Do we find him settling on his wife's issue *great states and kingdoms?* Do we find *his father* making him *a King*, on the eve of the marriage, because a person of lower title would be *beneath a Queen of England?* Do we find him giving his bride, as a bridal present, jewels to the amount of *half a million of our money?* Do we find him settling on the Princess Charlotte a jointure of *a million sterling a year*, if she should outlive him? No; but (and come and boast of it, you shameless revilers of this Catholic queen!) We find our Protestant Parliament settling on him fifty thousand pounds a year, to come out of *taxes raised on us*, if he should outlive her; which sum we now duly and truly pay in full tale, and shall possibly have to pay it for forty years yet to come! How we feel ourselves shrink when we thus compare our conduct with that of our Catholic fathers!" It is to be remarked that the italics and parentheses in the extracts from Cobbet are *his*.

At page 130 the historian says:—"The traitors and leading rebels of her reign were all, or affected to be, of the new sects. Though small in number, they made up for that disadvantage by their indefatigable malignity—by their incessant efforts to trouble the state, and, indeed to destroy the Queen herself.

At page 131 he says:—"The fact is, the persons put to death were chiefly of very infamous character, many of them *foreigners*, almost the whole of them residing in London, and called in derision by the people at large, the "*London Gospellers.*" Doubtless out of *two hundred and seventy-seven* persons (the number stated by Hume, *on authority of* Fox), who were thus punished, some may have been real Martyrs to their opinions, and have been sincere and virtuous persons; but in this number of 277, many were convicted felons, some clearly traitors, as Ridley and Cranmer. These must be taken from the number; and we may surely take such as were *alive* when Fox first published his book, and who expressly begged to decline the honor of being enrolled amongst his "*Martyrs.*" "What a hypocrite, then, must that man be who pretends to believe in this Fox! Yet this infamous book has, by the arts of the plunderers and their descendents, been circulated to a boundless extent amongst the people of England, who have been taught to look on all the thieves, felons and traitors, whom Fox calls "*Martyrs,*" as sufferers resembling St. Paul! The real truth about these "Martyrs," is, that they were generally a set of most wicked wretches who sought to destroy the Queen and her government, and under the pretence of *conscience and superior piety*, to obtain the means of again preying upon the people. No mild means could reclaim them; those means had been tried: the Queen had to employ vigorous means or to suffer her people to continue to be torn by the religious factions, created not by her, but by her two immediate predecessors, who had been aided and abetted by many of those who now were punished, and who were worthy of ten thousand deaths each, if ten thousand deaths could have been endured. They were without a single exception, *apostates, perjurers, or plunderers*; and the greater part of them had also been guilty of flagrant *high-treason* against Mary herself, who had spared their lives; but whose lenity they had requited by every effort within their power to overset her authority and her government. To make particular mention of *all* the ruffians that perished upon this occasion, would be a task as irksome as it would be useless; but there were amongst them three of *Cranmer's Bishops* and *himself!* For now justice at least overtook this most mischievous of all villains, who had *justly* to go to the same stake that he had *unjustly* caused so many others to be tied to; the three others were Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley, each of whom was, indeed, inferior in villainy to Cranmer, but to few other men that ever existed." After giving the character of Cranmer, he says—"And Mary is to be called "*the Bloody*," because she put to death masters of iniquity like this! It is surely time to do justice to the memory of this calumniated queen."

At pages 137, 138 and 139, the honest, impartial historian continues thus:—"While all historians agree that the loss of Calais preyed most severely upon the Queen, and *hastened her death*—while they all do this great honor to her memory, none of them attempt to say, that the loss of Boulogne had even the smallest effect on the spirits of her "Reformation" brother! He was too busy in pulling down altars, and in confiscating the property of Guilds and Fraternities to think much about national *honor*; or, perhaps, though he, while he was pulling down altars, still called himself "Defender of the Faith," he might think that territory and glory, won by Catholics, ought not to be retained by Protestants. Be this as it may, we have seen a loss to England much greater than that of Calais; we have seen the half of a continent cut off from the Crown of England, and seen it become a most formidable rival on the seas; and we have never heard that it *preyed* much upon the spirits of the Sovereign in whose reign the loss took place."

With the loss of Calais at the bottom of her heart, and with a well grounded fear that her successor would undo, as to religion, all that she had done, the unfortunate Mary expired on the 17th Nov., 1558, in the forty-second year of her age, and in the sixth of her reign, leaving to her sister and successor an *example* of *fidelity, sincerity*, patience, resignation, generosity, gratitude, and purity in thought, word and deed; an example, however, which in every particular that sister and successor took special care *not to follow*. As to those *punishments* which have served as the ground for all the abuse heaped on the memory of this Queen, what were they other than punishments inflicted on offenders *against the religion of the country?* The "*fires of Smithfield*" have a horrid sound; but to say nothing about the *burnings* of Edward VI., Elizabeth and James I., is it more pleasant to have one's *bowels ripped out* while the body is alive (as was Elizabeth's favourite way), than to be burnt? Protestants have even *exceeded* Catholics in the work of punishing offenders of this sort. And, they have punished, too, with less reason on their side. The Catholics have *one faith*; the Protestants have *fifty faiths*; and yet each sect, whenever it gets uppermost, punishes in some way or other the rest as offenders. Even *at this very time*, there are, according to a return recently laid before the House of Commons, no less than *fifty-seven persons* who have, within a few years, suffered imprisonment and other punishments *added to it*, as *offenders against religion*; and this, too, at a time when men are permitted *openly to deny the divinity of Christ*, and others openly to preach in their synagogues, *that there never was any Christ at all*. A man sees the laws tolerate twenty sorts of Christians (as they all call themselves), each condemning all the rest to eternal flames; and if, in consequence of this, he be led to express his belief, that they are *all wrong*, and that the thing they are disputing about is altogether something unreal, he may be punished with *six years* (or his whole life) of imprisonment in a loathsome gaol! Let us think of these things when we are talking of the "Bloody Queen Mary." The punishments now-a-days proceed from the maxim that "*Christianity* is part and parcel of *the law of the land.*" When did it *begin?* Before or since the "Reformation?" And who amongst those sects, which it would seem this law tolerates; which of them is to tell us; from which of them are we to learn *what Christianity is?*

"As to the *mass* of *suffering*, supposing the whole of the persons who suffered in the reign of Mary to have suffered solely for the sake of religion, instead of having been, like Cranmer and Ridley, traitors and felons as well as offenders on the score of religion, let us suppose the whole 277 to have suffered for offences against religion, did the *mass of suffering* surpass the mass of suffering, on this same account, during the reign of the late King? And unless *Smithfield* and *burning* have any peculiar agony, anything *worse than death* to impart, did Smithfield ever witness so great a mass of suffering as the *Old Baily* had witnessed, on account of offences against that purely Protestant invention, *bank notes?* Perhaps this invention, expressly intended to *keep out Popery*, has cost ten times, if not ten times ten times, the blood that was shed in the reign of her whom we still have the injustice or the folly to call the "*bloody* Queen Mary," all whose excellent qualities, all whose exalted virtues, all her piety, charity, generosity, sacred adherence to her faith and her word, all her gratitude, and even those feelings of anxiety for the greatness and honour of England, which feelings hastened her to the grave; all these, in which she was never equalled by any sovereign that sat on the English throne, Alfred alone excepted, whose religion she sought to re-establish forever; all these are to pass for nothing, and we are to call her the "*bloody Mary*," because it suits the views of those who fattened on the spoils of that Church which never suffered Englishmen to bear the odious and debasing name of *pauper*."

It is very probable that "A Normal School Student" will learn from the above extracts more truth regarding the history of Mary than ever he did before. I purpose in my next to enlighten him about "Good Queen Bess."

A TEACHER.

MILITIA AFFAIRS.

Correspondence between Major McGill, the Adjutant General, and the Commander-in-Chief.

[*Copy—No.* 1.]

Adjutant General's Office,
29th November, 1860.

Sir,—The attention of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has been directed to an advertisement in the *Examiner* newspaper, of Monday, 12th November last, containing resolutions said to have passed at a public meeting of which you were Chairman. As those resolutions impugn the course adopted by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, with regard to the Volunteer Force, I have to request that you will inform me if it is the case that such resolutions were passed at any public meeting presided over by you?

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servt.,
P. D. Stewart,
Lieut. Col. and Adjutant General.

To Major W. McGill, Queen's County Militia.

Reply to No. 1.

Charlottetown, 30th November, 1860.

Sir,—Acknowledging the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, but in which I am unable to discover if it emanates from the Lieut. Governor or only from yourself, I, however, in either case take leave respectfully to enquire by what right or authority, I, a citizen of Charlottetown, am interrogated respecting the affix of my name to certain resolutions published in the *Examiner?*

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servt.,
Wm. McGill.

To Lieut. Col. P. D. Stewart, Adjt. Genl.

No. 2. Militia.

Adjutant General's Office,
30th November, 1860.

Sir,—In answer to your communication of this day's date, I have to say that I made the enquiry conveyed in my letter of the 29th November, of you as Major in the First Queen's County Regiment of Militia, and not as a private citizen of Charlottetown; and I have to request a distinct reply, at your earliest convenience, as to whether you were present as Chairman at the Meeting when the resolutions referred to in my letter of yesterday were passed.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servt.,
P. D. Stewart,
Lieut. Col. and Adjutant General.

To Major W. McGill, First Queen's County Militia.

Reply to No. 2.

Charlottetown, 1st December, 1860.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 30th November, in which, as you make no reference to the Lieut. Governor, I respectfully take leave to reiterate to you the fact brought before you in my communication of yesterday, that you have no legitimate power to trench upon my private rights, nor authority to invade my personal privileges as a Citizen, and under that firm conviction I must decline any other answer than is herein conveyed to the questions put to me under assumed command in your communications of the 29th and 30th November.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servt.,
Wm. McGill.

To Lieut. Col. P. D. Stewart, Adjt. General.

No. 3. *Adjutant General's Office,*
17th December, 1860.

Sir,—I am directed by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to acquaint you that, having presided at a public meeting which passed resolutions censuring the course pursued by His Excellency with regard to the Volunteers, is, so long as you hold a Commission in the Militia, a grave breach of military discipline, calculated to set an example of insubordination which His Excellency cannot overlook.

His Excellency has no wish to exercise the least control over the expression of the opinion of any private citizen on any subject whatever; but he cannot permit an officer of the Militia to shelter himself under the cloak of a private citizen, in order that he may impugn the actions of the Commander-in-Chief.

His Excellency is unwilling to believe that you have willingly committed so serious a violation of military decorum as to be a party to the passing at a public meeting of resolutions condemnatory of his actions as Commander-in-Chief, while you, at the same time, hold a Commission in the Militia Force, which is strictly under His Excellency's exclusive command. In the belief, therefore, that you acted in ignorance, His Excellency is willing to accept a retraction of those resolutions, in so far as you were concerned.

In the event, however, of your failing to comply with this condition, I am commanded by His Excellency to inform you that the only alternative will be the removal of your name from the list of Officers of the Militia of the Colony.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servt.,
P. D. Stewart,
Lieut. Col. and Adjutant General.

To Major McGill, &c., &c., &c.

Reply to No. 3.

Charlottetown, 21st December, 1860.

Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, under authority of the Lieut. Governor, date the 17th inst., in which you revert to certain resolutions published in the *Examiner*, above my name, referred to in your letters of the 29th and 30th November, and 1st December last, informing me that unless I retract those resolutions, in so far as I am concerned, His Excellency will take the alternative of removing my name from the list of Officers of the Militia of the Colony. Passing, without comment, the rude language and offensive passages which occur in your letter, without authority, I presume, of His Excellency, my course in the substantive matter is to me so obviously clear that unhesitatingly, in all proper deference and respect to Lieut. Governor Dundas, I have to acquaint you, for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, that no consideration or threat will induce me to forego my legal freedom of action; and I will in no way be a voluntary party to the abnegation of my legitimate rights and privileges as a citizen and a subject of His Excellency's Imperial Mistress; and in full conviction of not having gone beyond the limit of those acknowledged rights and immunities, I must respectfully but firmly and decidedly decline to retract.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servt.,
Wm. McGill.

To Lieut. Col. P. D. Stewart, Adjt. General.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY LIEUT. GOVERNOR DUNDAS.

May it please Your Excellency.

I am aware that in addressing your Excellency the practice is not an usual one, although it has sometimes been adopted; but to every general rule there is an exception. The present occasion and the extraordinary circumstances which give rise to it, form one of these. It is a maxim that the Queen can do no wrong; but Her Representative enjoys not the same immunities. Her Majesty has invested you with certain prerogatives, to be used for the public benefit and not for your own private interest; or to gratify a spirit of petty tyranny. Your Excellency's appointment to the Government of this Colony is one of those political jobs arising from political necessity, which are so disgraceful to Downing Street. A Tory Lord Advocate was wanted for Scotland, and in all that country no constituency could be found to return a Representative whose opinions were in accordance with the ministry of the day; but the happy idea suggested itself to them of purchasing your constituency—your support, as an individual, being nill, the consideration being the Government of P. E. Island. If your presence and abilities *shed* little lustre in the House of Commons, it has been comparatively less as the Governor of this Colony. Ever since your arrival on the Island your career has been marked by the desire of governing for the benefit of the few and not for the many; and by infusing into the Island a spirit of religious intolerance, and fanning the expiring flame of bigotry. The *Gazette* of this week informs me that my name has been removed from the [illegible] of the Militia of the Colony. I am not surprised at the removal, neither would I be at any unconstitutional act you may commit—folly, bigotry and stupidity appear to be your evil guides.

It will be necessary for me to inform my readers of the cause of this petty act of tyranny.

A number of the inhabitants of Charlottetown formed themselves into a Volunteer Company, to be styled the Celtic Volunteers, and unsolicited on my part, nominated me as their Commander, at the same time directing me to apply to your Excellency to order them to be supplied with the necessary arms and accoutrements. The false and ostensible excuses with which your Excellency coupled your refusal of this request are embodied in the resolution of which your Excellency complains, the truth of which can be established by the testimony of Mr. Reddin and Mr. Malone, who accompanied me. The real reason was easily understood; it was religious bigotry and political hatred, because none of the Company's political opinions were in accordance with your Executive. The sting which your Excellency is wincing under consists in the truth, contained in the resolutions which are incontrovertible and affords no way of escape from the untruth which is thereby fastened upon you. My removal from the Militia Force is more attributable to another reason than my connection with the resolutions. It is because I endeavored legally to resist the acts of cruelty performed in your name, as instanced by the ejection of the widow and the fatherless from off the Loyalist Lands, and the demolition of the houses of the poor. Such an act would, of course, bring down upon me the wrath of those irresponsible advisers who may be seen continually prowling round the precincts of Government House.

I am aware that by the Queen's regulations Officers of the Army are prohibited from either expressing their approval or disapproval of the acts of the Commander-in-Chief. Such rules and regulations are not applicable to our Militia, because it is not an embodied Force, and the law for its annual meetings has been suspended for the last ten years. But allowing, for the sake of argument, that it was—those officers who presided at the meeting of several Volunteer Corps which gave an expression of approval to the appointment of an Officer over the head of Capt. Rankin, were guilty of a violation of the same regulations, and ought to have been visited in a similar manner; or why was not Colonel Coles dimissed when, in his place in the House Assembly, he accused your Excellency of telling Her Majesty's faithful Commons an untruth, which had been placed in your mouth by your Executive advisers in relation to an address of the House of Assembly?

If the right of free discussion is, in future, to be denied to Officers of Militia, few men of independence will retain their Commissions.

The Adjutant General informs me that your Excellency has no wish to exercise the least control over the expression of the opinions of any private citizen. I have not the least doubt you would make the attempt were it likely to succeed. It would not be the first time were you to do so. You cannot possibly have forgotten your famous speech in Parliament, which earned for you the name of "Thirty-nine Pounder Dundas." Your Christian and humane advice to the Government to prevent the expression of public opinion by the use of this instrument of war, on an unoffending populace—however wise that advice may have been—was not acted upon; and the blood, perhaps, of slaughtered thousands does not cry to heaven for vengeance; neither are mothers mourning their slaughtered offspring, nor orphan children their murdered parents, which would have been the case had your suggestion been carried out. But for a more recent attempt to prevent freedom of action, I shall instance the case of a Clergyman who has recently left our shores, and who was supposed by your Excellency to be the correspondent of the *Glasgow Gazette*. In order to accomplish his destruction by misrepresenting him to the society by whom he was employed, you endeavored to prevent him obtaining the small pittance which he was allowed, and you have now deserted the Church of your Fathers, because its Ministers would not be your accomplices in this cruel act of injustice; and also ignored her existence, as a national Church by refusing to assign her a position at the reception of the Prince of Wales similar to the sister establishment of England.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your Excellency's obedt. servt.,
William McGill,

December 26, 1860.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir—A writer in one of the last Nos. of the *Monitor*, calling himself "A Normal School Student," makes some remarks on my letter regarding the Normal School; but he declines the rather difficult task of refuting one word of what I have written, and prefers calling hard names, insinuating that Grammar and Geography are not taught at the Convent, that I am a clergyman, that Mr. Roche is disloyal, &c. It is none of his business who or what I am, and his insinuations in this matter are, to say the least, in very bad taste. I would not notice his effusion were it not that he has thought proper to make an attack on the Convent, saying, "*if report speaks truth*, the 'literary education' of the Convent is limited to committing to memory the prayers of the Church." Now, this is a contemptible and mean calumny, as the numerous Protestant ladies and gentlemen who attended several public examinations at the Convent can amply testify. It is very probable that "A Normal School Student" was never present on any of these occasions, for it is likely he is of too low a character to be admitted into any decent company, but let me assure him that the pupils of Notre Dame at their examinations exhibited proofs of their "literary education" which the combined efforts of him and his master would labour in vain to surpass. The writer in the *Monitor* appears to be devoid not only of religious training, but also of the feelings of a person having the least pretensions to the name of a gentleman, otherwise he would not stoop so low as to throw his malicious darts at females. I would inform this student that the ladies of the Convent are able to explain any difficulty with which their pupils may meet in English Grammar, and that they are not obliged to allow their pupils to decide such difficulties by a majority of votes, as Mr. Webster allows his pupils to do occasionally; neither are they obliged, from their ignorance, when hearing spellings, to look out in a Dictionary for the meaning of nearly every other word; and when the pupils titter and laugh at such an exhibition of ignorance, permit them to decide the matter by vote. Can as much be said of Mr. Webster, Master of the Normal School? This gentleman may well exclaim, "Save me from my friends," for had not "A Normal School Student" been so officious, Mr. Webster might have escaped this expose of his ignorance and "inefficiency," and I would not, perhaps, give the following illustrations of the "moral training" of the Normal School. A short time ago a gentleman from Nova Scotia, and a friend of Rev. Mr. Sutherland, entered the Normal School, when a number of the little urchins cried out, "*Here comes Sutherland's goat!*" Admirable training this! On another occasion a person entered this school and was asked by a number of the hopefuls if he had a "quid of tobacco!" What beautiful, what excellent training! The windows and plastering of the little "castles" on the premises are broken, and the walls of these buildings are marked with inscriptions which are filthy, obscene and beastly in the extreme, and are *prima facie* evidence of the unspeakable filthiness, turpitude and moral depravity of at least some of the students of the Normal School, not excepting, perhaps, the writer in the *Monitor*. Notwithstanding that the Bible is used in this school, these facts bespeak a deplorable state of things.

I believe that not only Mr. Webster is quite unqualified for his present situation, but also the Rev. Mr. Sutherland, who brought him here. Although this Rev. *Savant* appears to have pretensions enough to think that there is not a man at the Board knows half as much as he does, yet it was he, I believe, who asked a person what was the overland route from Charlottetown to Boston! Not long since a person parsing this line:

"On Erie's banks where tigers *steal* alone,"

called *steal* a neuter verb, but he was corrected by the Rev. Mr. Sutherland.

These are only a few illustrations of this Rev. gentleman's profound ignorance, and of his total unfitness to be a member of the Board of Education.

I would remind the writer in the *Monitor* that my object was to show that the Normal School was not what the country thought it would and should be, and not to praise Mr. Roche, whose name I mentioned only accidentally, and who has, I perceive by the last *Monitor*, replied for himself. If a Normal School Student's understanding were not of a very inferior calibre, he would be able to perceive that it would not make the Normal School anything the better whether the books used by Mr. Roche were good, bad or indifferent. This individual has, however, unwittingly furnished the enemies of the Normal School with the strongest proofs of its inefficiency, and he has completely cut the ground from under his own feet. By endeavouring to lower Mr. Roche's qualifications he has almost degraded Mr. Webster; for, notwithstanding that "Mr. Roche himself is not the pink of perfection," as the writer insinuates, yet country schoolmasters of all nations and religions consider his instruction so far superior to that imparted by Mr. Webster that they prefer giving Mr. Roche, in many instances, "six shillings a week" to losing their time going to Mr. Webster at the Normal School, where "they can receive their education *free*." This speaks volumes either for Mr. Roche's superiority or Mr. Webster's inferiority. People [illegible] P. E. Island, mark this. You are heavily taxed for a Normal