sombre and intricate Gothic style of the middle ages, wander through the damp aisles of Notre Dame and St. Etienne. Of the services in these churches we cannot say much. We have not desired nor dared to enter them on the Sabbath. The fourth commandment is binding on our conscience in France as well as in America. We would make the Sabbath a delight here as well as at home; and whatever others may think or do, we cannot spend these hours, consecrated to the welfare of the soul, in listening to fine music, or sanctioning by our presence the mummeries by which men profess to convert a piece of biscuit into Israel's God. Neither can we describe the out-door amusements of Paris on the Sabbath. The witnesses on this point are already sufficiently numerous—too numerous, we think, for the honour of Protestant Christianity. The aggregate of Sabbath-breakers in this gay metropolis is annually swollen by thousands of church members from Protestant lands, who think they atone for their own evil example by telling their friends at home that there is *no Sabbath in France*. Such persons should be reminded that there is not only a Sabbath here, as there is every where in God's world, but a remnant who regard it. There are thousands, even in this city, who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of Popery, and do not neglect the weighty matter of the law. There are several native Protestant congregations, besides those which worship in the English and American chapels. Though these congregations labour under many disadvantages from without and within, yet are they as lamps shining in a dark place. Christian travellers who come hither ought to strengthen the hands of them that do well. On the Sabbath after my arrival I listened to an admirable sermon from Dr. Kirk, who came here to establish a church under the auspices of the American and Foreign Christian Union. I was grieved at the smallness of the congregation when I knew that in the hotel where I staid there were more than enough Americans to fill the chapel. Most of them, I presume, had gone to be horrified at the follies of Popery. If this letter were not already too long, I should like to say a few words on the religious aspect of France. There are signs of hope in the horizon. Though Popery is petted by the Government as an engine of political power, Protestantism is protected in its most essential rights. There is an increasing demand for the word of God, and the American Bible Society, with its noble ally in Great Britain, is supplying this want. The seed of divine truth will one day bear a glorious harvest. The tide of the Reformation, rolled back by the massacre of St. Bartholemew and the banishment of the Huguenots, is again beginning to rise. If any man thinks the character of the people does not furnish good material to make Protestant Christians, it will be enough to remind him that *John Calvin was a Frenchman*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To D. MACLEAN, Editor of the "Islander."

SIR,—Observing in the *Islander* two letters from you to (a part of) "the Editorial Committee of the *Protector*," I thought it might be well for you and them if one not immediately concerned in the dispute to which your letters refer should make a few remarks by way of explanation. This I purpose to do.

Your letters are marked 1 and 2. No. 1 I intend to pass unnoticed, as there is nothing deserving of comment in it—at least separable from that to which No. 2 refers. The tone and character of your letters do you much injury, and can benefit none but those whom we designate as reckless. You write not for reflecting men, but for men whose moving principle is that of fear. The motto of all able writers is *Non vi sed virtute* (not violence, but excellency). But the weak, like you, will bluster.

Your second letter is composed of two parts. 1. We have pure unmitigated nonsense—perfect raving. You, in amount, assert you are a prophet, have a prophet's commission, stirred up by a prophet's *impulse* which you cannot arrest! We are treated with Jonah, Nineveh, and then the prediction! Saul among the prophets this, verily! The world has seen queer prophets in its day—Mohammed, Joe Smith, D. Maclean—a beautiful triad! I have looked into the history of the veritable Jonah, and find that my first impression about you was wrong. I thought you bore no resemblance to him. But I find, like you, he was very crabbed; and, like you, he fled from the presence of the Lord (from duty); and, like you, he is pressed upon our attention in connection with a *great big whale!* But you, our modern Jonah, have in your letter (2) a defence. Let us consider it.

Your particular objection is at the statement of the *Protector*, to the effect that you occupy, in the Bible agitation, a post of opposition to Protestants. The amount of my remarks will be that such a statement is true: that whether you intended it, such is the legitimate conclusion to which we are drawn by a candid review of your history in this business; therefore, if you have any to blame for this, the sin lies at your own door. Let us see.

In order to see the true bearing of the statement—the "Resolution was lost, and we think it should," and to place its author in a correct position as regards its true meaning, we must view you in the light of what you did and said before and after you wrote it. Adroitness, by a process like this, is circumvented and exposed. Now, Sir, I call the reader's attention to your position before Mr. Haviland's Resolution was tabled, and to what it was afterwards.

A comparatively recent date recognizes you a member of our government, and also associates you with conduct bearing upon the Bible of a very unhappy character. After all your explanations, an impression, be it right or wrong, is indelibly left on the public mind that you can be no great lover of the Scriptures. Such a feeling, under present circumstances, will arise with invigorated power, to your positive prejudice. But, Sir, it must be most damaging to your special pleading simply to remind the public that you frankly confess to discountenancing and opposing the Protestant movement, as improper. Having taken such a stand, in order to keep up the prestige of your name and support the appearance of consistency, all know you would be naturally disposed to find fault, even when no error existed. The strength of your opposition may be ascertained by calling to mind the contemptuous manner in which you spoke of the Protestant movement in Nova Scotia; and while columns of the *Islander* were open for all sorts of abuse upon the principal individual who figured in the movement, as well as against the movement itself, we have never seen anything like a defence of it registered in the paper which you conduct. Let the foregoing be carefully noted.

It is not without crafty design you labor to identify the Protestant movement in that colony with the political necessities of Joseph Howe. Whilst far from hinting that this hon. gentleman is influenced by motives similar to those of Henry the Eighth in advancing the English Reformation, your conduct reminds one of the wily Jesuit who steadily represents that glorious work as but one of the dark and fitful phases of the ever-changing mind of that execrable tyrant. Judge righteously, and judge of the cause upon its own merits. It is of God, though you should be successful in proving that wicked men may be used as instruments for its advancement. Assyria was Jehovah's "rod."

It was a little curious to find you lately travelling so far from your accustomed track, as to be found lauding clergymen in very high terms, and men wondered still more when it was found the priests of Montreal were your happy proteges. Further—though you now confess that the "umbrage" taken by the Protestants at the Bishop's letter was "reasonable"—so far as I recollect, I have never read anything which went to show that you considered his demand an invasion of Protestant rights. The cry of godless schools rung through our land, and a Catholic Bishop's "*must*" was uttered to enforce the same, and raze Protestant institutions to the ground; and ready as you are to tell it when anything hurts your feelings, you remained a passive auditor, and cared nothing for these things. Does this not look something like a post of opposition? Your conduct was negative, indeed, to some extent; but even this had a positive bearing favorable to Popery; while you did say things which were intended to put down the agitation, by inducing Protestants to think their cause an unjust or bad one. When calmly considered, the foregoing position might be expected to induce you, as its legitimate and only result, both to think and assert that the "Resolution should be lost," and enables us to perceive what you did "think."

2. I come to speak of what has been written by you bearing on this case since the Resolution was lost. The first thing was to write your deliberate opinion (all you could do) that it should be lost. That you intended not only the Resolution should be lost upon its own merits, but as the expression of Protestant feeling developing itself in law, I take to be evident from your line of remark. Ignorant—(this very ignorance itself is insulting to Protestantism, and worthy of special note in one so felicitous as you in securing all kinds of news)—Ignorant as you pretend to be about the petitions, you did know that there was a great agitation; you must have known, also, that that agitation was drifting to the floor of the House of Assembly—what Protestant ministers and laymen were agitating throughout the country would be repeated within the walls of the Province Building. You must have known that Resolution was but a condensation of all that had been said by Protestants—that they who were in its defence, and those *against it*, were representing respectively Protestant and Catholic interests. You must have a contemptible opinion of Protestants if you thought all the agitation was to pass off in smoke;—if, after asserting again and again that we must have some effectual method of protecting ourselves, we should leave the subject where we found it. Now you must have known, further, if that Resolution did not represent Protestant feeling, there was nothing else that had such a bearing before the House. All this at least you must have known, if you are one tenth part as clever as you think you are; and, knowing all this, do we ever hear you lament that Protestants have *failed in their efforts*?—that they have done so through the inability of those to whose cause the maturing and perfecting the work was committed?—that a *good cause* was lost by bad hands? Nothing of all this. No matter how much Protestants *as such* may be disappointed, and their interests sacrificed, you are perfectly indifferent. You curtly wrote, the Resolution was lost, and should be. You from first to last spoke against the movement. In your remarks you *make no distinction between the Resolution and the movement—between Mr. Haviland's position and that of the Protestants*. If you felt that there was such, why not distinctly point it out? This in all fairness you were bound to do, since you were the first to seek for such difference. When the Resolution was lost, you knew the movement was definitively, for the time being, lost. The Protestant movement lost, and with all this you were satisfied. It met the fate you think it deserved! Such is your "creed" on this point—but it is not Protestant.

But the question comes up, What *right* had you to fasten upon the Resolution the charge of compulsion? If this charge is plainly not in accordance with its spirit and wording, but manifestly against both, then you are as guilty in coming to the conclusion you have, as a juror or judge that asserts his decision contrary to evidence. The public, granting you ability to scan and rightly interpret the character of the Resolution, unhesitatingly seek a reason for your charge in hostility to the Protestant movement. It holds you guilty for *reaching* the conclusion you have. Mentally or morally you are guilty. You have never yet given a satisfactory reason for your "opinion." The public has a right to decide. It has done so, and corroborates heartily the statement of the *Protector*. There must be some moral cause to account for the action of the man who hermetically closes his eyes to the light of day, and persists in asserting it is night. I ask the public to look at the wording of that Resolution, which, because, as you say, of its compulsory character, should be lost. Does it not define most clearly when the "shall and may" are to take effect? Mark; not in Catholic Schools, nor in Infidel Schools—nay, mark—not even in Protestant School, without consulting "parents and guardians." *It does consult parents*. This is one side. The other is, that if parents and guardians have children going to School, no matter who attend there besides—whether Roman, Pagan, or Infidel—Protestant children have a right to take and there read their Bibles, under such circumstances, without fear or favor. If any Bishop or Priest will cry against this liberty, then our children "shall and may" read the Scriptures notwithstanding. That is the purport of the Resolution, and nothing else; and yet you assert it should be lost. What?—mark the answer, Protestants!—your right to read the Bible when others object to it! The Resolution asks no more than a *defence of our right*, and you cooly "think" we ought to lose this! Why, sir, it is not only time to tell you that you are an enemy to Protestants, but to treat you as such. The "shall and may" has a distinct and *easily understood* reference to the Bishop's demand that schools "must be godless" in this Island. Had that vandalic cry been never heard, that clause would have been unnecessary; but, having been *authoritatively* uttered, nothing else would be sufficient—anything less, a perfect mockery. Even the strong arm of law is broken by the fanaticism of Papists, to carry out the imperious will of Priests and Bishops. What have you said by way of thought or "opinion" to provide for such a difficulty? You sin there with great aggravation, when you say our Resolution was compulsory. You *knew* that such was the cry Catholics raised against us; and you further knew, Sir, that compulsion sounds harsh in the ears of Protestants. If you were successful in establishing this charge, you were perfectly aware that the measure would be deserted by its own supporters. Wishing from your heart to damage the movement, and vainly calculating upon the influence of your own authority—upon these grounds, and not upon the merits of the Resolution, you raised the charge of compulsion. The charge would hide your real intentions—give you the appearance of the friend of liberty whilst planting your foot upon our dearest rights, meantime expecting our excessive favor and applause!

You write, "We oppose that part of the Resolution which deprives the Board of Education and School Visitor of the power to say whether the Scriptures shall or shall not be read in schools." This does look a little friendly to our movement. But what if the Bishop should say to the Government, "Take order and prohibit the Scriptures from the schools?"—a thing which was well nigh done at a certain time, of which you may have some recollection. (I mean that the Government or House of Assembly might do what the Board &c. has now the power.) You suggest no provision for such a probable enterprize. But the moiety of grace you are pleased to give us seems too much to be palatable to Catholics. You hasten to eat up your words, and immediately add, "The Act is left as it was. . . . . But we do not think that the provision need cause any anxiety," &c. The amount of the whole is—the present state of things is well enough; Protestants *have no just cause of complaint*. Why, Sir, the tone of your remarks is in perfect keeping with Mooney's, Whelan's, and Warburton's speeches! They were perfectly satisfied with the present state of things, and you *think it should cause no anxiety*. Herod and Pilate on certain occasions will be reconciled.

Your reference to the compromise between the Evangelicals and "others" in Manchester, as explanatory of your views, throws additional light upon your "remarks." However that arrangement may do in England, it is plain it cannot be sufficient to meet our case. It is not enough to meet the Bishop's "must," or the grasping policy of Romanism, upon the subject of education. You do not tell us what redress parents might have in case Teachers might Jesuitically recile from their engagements to teach the Scriptures; much less have you looked at the real danger to which we are exposed, of being flooded with teachers, and that too by your favorite scheme, who would not come to any such arrangement. You distinctly assert that the Bible ought not to be taught in the Academy. Being silent as regards the Normal School, it is fair, until you assert the contrary, to suppose that the present state of that institution gives you no "anxiety." But are we not to look to these two institutions as the principal means to supply us with teachers, who, passing through mediums which frown upon the Bible, might be expected to receive a similar disposition, and labor to impart it in rural districts? The least that can be said against your theory is, that it would create difficulties between parents and teachers, and virtually place redress beyond the power of the former; whilst the evident tendency of it in a mixed society like ours, in which Catholic influence is so strong, Catholic intrigue so rife, and teachers educated in "godless" institutions, would be to shut the Bible out of many Protestant schools. You have either not studied the subject at all, or wish to impose upon your readers. Your remarks either mean nothing—are a sort of non-committal—or are basely and deeply traitorous of Protestant rights. Such I take to be the true and Protestant interpretation of your "exceedingly harmless remarks."

Mr. Haviland's Resolution refers the subject to parents; you agree with the reference. But he provides that the reference shall have significance. You, on the contrary—*if Catholics are to obey their Bishop, and be faithful sons of the Church*—render it *nugatory*. In the hands of the one it is a privilege, in the other a sham.

Here I should like to know how you can so "brazen it out" as to assert without a blush that you agree with Mr. Laird's petition, and *at the same time* oppose the introduction of the Bible in the Academy and Normal School? Let Protestants weigh your statement on this point. But if this is agreement, the easily-bent hoop may be said to agree with a straight line because it *touches* it in one part, and then leaves it to infold *itself*. Had the *Protector* made such a remark, it would have been met with "awful," "misrepresentation," &c. The reason you assign for this rejection is, moreover, wholly unprotestant, and has no bearing upon the merits of the dispute between us and Catholics. It is not a question as to whether the citizen may be more intelligent and better able to instruct his children in the Word of God than the countryman; but whether the Scriptures, by virtue of their inherent right, ought not to be in all institutions professedly Christian;—whether a teacher, as such, or a scholar, as such, individually and collectively, dare reject what God has bound all men in every place to love and study;—whether parents can, as Christian parents, be parties to any transaction that either ignores or frowns upon the Bible;—whether a "godless" education, be it given in an academy or out of it, in town or country, be not *worse than useless*. Your position is expediency—ours, as Protestants, moral necessity; yours, political considerations—ours, stern uncompromising duty to God and man. Whether it be right to obey God or man, is our question. Whether it be right to obey man, is yours. No wonder, then, the *Protector* considered you not with us, but against us.

It is pitiable to see weakness struggling to break the strong net its own folly has wrapped around it. Such is your position when you flaunt so terribly about "literary forgery" "changing an opinion into a positive assertion." Sir, if you conscientiously supposed the Resolution guilty of holding compulsory principles, which in this case is persecuting ones, you had a right to speak out, and that, too, in stern, clear, authoritative assertion, and not in hesitating or doubtful "opinion." If the Resolution is what you represent it, the *Protector* paid you a compliment in placing you in *opposition* to it. Your complaint, then, must arise from a consciousness that the Resolution was not compulsory—was not what you said it was. That this is so clear to all, you feel ashamed to have it go abroad you said so. Thus it happens that this dire accusation you lay on the *Protector* is the worst thing for yourself, and drags from your unwilling lips "*Pacavi!*"—I have sinned.

Observing that you feel no delicacy in attributing motives, I have shown that yours may not be the purest. Your implication, that had a quarrel existed between you and the editors of the *Protector*, it would have accounted for their hostility to your course, is excessively mean, and could not be here noticed, were it not that the drift of the remark is to injure the Protestant *movement*. Well apprised that they who are embarked in this enterprize will bear it—that if they do not carry it out it must fail—you strive to injure their characters, supposing the end will justify the means. As well as Howe, you may have great political interests to subserve. Your selfishness for its pleasing development *may require* popish favor—the ruin of the character of Protestant ministers, and the destruction of the *Protector!* You seem willing, and *think* yourself quite able for the holy work of spoliation! My advice is, give up such ideas, and *cease to prophecy!*

1. I accuse your "remarks" on the Resolution of being doubtful at first sight. Like the crafty King of Ithaca, you scatter ambiguous expressions among the people; but, when carefully examined, dangerous in the extreme to Protestant interests.

2. You treat the Papists, who have been aggressive—their priesthood a politico-religious establishment—with much more respect than Protestants, or our Protestant ministers, though we are acting on the defence, and seek to deprive no one of his rights, natural, civil, or religious. Like a straw, this shows how the tide sets. Your obedient servant,

Aug. 26, 1857. VOX POPULI.

The Protector & Christian Witness

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1857.

GRATITUDE

There is no duty more becoming dependent creatures, yet none more habitually neglected, than thankfulness to the Most High God, the giver of all good. Among men ingratitude for continued favours is condemned as a crime almost unpardonable, and never to be forgotten. Why not thus regard man's conduct towards the Supreme Benefactor? The very continuity of our mercies, through want of reflection, prevents our full appreciation of their value, while the universality of our guilt suppresses individual accusation. Our benefits fill the wide range of the spiritual and physical worlds—from God's greatest gift, His well-beloved Son, down to the air which we breathe. For our spiritual mercies our gratitude cannot be too frequent or too fervent; in respect to temporal blessings, special reasons call for special thanksgivings. We who inhabit this Island enjoy many earthly favours for which we ought to be thankful. Our form of government is fitted to protect us in our civil and religious rights—our climate is healthy beyond many—our soil is fertile—and God has just blessed us with, generally speaking, an abundant harvest. There are some, indeed, whose lips seem incapable of uttering an expression of gratitude. From such murmurers a fair report of the increase of the earth cannot be expected, for with them something is always deficient. This spirit is all the more offensive when it influences the public opinion of the country through the press. In reading such paragraphs we are tempted to think that the writer must be of kindred spirit with the ten *unbelieving* spies, whose false report to Moses led to such disastrous consequences. Let our unworthiness be balanced with our unnumbered blessings, and cold must be that spirit that is not incited to praise his Bountiful Benefactor. On this subject the sentiments of an inspired poet, the result of matured and devout observation of the works of Providence, may, alike for their beauty and their glowing gratitude, with propriety be inserted. Addressing his Maker, he says:

Thou visitest the earth, and waterest it;
Thou greatly enrichest it with the river of God, which is
 full of water;
Thou preparest them corn, when thou hast so provided
 for it.
Thou waterest the ridges thereof abundantly;
Thou settlest the furrows thereof;
Thou makest it soft with showers;
Thou blessest the springing thereof.
Thou crownest the year with thy goodness;
And thy paths drop fatness.
They drop upon the pastures of the wilderness;
And the little hills rejoice on every side.
The pastures are clothed with flocks;
The valleys also are covered over with corn;
They shout for joy, they also sing.

We take the liberty of respectfully suggesting to our Government the propriety of appointing a day of Thanksgiving so soon as the harvest is completed. Should this be neglected, we trust that the various religious bodies will, through their Presbyteries or managers, set apart a day for such a purpose; and it would be most desirable if the same day could be adopted by all. The ascending of praise will be followed by the descending of blessings.

RELIGIOUS ITEMS.

A good work is going on among the Spaniards in Gibraltar and Algeria through means of Spanish converts.

A Roman priest in Germany, like the famous Martin Boos, has been zealously encouraging the circulation of the Bible among his people.

Several priests in Lombardy have been excommunicated because they refused to teach that belief in the immaculate conception is essential to salvation.

Protestants are daily increasing in France. Multitudes would leave the Church of Rome, were not the dread of persecution deterring them.

The Moravian brethren, so renowned for their missionary zeal, held a Meeting of Synod lately at Herrnhutt, Germany. Some alterations were made in their form of government, bringing them into near resemblance to Presbytery. Their meetings were very refreshing. They exhibit an admirable type of Christianity.

There is an immense establishment for the manufacture of Romish images at Zurick, Switzerland, which is insured to the amount of £60,000, and said to be realizing to its directors large profits.

Queen Victoria and Prince Albert are contributors to the erection of Luther's monument in Germany.

The missionaries in China report continued friendliness on the part of the natives, notwithstanding the Canton affair—and the prospect of large additions to the number of converts.

ADDRESS TO REV. MR. LLOYD.

[Though we do not agree with those who make a parting address to their Minister an excuse for giving utterance to their own peculiar opinions and displaying their party feeling, and cannot think it the best way of complimenting or even serving a Minister, to make use of the address presented to him as a medium for attacking "Evangelicalism," and must regret that these very expressions have prevented the address from being more numerously signed, we, nevertheless, at the request of its subscribers, insert it with its answer. We trust that both the Rev. gentleman to whom it has been presented, and his amiable family, who are about leaving this Island for the mother country, will reach their native shores in health and safety, and be blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus, as well as made partakers of such temporal mercies as the same Saviour in his love may see fit to bestow upon them.]—*Ed. Protector.*

TO THE EDITORS OF THE PROTECTOR.

Gentlemen,—I am commissioned by the members of the congregation of St. Paul's, who have appended their names to the enclosed Address to the Rev. Charles Lloyd, on the eve of his departure from this Island, to request your insertion of the same, together with the Rev. gentleman's answer, in your next week's issue.

I remain, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

STEPHEN SWABEY.

Sunday evening, Sept. 13, 1857.

To the Reverend CHARLES LLOYD, B. A., *Ecclesiastical Commissary of Prince Edward Island, and Rector of St. Paul's, Charlottetown.*

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:

On the eve of your departure from this Island, and our consequent loss of your services as our Parish Priest, permit us to express to you our sincere regret that any circumstances should have occurred to render your removal from amongst us necessary.

We, as members of Christ's Holy Apostolic Church, render hearty thanks to Him, as our invisible Head, for His mercy in sending you as His minister among us, and in permitting you, even for so short a season, to uphold in her services, and in your preaching and daily walk, the beloved Ritual and distinctive doctrine and character of our branch of the Church Catholic, manfully and unswervingly—yourself treading and exhorting us to walk in her well-marked and righteous paths—avoiding on the one hand the fatal errors of schismatical latitudinarianism, and on the other the most spurious *so-called* evangelicalism of these dangerous days.

We trust it may be God's good pleasure to restore those members of your family who are now labouring under bodily indisposition to health, and that a hearty welcome may greet you and them on your return to your native land, where may you find a cure in God's Vineyard more congenial to the habits and feelings of a member and minister of our beloved Church, as also to those of a Christian gentleman,—and one who, we fully believe, humbly strives to adorn the doctrine of his God and Saviour, walking in Faith and Hope, and not omitting the exercise of that other and better Christian virtue, Charity with all men.

Again asuring you, dear Sir, that our prayers to the Throne of Grace shall cease not that you and yours may be blessed by the God you serve, for His dear Son's sake, in this troublesome world, and that in that glorious immortality "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest," you may be found with the Saints in Light.

Believe us to remain, with all respect and regard, ever your affectionate and grateful Parishioners,

James Warburton	George Day
T. A. Montgomery	Samuel Martin
William Swabey	John E. W. Alleyne
Stephen Swabey	Charles DesBrisay
John Aldous	William Stewart
Charles R. Coker	Edward J. Hodgson
John Ball	E. M. Stratton
Joseph Ball	Peter Stewart, Lt. Col.
Arthur Penny	John Barrow
John J. Jenkins	James Coles, jr
Samuel Swabey	Henry Palmer
W. T. Pethick	Thomas Scott
Thos. Pethick	E. Stewart
George Coles	M. Stewart
John T. Rowe	James Coles, sen.

The Feast of St. Bartholomew,
Charlottetown, P. E. Island, 1857.

[REPLY.]

GENTLEMEN AND BRETHERN IN THE LORD—

Your Address finds a ready access to my heart; but I must not suffer the tone of affection which pervades it to lull me to a forgetfulness of my unworthiness of the praise which it conveys.

I receive it with humiliation as well as gratitude,—humiliation in the consciousness that its terms so far exceed what might be expected even from the judgment of indulgent friends, and gratitude to God, who in addition to His protecting care, so ill deserved, brings friends around me to cheer my departure hence with expressions of approval so supporting.

Joined by conviction, no less than attached by love and native calling to the Church of England, I glory in the thought that my Church is Catholic and Apostolic. I have endeavoured to avoid, as I have ever disliked, all extremes in religious opinions or observances, believing that the true and narrow road of which our Saviour has spoken is pointed out by the Articles and Ritual of our own ancient and National Church, and that he who walks truthfully in her doctrines and ordinances, walks surely in the ordinances of the Lord.

I would have my moderation to be known unto all men who enquire of me, and should my Heavenly Master yet assign me a spot of ground in His Vineyard in the land of our fathers, I trust it will be where moderation, peace, and love preside.

I thank you most sincerely for your prayer that my family may have health of body while on earth, and that, for the sake of God's dear Son, we may enjoy an immortality with the Saints in Light. O! how fervently do I desire and pray, that to your endless blessings you may, yourselves, realize the same, and that we may together join in hallelujahs with the multitude which no man can number, before the throne of God, and of the Lamb, for ever and ever!

Believe me, gentlemen and fellow-Churchmen,
your faithful friend,
CHARLES LLOYD.

To the Hon. WILLIAM SWABEY,
STEPHEN SWABEY, Esq., &c. &c. &c.

☞ The Rev. Edward Anderson, from the United States, will preach (D.V.) in the Cross Roads Baptist Chapel, Lot 48, next Lord's Day, in the afternoon, at half-past 3 o'clock.

☞ The Rev. Alexander M'Kay, of Belfast, will preach (D.V.) at Little Sands, on Monday the 21st Sept., at 11 o'clock.

ACCIDENT.

On Tuesday evening, the 25th ultimo, the body of a youth, apparently about 18 years of age, was found floating on the surface of the water, a short distance from the shore, off Adams's Pond, about 5 miles to the westward of New London Harbour, by four fishermen, on their return from fishing, and by them taken to the shore. On Wednesday morning following one of the men, Mr. Peter Murphy, gave information thereof to James Pidgeon, Esq., J. P., who immediately proceeded to the spot where the body was lying, and in the presence of several other persons, had it stripped and examined to see if any marks could be found thereon, that might lead to the discovery of who he was, but could find none on either body or clothes. The body was then wound in cotton, placed in a Coffin—previously prepared by order of the said Justice—and conveyed to the Graveyard of St. Thomas's Church, New London, and there interred.

Apparently he had not been long dead, the body not being the least decomposed, nor any of the clothes off it. The face, and part of the fingers were gone, the scalp torn off the scull, and hanging down near the nape; fair complexion, light hair—a small portion of which was underneath the scalp—body tall and rather slender, about 5 feet 9 inches in height, had on a blue serge shirt, red flannel drawers, and light blue and black checked doeskin pants, grained leather American made boots, with brass sparrow-bills in the heels, socks light blue, ribbed, with white tops and toes; nothing in the pockets of the clothing.—*Isl.*

APPOINTMENTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor in Council has been pleased to make the following appointments, viz:

Mr. Denis Quinlan to be Secretary and Treasurer of the Northern Branch of the Royal Agricultural Society for the current year, in the terms of the Act of Incorporation.

Mr. William Hawkins McKay to be Harbour and Ballast Master for Richmond Bay, in the place of Mr. Benjamin Thomson, who has resigned that office.

His Excellency in Council has also been pleased to establish a Post Office near Plaster's Mills, on Township No. 14, and to appoint Mr. Alexander McKinnon Postmaster, in terms of the Act of 14th Victoria, cap. 12.

☞ Mr. S. K. G. Nellis—who was born without arms—delighted a large and respectable audience last evening, at the Temperance Hall, with his singular and very original performances. Mr. N. will, we understand, give an exhibition in Georgetown on Friday the 18th and Saturday the 19th instant. See his advertisement in another column.

NEWS BY THE ENGLISH MAIL.

(*From Willmer & Smith's European Times, Aug.* 29.)

INDIA.

The intelligence from India this week is of a depressing character. We learn by the telegraph from Trieste of the surrender and subsequent massacre of the garrison at Cawnpore. The name of Nena Sahib was previously known to infamy by his wholesale butchery of helpless women and children, and it has now transpired that he has had a second opportunity of indulging his cruel propensities, for he has slaughtered the whole of the garrison at Cawnpore, after they had surrendered, owing to the pressure of famine, and in violation of his solemn promise that their lives would be spared. In this most distressing affair Sir Hugh Wheeler lost his life. "He was a soldier," we are told, "of the Lake school. He entered the army in 1803, joined his regiment at this very station of Cawnpore, and marched there, 54 years ago, to the conquest of Delhi. He has distinguished himself since in Affghanistan and elsewhere, and his long term of service comprised almost half the period of our rule in India." That a veteran of his high standing and lengthened experience should fall at the human shambles by a remorseless butcher like this Nena Sahib is a catastrophe as lamentable as it is unlooked for. But it is some satisfaction to know that the monster was subsequently twice attacked, and utterly defeated, by General Havelock, who has re-occupied Cawnpore. The following remarks in a metropolitan morning contemporary will find a response in every British bosom: "Nena Sahib has released us from all obligation; and if he or any of his gang escape the halter it must only be because the bullet or the bayonet has been beforehand with it. We trust that England will spare no cost of men or of money to vindicate justice and humanity upon the person of this savage and his myrmidons. Extraordinary crimes require extraordinary penalties; and, if we mean to sustain British rule or human nature itself, in any wholesome sense of that term, in Hindostan, we must make a signal example of the men who have offered these affronts upon it. We occasionally hear whispers about cheap sentiments of mercy and pity for these men. Whatever we may desire for their souls, it is a plain matter of business what we have to do with their bodies, and not only India but the world will be intolerable if we neglect our duty to them. Nothing else will tell upon the Mahommedan or the Hindoo. For our religion, our teaching and preaching, thay have an utter contempt. Fortunately they understand what it is to be hung, and have a particular objection to it. What we have to teach the followers of Mahommed and the worshippers of Vishnee is that, whatever their creed or their caste, we treat murderers as we do dogs, and in all moral respects we rate them a great deal lower."

The other features of the Indian news are hardly more cheering. Delhi, on the 14th, still held out. The enemy, the telegraph assures us, had made three sorties, in every one of which they were defeated with great loss; but the British force before the place is evidently unequal to its subjugation, and we must wait patiently until the reinforcements have arrived from this country. Sir Henry Barnard died of cholera on the 5th of July, and the preceding day the brave Sir Henry Lawrence expired of a wound received in the discharge of his military duty. Willoughby, the noble fellow who fired the powder magazine at Delhi, is no more, and Neill, another noble and reliable soldier, was almost at the point of death while making exertions for the defence of Allahabad, and the relief of Cawnpore. Worse than all, disease appears to have added more to the mortality of the European soldiers than the worst efforts of the enemy. Famine and pestilence are foes more dangerous than the sword, and against these terrible enemies the British troops were struggling in various points as best they could. This is a very uncheering picture of our future prospects. "The first troop ship for India sailed from England on the last day of June. Since that time troop ships have been taking their departure almost daily for Calcutta and Kurrachee. The average voyage to India round the Cape cannot be estimated under three months. About the end of September the first reinforcements may begin to reach Calcutta and Kurrachee, and they will be dropping in there throughout the months of October, November, and December. But troops cannot be forwarded from Calcutta to Allahabad, or from Kurrachee to Moultan, in less than three weeks. It will, therefore, be the beginning of November before the first driblets of these vaunted reinforcements reach the theatre of war, and what effect, in the meantime, may not battle, pestilence, and famine have on the European force?"

This is a gloomy but rather an overcharged picture. It must be remembered that the troops destined for China have, ere this, reached India, and that the revolt is still confined to the presidency of Bengal. The geography of the district to which the mutiny is mainly confined is not without interest at the present moment. "It is bounded by the Juma on the west, by the Saone and the Gogra on the east. The spirit of insurrection has not caught the hill tribes on the lower acclivities of the Himalaya on the north; nor does it appear to have made serious inroads on any district south of the Nerbudda. The region within which England has to trample out the flame and sparks of insurrection is easily defined. It is a wide and populous region, but England has grappled with more formidable foes ere now." The Bombay and Madras presidencies continued tranquil at the date of the last accounts, and amongst the most pleasing features of the news may be mentioned the fact that, at Saugor, the 31st Regiment, under their native officers alone, drove the revolted 42d out of the station. There had been some disturbances at Hyderabad, in the Deccan, but they had been suppressed. The remaining regiments in the Punjaub had been disarmed. Upon the whole, then, although things are bad enough, they might be worse, and the work which is before us is one of time only. It may cost much blood and treasure, and be accompanied by some delay, but the certainty of our ultimate triumph cannot be doubted, and with it will come the wisdom which is ever dear when purchased by experience.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Queen is fond of excitement; she moves about with extraordinary rapidity. The cruise in the channel is followed by a journey to Scotland. On Thursday the Royal family arrived at Buckingham Palace from the Isle of Wight, and yesterday morning the illustrious party left the Great Northern Railway station at King's Cross for their autumn home in the Highlands. Last night her Majesty slept at Holy-rood house, and this morning will proceed to Balmoral. The middle of October is named as the time for the return of the Court to London.

It is satisfactory to know that the commerce of the country is progressing most favorably. The trade and navigation returns for July have been published, and the result is all that could be wished. During that month of the present year the exported produce amounted to £12,201,000; in the same month of the previous year to £9,968,000; and in July, 1855, to £8,150,000. The increase is, therefore, more than eighty per cent. on the corresponding month of 1855, and about twenty per cent. on that of 1856. In the seven months of 1855 the exports were £51,262,000; in the seven months of 1856 £63,936,000; while in those of the present year the total is £73,150,000, so that the increase is about nine millions as compared with 1850, and twenty-two millions as compared with 1855. The import tables are also cheering. Most of the articles of domestic use show an increase on last year, especially tea, the more surprising considering the present position of affairs in China. The navigation returns are not less consolatory.

The laying down of the Atlantic Cable is delayed until next year. The engineering and scientific world are offering in the meantime every imaginable suggestion to ensure success. The officers in command of the ships that formed the telegraph squadron have given their individual experience and opinion, and they say in substance that they know of no nautical or physical obstacle to success. Improvements, nevertheless, in the machinery for paying out the cable are suggested, but they repudiate the idea that any under or surface currents between Ireland and Newfoundland exist to interfere with the permanent safety of the cable. Professors Morse and Thompson declare that the cable in existence is the most perfect and the best adapted for the work which ingenuity can devise, which they have tested by experience.

It is now determined, we believe, that the Cable which was intended to connect England with America shall bring us into immediate proximity with India, and if we are to credit all that we hear and read the communication will be opened before the end of the year, at a cost, it is said, of £700,000. If the scheme can be carried out so as to link Alexandria with Aden, and Aden with Kurrachee on the Indus, the money will certainly not be lost, but it is much easier to speculate on the accomplishment of such a project than to realise it.

The dispatch of troops to India knows no intermission, and the last intelligence from the scene of operations proves that this is a wise precaution. A ministerial jour-