

# The Carleton Sentinel.

Devoted to Agriculture, Literature, and General Intelligence.

Published and Edited

"Our Queen and Constitution."

By James S. Segee.

NUMBER 47.

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1851.

VOLUME 3.

## PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

### COMMERCIAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Capital, £150,000

R. ENGLISH, Esq., Director, JAMES GROVER, Esq., Cashier.

WOODSTOCK AGENCY.

DISCOUNT DAY, Thursday.

NOTES or BILLS for Discount must be left with the Cashier before 3 o'clock on Wednesdays.

### CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Capital, £35,000.

WOODSTOCK AGENCY.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.—C. CONNELL, J. KITCHUM, D. L. DIBBLEE, and JAMES R. TUPPER, Esqs.

AGENT and CASHIER.—JAMES ROBERTSON, Esq.  
Notes or Bills for Discount must be left at the Bank before 3 o'clock on Mondays.

### COLONIAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF LONDON,

CAPITAL, £500,000, Sterling.

JAMES GROVER, Esq., AGENT, WOODSTOCK.

### NATIONAL LOAN FUND

Life Assurance Scty. of London;

CAPITAL, £500,000, STERLING.

JACOB & WINSLOW, AGENTS, WOODSTOCK.

### CENTRAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

CAPITAL, £50,000 STERLING.

L. P. FISHER, Esq. AGENT, WOODSTOCK.

POLICIES issued immediately on application to the Agent, here.

### EQUITABLE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF LONDON,

Capital, £500,000, Sterling.

JACOB & WINSLOW, AGENTS, WOODSTOCK.

### CARLETON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

JOSEPH HARVEY, Esq. PRESIDENT,

JOHN DIBBLEE, CHAS. CONNELL, CHAS. PERLEY, GILBERT SPURR, BENJAMIN CHURCHILL, CHARLES CAMPBELL, SAMUEL PORTER, RICHARD ENGLISH, ARNER BULL, and CHARLES EMERY, Esqs., Vice Presidents.

H. E. DIBBLEE, Esq., Secretary.

JAMES GROVER, Esq., Treasurer.

### WOODSTOCK MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.

CHARLES CONNELL, Esq. PRESIDENT,

W. T. BAIRD, & R. ENGLISH, Esqs. Vice Presidents.

JAMES ROBERTSON, WM. LINDSAY, & E. R. PARSONS, L. P. FISHER, H. E. DIBBLEE, and ROBERT A. HAY, Esqs. Directors.

D. L. DIBBLEE, Esq., Secretary.

JAMES GROVER, Esq., Treasurer.

### PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY, OF HARTFORD, CONN.

JOHN BALLOCH, Esq. AGENT, WOODSTOCK.

### HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,

JOHN BALLOCH, Esq., AGENT, WOODSTOCK.

### THE AMERICAN

### LIVE STOCK

### INSURANCE COMPANY,

VINCENNES, INDIANA.

Charter Unlimited: Granted 2nd January, 1850.

CAPITAL—\$50,000!

Stockholders Individually Liable.

For the Insurance of

HORSES, MULES, PRIZE BULLS, SHEEP AND CATTLE.

Of every description, against the combined risks of FIRE, WATER ACCIDENTS, and DISEASE; also upon Stock driven to Eastern Markets, or transported South.

Losses paid in 30 days after proof of death.

DIRECTORS:

JOSEPH G. BOWMAN, Council; John Wise, Merchant and Bank

Director;

FRYDRIAND EBERWINE, Mer- Alvin W. Tracy, " " "

chant; Hon Abner T. Ellis, Esq., State

Capt. Isaac Mass, Merchant; Senator, & Mayor of Vincennes

George D. Hay, Merchant; Abn. Smith, Farmer, Bank D;

Hon. Thomas Bishop; rector, & Audt. of Knox county.

JOSEPH BOWMAN, President.

E. SHURTLEFF WHITNEY, Secretary.

WM. BURTCH, Treasurer, Merchant, and President Vincennes Branch of St. Bank, Indiana.

W. R. NEWCOMB

Agent for Woodstock.

Woodstock, September 1850.

## THE EARL OF ENNISKILLEN AND THE HOME SECRETARY.

[From the Bytown (C. W.) Orange Lily.]

The Earl of Enniskillen, the Grand Master of the Orangemen of Ireland, has published an Address to the Protestants of Great Britain, in which he comments with much truth and force upon the injustice done to the members of the Orange Institution by the Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, in his refusal to present the loyal Address of the Brethren to Her Majesty the Queen. The able and illustrious Chief of the loyal Orangemen of Ireland, shows clearly the inconsistency and despotism of the Home Secretary in intercepting the Address.

The base act of the transaction is accounted for by him on the ground that the Orange Society had been disorganized at the command of King William IV. who, in conformity with an address presented by the House of Commons in the year 1836, called upon the Orangemen to disband, which they immediately did with an uncomplaining spirit of loyalty unparalleled. However, in the year 1844, on account of the trouble given to the loyal and peaceable inhabitants of the country by Ribbon Societies, it was deemed advisable to re-form the Orange Society, and upon the advice of eminent lawyers it was re-organized upon a principle entirely conformable to the laws, and as such it has existed ever since. At different periods since the reusucitation of Orangeism, the Orangemen of Ireland have received substantial proofs of the regard, favor, and confidence of the Government; and it cannot be regarded as other than a most intolerable stretch of official arrogance in Sir George Grey to suppress the Address of the Orangemen in the reign of Queen Victoria, because the Society under a more objectionable guise had been discouraged in the reign of William IV.

The Orangemen of Ireland, under the existing provisions of their Institution have always been distinguished by the clearest evidences of royal favor; and it may well be to them, and their friends, a matter for indignation and astonishment to receive, so unexpectedly, such undeserved and uncalled for treatment from an officer of the Government. The Orangemen of Ireland are loyal beyond impeachment or suspicion—they are banded together according to law for the purpose of supporting the laws and defending each other; and who will dare to assert that they are unworthy of enjoying all the rights, immunities and privileges guaranteed by a free Government and an impartial Constitution to all loyal subjects? Addresses have been received, and duly transmitted to the Royal presence, emanating from Papists, and no doubt Sir George Grey would have had small scruple to do the polite for a band of Ribbonmen, hailing their expressions of veneration and esteem for the Sovereign as proofs of awakening loyalty. Why then did he refuse to present the Orange Address to Her Majesty? We believe he did so, because he is an enemy at heart to all that is revered and cherished by Orangemen.

We copy the following remarks, as most appropriate to this subject, from our able contemporary, the *Dublin Constitution and Church Sentinel*.

"Now, what says the Bill of Rights, in its fifth article—'IT IS THE RIGHT OF THE SUBJECTS OF THE REALM TO PETITION THE KING.' If it be 'the right' of subjects to petition the throne, and if there be an officer appointed to forward their petitions, that officer violates his duty when he refuses to recognize the subjects' 'right.' The law says the subjects have a 'right' to address the Queen; Sir George Grey stands up and tells the most loyal subjects in the state 'You shall not petition the Queen; Popish prelates may petition the Queen—men who trample upon the laws may petition the Queen. I will allow them' to exercise, 'the right' of subjects, but upon 'the right' of Orangemen I will trample, 'the right' of the Protestants I will violate, 'the right' of the loyal and the devoted, I will utterly set at nought and laugh to scorn." If Sir George can do this, what may he not do? It is "the right" of an Orangeman to enter into his own house but he may to-morrow, or next day, find a policeman standing at his cottage door and impeding the exercise of this "right," under the instructions of Sir George Grey. A man may be sitting down to eat his breakfast with his little family, and Sir George Grey may send in a Janissary to tell him that he does not choose to let him exercise "the right" of eating bread and butter, or "the right" of drinking a cup of tea. It is not half as great tyranny to prevent us from eating our breakfast, as it is to prevent us from stating our grievances to the Queen. It is a thousand times more despotic to prevent us coming with our complaints before our most gracious Sovereign, than it is to prevent us from entering into our own humble homes. Now, really, is there no redress against this unconstitutional conduct of the Home Secretary? Will Irish Orangemen submit to this? Will English Orangemen submit to this? Will the Orangemen of London—will the Orangemen of Bradford submit to this? Will the Orangemen of Derry, of Enniskillen, of Belfast, submit to this? Or, are we to understand that the Bill of Rights is a delusion, a mockery, and a snare? We venture

to say, that this question ought not to be left undecided. A petition to the Queen, with respect to our serious grievances, should be got up by the Orangemen, and sent to Her Majesty by the proper officer; if he refuses to present it, it should be returned to him again, with an imperative call on him to do his duty; and, if he shall refuse, he should be called to account before the proper tribunal as a violator of the rights of the people, so as that we might exactly learn, from the decision of competent authority, whether the possession of liberty by British subjects is not altogether a mistake, and whether loyalty is not, in fact, a crime and an offence."

[From the Halifax Guardian.]

## MISS TALBOT.

Another scale has fallen from the eyes of England. The pseudo Hierarchy of Car Wiseman roused her from a long slumber of fancied security. At first she doubted the reality of so daring an assumption, but the bold and unmistakable language of the haughty priest, dissipated all doubts on this head, and called forth such an expression of feeling, as proves that England is still thoroughly sound at heart. It is true that some unworthy and apostate members, bearing the name of Protestants, but labouring covertly in the cause of the great enemy of the Protestant faith, have inflicted extensive injury upon the Church they have sworn to uphold and protect.

The film which blinded the eyes of England to their proceedings has fallen off, and the light which shines upon them will render them for ever innocuous. Still there is danger, great and immediate danger, both from within and from without. Our foe is artful, unscrupulous, and almost omnipresent. You meet him not only in the public places of the world, but in the Church and in the Parliament, insinuating himself into the very bosom of our families, corrupting or endeavouring to corrupt the principles of our faith, engaged in an unceasing warfare against the spread of the great truths of the Gospel. The real character of Popery is now, thank God, perfectly understood in England. The principles of our faith require complete toleration to all; but to a party faithless on principle toleration must be extended with a watchful eye. It would seem as if Providence had intended that we should see the whole rottenness of the system, and the case of Miss Talbot is but another illustration of its real character. The facts of the case may be stated in a few words—Miss Talbot, an orphan and a ward of Chaucery, with a fortune of £80,000, was given in charge to the Earl of Shrewsbury, who sent her to a convent for her education. That education finished, she returned to Lord Shrewsbury, who found her, however, in the way, and sent her once more to the convent. At this point the accounts of parties assume a most conflicting character. Mr. Berkeley, the step-father of the lady, representing her positive unwillingness to adopt a conventual life; while the pseudo bishop of Clifton, represents her as writing a most supplicating letter to be admitted as a postulant, as she was anxious to dedicate herself to the service of Heaven and retire altogether from the world.—Here are two contradictory statements. We have ourselves little doubt as to which has the larger share of truth, but we have grave fears as to which party will succeed in accomplishing their object. The victim has been well prepared for the sacrifice. She may love the world much, but most likely she will fear the Church and its anathemas more. Where the mind has become a waste, from a life of superstitious idleness, little firmness of purpose can be expected; she may loathe her prison and yet refuse to leave it. It is quite possible that she may resign herself to a life of cheerless and despairing solitude, rather than incur the displeasure of a Church that never forgives, and the denunciation of a priest already in imagination gloating over her gold. But whatever may be the result another great and useful lesson will be learned by the British people, of the grasping and unprincipled character of that system which is once more raising its head amongst us. Surely it should make some of its Protestant supporters pause in their own fancied career, but of this indeed we have but slender hopes. The enemies of all religion have always arrayed themselves on the side of popery. We have ever found the infidel and the demagogue supporting the papist against the protestant; and the late division in the House of Commons has been no exception. But it has left behind it one cheering fact—the weakness of the common enemy in this great assembly. Papist, puseyite, infidel, demagogue, united could only muster 95 in 656. There is yet room for thankfulness and joy. Miss Talbot may be sacrificed—we fear she will—but her sacrifice may save succeeding victims. The altar and the priest, if they cannot be purified, shall at least be guarded. No Church in an enlightened country can be a licensed robber, whether the victim be the dying, the orphan, or even the depraved, who in his expiring agonies seeks to purchase salvation from a church whose peculiar characteristic in all ages and at all times, has been its power, its pretended power, to release from moral obligations and to absolve from crime.