...EWS
...rought
...s:
...e to say
...hould not do.
...ll be determined
...sideration of all the
...s. Meanwhile the first
... our duties is *to finish the re-*
...blockade at once, by employing the
... and most efficacious means."

The Times says that it the English Government, as the London Times states, admits Capt. Wilkes' right to visit and search the Trent, but insists that he should have taken her into a prize court for adjucation, "we are by no means sure that our Government will not concur at once in this opinion." The Times adds:

"In our opinion, England and the world may rely upon it, that in this matter, as in every other, the public peace will not be disturbed or hazarded by any persistence of the American Government in an unjust and unwarranted public act. If the act of Capt. Wilkes was not in conformity with public law, it will be disavowed. And in deciding this point our Government will not be affected, either by the unworthy sentiments so lavishly imputed to it by the English Press, or by the more ignoble apprehension lest doing right should be imputed to a wrong motive. We see it rumoured that the Emperor of France has tendered his mediation in this instance. It is a case peculiarly fitted to such a mode of settlement—and we see no reason why, if offered, it should not be accepted. But we do not believe it will be needed. We have full faith in the wisdom and the justice of our Government, and believe that if war with England can be avoided with honor, they will have no difficulty in finding the means of doing it.—Nor do we see anything in this case, in its present aspect, to render a pacific adjustment perfectly compatible with the honor of both nations."

The Herald thinks there is no need of getting excited over the news. *It says:*

"All this excitement has been produced in England by the agitation of the cotton merchants, the politicians and manufacturers in want of the raw material, demanding instant reparation of this alleged outrage to the British flag; and the government, feeling the necessity of doing something in consequence of the pressure of the tory party upon them, have taken the strong position reported in this news. Every one who understands the relations of the British Government to the people will at once see the reason of this diplomatic move. But on carefully reading over the opinions of the leading English newspapers, it is manifest that they have a very bad case, and that it will be a very difficult thing for them to establish their right in the eyes of the world. The right of belligerents to board neutrals has been conceded by England for more than a century, and it is part of her maritime code, insisted upon by her for years; and so patent is this fact that the London Post and London Times had already decided the matter in our favor, although the latter journal said that this event called for a new code.

"The continental powers of Europe, including France and Russia, will exult over this transaction with undisguised pleasure. It is a telling blow at the prestige of England's absolutism on the sea, and hence the indignation in London, Liverpool and Manchester. The United States government, in assuming the responsibility attaching to this Mason and Slidell seizure, at this crisis of a continental domestic war, cannot be weak or doubtful of the issue; and such will be the general opinion of Europe. We dare say that essentially we shall command the respect of the sober second thought of England herself. We incline to think that her sagacious statesmen will soon realize the fact that England's only route to our southern cotton fields leads through the city of Washington, and that it is safer to consent to the restoration of our Union than to risk the possible European consequences of intervention to achieve our destruction, however desirable this may be, in view of the future control of the affairs of North America.

"Meantime we are confident that this Mason-Slidell affair, without interrupting our relations of peace with England, will have a great moral effect in favor of our government and our cause throughout the European continent; but if England is determined, in spite of her own code and long practice, to make demands upon this government such as are indicated by the London Observer, she must of course assume all the responsibility of a war between the two nations. It will not probably enter the mind of a single American for a moment, even after reading the news in our columns to-day, that Mason and Slidell will be surrendered to the English government."

The Boston *Herald* of the 19th inst., says:—
The savage tone of the English press and people has aroused a deep and determined feeling throughout this country. Messrs. [illegible]lidell and Mason will not be [illegible] to Great Britain under any [illegible]stances. The arrogant tone of the English press will only serve to unite us the more firmly together and to prepare the nation for any emergency."

THE AMERICAN HUMBLE PIE.

The braggadocia of the Northern Press has been so marked and offensive with respect to the seizure of Mason and Slidell that we cannot be surprised to see the Federal Government satirized and quizzed is the most unmerciful manner, until some new cause for excitement shall arrise; and we believe there are not many persons in the Provinces who will manifest much sympathy for the victims under the trying ordeal. The St. John Freeman of the 3rd instant, has the following short but caustic article on the release of the Southern Commissioners:—

We have all become accustomed to the announcement, in terms the most grandiloquent, that the Federal army had won a glorious victory and had retreated in good order.

A victory we have already seen celebrated in the most extravagant style. All the cities, all the great talkers in the Union, seemed to vie with one another in extolling the glorious achievement of Capt. Wilkes.

Now we have the retreat and who shall describe it? Believe the American chroniclers and the repulse at Big Bethel, and the rout at Bull's Run were glorious feats. Believe Mr. Seward and the surrender of Mason and Slidell is a magnificent success; the consummation of the wishes of the United States, the establishment of a great principle for which they had long contended.

And yet it is a retreat; a disgraceful rout; an ignominious flight; a total collapse of brag and bluster and blather. Mr. Seward can not himsel believe a word of it. The people of the United States; the people of England; the people of the whole world will see in it a concession made by terror to force of that which justice would never have conceded to right without a fleet and an army at its back. Better, a thousand times better for his own reputation sake, for the honour of the country that he had made no such silly effort to cover with idle words the true character of this surrender.

Bitterly should the United States rue the day when the miserable faction now in office got the controul of the country. Heavy is the price, in division and discord, debt and bloodshed, humiliation and degradation, they have to pay for their fanaticism and intolerance, their Know Nothingism and Black Republicanism. Exeter Hall has for some years been the real seat of government of some of the States, and it extended its sway until its minions became the rulers of the whole land, and lo! the results. Was ever a proud people so humiliated? was ever a great nation brought so low? was ever so glorious a destiny so marred? Swift indeed has been the stroke of retributive justice; but it may be that this very swiftness will prove the greatest mercy.

The people of the Province accustomed to the workings of Responsible Government, can not understand how, after what has happened, Seward and Wilkes and Cameron can remain in office; how the people can endure them any longer.

The Burnt District of Charleston.—The New York Herald says:

"This portion of Charleston comprises the most compact and all the business parts of the city, except some wholesale houses northward. Nearly all the public buildings were consumed; and should the fire extend in the direction in which it was moving at last accounts, it would sweep the entire of the fashionable residences down to Ashley river. It appears that the docks and warehouses along the Cooper river had not been touched, owing to the wind blowing from that direction. But the fire had crossed the eastern side of Broad street, and should it proceed in that direction the destruction would be immense, as very many of the buildings are frame in that quarter. The city generally contains so many frame buildings as to partly account for the extensive nature of the conflagration. The high wind did the rest.

Among the buildings included in the burnt district are two iron foundries, one of them lately employed in the manufacture of cannon, and the other in making cannon balls and shells. Several churches and nearly all the public buildings, banks, ...

King street is the chief street of the city, and was the Broadway of Charleston, though not much improved in its buildings. Broad street was a very important street, containing newspaper offices, banks, insurance offices, stores, &c. There is no evidence of the fire having extended south of the post office, in Broad street. East Bay street contained all the offices of the cotton factors and leading commission merchants. It is the nearest street to Cooper River, running parralled with it. The short streets which run down from it to the docks also contain important offices and warehouses. Meeting street contains the Mills House, Charleston Hotel, Institute Hall, the market and the theatre. The market stands upon the easterly side of Meeting street. The different departments are devoted to beef, vegetables, fruit, and fish, and are separate and commodious. The main building is of stone, and was erected in 1841."

THE LATE PRINCE CONSORT.

The papers received by the steamship Asia, as mentioned in another column, are filled with obituary and biographical notices of the late Prince Consort. Colonial and foreign papers are also replete with comments on the loss the British Sovereign and her people have sustained by the demise of his Royal Highness. Indeed, from all parts of the world from which we have heard, but one opinion is expressed. From men and journals of every shade of difference—social, political and religious—there has gone forth

"A long low distant murmur of dread sound,
Such as arises when a nation bleeds
With some deep and immedicable wound."

The rapid progress of the fatal malady and its unexpected termination, have impressed the general heart with feelings akin to those experienced by individuals who have lost a friend or relation; nor is it to be wondered at that such should be the case. Elevated by the personal preference of a deservedly beloved Sovereign to the position of her husband, his life in that relation had disarmed jealousies—had conciliated national and personal antipathies, and gained for him the affectionate respect of a people not prone to lavish their esteem upon foreigners raised to a high position among them. This result the deceased achieved, and the whole tenor of his wedded life, while it formed a model of domestic purity and happiness, had the public benefit of its example to the world, that the most exalted station, the most ample wealth, are not incompatible with the proper discharge of the virtues which give their lustre to the charmed circle of those of low estate.

When we consider that the death of the Prince is regarded as a national affliction—when we reflect that far away mid "regions of thick ribbed ice," the fur clad Esquimaux will sorrow, because he shall hear that Franklin's Queen turns a widow's eye upon her children—that the swarth denizen who dwells beyond the Indus will grieve for the affliction which has fallen to the lot of the Empress of Hindostan,—who shall depict the anguish of her soul as she,

"———bent her o'er the dead
Ere the first day of death had fled—
The first dark day of nothingness—
The last of danger and distress;
Before decay's effacing fingers
Have swept the lines where beauty lingers,
And marked the mild, angelic air—
The rapture of repose that's there."

The shock occasioned by the death of His Royal Highness has been, of course, intensified by the consideration of the fact that, in the prime of life, with no known tendency to disease—with every human adjunct to make life last till the three score and ten—his day and generation should have passed away so early and unexpectedly. Had his years bowed his limbs—had a feeble constitution betrayed the ambush of the spoiler, we might not have been so grieved; but the British pe[illegible]ple in reference to this sad event may ado[illegible]pt the lines of Scott:

"The hand of th[illegible]
Takes th[illegible]e reaper
Bu[illegible] ears that are hoary,
[illegible] the voice of the weeper
Wails manhood in glory;
The autumn wind rushing
Take the leaves that are searest,
But our flower was in flushing,
When blighting was nearest."

The youthful heir to the throne will, we presume, have his attention turned to the public business and relations of the Empire more than hitherto, as his father's death will render his personal intercourse more necessary to the Queen than it has been; and we shall have cause for thankfulness if his conduct in the high destiny which we may presume awaits him, shall be found to justify the anticipations of the nation, which asks of their future monarch but that he may approve himself worthy of his parents, who have done all that in them lay to make him fit for the eminent station to which he has been born.

The late Prince was remarkable for the possession of strong practical sense, which was always available to discriminate between the position of a foreigner, married to the Queen of a country possessing a constitutional Government, and that of a husband using the influence of his position to interfere with the public affairs of that country. It is true that several years since a report was circulated, and by many believed, that Prince Albert had improperly transmitted intelligence of an important nature to the Prussian Court; and for a moment his popularity waned; but as the moon emerges only the brighter from the temporary obscuration caused by the passing cloud, his character stood higher than before, from the reaction consequent on the proof of the injustice of the accusation.

His patronage of art—his exertions for the improvement and extension of education—his devotion to the mental and moral culture of his children—the dignity and courtesy of his demeanor—have made his death a public calamity, and will vindicate to posterity his right to have his name inscribed, not in the Valhalla of the destroyers of their kind, but in that true Temple of Fame where the real benefactors of their race have their memories enshrined.

Although the record of the life of the warrior who has faced death in all its varied forms, on field and wave, takes a strong hold upon the imagination, by reason of the daring or the suffering it represents, the advancing intelligence of the age is appreciating those laurels which are not stained with blood; and we feel assured that while the memories of Nelson, Wellington, and her hosts of military heroes, will be cherished by Britons, as long as Britain shall last, the souvenirs of Prince Albert will be fondly cherished as those of one

"Who fell not in climbing the icy steep
Which ambition delights to scale;
For the deeds of his arm not a widow shall weep,
Nor an orphan her father bewail."

LOYALTY OF IRISH CATHOLICS.

Not satisfied with having done his best to insult and malign the Catholics of this Island, Mr. Secretary Pope—whom the Catholics help to support—has, in the last *Islander*, attempted to fasten the stigma of disloyalty, and something worse, on Irish Catholics in America. He could not allude to the liberation of the Southern Commissioners, and the re-establishment of peaceful relations between Great Britain and the United States without making the following foul aspersion on the whole Catholic community:—

"The sensible men of the Republic surely can have no desire to engage in a war with England. Those who regret that such a war has been averted, will, in our estimation, be found among the vilest of the population of a country which counts amongst its citizens the expatriated villains of every portion of the Old World.

"The two millions of Irish Catholics will, we presume—judging from the tone of the articles in some of the United States papers, in the Nation, and from the proceedings at the recent mass meeting held in Dublin—be most especially disappointed when they see they will have longer to wait for that day, "which their fathers' eyes were hot to see"—the day on which they will be afforded an opportunity of fighting against England."

There is no doubt that the choice expressions "expatriated villians," were intended for Catholics generally, in all parts of the British American possessions, as well as for the "two millions" in the United States. We have not the shadow of proof that any considerable number of the Britain, or are disappointed that it is not likely to occur. None of the Catholic organs in America, that we have seen, breathe anything like the insane spirit of hostility to England, or the bluster and bravado of American prowess, which characterise the journals under the control of native born citizens of the Northern States. The "expatriated villains" may not love England too well, on account of the oppressions which drove them from their native soil; but they have sense enough to know that a foreign war at the present time would be disastrous to their adopted country and to themselves, who would be largely engaged in it, and that the nation which they might wish to see humiliated would only emerge from the contest with fresh laurels and renovated power. With an impression of this kind on their minds, we should suppose that the Irish Catholics in the States rejoice that there is no occasion for a war with Great Britain.

As regards the Irish Catholics in the Colonies, it will take an abler man than William H. Pope to prove a charge of disloyalty against them. The visit of the Prince of Wales gave rise to remarkable illustrations of their character in all the Provinces, eminently creditable to them, while the same event showed how hollow, selfish and worthless was the loyalty of many of their religious opponents. The feelings of the Irish Catholics of Canada have been always considered a fair indication of the spirit which animates their brethren in the other Provinces, and it is fortunate that we can now adduce testimony to prove the genuine loyalty of this maligned body from the pen of a gentleman who might be supposed to encourage sentiments far different from those that are cherished by faithful subjects of the Queen. Mr. Thomas Darcy McGee, who was conspicuous some years ago for his strong attachment to, and his defence of the principles of the defunct Young Ireland Party, and who is now a member of the Canadian Parliament—has recently published a letter in which we find the following remarkable passage:

"I declare most absolutely, and it is well the opponents of Canada should know the fact in time, that the Irish inhabitants of this province will be found embattled as one man in defence of the Canadian Constitution and the imperial connection. To those who do not know Canada—who do not know the ample freedom we enjoy, social, civil and religious; who do not know how many institutions sacred to an Irishman's worship, and dear to an Irishman's sense of equality, are found flourishing on this soil, the declaration I have made may be deemed doubtful or exaggerated. But I repeat solemnly, and most absolutely, that I know what I say to be the literal and exact truth. There is hardly a group of Irish settlers in Upper or Lower Canada that I have not personally visited during the last four or five years. There is not a man of note amongst them, laymen or cleric, that I have not met, and I declare that I have yet to meet the first man of all those bodies and orders of men who does not frankly and loyally prefer our Canadian institutions to those of the United States. Formerly, I believe, it was different with many among them (as I own it was some years ago with myself); but since the era of "the Know Nothing" movement, the last vestige of political preference for the United States has disappeared among the Irish here. There is, and I think there ought to be, a warm good will toward the Federal cause in its integrity; there is a natural interest felt in the Irish contingent in the Federal army; there is a keen and exquisitely painful sense that a war on our frontier with the Northern States would be for the Irish, in truth, a fratricidal war; but for all this no Irishmen in Canada will hold back from the defence of his own soil, and if other Irishmen—misled by false reports of our discontent—should come here as invaders, their blood be upon their own heads, not on ours!"

As to the loyalty of the Catholics of Ireland at the present time, the declarations of their Bishops and Archbishops—whose mission it is to guide their flocks in the perf[illegible] duties to society as well as in [illegible] purely spiritual affairs—will be accepted [illegible]s good testimony on behalf of the Catho[illegible] people of their own country. We are indebted to the Fredericton "Head Quarters," a Protestant paper, for the following apropos selection:—

Loyalty of the Irish Hierarchy.—The London Tablet gives the subjoined extracts from the addresses of the Bishops of Ireland to their several flocks.

The Apostolic Delegate and Primate of Ireland, the Archbishop of Ireland, the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, says:—

"No grievances, no afflictions, will induce us to join in chanting the praises of sedition and rebellion. We shall ever be good and faithful subjects, not through any romantic or absurd sentimentality, but through principle, and for conscience sake. The writers in the English press seem to think that we are all conspirators, and that we desire nothing so much as a French invasion. I am persuaded that every man in Ireland would look upon any foreign invasion as the greatest calamity that could befal the country."

The Primate of All Ireland, the Archbishop of Armagh, the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, says:—

"Of Her Most Gracious Majesty, whom may God long preserve, she has no more loyal subjects than we are."

The Archbishop of Cashel, the Most Rev. Dr. Leahy, says:—

"We know how to preserve inviolate the allegiance we owe to the Queen as our only temporal Sovereign; and to none of Her Majesty's subjects do we yield in obedience to her authority."

The Bishop of Limerick, the Right Rev. Dr. Ryan, says:—

"The people would prove themselves to be not only good citizens and loyal subjects, but sincere and pious Christians. Let no one imagine that it is not part and parcel of Catholic discipline and Catholic morality to obey the chief authorities in the State."

The Bishop of Cork, the Right Rev. Dr. Delaney, says:—

"We need not delay in declaring our loyalty to the gracious Sovereign beneath whose sceptre these great realms are governed."

The Bishop of Ossory, the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, speaks:—

"Of Catholic Ireland, with five millions of faithful and loyal subjects, ready to maintain with their blood and lives, if necessary, their kingdom and their Queen against foreign invasion."

The Bishop of Galway, the Right Rev. Dr. MacEvilly, says:—

"We will yield to no other portion of our fellow subjects in sentiments of undivided allegiance to the gracious Sovereign of these realms. From the dictates of duty we never fail to proclaim, with the Apostle, that obedience voluntarily, interior, hearty obedience, was to be tendered to all persons who were placed in high authority over them, and this not only to those who wielded the supreme, but also *the subordinate occupiers of authority*, governors, and magistrates, so long as they inculcated nothing evil, and outstripped not the limits of their authority. For not only is the temporal power from God, but the different gradations and species, and distributions of governing authority are also arranged by Him, and exist by his sanction and ordinance."

The Bishop of Elphin, the Right Rev. Dr. Gillooley, says:—

"We have always been dutiful subjects of the British Crown. Allegiance to our gracious Queen is with us a duty prescribed by allegiance, and strictly enforced by the Church."

The Bishop of Ferns, the Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, says:—

"The history of the Irish people proved that they were, as they ever would be, faithful to her gracious Majesty."

These expressions of the Hierarchy of Ireland are surely worthy of more consideration, as indicating the loyal spirit of the Irish Catholics, than the silly meeting which was held at the Rotundo in Dublin, to which the Islander has referred, but in which no man of note or influence appears to have taken any part. The fact of The O'Donohue being the Chairman of the meeting, manifested the absurdity of the movement. His ancestral acres procured for this gentleman a seat in Parliament, but he has never passed for any thing better there than a half crazy enthusiast.

Now, let us see how the Irish and English Catholics in England feel under the awful calamity which has lately fallen upon the Royal Family, an event which was eminently calculated to bring out the devotional feelings of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. The London "Weekly Register and Catholic Standard," is, perhaps, the ablest paper of the kind published in the world—not even excepting the Tablet: it represents not merely the opinions of the Catholics of England, but may be said to speak the sentiments of the whole body throughout the Empire. This paper, in noticing the death of the Prince Consort, for whom all its columns are in mourning, thus bears testimony to the sympathy of the Catholic community for Her Majesty in this hour of her affliction:—

"We are confident that in this awful hour she will not want the earnest prayers of her Catholic subjects. The Cardinal-Archbishop, making use of the opportunity which the freedom of our position gives us, sent out a Pastoral as soon as any anxiety was felt, calling for their prayers for the recovery of the Prince, for the sake alike of Her Majesty and of His own virtues, so highly appreciated by the country. This was read at the earlier Masses on Sunday As the morning advanced, the fatal termination of the disease became known. We have no doubt that a similar step would have been taken in the Established Church. But the rapid progress of the disease made it impossible to obtain an order from the Queen in Council, without which the Protestant Bishops are not allowed to give such directions."

We read in the same paper, under the editorial

which, we think, is the most graceful and eloquent tribute to his memory we have yet seen in any of the public journals. Though it gives some inconvenience, owing to our limited space, we must make room for the following extracts:—

The manner in which the death of Prince Albert has been received leaves a loyal subject nothing to desire. Every shop has been partially closed, and the purchase of mourning by the humbler classes of society (to say nothing of those who usually follow the example of the Court) has been universal, far beyond precedent. Men's minds have been thrown back forty-four years, when the heiress of the throne, the wife of the deceased Prince's uncle, was taken scarcely more suddenly. The impression then made has never been forgotten. It was caused by the natural sympathy of all kindly natures with one cut off in a moment when just entering life, with every promise of so brilliant a future, and by what was known of the happiness of her few months of married life. Perhaps, moreover, the extreme and justly-merited unpopularity of her father, and the whole history of his life, acted, no doubt, as a foil to the early promise of his child. We have now lost a possession, not a hope. The subjects of Queen Victoria especially pride themselves upon the practice of the domestic virtues. Many of them go so far as to doubt whether real family life can be found on the Continental side of the Channel. Specially, therefore, did they rejoice that Her own family circle was the model of an English household. Perhaps comparatively few have felt till now how much we are indebted for this great benefit to the personal character and conduct of the Prince Consort. Those who can remember his marriage, need not be reminded that, remembering the conduct of the son of George III, men looked with gloomy forebodings to another series of scandals, vices, and family quarrels. Such an expectation showed nothing cynical. What was naturally to be looked for in a man of twenty, placed suddenly and without preparation in a position of the highest wordly prosperity, with no causes of anxiety and care, in the absolute disposal of an immense income upon which there was hardly a call; with no regular business or profession to employ his energies and occupy his leisure, and placed at the head of a splendid and luxurious Court? Perhaps no one had ever before been in exactly the same position; but many had been in one somewhat resembling it, and we doubt whether an instance could have been found of one who had not either thrown public affairs into confusion by an ill-regulated ambition, or devoted himself to what is called a life of pleasure. Moreover, even English Protestants felt that a German Protestant Court and a German University were not likely to have supplied a religious raining qualified to counteract all these dangers. And yet Prince Albert has conducted himself with so much discretion, that only once or twice has he ever been charged with any undue interference with public affairs, and never has there been so much as a breath of scandal against his domestic virtues, or those of the Royal family. On this head he has received less than justice, and England is now learning, almost with surprise, how much of the high moral tone of the Court she owes to the husband of her Queen. We may add that although the education of the Prince had of necessity imbued him with religious tendencies, which could not but be disapproved not by Catholics alone, but by any one who held consistently the doctrines professed even by the Protestant Establishment. Yet even here the progress of his own mind had been in a better direction, and it is mentioned as a proof of this, that he strongly disapproved the publication, lately so notorious, of the "Essays and Reviews." His personal character was distinguished by unsullied purity, the faithful discharge of all relative obligations, an unmistakeable love of truth, and a high sense of duty. Our country must sink much lower than it even has, before these qualities will cease to be highly valued among us. For the rest, the subjects to which he has devoted himself, and with which his name is connected, were well and wisely selected. The education of his children was his most immediate duty; and it is well known that he made it his first object. After this, came the patronage of Science and Art. The Great Exhibition of 1851 was peculiarly his own; and the testimony of competent judges unanimously declares that the schools and exhibitions of art, of which he was the author, have already changed the character of English manufactures. * * * * *

So far as appears from the public papers, one person alone seems as yet to have remembered that the very existence of the Prince, for whom these Islands are mourning, has not passed away like a falling leaf. That is the Catholic Bishop of Troy, whose earnest expression of his hopes for the happiness of the Prince is said to have drawn tears from the congregation at Chelsea on Sunday. Whether we are to consider the notice in the [illegible]dard, the representative of the High Church party in the Es[illegible]ment, as another exception, our readers must judge. It seems to savor of the spirit-rapping doctrine rather than of Christianity. It proposes that we should all "pray that his mighty shade may still walk hand in hand with the Royal partner whom he loved so faithfully and so well."

We might say much more on Catholic loyalty, but we shall not mar the beauty of the above extracts by further remarks of our own.

SOIREE OF THE CHARLOTTETOWN READING ROOM AND DEBATING CLUB.

The Tea Soiree in aid of the funds of this Institution came off on Tuesday evening, the 31st Dec. last. As regards the number present, we regret to say the Soiree cannot be considered as successful; but this was to be attributed, we think, rather to the evening chosen, and other causes, than to any want of interest in the welfare of the Institution. A little after 8 o'clock, the intellectual part of the entertainment commenced by Mr. W. Murphy taking the Chair, and addressing a few very appropriate remarks on the importance of the Institution—the very great increase in the number of its present members as compared with its muster roll when first started—the advantages which its Reading Room offered, being superior to any Reading Room ever established in the Island—the progress which especially its junior members had made in the art of speaking, and on various other topics connected with the Society. He was followed by the Hon. E. Whelan, who made a few observations on the importance and advantages of Debating Societies—illustrating his remarks by reference to the career of some distinguished men, who had laid the foundation of their fame in such institutions.

Mr. W. Monk then took the platform, and afforded the company much amusement by reading the humorous trial of Bullem vs. Boatem and Boatem vs. Bullem.

Mr. W. A. Johnston then addressed the audience. He commenced by stating the reasons which had induced him to accede to the request made to him that he should take a part in the proceedings of the evening, and expressing his conviction that it was the duty of every one to contribute his quota, though that quota might be a mite, to all objects having for their aim either the improvement or the rational entertainment of the community. Then apologising for introducing matters of a somewhat personal nature before the company, he in a few observations, marked by an honest indignation, the keenest satire, and most cutting irony, referred to a slander set on foot with regard to his lecture, delivered at that Hall on the Thursday previous, before the Y. M. Christian Association. Mr. Johnston, anxious not to perpetuate unpleasant feelings, has with more generosity than was, perhaps, to be expected under the circumstances, declined to furnish us with these remarks, though, being committed to paper, they are ready at all times to be referred to when required. He then gave this short account of the lecture. It was written by himself, and delivered some six years ago in Halifax, to a very intelligent audience, who received it in a most gratifying manner. It occupied two evenings in its delivery—was publicly and most favorably criticised by Dr. Forrester, a well known scholar and minister of the Free Church in Nova Scotia, the Superintendant of Education, and the Principal of the Normal School in that Province. It was subsequently published in the Provincial Wesleyan paper there. Mr. J. then read from that paper the heading to the lecture, when it appeared with his name and as published by request, and he then stated that for convenience sake he had cut the lecture out of the paper, and pasted in a book, which he had openly and without the slightest attempt at concealment, read from on Thursday evening — the only remarks which were written for that particular occasion being those on the Trent affair, which were written on a distinct sheet of paper. Mr. Johnston here said that he had written to the Chairman, telling him that he would refute this slander at this Soiree, and suggesting his presence if he had either vindication or retraction to make—that he had received a reply from him, admitting that he had given utterance to the aspersion, but in his own house, and that others had said the same thing; and after making some appropriate observations, regretting that a little more charity had not been shown, by which much mischief and unpleasantness would have been avoided, and assuring those present that whatever remarks he at any time should make as his own, would be his own, both as regards sentiment and expression.

Mr. Johnston concluded by the following eloquent observations on Poetry.

This is a purely literary Institution; its objects are to promote the cultivation of the mind, to encourage a taste for reading, a habit of thought, and an aptitude for clothing thought in ready and graceful language; but he might be told by some eminently practical man: "Oh, this is a mere waste of time; it does not encourage the arts, sciences, and mechanics; and some of your poets and men with great brains and lofty genius have committed suicide." Well, after all, he could only reply that the blessings of Providence are pretty equally divided, and if to fall by their own hands is a fate to which men with brains are subject, they who indulge in these sentiments, and object to the cultivation of literature on this ground, may reasonably believe that no such disaster will befall them. Without fear of a suicide's grave for them, they may well hope to live on to a "green old age,"—truly green. There are some men, he continued, who have no poetry in their souls, and can behold no beauty in the outer world—who appreciate not the expressions because they feel not the sentiments with which genius seeks to pour out its perceptions of the beautiful, the noble, the exalted, the sublime; and this is poetry, whether it be in measured verse or not. They would seek to bring every thing down to their own standard of true worth. "What will it fetch? *What money can be made out of it?*" And while they talk about the arts and mechanics, the arts and mechanics which will increase wealth are those only which find any favor in their eyes. "Cui bono?" is their continual cry; to add to the almighty dollar their loftiest aim. All high sentiments—all nobleness of mind—all appreciation of the sublime or beautiful, are crushed out of their ...

"Still all the day their iron wheels go onward,
G[illegible]ding life d[illegible] to its mark;
And the children's souls which God is calling sunward,
Spin on blindly in the dark."

Such sentiments are a slander on nature—a libel on our common humanity. Why, he would ask, if the useful was the aim, the only good—why was nature made so beautiful? Every mere necessary end might have been attained, and yet this fair world have presented no pleasing spot on which the eye might gaze with delight. Why is space hung with those brilliant orbs which sparkle in the coronet of heaven, each one of which is a bright page in the Book of Nature, teaching us that the beautiful as well as the useful was part of the design of the God of Nature? Why, he would ask, was this earth made so beautiful, clothed with its lovely untiring green, its majestic forests, its towering mountains, its undulating valleys? Why does the golden fruit come in so fair a form? Why the beautiful blossom heralding its coming? Why the *graceful waving fields of corn?* Why do the rushing rivers present at every turn new beauties and an endless variety? Why is the ocean at times so grand, so sublime—at times so beautiful, so brilliant—every crested wave sparkling in the sunbeam like a vast expanse of molten fire? Why green Niagara, that avalanche of waters with its never ceasing roll—best emblem of eternity? In this he sees no beauty, but only deplores such a waste of water power—thinks it a good "location" for a mill site; and perhaps with an eye to the main chance, this eminently practical man would seek to make money out of the "Falls," and set up on its bank a "shaving" establishment, and to save the expense of fuel would think to keep himself supplied with "boiling" water from its seething cauldron. In the snowy Alps—in the frowning Drachenfels, whose tops, gray with crumbling ruins, are yet green in the memories of a thousand years—he sees no beauty, because he sees no usefulness. He knows not the charm of music. In the joyous carol of the birds, tuning their hymn of praise to their Maker—in the rush of the foaming torrent—the moan of the sea shore—the gentle ripple breaking on the silvery strand—the angry dash of the waves against the storm beaten rock—the gentle hum of nature on a stilly summer's eve—in the breeze sighing through the leafless forests, or in the "night winds," as they "creep from leaf to leaf"—in all these he hears no music—he perceives no beauty, because he hears not in all the sweet clink of the dollar. The God of Nature, when he made this world, (Mr J. continued) and he spoke it with all reverence, was a poet—his heart was full of poetry and sublimity. This fair world was the poetry of God materialized. But another objection is, that poetry is not piety, wrapping himself up in the Nessus robe of austerity, which, because it deceives himself, he fondly imagines will deceive others, and Him also "who searches the heart"—this "over righteous" man tells us there is no religion in poetry, and therefore Christians and Christian Associations should not encourage its growth. This is a libel not on Nature, Mr. Johnston said, but on his God; for God's word is full of the loftiest poetry. Listen to the sublime musings of Job—the magnificent poetry of Isaiah—the sweet warblings of David—and as this "overrighteous" man would say, and his fellow men, "I am holier than thou," so in his heart he says to his God, "I am of better judgment than thou, to cultivate a love of poetry, in which thou hast seen fit to communicate a portion of thy word to us is a mere waste of time." I stand here to-night, said Mr. Johnston, and in the name of our common nature, whose best and purest feelings give the lie to this utter utilitarianism—in the name of this fair world, whose every spot proclaims the libel, and with all reverence, in the name of Him who has implanted those feelings and created this world, so full of beauty—I denounce this doctrine as unworthy a man, ignoble, and derogatory, and insulting to the God of Nature, and of man. But you, ladies and gentlemen, he continued, all know and feel that there is something higher and nobler in our nature, which cannot be satisfied entirely by those means which contribute only to our animal and material comforts, "aspirations in each heart after a better, higher bearing"—things more exalted. Cherish these sentiments. Seek to improve, and elevate your minds—encourage the love even of poetry, for though it may not add to your material wealth, it will add to your wealth of mind. Remember in whose image you are made, and thank your God that he has planted in your breasts feelings which derive pleasure from the contemplation of the wondrous, the beautiful, and the sublime; and thank him also that he has made this fair world for you so full of beauty and of poetry. After this address, which was listened to with great attention, and elicited frequent bursts of applause, Mr. Johnston occupied half an hour in reading the very humorous trial from the Pickwick Papers of Bardell vs. Pickwick, the striking passages in which were rendered with much taste and judgment, calling forth frequent peals of laughter.

Mr. Le[illegible] then concluded the evening's entertainment by re[illegible]ding his well written poem on the end of the year, which has already been published in one of our newspapers.

BOOK PEDDLERS.

We have given in another column a rather long letter on Book-peddling by American travelling agents. We doubt if the subject is deserving of all the public notice given to it, for the people who allow themselves to be imposed upon in the manner described, seem to be insensible to the lessons of experience or to the words of caution so often addressed to them; or—what is likely to be the case with many of them—perhaps they consider a trashy book as useful to them as the best that was ever printed,—it fills a certain amount of space, and makes a show on the little parlour book case; and it is for that purpose—and that only—which hundreds of persons pretend to encourage literature and science. The author of Hudibras says:

"Doubtless the pleasure is as great
In being cheated as to cheat,"

and very likely some of the dupes of the Yankee book peddlers are governed by this motive in laying out their spare dollars. But we cannot see why the Government should not make a little money out of the business as well as the Yankee bibliopolists themselves. We have a law on our statute book which requires hawkers and peddlers to take out and pay for a licence before they can vend their wares along the public highway. Now, a book is no less an article of merchandize than a few yards of cotton, thread, needles and tape; and the latter are often far more serviceable in a family than the former. We think, therefore, that the book peddlers should be made to come under the law relating to peddlers generally. If the law, in its present state, will not embrace their case, it should be amended; and if such an arrangement do not afford the necessary protection to the credulous who suffer themselves to be imposed upon in the purchase of worthless books, there will be at least some gain to the public revenue.

THE BRITISH REVIEWS AND BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE.

We invite the attention of our readers to the advertisement which appears in another column from Leonard Scott & Co., the enterprising publishers in America of the above excellent periodicals. Any persons who may be desirous of getting any or the whole of these publications, can do so by leaving their orders at this office. The American reprints are in every respect quite as good as the originals from Britain, and are furnished to subscribers on this side of t e Atlantic nearly as soon as they can b obtained from home, at one third of the English cost.

We received by the last U. States Mail, Blackwood's Magazine for November and December—the London Quarterly Review, the North British Review, the Westminster Review, and the Edinburgh Review for the last quarter. It is unnecessary to particularize their contents. They are all replete with the most useful and entertaining matter, our appreciation of which will be more fully shown by our transferring a portion of it from time to time to our columns.

ANOTHER ENGLISH MAIL

Was received here this morning, (Monday.) Latest dates are to the 28th ult.—one week later than the news by the Asia. The papers furnish no foreign news of importance. English journals are chiefly occupied with details of the funeral of Prince Albert, reminiscences of his life, and comments on the Anglo-American question. The Queen and Royal family had retired to Osborne, and it is said Her Majesty continued to enjoy good health.

We intended to have given in this No. a *quid pro quo* in exchange for the compliments lavished upon us by the *Islander* and *Monitor*, a few days ago, in reference to the petition for a dissolution; but we find that all our space is taken up with much more entertaining matter. We desire to assure our contemporaries, however, that we shall take an early opportunity to devote especial attention if not to themselves, at least to their masters in the Government.

☞ Burdell, the American sailor, who was convicted of the murder of Policeman Gardiner at Halifax, a few months ago, has been sentenced to 14 years imprisonment in the Penitentiary, with hard labour. The other convict, Capt. Lane, has not yet

Meeting of the Legislature.—A Proclamation appears in the last "Gazette," summoning the Legislature to meet for the dispatch of business on the 20th February next.

Respect for the late Prince Albert.—On Wednesday last, after the receipt of official intelligence of the death of the Prince Consort, forty-two minute guns—(the number corresponding to the age of the deceased)—were fired from St. George's Battery. His Excellency the Lieut. Governor enjoins all Her Majesty's subjects in this Colony to put themselves in decent mourning.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Protestant.

"It is a shame to charge men with what they are not guilty of in order to make the breach wider, already too wide."—Dr. Montague, Bishop of Norwich.

Mr. Editor—My numerous occupations have prevented me from noticing sooner your comments on my letter of the 10th instant. To answer all the irrelevant questions and objections which you may think proper to make would render this correspondence interminable, and would draw me off from the main point at issue between us, namely, whether the Popes have used their influence to repress freedom of thought? However, I will make a few remarks on your gross and unjust insinuations regarding *Indulgences*. On no other subject do Protestant writers more outrageously calumniate their Catholic neighbours than on this same point. They unblushingly assert that the Catholic Church, by Indulgences, permits her followers to commit sin, and many of their readers believe this to be true. No longer than a couple of weeks ago I was in conversation with a person from the Scotch Settlement who appeared to be most firmly convinced that Catholic Priests, for a pecuniary consideration, give permission to the "faithful" to commit all manner of crimes. This poor man's uncharitable impressions were, without doubt, the result of some of the innumerable calumnies which are daily published, in the most unscrupulous manner, against us "Papists." Now, one of two things is certain. Those who publish those calumnies either know them to be such, or they do not. If the former is true, then are they a disgrace to the Christian name, since they knowingly and maliciously malign their neighbours: if the latter is true, then their ignorance cannot be invincible, seeing that they have numberless opportunities of informing themselves regarding the doctrines of Catholics from the decrees of the *general councils*, from our formularies of faith, and even from our small catechisms, and consequently their unchristian accusations are altogether inexcusable. I am willing to give you the benefit of the most charitable construction which can be given to your motive in publishing calumnious insinuations, after taking into consideration that you must have had an opportunity of informing yourself regarding the doctrine of Catholics, seeing that you appear well versed even with the decrees of the Congregation of the Index.

If you have not spent several years in acquiring a knowledge of Catholic phraseology, you have been, I hope, an assiduous reader of your Bible, and have noticed the following important commandment:—"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Now, Sir, it is a matter of some importance for us to consider that we shall all, even the editors of Evangelical Witnesses, be examined before the judgment seat of Christ on our observance of this commandment, and that the calumnious charges of idolatory, &c., which now serve the purpose of rousing popular fury and prejudice against Catholics, shall then only serve to cover their guilty authors with well merited confusion.

As to your quotations from Motley and D'Aubigne, they are worthless, and would be so were they ten times as numerous, for this reason that the testimony of interested or prejudiced persons in favour of their own party or against their adversaries is absolutely good for nothing. One would have thought that you, who seem to say that you have not spent any of your time in acquiring a knowledge of "important matters," would have known this much of the law of testimony.

It is a doctrine of the Church, tha[illegible] sell anything sacred is a sacrilegious crime; and if any clergyman has so far forgotten his duty as to sell *Indulgences*, his conduct cannot, with any justice, be imputed to the Church. Avarice has caused many a crime, it even caused Christ Himself to be sold for thirty pieces of silver, and we should not be surprised if there have been since the time of Judas some individuals who have abused their ministry. It is not in accordance with sound reasoning to deduce a general conclusion from a particular fact. The teaching of the Church cannot certainly be inferred from any words which may be attributed to Tetzel who was, in 1518, reprimanded by Carl. Meltitz, in the name of Leo X., and who is admitted even by Protestant writers to have acted contrary to the doctrines of the Church. In Reinhard, p. 277, t. 1., we read the following:—"Thus Tetzel's Indulgences produced its effect without interior expiation, whereas the Indulgences which the Pope grants to the faithful avail not unless the sinner has wept, confessed his sin and done penance. Tetzel, then, deceived the Pope, his Bishop and auditory."

But you may ask what is an *Indulgence* if it is not a permission to commit sin? As a knowledge of the real doctrine of Catholics on this point may be the means of deterring you from attributing to them practices which they condemn as strongly as you do, I will endeavour to explain our teaching on this point. "I suppose, first, that no one will deny that a sovereign prince, in showing mercy to a capital convict, may either grant him a remission of all punishment, or may leave him subject to some lighter punishment: of course he will allow that the Almighty may act in either of these ways with respect to sinners. I also suppose that no person, who is versed in the Bible, will deny that many instances occur there of God's remittting the essential guilt of sin and the eternal guilt due to it, and yet leaving a temporary punishment to be endured by the penitent sinner. Thus, for example, the sentence of spiritual death and everlasting torments was remitted to our first father, upon his repentance, but not that of corporal death. Thus, also, when God reversed His severe sentence against the idolatrous Israelites, He added, *Nevertheless, in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.* Exod. xxxii. 34. Thus again, when the inspired Nathan said to the model of penitents, David, *The Lord hath put away thy sin*, he added, *nevertheless the child that is born unto thee shall die.* 2 Kings, *alias* Sam. xii. 14. Finally, when David's *heart smote him, after he had numbered the people*, the Lord in pardoning him, offered him, by His prophet, Gad, the choice of three temporal punishments, war, famine, and pestilence. *Ibid* xxiv. The Catholic Church teaches that the same is still the common course of God's mercy and wisdom, in the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism. The essential guilt and eternal punishment of sin, she declares, can only be expiated by the precious merits of our Redeemer Jesus Christ; but a certain temporal punishment God reserves for the penitent himself to endure, 'lest the easiness of his pardon should make him careless about falling back into sin.' (Conc. Trid. Sess. vi., cap. 7, cap. 14, Sess. xiv., cap. 8.) Hence *satisfaction* for this temporal punishment has been instituted by Christ as a part of the Sacrament of Penance. This Council at the same time declares that this very satisfaction for temporal punishment *is only efficacious through Jesus Christ*. (Sess., xiv., 8.) Nevertheless, as the promise of Christ to the Apostles and to St. Peter in particular, and to their successors, is unlimited: *whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.* (Matt. xvi., 19, xviii., 18.) the Church believes and teaches that her jurisdiction extends to this very satisfaction, so as to be able to remit it wholly or partially, in certain circumstances, by what is called an *Indulgence*. (Trid. Sess., xxv., De Indulg.) St. Paul exercised this power in behalf of the incestuous Corinthian, (2 Cor., 11. 10.,) and the Church has claimed and exercised the same power ever since the time of the Apostles down to the present. (Tertul. in lib. ad Martyr., c. 1, St. Cypr., l. 3, Epist. Concil., 1, Nic. Ancyr., &c. Still this power, like that of absolution, is not arbitrary; there must be a just reason for the exercise of it, and there must be a certan proportion between the punishment remitted and the good work performed. (Bellarm. Lib. 1, De Indulg., c. 12.) Hence no one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of an indulgence though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end; (*Ibid.*) and hence the pastors of the Church will have to answer for it, if they take upon themselves to grant indulgences for unworthy or insufficient purposes."

This explanation ought to silence your sarcasms on this point. If you write any more on the matter of indulgences, you will perhaps favor your readers with your opinions regarding the indulgences which patriarch Luther was in the habit of granting to himself and others. Thus, for example, he dispensed with himself and Catharine Boren from their vows of a religious life, and particularly of that of celibacy, and even preached up adultery in his public sermons. ("Si nolit Domina, veniat ancilla, &c." Martini Lutheri de Matrimonia Sermo habitus Wittembergæ Anno 1522 tom V. Oper. Luth. Wittembergæ, 1544, p. 119 et seq.) He also in conjunction with Bucer and Melancthon granted an indulgence to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to marry a second wife, his first being still living. It even appears that more reformers than these were in the habit of giving and receiving indulgences, for Bucer tells us that: "The greater part of the people seem only to have embraced the Gospel, in order to shake off the yoke of discipline and the obligation of fasting, penance, &c., which ...

without control. Hence they lent a willing ear to the doctrine that we are saved by faith alone, and not by good works, having no relish for them." (Bucer, De Regn. Chris. l. 1. c. 4.

I have said that the prohibitions of the Index are not in force her. You on the contrary maintain that they are, unless a decree of the Pope to the contrary has been issued. Now, allow me to tell you, without however desiring to hurt your feelings, that what you have written on the subject shows how very little you know about it. You seem to take it for granted that a decree of the Congregation of the Index is obligatory on all the faithful as soon as it is issued. In this you are mistaken, for a law to have effect must be sufficiently *promulgated*. The question then is, have the decrees of the Congregation of the Index been sufficiently promulgated in the Diocese of Charlottetown? I am not obliged to prove a *negative*, consequently the *onus probandi* rests on you, and you should prove that these decrees have been regularly and sufficiently promulgated here in accordance with the rules of Canon Law and the established customs of the Church in such matters; in a word, with all the conditions required. If you are desirous to know what are those conditions, I would respectfully refer you to the works of *Wigers, Boudart, Steyaert, Billuart, Elbel, Layman, Urban VIII, Benedict XIV* and other theologians and canonists. If you are not able to prove that those decrees have been sufficiently promulgated in this Diocese, then would I take the liberty of giving you the friendly advice not to write about anything in future concerning which you know little or nothing.

To prove to you that the Index is not in force everywhere, I may refer you to Bouvier's *Institutiones Theologicæ*, where you may read: "Libri a Congregatione Indicis proscripti, apud nos leguntur sine licentia, si ab episcopis non prohibeantur." (tom. IV., p. 582.) The same author, in tom. V., p. 118, says:—"Index non ubique viget aut non admittiur quoad omnia. Si post Concil. Trident. in quibusdam conciliis particularibus Index receptus fuerit, mox in desuetudinem abiit secundum probatos auctores nostros, Collat. Andeg. Collet. Theol. Pictav., &c.

Towards the close of your comments you propose two difficulties which are in substance:—If a book placed on the Index is a good one, where is the necessity of asking permission to read it? if it is a dangerous or bad one, how can permission be given to any one at any time or place to read it? These difficulties vanish when we consider that the reading of a book is neither good nor bad *in itself*, but may become either by reason of some circumstance connected therewith. That which is bad *in itself* can never be permitted to any one. That which is indifferent in itself may be permitted to some and prohibited to others, may be permitted at one time or place, and not at another. No one favoured with common sense will deny this. That which is perfectly lawful at one time may not be so at another. For example, it is lawful for Catholics to eat meat at one time, and not at another. The eating of meat is not sinful in itself, and yet it becomes sinful on the days on which it is prohibited by the Church. For sufficient reasons a person can get a dispensation, or an *indulgence* as you would have it, to eat meat even on prohibited days, and certainly to call such a permission an indulgence to commit sin would be the meanest kind of quibbling imaginable. Some one fond of proposing shallow objections may say: Is it not wrong to make a sin of that which is not sinful in itself? To such a one I would answer that the eating of fruit is not sinful in itself, and yet we find that the sin of our first parents consisted in eating fruit contrary to the prohibition of God. Servile works are not sinful *in se*, and yet they become sinful when performed on a Sunday without necessity.

Thousands of instances might be given to show how circumstances may change the morality of actions. To *encourage education* by giving to a Protestant College a large grant from funds to which "Papists" contribute is, no doubt, in your opinion, a very praiseworthy act; whereas to *encourage education* by giving to a Catholic College any assistance from the same funds would be, I presume, in your estimation, little, if anything, short of sacrilege. So much do circumstances change matters. With regard to books, no one except a person of the most obtuse intellect will deny that a book which may be harmless, useful, or even necessary for one individual may be extremely dangerous for another, and tend both to pervert his understanding and corrupt his heart. It is lawful and even necessary that a physician read books which describe minutely the various parts of the human body, and treat of the several diseases connected therewith; but few will say that it would be proper to place such books in the hands of a young female or indeed of any young person, not because such books are absolutely bad, but because they are relatively so. I have heard it said that since you took your seat in the editorial chair you have occasionally moralized about novels, and lectured some of your contemporaries regarding some pieces of composition which they printed; in fact, that you have made your journal an "Index" on a small scale. If this is true, I may say that before you condemned a book or piece of writing you are supposed to have read it. Now, if such a book or piece of writing were good, why recommend others not to read it? and if it were bad, why read it yourself? You will probably answer, that although you might read it with impunity, there are many others who would not, and besides it is necessary that some one read immoral and erroneous books in order that they may be condemned and refuted, so that the unwary may not be corrupted thereby. The same may be said of those who get permission to read bad or dangerous books which are on the Index.

There are other points in your article of the 21st instant to which I would wish to reply in this communication, but I find that I have already exceeded the bounds of an ordinary letter, and that it is time to conclude, which I do by subscribing myself

Your very obedient and humble servant,
A. McDONALD.
St. Dunstan's College, Dec. 31, 1861.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

YANKEE PEDDLERS.

Sir—As the Editor of the most extensively circulated paper on the Island, I think it is your duty to warn those of your country subscribers who have not yet been swindled by Yankee book agents and peddlers of the "tricks and traps" used by these travelling gentry, who invariably misrepresent their worthless goods to those who possess no means to detect the fraud till too late.

The first swindler visited our "Island home" a few years ago, and he met with such good success that a perfect host of his Connecticut friends have swarmed to our shores, like vultures to their prey, and the result is, our Island is deluged with worse than useless books, sold at an exorbitant price, and filled with exaggerated accounts of American history, calculated to deceive the uninformed, and to poison the minds of the young. Enter any respectable farm house on this Island, and the first thing you notice is a large book, gaudily ornamented, with "Cottage Cyclopedia," or "History of the Eastern World," in large gilt letters. The girl in the kitchen wears a brooch worth a ninepence, for which she gave the result of two months' hard labour; the lady of the house has a penny ring, for which a dozen cows yielded their riches for a week. But I am happy to say that through the great influence of the many warnings given by the Island Press, the people are being made sensible of the folly of purchasing from irresponsible people.

The present representatives of Yankee Booksellers have not degenerated from their predecessors in deception, knavery and meanness. Devoid of all manly feeling, they do not hesitate a moment to perpetrate any act, however mean, which may secure to them the disposal of another worthless Cyclopedia. People who purchase from book agents ought hardly to be pitied, if they continue their purchases after being made aware of the fact, that, almost without an exception, book agents are selected from the worst grades of society. The book publishers advertize for those out of employment, or who are unable to find other means of subsistence. Of course none but worthless or lazy people will accept such an occupation. When, therefore, a strong healthy man, with the looks of a person capable of anything from pitch and toss to manslaughter, sneaks into a house, and solicits subscriptions for books, doubts as to his moral value in society will naturally arise.

Last spring and summer two Connecticut book agents travelled over the Island, soliciting subscriptions for a trashy, unreliable book called the "Cottage Cyclopedia." This book should not be allowed a place in any Islander's house; it is filled with elaborately written sketches of Americans and a few meagre lines on Englishmen: detailed information on American towns, *and not one line on English cities*, save London; numerous paragraphs on American laws and the Constitution of the late United States; and a few brief and hurriedly written remarks on the Constitution of old England; long columns devoted to the perpetuation of the name and fame of the signers of the "Declaration," while the names of never to be forgotten Englishmen are ignored. Among the list of massacres, arranged in chronological order, from 937 B. C., are inserted massacres falsely alleged to have been committed by the English, and the savages under their command; for instance: the massacre of 64 Americanes at Dartmoor in 1815; of the massacres of Wilkesbarre and Cherry Valley by the "British and Savages," under the command of Col. Butler, &c. &c. These massacres were committed by the Indians, who were entirely beyond the control of the English, but they were provoked by the treachery and barbarity of the Americans. These are but a few of the characteristics of the Cottage Cyclopedia, as noticed in a cursory glance at its contents. As regards the amount of reading matter in this bundle of bound wrapping paper, there are 989 pages, printed on a very coarse thick paper, with extremely wide margins. Of these 989 pages, 682 are devoted to American subjects. As regards the value of this book, it can be estimated from the cost of it per volume, as taken from publisher's own entries:—Printing by job, 45 cents; sewing and folding by job, 20 cents; binding and gilding, 35 cents; making the first cost of the Cottage Cyclopedia sold on this Island for four dollars and a half, only *one dollar*. Perhaps the readers of the *Examiner* may not be aware of the subterfuges employed to obtain subscribers. On visiting a town the a[illegible] call on the clergy; to those who are unw[illing] subscribe, [illegible] present a co[illegible] and le[illegible]