

upon the subject; but, as he had been alluded to, among others, as promising his support, he would briefly state the facts of the case so far as he was personally concerned. The rev. gentleman waited upon him (Mr. Pope) and stated the objects of the institution, and explained to him the nature of the prayer of the petition. This was the first time he had seen the rev. gentleman, and he expressed to him (the petitioner) that he was pleased that so creditable an effort was made to establish an institution on the system for educating in the higher branches of learning, and expressed a wish that the Academy might be turned into something of the kind—where children could receive a sound classical education that might fit them for any profession. But as for promising his support to the prayer of the petition he never intended to support it nor never said he would. He certainly said he would not give it his decided opposition, but that was tantamount to a promise of support. Still, he considered that as Catholics were so numerous they should at least be entitled to a grant. If any Protestant clergyman made an application for a like object, he would be among the most ready to give such a prayer his support, but, as many advantages with respect to education were enjoyed now which were not enjoyed formerly he did not think that—especially as it was not under the control of the Government—the St. Dunstan's College should be endowed; for, if it were, it would be the means of creating much ill-feeling in the community. He was so convinced of this that he had, privately, intimated to the hon. member from Georgetown, Mr. McDonald, that he would like to see the petitioner's friends prevail upon him to withdraw the petition.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN then read his resolution, which is as follows, and which, with the consent of the Hon. Col. Secretary, was incorporated with the one moved by him previously:—

Resolved—That it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of that part of the petition of the Rector of St. Dunstan's College asking for an annual sum or endowment for the support of that institution.

The House divided on the resolution as amended,—which was adopted on the following vote:—

NAYS—Messrs. Laird, Muirhead and Dingwell. AYES—Honbles. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer, Whelan, Speaker, Mooney, Wightman, Palmer, Messrs. McGill, Cooper, Munro, Perry, McDonald, Douse, Montgomery, Pope—15.

The House resumed, and the Chairman reported that the following resolution had been agreed to:—

Resolved, That it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of that part of the petition of the Rector of St. Dunstan's College, asking for an annual sum or endowment for the support of that institution; but that it be recommended to the House when in Supply, to vote a sum for the purpose of obtaining Instruments, Maps, and Apparatus, for the Institution.

Mr. LAIRD then moved that all after the word "institution" be struck out.

Mr. CLARK said as he had been in the chair he had not an opportunity of expressing his sentiments on this subject, and he would not give a silent vote. In brief, he was opposed to all State aid towards religious purposes. He did not go for endowing St. Dunstan's College, not because it was instituted by Catholics; but because he did not think it was a good principle to institute. He would also be opposed to endowing any Protestant establishment of the kind. With respect to the Bog School, if he had known it was sectarian he would not vote for a grant towards its maintenance, for if sectarian schools were encouraged, they would be productive of evils which would be felt sooner or later.

The House then divided on Mr. Laird's amendment:—

AYES—Mr. Laird, Hon. Mr. Montgomery, Messrs. Dingwell, Muirhead, Pope and Douse—6.

NAYS—Honbles. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer, E. Whelan, R. Mooney, J. Wightman and E. Palmer; Messrs. McGill, Cooper, Clark, Munro, Perry and McDonald—12.

So the amendment was lost and the resolution carried, as reported by the committee. Adjourned for one hour.

T. KIRWAN, Reporter.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR,—I have been rather too long without fulfilling my promise of exposing some of the falsehoods of Mr. Fitzgerald, but the delay has been occasioned by my being too much occupied with more important duties.

Mr. Fitzgerald, having defined the errors of the Arians, says:—"It is unnecessary to say, with respect to this doctrine, that this cannot be Protestant, from the simple fact that it was patronized by two, if not by four, Bishops of Rome, and was approved of by at least seven different councils. Liberius, 352, Bishop of Rome, actually signed the Arian confession of faith, and condemned Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy. Felix, 356, Bishop of Rome, was raised to the Pontificate by the Arian faction; and his name, as well as that of Liberius, is placed on a roll of canonization, and regarded as a Saint to this day." (I never before heard of a name being regarded as a Saint.) If Mr. Fitzgerald's Protestantism is based on such admirable logic as is contained in the first sentence above quoted, it is not a very "rational thing" at least. The merest school boy pretending to have the use of his reason could not pen greater nonsense. Should Mr. Fitzgerald follow up the same method of argumentation, he will find that his share of Christianity is indeed very insignificant; for he well knows that every article of Christian belief has been "patronized," not by two or four Popes only, but by every Pope that has sat in the chair of St. Peter from the time of the Apostles.

It is not true that two, if not four, Bishops of Rome patronized Arianism. Pope Liberius was persecuted for his orthodoxy by the Arian Emperor Constantius. That despotic tyrant, finding that he could not, by either bribes, threats or menaces, shake the Pope's firm resolution of remaining faithful to the Catholic cause, resorted to banishing him to Berea, in Thrace. On his way into banishment, the eunuch Eusebius, by order of the Emperor, offered him money to pay his expenses; but the spirited bishop rejected with scorn the proffered bribe, and said to him: "You have rendered all the churches of the world desolate, and you offer me an alms as a criminal; go commence by being a Christian." Liberius had passed two years in banishment, when "the continual solicitations of Demophilus, seconded by the delusive arguments of Fortunatian, the temporizing Bishop of Aquileia, induced him to believe that he might sign the first formula of Siriniam (which contained no heresy) without violating the Catholic faith. Liberius fell into an error of judgment, but he did not by any means fall into heresy. The Church has never taught that Popes are impeccable. St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Epiphanius and St. Sifricius, all of whom had a much better opportunity of knowing Liberius than either Mr. Fitzgerald or his favourite Dr. Edgar, speak of that Pope in the highest terms. The Greek Menology, speaking with reference to him, says: "The blessed Liberius, defender of the truth, was Bishop of Rome under the Emperor Constantius. Inflamed with zeal for the orthodox faith, he protected the great Athanasius, persecuted by the heretics and driven from Alexandria, because he nobly defended the truth. For while Constantine and Constantius lived, the orthodox faith was maintained; but Constantius being left master, as he was a heretic, the Arians prevailed. Liberius, having severely censured their impiety, was banished to Berea, in Thrace. But the Romans being attached to him by faith and affection, went to the Emperor and demanded him. He was consequently sent back to Rome, where he terminated his life, after having governed his flock in a saintly manner." Acta S. S. 23 Sept. Should Mr. Fitzgerald be curious to know more about Liberius, let him read Athan. Hist. Arian. ad Monachos, n. 39, Theod. l. 2, c. 15, 16 et 17, Ambr. De Virgin., l. 3, c. 1.

Felix, whose name Mr. Fitzgerald says is placed on a roll of canonization, was an anti-Pope, elected by the Arians during the absence of Liberius, in exile for the faith. The name of Felix may be placed on a "roll of canonization," so may those of Luther, Calvin, Knox and Henry the Eighth, but by whom? It is worse than folly to bring the actions of anti-Popes as proofs of the fallibility of the Church. Suppose

that, in 1848, when Pius the Ninth was obliged to leave Rome, the Protector "faction" got into power, and the Rev. D. Fitzgerald was elevated to the Papal throne, under the title of Pope David the First! no person of sane mind would, for a moment, maintain that the Catholic Church would be responsible for the absurdities or impieties that might be taught, countenanced or "patronized" by the said anti-Pope David, even although the name of the same David should be, by his admirers, placed on a "roll of canonization."

I would, Mr. Editor, take up too much of your valuable space were I to follow Mr. Fitzgerald in all his devious wanderings about Councils, &c.; besides whatever appears in the columns of the Protector against Catholicity is so universally considered, even by Protestants themselves, to be such abominable lies, that the unholy sheet is absolutely harmless in that respect. As Mr. Fitzgerald appears peculiarly fond of the catechetical style, perhaps it would not be inappropriate to propose to him a few plain questions, which I suppose he will answer for the information of the readers of the Protector. Did not the Nestians, Sabellians, and Patripassians, being "unlearned and unstable," and wresting "the scriptures to their own destruction," in impiously denying the distinction of persons in the Godhead, found their doctrine in those texts of scripture: "I and the Father are one;" "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine;" "Did not the Arians found their impieties on these texts: "Now this is eternal life: that they may know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," "For the Father is greater than I?" Were not these same scandalous and violent heretics biblicals of the true stamp, when they objected to the word consubstantial in the Nicene Creed, because it could not be found in Scripture? Mr. Fitzgerald says: "The Helvidians, 388, spake slightlying of the value of celibacy and fasting." Did these heretics live at the present time they would find but too many of their brethren. Does Mr. Fitzgerald know any modern Helvidians connected with the Protector who "speak slightlying of the value of celibacy and fasting," and who, judging others perhaps from their own lechery, consider the former impossible, particularly in the case of Catholic Priests and Religious, and view the latter as a Popish superstition? When these modern Helvidians outrage public decency by attacking ladies of a congregation, we shall at least have a suitable name for them. Why did Mr. Fitzgerald pass so smoothly over the Mormons? Why did he not favor the readers of the Protector with the history of their rise and progress? Why did he not inform them that they are likely, one day or other, to overrun the fair fields of America like a pestiferous vapour? Why did he not tell them that they adduce many examples from the Bible to justify their abominable polygamy? Why did he forget to tell them whence they emanated, and whence the territory of Utah is now being peopled by the deluded victims of a degrading heresy? Why did he not inform them that they (the Mormons) are coming from non Popish countries, such as Wales, Scotland and Sweden? Many more such questions might be asked, but I consider these enough for the present.

No book has ever been so shamefully abused as the Holy Bible. Every blasphemy that every impious teacher has advanced, has been supported by Scripture. All upstart teachers of error have had always the same characteristics, viz., a pharisaical pretension to superior sanctity, a volubility of speech, a disgusting self-sufficiency, a never-failing torrent of abuse, a spirit of unrelenting intolerance, and above all, a superabundant stock of ignorance. They have been such men as those to whom Captain Heshaw (a Protestant), High Sheriff of the city of Kilkenny, lately made allusion in his speech on the occasion of his presenting a pair of white gloves to assistant Barrister Mr. Corballis, Q. C. His words are: "The . . . must look upon us as idolaters, or as worshippers of fire and Baal, rather than as Christians, or they would not establish a missionary society to send amongst us a set of vulgar and illiterate men to shock the feelings of the inhabitants and to make the name of a missionary society an insult not only . . ." I am sorry to say that our own little Island is not wholly free from such public nuisances.

My reason for taking any notice at all of Mr. Fitzgerald's effusions, is the fact, that he has been the principal actor in endeavouring to get up a persecution against the Catholics. He it was that dishonourably copied the Catholic Bishop's letter to the Secretary of the Board of Education. He it was that first misinterpreted that letter, and endeavoured to make Lordship's meaning appear odious. The Bishop, it is true, made use of the word "godless," an expression first used in the sense of his Lordship, by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, I believe, and which nearly every school-boy in Britain knows to be synonymous with common, when applied to schools. Had the Bishop known that his letter would have fallen into such hands as Mr. Fitzgerald's, he would, perhaps, have been more particular in his expressions. It is needless to mention, for it is already too well known, how that venerable prelate has been basely and ungenerously attacked by those connected with that uncharitable sheet, the Protector. I will not enter into a defence of his letter, for it is evident to every person of common judgment and honesty that he acted only on the defensive, and that he never attempted, nor ever entertained the remotest idea of infringing the rights of Protestants. His noble and christian-like demeanour is too well known to need defence or commendation at my hands.

If the Bishop of Charlottetown has not attempted to infringe the rights of Protestants, I regret that as much cannot be said of those connected with the Protector, with regard to Catholics. They have "shadowed forth," in unmistakable terms, their intention of depriving Catholics of their political and religious rights. The Protectorites I believe to be closely connected with a society in Nova Scotia called the Protestant Alliance, whose violent attempts against the liberty of Catholics, the Protestant conservative government of that Colony have exposed, in scathing language, for the repression of all liberty-loving citizens. It would have been much better for the conservatives of this Island had they treated the Bible question in the same manner as did their political brethren in Nova Scotia. I do not believe that Mr. Palmer is intolerant with regard to religious matters, or that he is inclined to be a persecutor; but he could not help perceiving that the Protector was desirous of awakening a religious strife in the Island. Why then did he not—he and his colleagues—when they had it in their power, endeavour to avert the threatened storm of rancour and ill-will? He, no doubt, in his heart, reprobated the violent course pursued by that journal; why had he not the moral courage to stand up manfully in his place, and disapprove openly of it, and defend as he should the just rights of all our citizens? Why did he endeavour to introduce a "shall" enactment with regard to the reading of the Bible? Did he wish to infringe the religious rights of Catholics, or did he wish to make political capital out of the Bible question? I have heard one of what is usually called the Family Compact say, that he thought the Bible question a mere political dodge, and I believe such to be the case myself. Any person or persons that would cause directly or indirectly religious dissension, and make use of it as a stepping stone to political power, are unworthy of the confidence of a free people. I hope that next week Protestants and Catholics will show the world that we do not live in the intolerant days of Knox.

By inserting the above in next Monday's Examiner, you will much oblige your humble servant,
Queen's County, June 18, 1858.

LECTOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—Observing in your paper of the 14th instant a grossly impertinent and untruthful letter, signed "William B. Wellner, City Clerk," we beg to intimate, through you, that we will take an early opportunity to lay a plain and unvarnished statement of facts before the citizens of Charlottetown and the public in general, who will do well to suspend their opinion relative to the several matters complained of by Mr. Wellner, until they have seen our version of the affair. Having, in our report to the City Council, dealt as leniently as possible with Mr. Wellner, we will, now, in accordance with his own suggestions, "out with the truth."

We are, sir, your obedient servants,
J. W. MORRISON,
DANIEL DAVIES.

Charlottetown, June 19, 1858.

(FOR THE EXAMINER.)

"£1000 reward." Such is one of the sentences by which the editors of the Protector head one of their proclamations. The heading, of course, is likely to attract attention; just as a poor frail one would, in the streets of London at midnight, accost the passer-by with some startling announcement to detain him while she plied her poisonous words. The "reward" is a swindle. It is offered for proof of certain Catholic doctrines. But what kind of proof? Proof before whom? Who is to be the umpire? If he be a Protestant, he cannot be pronounced unbiassed; if a Catholic, he cannot be said to be uninterested. Is he to be an Infidel? What evidence will be admissible? Evidence of the senses, or evidence of mere human reason? "Is Christianity itself as capable of demonstration as a problem in geometry, or a question in the rule of three?" In fact the swindlers know they can never be called upon to pay what they offer, yet never mean to hand over; but the thing does well enough to make empty sound. The low subterfuge is distasteful to all respectable Protestants in this community.

They (the editors) ignore tradition, and believe that the Bible is the whole rule of faith. I believe in tradition, and I know by Scripture that we only possess a portion of the Sacred Writings. "Jesus saith to him: because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed." John, c. 20, v. 29. Jesus Christ has bestowed upon His Church a mouth to utter and wisdom to declare all His will and council: so that whatever she declareth for truth must not be doubted, and whatever she commandeth must necessarily be obeyed. "For I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist or gainsay." Luke, c. 31, v. 15. Again He has said: "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth Him that sent me." Luke, c. 10, v. 16; Matthew, c. 10, v. 16; John, c. 13, v. 20. So take care, reverend editors, what you are about. Christ never wrote any of his doctrines himself; and I will feel obliged if you will point out where he commanded his disciples to commit any part of them to writing. How did the primitive Church do for many years before the writing of the New Testament was perfected? Ireneus bears testimony to the fact that "one hundred and fifty years after Christ many nations lived christianly, and godly also, without the use of the written Word at all," only by the guide of the Apostolic tradition. St. Augustine says: "Many articles are not found in the writings of the Apostles, nor in the Councils of following ages, yet because they are held by the whole Church, they are esteemed to have been delivered and commended by the said Apostles." Where, reverend sirs, is it written that the Holy Ghost should be adored? It is not written anywhere, yet you hold it as an article of faith. St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, declares plainly that he gave them commandments and instructions which are not written; and the necessity of unwritten traditions has been proven by the Holy Fathers Epiphanius, Basil, Chrysostom and others. St. Paul, in his second epistle to the Thessalonians, says: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle." Chap. 2, v. 4. St. Chrysostom says, by this saying of St. Paul, it is manifest that the Apostles did not deliver all things by their epistles, but that they also delivered many things without writing which are as worthy to be believed as those things which they left written, and therefore, let us esteem the traditions of the Church to be worthy of faith and credit.

Now, reverend sirs, I ask you in the name of common sense (your principal standard), do you really think that God's divine law leaves us subject to the draft of a pen, and that unless it be written it must lose all credit and estimation? What proof have you of the proceeding of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son, as from one beginning,—that the Father is unbegotten,—that the Mother remained a perpetual virgin,—that Sunday ought to be kept holy,—that Easter Day should always be celebrated on Sunday,—and other such like, unless the observation of holy tradition and the authority of the Church? How, reverend gentlemen, are those heretics to be disproved, who denied all the Four Gospels? How do you know there are four Gospels, neither more nor less, unless by the traditions of the Holy Catholic Church? How are those four gospels to be rejected which are attributed to the Apostles Thaddeus, Barnabas, Bartholomew and Andrew? I would like to hear you answer some of these questions. You receive the Scripture upon the bare authority of the Church, and of unwritten traditions you have no other grounds; yet you condemn such like traditions, notwithstanding that without their help you would have no Scripture at all. Such conduct as this, my dear sirs, is both absurd and inconsistent.

I must now take leave of you, and with these remarks, dismiss you for the present.
Queen's County, June, 1858.

J. K. B.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR,—The Protector of Thursday has a leading article designated "The Struggle," the principal effect of which is to torture the present political crisis into a "struggle between Romanism and Protestantism." How disappointed must its reverend editors have been yesterday, when, congregated as they were for the occasion at the door of their printing office, they could not hear reported one word indicating religious hostility from the mouths of even their pet candidates, or indeed proposers, secondors, or candidates of any kind. How small they must feel—how conscious that their efforts to create hostility have been defeated by the whole population—Catholic as well as Protestant. I rejoice to see, now it has been fairly tested, that they (the Protector people) are impotent to set man in array against his brother. Neither can they persuade the Protestants that they and their religion is in any danger from Popish aggression. Their political efforts—for they are nothing else—have proved a failure. But I now come to their religious character. Surely it amounts to blasphemy to invoke the Holy Scriptures for the sake of setting man against his fellow-mortals. At all events, I who consider myself as faithful a Protestant as any one of their Reverences, and Reverences so called, have not so learned Christ—He who is my Master, (I know not whether he is theirs), the mild and merciful Saviour, would have us united as one fold under one shepherd. It was His divine will to lead His sheep, though of different flocks, into the one refreshing pasture of His redeeming love. It is the aim, impotent though it be, of the Protector people to scatter these flocks to the four winds. Nay, more, to array them in hostility against each other—an attempt, oh, how unorthodox of God's ministers! But, as I said before, the effort has signally failed; and so disgusted are truly moderate and tolerant Christians with their career, that it may be fearlessly asserted, the political cause which they have laboured hard to serve has suffered by the increasing abhorrence that exists at their machinations. In fact, they have really influenced "the struggle," and have been, though contrary to their design, the best friends to the Liberal candidates; uniting all men, of all religions, against the dangerous attempt to disturb the peace of the whole Island.

I hope the Liberals, and I particularly address the Roman Catholics, will continue to feel assured that the constitution of their country is sufficiently strong to protect them even against these wicked apostles, and continue to preserve, without an exception, that quiet and peaceable demeanour which will be sure to give them a victory. But let not the Liberals be deceived into the notion that the Tory candidates to whom I refer are acting under any conviction. They would, one and all, exclaim to-morrow, "the Bible, the Bible," could they get a vote by it. Not their convictions or prudence

has closed their mouths, but the sovereign will of a constituency who have seen through the flimsy disguise in which political objects have been dressed up for the purpose of personating a religious character. I am yours truly,
A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
Charlottetown, June 18, 1858.

ADDRESS TO THE REVEREND PETER MCINTYRE, P.P., TIGNISH.

The esteemed and zealous pastor of the R. C. Church at Tignish, being about to make a tour of the European Continent, for the benefit of his health, in course of which he will visit the Eternal City, has been presented with the following Farewell Address by his parishioners:—

TO THE REVEREND PETER MCINTYRE, PARISH PRIEST OF TIGNISH.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—We, the Catholics of Tignish and the surrounding settlements, having heard of your intended departure from this parish, beg to assure you that this unexpected intelligence has created in us feelings to which no words can give adequate expression.

Any circumstance that would deprive us of your presence, even for a short period, must be cause of regret to us all; but on the present occasion we cannot but rejoice at your intended tour, when we hope that it may be the means of restoring that vigorous health which has been impaired by your unceasing exertions to advance our spiritual welfare.

The zealous and paternal manner in which you have discharged your arduous duties during the fifteen years you have been amongst us, has so deeply impressed the hearts of your parishioners, as to excite the liveliest emotions at your contemplated separation from them. Ever at hand to respond to the calls of duty—fearless of cold and tempest, you risked every exposure to afford that consolation to the sick and dying which a Catholic Priest alone can give, and by which you have won not only the love and esteem of your humble flock, but secured to yourself, we trust, that fadless crown which is the inheritance of the just made perfect.

Reverend and dear Sir—With the charge of four parishes, one of which is the largest in the diocese, your zeal and devotion to the interests of your flock were as conspicuous in the remotest confines of your mission, as in the immediate vicinity of your residence. The large brick church now in course of erection, and the various other evidences of your zeal and perseverance, will be enduring monuments of your piety and of your labours in the service of our Holy Church. To your unwearied efforts on our behalf, we must attribute the injury to your health; and in view of these efforts, we may you exclaim with the Psalmist: "The zeal of thy house, O Lord, hath eaten me up."

And now, Reverend Sir, we must reluctantly and painfully bid you farewell, and we hope that your separation from us will be of short duration. It would be vain for us to attempt to enumerate the inestimable advantages conferred by you as a Priest, or to describe the kind acts, good advice, and friendly interference by which you have sought to improve our social condition, during the long period you have resided amongst us. We feel assured that you will give us credit for a sincere and grateful appreciation of them all, and believe that our most fervent prayers will be addressed to the Throne of grace and mercy for your temporal and spiritual welfare—for your speedy restoration to health, and for your early and happy reunion with us.

Reverend and dear Sir, your obedient servants,
STANISLAUS F. PERRY, J.P. ARTHUR DOYLE,
NICHOLAS CONROY, J.P. CHARLES ARSNEUX,
FLORENCE MCCARTHY, BENJAMIN WAITE,
JOSEPH RICHARD, THOMAS BRENNARD,
MICHAEL READY, NEIL GILLIS,
HUBERT GAUDET, EDWARD FOLEY,
JOHN CHAISSON, SYLVIAN GALLANT.
Signed on behalf of the Parishioners of Tignish and adjacent districts.

(REPLY.)

MY DEAR FRIENDS,—With sincere gratification and thankfulness I receive your too flattering address. When I reflect upon the many acts of kindness which I have experienced during my sojourn of fifteen years among you, I cannot but regret the necessity of this separation, which is no less painfully felt by me than is expressed by yourselves. The impaired state of my health requires a change of climate for a while. Though this separation may have its sorrows, yet it is not void of consolation, as it shows, by this address, that my anxious desires to fulfil faithfully the duties of my sacred ministry have not been unappreciated by you, and that as kind and faithful parishioners, you deserved all the respect and solicitude which I, as your pastor, could bestow upon you.

You have kindly alluded to the labours and difficulties I have had to encounter during my stay among you; but I have been cheered on, and my labours were lightened by the readiness with which you always co-operated with me, by your generous contributions and indefatigable energy in behalf of our new brick church.

The feelings of respect and affection which have been this day manifested towards me, I fully reciprocate; and I sincerely hope that harmony and mutual good will may continue to dwell among you; and be assured that wherever I may be, Tignish and my old friends and faithful parishioners will be uppermost in my thoughts.

I will now bid you farewell, with the wish that all the happiness attainable in this world may be yours, and in the hope that we all may meet again, and continue that mutual feeling of attachment and respect which so happily at present subsists between us. Once more farewell, and may God bless you.
PETER MCINTYRE.

Tignish, June 8th, 1858.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., JUNE 21, 1858.

THE DESPATCHES.

THE *Islander* of Friday last contains a lengthy article in reference to some despatches which have passed between the Secretary for the Colonies and His Excellency the Lieut. Governor, on the subject of the Loan Bill and other measures which have been under the consideration of our local Legislature. Those despatches were printed by order of the House of Commons, prior to Lord Stanley proposing the Imperial guarantee for the Loan, and two or three copies were sent to this Colony, one of which is now in our possession. The editor of the *Islander* has obtained the copy which was placed in the Exchange Rooms, and ostentatiously parades extracts from some of the despatches, as if the public had never seen them before. If he will turn to the Appendix to the Journal of our Assembly for 1856, he will find some of the documents from which he has quoted, and which were long ago the subject of discussion in the Legislature, and were commented on at the time by the press of this Colony. In unearthing those old documents, the *Islander*—true to its tactics in former years, when Sir H. V. Huntley and Sir A. Bannerman were vilified because they would not lend their influence in England to promote the designs of the Tory party—has complimented the present Governor by directing against His Excellency a considerable amount of personal abuse. If anything were wanting to establish the well-merited popularity of Sir Dominick, it is the abuse and misrepresentation of such a paper as the *Islander*—the worthy organ of the discomfited Tory faction.