

ter, paid what they deemed reasonable and could afford, therefore were far more justly treated than their white brethren in Beaufet. Mr. White says at page 10th, "Mr. Collett know that I had, from the very first, done my utmost to put them (the pews) down and make every sitting free." Now I knew no such thing; that it might have been his wish to destroy the pews is likely enough, and that he did destroy the free pew granted by the Parishioners for the perpetual use of the *Teacher of the Colonial Church and School Society*, is quite true, and never yet has another one been granted in lieu thereof; so that that gentleman at the present moment has to seek a sitting where he can find one; but that it was ever Mr. White's wish to make any thing free where the Church is concerned appears unlikely, and the whole of his conduct goes far to prove the contrary. So far from Mr. White not having any Reports of the Church Society in 1849, as he asserts, I have, and can produce one presented to me by him during that year, bearing his name and compliments thereon. In the same page he says:—"The parents of the children never once sought the rite at my hands," alluding to Richard Collett's and Samuel Masters' applications for baptism of their children. Mr. White here refers, also, to my application for baptism of the child of the former, March 23d, 1850, as though I was the only person present, which was not the case, being accompanied by Richard Collett, the infant's father, when as is frequent if more than one party waits upon another, one only was spokesman, and I addressed Mr. White, my son being present assenting, and quite ready to reply to, or answer any questions put to him, but none were, and therefore, as is stated in his Declaration, the plain, blunt refusal stands fully proved, and Mr. White endeavours in vain to quibble himself out of it; Richard Collett's child was brought to St. John's, and there christened by the Rev. C. Blackman.—(Vide Appendix, No. 2)

In Masters' case, (in whose Declaration there is a mistake of 8th April instead of 6th January) Mr. White acknowledges his having bound himself by his signature to pay ten shillings, which was before his *first* child was christened by him, and the second one which he also refused, was baptised by the Rev. Mr. Peach, Wesleyan Minister, as well as the third; yet Mr. White fraudulently meets the charge of refusing to baptise the *second* child by palming off his incorrect entry of the baptism of the *first* child. How is it that Ingram's case has not been attacked! The refusal to christen his child was made in the Church upon the Sabbath-day, in presence of the Godfathers