

# The Carleton Sentinel

Devoted to Agriculture, Literature, and General Intelligence.

Published and Edited]

"Our Queen and Constitution."

[By James S. Segee.

Number 36.

WOODSTOCK, N. B., SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1853.

Volume 6

## The Carleton Sentinel.

Is Printed and Published every Saturday afternoon, by JAMES S. SEGEE, at his Office in Woodstock, N. B. All Letters (addressed to him) on matters connected with the SENTINEL, must be Post Paid.

TERMS.—Ten Shillings per annum if paid in advance, Twelve Shillings and six pence if not paid in advance, and paid before the expiration of six months, and Fifteen Shillings if not paid at the expiration of six months. No Subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.—First insertion of each square of twelve lines, or under, Five Shillings, each subsequent insertion One Shilling and three Pence, extra lines, first insertion Fourpence, subsequent insertions one Penny.

JOB PRINTING promptly executed with neatness and care.

### AUTHORISED AGENTS.

H. BAIRD, Esq.,	Andover.
P. C. AMREAN, Esq.,	Madawaska.
W. M'KENZIE, Esq.,	Richmond.
GEORGE RYAN, Esq.,	King's County.
A. A. DAVIDSON, Esq.,	Newcastle.
Dr. ROBERT WILEY,	Simonds.
Mr. J. H. MULLIN,	Fredericton.
Mr. SOLOMON HOWE,	Poquiock.
Mr. GEORGE MILBURY,	Wicklow.
Mr. JOHN CARVILLE,	Richmond.
Mr. THOMAS BOYD,	Simonds.
Mr. GEORGE CURRIE,	Tobique.
Mr. JACOB TILLEY,	Sheffield.
Mr. GEORGE N. RISTEEN,	Kingsclear.
Mr. JOHN PERKINS,	Presqu'isle Set.
Mr. H. A. VREDENBURGH,	Queen's County.
Mr. HORACE AMES,	St. Andrews.
Mr. JAMES COOPER,	St. John.
Mr. JOHN KEYS,	Victoria Corner.
Mr. W. S. NEVERS,	Beckaguimick.

### VALUABLE PROPERTIES FOR SALE.

THE following properties are offered for sale on very moderate terms—

The Lot of Land fronting Brunswick Street, and adjoining the new Gaol in the City of Fredericton, having a front of 66 feet, and extending in rear to the lot leased to Thomas Sweade.

The lot leased to the said Thomas Sweade, fronting 30 feet on St John Street, and extending in rear of the above-mentioned lot to the Gaol lot.

The leasehold property in the said City, known as No. 11, block No. 1, under lease from the Church Corporation, at a rent of £3 2s. 6d. per annum, with House, Shop, and Barn thereon, at present occupied by Mr. K. Forman.

The lot of land in the Hanwell Settlement, Parish of Kingsclear, County of York, No. 15, containing 200 acres more or less, about eleven miles from Fredericton.

The Farm formerly owned by Benjamin Yerxa, Junior, on the Keswick, County of York, being lot No. 40, in the grant to the New York Volunteers, containing 150 acres more or less.

The block of land in the Parish of Dumfries, County of York, on the south side of the river Saint John, and fronting thereon, formerly in the possession of Asa Dow, and next adjoining the property of Mr. John R. Patterson, containing 1013 acres, besides allowance for roads, &c. The land is laid out in 8 lots, each containing 115 acres more or less, and will be sold separately or together, as may be required.

The Farm situate in the Parish of Douglas, in the County of York, about 3 miles above the City of Fredericton, formerly owned by Wellington Yerxa, and containing 500 acres more or less.

The Farm, with valuable buildings and improvements thereon, on which Henry Baird, Esquire, now resides, in the Parish of Andover, in the County of Victoria, containing 100 acres.

100 acres of land in the said Parish of Andover, in the Salmon River Settlement, near the Grand Falls, granted in the Military grant to John Smith.

678 acres of wilderness land, of fine quality, in the Green Settlement, Parish of Kent, County of Carleton, granted to Robert Kerr.

160 acres of land joining the American line, on the Arestook River, granted to Robert Eggan.

400 acres of land with improvements, near Eel River, in the said parish of Woodstock, known as the Chapman Farm.

The lot of land and Store thereon, in the town of Woodstock, near the Upper Corner (so called,) formerly owned and occupied by the late A. S. Carman, Esquire.

The lot of land on Little River, in the parish of Waterbury, Queen's County, formerly owned by Joseph and Samuel Estabrooks, containing 300 acres, and described as lots Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7, in the grant to Elijah Estabrooks and others.

All these properties will be sold very reasonably, and information regarding them can be procured on application to

W. F. DIBBLEE, Woodstock,  
G. W. RITCHIE, Fredericton, or  
ROBERT RANKIN & Co. St. John

April 30, 1851.

### KINGSLEAR TANNERY.

THE subscriber returns his best thanks to all his friends and customers, for past favors, and hereby solicits a continuance of their patronage. He also begs leave to inform the public, that he will in future pay cash for Hides, when requested; or manufacture them on the shares, as formerly.

WILLIAM GIBSON.

Kingslear, Nov. 10, 1852.

### A LETTER

To the Clergy of the Church of England in the Diocese of New Brunswick.

FREDERICTON, February 15, 1852.

REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,—Having received returns from most of the Parishes in this Diocese, on the subject of Diocesan Synods, to which you called my attention in the autumn of last year, the result appears to be, on the whole, unfavorable to the enjoyment of this privilege by our lay brethren. And I am sure you will agree with me, that, if the laity do not themselves desire to meet with us in Synod, and with us to consider and propose such measures as appear likely to promote the well being of the Church, we should be the last persons in the world to attempt to force privilege upon others, which they do not wish to possess. In the United States, and in every part of the British Dominions, men argue very differently; but this is not our case. However, as I regard the whole of this proceeding on the part of many persons as a misconception of the nature of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and still more of my proposition to consider generally the desirableness of Synodical action, without committing ourselves to the details of that Bill, I shall set before you the information which I possess on the subject, and mention the part which I have taken in the matter, that everything may be clearly understood, except by those who are determined to misrepresent every action which is not done by themselves.

In the autumn of the year 1851, five of the seven Bishops of British North America met at Quebec, and adopted unanimously the following resolution, which, with the others then passed, was sent by me in the spring of 1852 to every clergyman in this Province. I may observe, by the way, that some little delay in the communication to the Clergy arose from our having forwarded our resolutions to His Grace the Archbishop, who intimated no disapproval of them, and even went so far as to express a "hope that we might enjoy the same privileges (of meeting in Convocation) which our brethren in the United States possess." I would also observe, that our resolutions were all forwarded to our absent brethren, the Bishops of Nova Scotia and Rupert's Land, who signified to the Bishop of Quebec their warm and cordial concurrence in all the main points touched on by us, thus proving happily that there is no substantial difference of opinion amongst us. The Resolution to which I have just alluded is as follows:—

CONVOCAION.—"In consequence of the anomalous state of the Church of England in these Colonies, with reference to its general government, and the doubts entertained as to the validity of any code of Ecclesiastical law, the Bishops of these Dioceses experience great difficulty in acting in accordance with their Episcopal commission and prerogatives, and their decisions are liable to misconception, as if emanating from their individual will, and not from the general body of the Church. We therefore, consider it desirable, in the first place, that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of England in each Diocese should meet together in Synod, at such times, and in such places as may be agreed on. Secondly, That the Laity in such Synods should meet by representation, and that their representatives should be communicants. Thirdly, It is our opinion that as questions will arise from time to time which will affect the welfare of the Church in these Colonies, it is desirable that the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity should meet in Council under a Provincial metropolitan, with power to make such rules and regulations for

the better conduct of our Ecclesiastical affairs as by the said Council may be deemed expedient. Fourthly, That the said Council should be divided into two houses, the one consisting of the Bishops of these several Dioceses, under their Metropolitan, and the other of the Presbyters and Lay members of the Church assembled (as before mentioned) by representation." In the discussion which has taken place on the question mooted in this resolution, the motives which led to it, and which are plainly avowed, have been studiously, and I think somewhat ungenerously, kept out of sight. We say that what has led us to favor this line of action is "the anomalous state of our church in these Dioceses," "the doubts entertained of the validity of any code of Ecclesiastical law," and "the misconstructions put upon our decisions, as if emanating from our individual will, and not from the general body of the Church." We proposed as a remedy, a wider representation of Churchmen, and regular assemblies at stated periods to collect their judgments, and agree upon things desirable to be done. May we not be believed when we assert what our motives and reasons really are? Would not a little thought have convinced men that we have trouble and vexation enough without seeking to involve ourselves in more trouble, except for some grave cause; and the weariness certain to attend us in the first meetings of Synodical assemblies, could only be recompensed by the practise of unity and godly love amongst our flocks, and by the maintenance of sound order and discipline? Is it not plain that, were it possible that seven Bishops of the Church of England should unite in dark and dangerous designs against the liberties of their brethren, the calling of public assemblies, in which the Clergy and Laity should meet, would be the most absurd of all possible methods to compass this end? But surely a little more charity might have taught the objectors, that to contrive, by means of Synods, (as has been publicly stated) to introduce some of the grossest errors of the Church of Rome into the Church of England, as it would be one of the silliest, so is it one of the most unlikely schemes for us to adopt, is foreign to the principles publicly by us avowed, adopted and recorded, and I trust we may say without arrogance, is contradicted by our known attachment to our formularies, and by the daily tenor of our lives.

I may, however, add on this head, that a simple, judicious, and accurate account of the reconciliation of a person to our communion from the Church of Rome, accompanied by a solemn form of renunciation of Tridentine errors, in detail, taken in great measure from a similar form prepared by Convocation, together with an account of a sermon preached by me on the same occasion, in the summer of 1851, in the Parish Church of Kingston, in which I earnestly inculcated the doctrines of our 39 articles, in opposition to the decrees of the Council of Trent, was refused insertion in the same newspaper, which has for some time past countenanced and published such charges as that just noticed. But to return to my narrative.—In the spring of 1852, I went to England, and was there occupied (except during a severe illness) in the business of the Diocese. But during the whole of my visit I never saw Mr. Gladstone, nor had I any opportunity had I been desirous, of concocting any plan for the introduction of Synods, with him or any other person. I was wholly occupied with other matters. I learned however, that petitions against Mr. Gladstone's Bill had been sent home from New Brunswick, showing that the Bill was known, and must have been published,

for surely no one would petition against a Bill which he had never seen. On my return to my Diocese, I heard that both Mr. Gladstone's first Bill and his amended Bill, had been published and circulated in the Diocese. Shortly after my return I received the following letter from Sir John Pakington, the Colonial Secretary.

DOWNING STREET, 30th July, 1852.

My Lord,—As your Lordship must naturally feel much interest in the Debates of last Session in the House of Commons, upon the Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone for regulating the Church of England in the Colonies, I forward to your Lordship some copies of the Speech in which I stated my objections to Mr. Gladstone's measure.

I also send to your Lordship copies of the Bill, and of the altered Bill which Mr. Gladstone subsequently introduced, but which was not discussed in the House.

The subject will doubtless be renewed in the next Session of Parliament, and in the event of legislation upon it by Her Majesty's Government, it will afford me much assistance if your Lordship will favor me with your opinion upon the present state of the Church in your Diocese, and what legislation you would suggest in order to place the Church in your Diocese in a more efficient and satisfactory position.

I have the honor to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

JOHN S. PAKINGTON.

The Lord Bishop of Fredericton,  
New Brunswick.

On this letter I shall now make some remarks.

The letter mentions, in the first place, that some copies of the Colonial Secretary's Speech were enclosed to me. This had already appeared in all the newspapers, consequently here was no information to communicate. Secondly,—a copy of Mr. Gladstone's first Bill and altered Bill was enclosed; these had also been published and circulated in the Province previously to my receipt of the letter. Thirdly,—no suggestion is offered to me of calling public attention to the subject of Synods, but "in the event of legislation by Her Majesty's Government," (a contingency sufficiently remote), my opinion on the present state of the Church in my Diocese, and on legislative changes desirable to me made, is requested. To this letter I have not yet replied, for the following reasons. After waiting a while to see whether I should be favored with the views of my elder brethren on the subject, I determined to take time to consider what reply should be given on a matter of so great importance, and was soon entirely occupied with my tour of confirmation through the Eastern part of the Province. Just before I set out, the Archdeacon, (whose views on the matter had been formed without any reference to Mr. Gladstone, as far back as the first establishment of the Church Society) wrote to me with a request from the Fredericton Deanery that I would call a meeting to consider the subject of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. I assented to the request, on condition that the Clergy in other Deaneries were desirous of the same movement, which as I said "did not originate with me," but with the Clergy themselves.

On further consideration it seemed to me much more likely to secure general consent, if I limited the subject of discussion to a point in which I supposed that most persons who had yearly met in our Church Society would agree, viz.—that it was desirable that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, by representation, should occasionally or statedly, meet and arrange affairs in which they are all alike interested.—I did not suppose it possible that any of the Clergy or any considerable body of the laity,