

could afford,
white brethren
"Mr. Collett
utmost to put
free." Now
his wish to
destroy the
perpetual use
ool Society, is
anted in lieu
ment has to
it was ever
the Church
his conduct
r. White not
49, as he as-
me by him
nts thereon,
the children
to Richard
ism of their
plication for
, as though
case, being
er, when as
mother, one
te, my son
to, or an-
therefore,
usual stands
to quibble
ught to St.
u.—(Vide

a mistake
owledges
shillings,
o, and the
Rev. Mr.
Mr. White
he second
m of the
a attack-
e in the
dfathers

and Godmother, and can be proved by other parties who heard Mr. White's refusal? Is it from this publicity, or because such a refusal might subject Mr. White to punishment by the Canon Law, which if put in force by the Bishop, might cause Mr. White's suspension? Or is it, because Ingram could neither be enjoloed or intimidated, as by most unworthy means others have been? I can but smile at Mr. White's attempt to damnify the credit of two of the declarants in the late Mrs. Kirby's case; although some truth may be attached to the name of the Cove alluded to, where they resided, it may be well to state, that *that* name arose from parties who resided there many years before the present parties did, and even allowing that a Tract may have proved beneficial to the juniors of a family, it cannot and will not justify Mr. White in his supposed advantage over the parents, who at all events have never yet had an Affidavit filed against them requiring their being bound by securities to keep the peace towards their neighbours, as the Rev. William Kepple White has, and that only a few weeks since. The remaining declarant (Mrs. Bendle) he has not dared to cast any reflection upon, well knowing, I presume, that every Minister who has visited this Bay for the last thirty years, would defend her from imputation, and to whom he must ever feel indebted for the charitable color of his conduct as stated in her declaration.

There is evidently an error in a date in Kirby's declaration, but of so trifling a nature as scarcely requiring the correction, of 1848 for 1849, which error arose in mis-copying the Register, in all other particulars regarding the child it is perfectly clear; the child referred to having been extremely ill was privately baptized in Beaufet, being of course only one portion of the ceremony, but being refused the completion caused the conveyance of it to Burin, where the remaining portion was performed, as proved by the Rev. Mr. Harvey's letter; as regards Kirby's mistake in the name of the officiating clergyman, there being three then in Burin besides the Bishop, let Mr. White make the most of it. This division of this service, by the bye, is not as discreditable as the division of a marriage service in the church of this place by Mr. White, when the bridegroom, in the middle of it, was required to place the ring and fee upon the book, and unfortunately for him having but one dollar, the Prayer Book was closed, the ceremony broken off, and himself dispatched for the remaining three dollars, and he was obliged to return up the Bay to borrow or procure as best he could, and after some day