

ENGLISH NEWS,

Arrival of the Pacific.

(By Telegraph via St. John.)

HIGHLY IMPORTANT FROM TURKEY! MORE FIGHTING—DESTRUCTION OF THE TURKISH FLEET BY THE RUSSIANS!—TURKISH ADMIRAL MADE PRISONER—INTENSE EXCITEMENT IN LONDON AND PARIS—EUROPEAN WAR DEEMED INEVITABLE.

ST. JOHN, Dec. 27th.—The steamship Pacific, arrived at New York yesterday at noon.

On the 30th of November the Russian fleet under Machukoff from Sebastopol, consisting of 21 sail, appeared off the Turkish harbor of Sinope. Vice Admiral Omar Bey, with 14 ships attacked them, and an awful naval combat ensued. The Turks fought like devils, and 13 of their ships were blown up and sunk—one escaping. Omar Bey was taken prisoner.

Of the Russian fleet two line-of-battle ships, three frigates, and five steamers were destroyed. The battle lasted one hour, with terrible carnage.

There was intense excitement in London and Paris on the reception of this news, and a European War is now deemed inevitable.

Flour had advanced 1s. 6d. to 2s. since the sailing of the America. Corn had advanced 2d. to 3d.

The Carleton Sentinel.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1853.

Proceedings of County Council.

COURT HOUSE, Woodstock, December 20, 1853.

Mr. Dibblee asked for information respecting another affair. Mr. Kearney had sued the County, and the Board had employed Mr. Fisher to defend. He would like to know if anything had been done in this matter.

The Secretary Treasurer informed the Board that he had been served with a notice, since the last Meeting of the Council by Mr. Jacob, stating that Kearney's action had been withdrawn.

Mr. Dibblee presented a bill from L. P. Fisher, Esq., for £3 10s.

Mr. Clowse supposed this was for costs in the Kearney suit, but he was under the impression that when an attorney was employed to defend a suit, he should not allow it to be withdrawn until the costs were paid.

Mr. Lindsay said this bill was not for costs in the Kearney suit, but a returner in the several suits, and for the written opinion.

Ordered to be paid.

The Secretary Treasurer read communications from Messrs. Cleary, English, Hay, and McBeth, Licensed Auctioneers, on the subject of the Licence money. Mr. Cleary's fees had only amounted to about £6, and he thought £3 rather too much to pay for a licence. Mr. English had only received 10s. fees. Mr. Hay had received none for the last year, had not sold anything in that time. Mr. McBeth had not sold for seven years, he did not reside in the County. Mr. Collins had paid £3 with the understanding that if any reduction was made in the amount of the Licence money he should have the benefit of it.

Mr. Lindsay read an extract from the Act, that would give the necessary instructions to the Secretary Treasurer how to proceed. All auctioneers who took out a licence were entitled to pay a fine of £5, if they did not pay over their fees. Mr. Collins paid and he should be protected; it was not fair to make one pay and allow others to sell without paying. Mr. English and Mr. Cleary had sold by their own confession, and they should be compelled to pay the fines. If they did not wish to pay they should give up their licence.

Mr. Dibblee thought that according to the terms of the By-law every one taking out a licence should pay the fees, but he thought it unjust to call on those for fees who had not sold. Mr. By had not sold for the last year, and Mr.

McBeth for seven years. He did not think it right to make them pay now.

Mr. Clowse said if they acted on this rule it would also be unjust to ask Mr. English to pay £3 when his commission only amounted to 10s.

Mr. Gallop thought it rather too severe to put the By-law in force now, as parties had received no intimation of the intentions of the Council to collect these fees until this fall, when the By-law was published. They should be dealt with as easily as possible at the present time. For the future they would act with their eyes open.

Mr. Lindsay said if Mr. English or Mr. Anybody else would take out a licence they should pay the fees. They interfered with the rights and privileges of those who did pay, and perhaps kept others out who were willing to pay and run the risk of getting employment sufficient to pay the fees at least. Mr. English would have sold more had an opportunity offered.

Mr. Harding said it was a matter of speculation with some of these parties; they took out a licence and if they had plenty of business they were willing to pay for it, if not they expected to go free. In his opinion every one who took out a licence and sold under it, should be compelled to pay, there was no injustice in that.

Mr. Lloyd thought all should pay who held the appointment or resign, they filled up a space to the exclusion of others and should pay the fees.

Mr. Clowse could see no hardness in the matter. If the By-law was a new thing he believed there was a regulation of the Sessions to the same effect, which should be acted on until their By-law came into force. He looked upon an auctioneer's licence in the same light as he did a tavern licence, the fees of the latter must be paid whether the party sold or not and he thought the Council would laugh at a man who had taken out a tavern licence if he applied for the money to be returned because he had had no customers.

Mr. Dibblee said that all who had sold since the By-law came into operation were subject to its provisions, but it might be a hard case if they had not sold since then and were compelled to pay the fees. Auctioneers were appointed by the Government, and they could not sell until they had first given bonds in the Secretary's office, then in the office of the Deputy Treasurer. Messrs. English, Cleary, Hay, and Collins had given such bonds.

Mr. Jones was not aware that any bonds had been given, but this knowledge had changed his views. He was at first for calling only on those who had sold for pay, now he would go for compelling all to pay who had entered into bonds they would have sold if they could.

Mr. Giberson would make a distinction. If those who had not sold under their licence would take up or have their bonds cancelled, they should be let off without payment, but if they allowed their bonds to remain they should be compelled to pay, as they could sell at any time.

Moved by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Lindsay,

That the Secretary Treasurer be directed to proceed against all persons now residing in the County, who have taken out auctioneer's licence, and in case of refusal that proceedings be taken for the recovery of the fine. Any auctioneer who had not sold since the time the By-law came into effect, shall be allowed to withdraw his bond without payment of fees.

Mr. Dibblee would object to this, they had been allowed to go on from year to year without payment if they did not sell, but now they were to be called upon at once to pay whether they had sold or not. They should have some notice and if they continued their licence after that, then compel them to pay over.

Mr. Jones said they were not by this resolution compelled to resign they could either pay the fees or resign as they pleased, if they wished to retain the appointment they must pay the £3.

Mr. Gallop thought the Council was acting with great moderation. All who had given bonds, and had not paid the fees were entitled to pay a fine of £5, whether they had sold or

not, but here only those who had sold were asked to pay, the others could resign without payment if they chose.

Resolution passed almost unanimously.

(To be Continued.)

[In our last we made Mr. Lindsay say that the Supreme Court should be applied to for a Mandamus to compel the Clerk to pay the amount of Lovely's fine, to the County. It was Hume's and Russell's fines he referred to.]

We need not encumber our columns with anything more in reply to the Advocate, than the following letters. We were charged with fabricating the statements mentioned in these letters, for the purpose of injuring the character of the Editor. A simple contradiction would not have been sufficient; we therefore feel called upon to give the letters in full.—They are published simply to clear ourselves from the charge made against us in the "Advocate," and not for the purpose of continuing a controversy as unpleasant to us, as it can possibly be to any of our readers. The replies to the various other charges made by the Editor of the "Advocate," will be found in full in "The Lunet," and we may here state that these replies would not have appeared or any notice taken of the charges, had the Advocate not alluded to us again in the manner he did in his paper of the 21st inst. We would also state that with the publication of these letters we drop the matter, unless called upon again by fresh charges to wield a weapon in our own defence.

To the Editors of the Lunet:

GENTLEMEN.—As my name figures largely in that beautiful little sheet, the "Advocate" extra. I will, with your permission, state how it came to be there, and leave the public to judge whether Mr. Todd or Mr. Segee has told the truth. It appears the "Sentinel" stated that Mr. Todd had been sued by a mechanic. This Mr. Todd denies, but brings in my name and brings up one Richard Mansfield who certifies that he finished a contract which I had failed to perform, much to Mr. Todd's inconvenience and loss. I would first ask Mr. Mansfield how he knew anything of the contract? was he present, or did Mr. Todd tell him? confess the truth Mr. Mansfield—that you knew nothing about it except what you heard from Mr. Todd! But, gentlemen there was a contract or verbal agreement; I will give you the particulars and leave the public to Judge between us.

In the early part of last winter I agreed with Mr. Todd to shingle for him the roof of a barn and shed for nine dollars, both buildings to be boarded ready for shingling. When I went to commence the work I found the buildings were not boarded. Mr. Todd said if I would board them he would pay me. This I done and found it a very difficult and disagreeable job, the boards being green hen-lock covered with ice and snow. I then went on shingling while the shingles lasted, and gave up when I had no more to put on, and even used a lot of cullings left from his house, which every carpenter must know lengthened the job and added to the difficulties. Mr. Todd then requested me to wait a few days until he could go to Jackson town for some, they being cheaper there than here. This I done. In about three days afterwards I met Mr. Todd on the street—he said he had the shingles; I stated that I would be up in the morning and put them on. Accordingly next morning I started to go to his house to work, first going to the Creek to purchase a chalk-line. On my way up, about nine o'clock, I was overtaken by Mr. Todd.—I told him I was on my way to his place to finish the shingling. "Oh!" he replied, "I have employed Mansfield to finish the work." I told him I thought this strange conduct on his part. He said that Mansfield was a poor man—that he had been sued, and that he had promised to give him the money; he had also agreed to finish the work for three dollars. I said nothing more then, but three or four weeks afterwards I went up to settle with Mr. Todd. I presented him my bill charging the work I had done. This he refused to pay, stating that I had not fulfilled my contract. Now, gentlemen, did you ever hear more than that? he breaks the contract by not having the materials on hand, if it was broke at all, but there was no time specified—he had the benefit of my work—done me an injury by employing another—and then refused to pay me for what I had done! These are facts not to be controverted. After waiting nine or ten months, I left the matter in the hands of a magistrate, with instructions to write to Mr. Todd, and if it was not paid in a reasonable time, to sue it. I had worked hard in an inclement season of the year to accommodate him, and I felt that I was entitled to my pay. I told the editor of the "Sentinel" I had sued him—I thought he had been sued, and in fact he should have

been and doubly sued. Now these are the plain facts of the case, and I would ask what cause Mr. Todd has for rejoicing over the statement he made that he was never sued in his life.

Yours, &c., CHAS. H. MCINDOE.

To the Editors of the Lunet:

GENTLEMEN.—I was much surprised to notice in an extra published in the "Advocate" office, that the editor had denied owing a mechanic for furniture. This denial would have been bad enough had it come from a common layman, but from a clerical gentleman it is too bad, more particularly as I can prove that the subject had not passed from his recollection.—Gentlemen, I am the man to whom he is indebted for the furniture. The "Sentinel" told nothing but the truth, and I for one believe he told the truth in every instance. I have good reasons for believing so, because if a man will tell a direct falsehood in one instance, he will in another, and that Mr. Todd has stated what he knew to be untrue, I now proceed to show. Three years ago I sold him some furniture, he was to pay for it in a short time, but has not done so yet. I called on him in June last for the money; he said he could not pay it unless I took store pay—this I refused, and he said "I might take the furniture back. This summer I was laid up eight weeks with a lame leg; on recovering I again asked him for the pay, and he promised to bring it down in a few days.—This, gentlemen, is but a short time ago, yet he coolly and deliberately denies the whole transaction—denies in the extra that he owes any man ten shillings for furniture. Gentlemen, I hurl the lie back in his teeth, he has the furniture now in his house, and if I was permitted, I could point it out to him or to any one else. Mr. William Blake called on me last week, and stated that Mr. Todd had only borrowed the furniture—think of that—only borrowed it! a poor mechanic lending furniture for three years! why, gentlemen the man must be actually mad. As I before stated the charge in the "Sentinel" is correct, and to this I will make an affidavit at any time.

Yours, &c., JOHN TAIT.

County and Parish Elections.

The elections for County Councillors and Parish Officers, took place in this County on Tuesday last. The candidates for this Parish were Messrs. Dibblee and Lindsay (old Councillors) and Mr. Robert Hay. The old Councillors were returned. Owing to the state of the roads but few people from the lower part of the Parish could attend.

We have not yet received returns from all the Parishes, but give those heard from, and will publish a complete list in our next or as soon as the returns are made.

The following Parish Officers were elected in Woodstock without opposition:

OVERSEERS OF THE POOR—D. L. Dibblee, James Grover, and Elijah R. Watson.

ASSESSORS OF RATES—Hugh McLean, Richard Dibblee, and Elijah R. Watson.

COMMISSIONERS OF HIGHWAYS—James McLaughlan, Joseph Scott, and Alexander Gibson.

TRUSTEES OF SCHOOLS—E. R. Patsons, David Munro, and George A. Bedell.

COLLECTOR OF RATES—E. M. Truesdell.

PARISH CLERK—James McLaughlan.

The meeting recommended James McLaughlan for appointment by the Executive as By-Road Commissioner.

The Councillors returned in the other Parishes, as far as heard from are as follows:

WAKEFIELD—L. R. Harding and Amos Gallop. (Old.)

RICHMOND—William Gray and John Hay. (New Parish.)

NORTHAMPTON—George Clowse (old) and William Hay (new.)

BRIGHTON—S. Dickinson (old) and William Richardson (new.)

SIMONDS—S. Burpee and Slason Carville, (both new, the old ones retired.)

WICKLOW—R. Kerr and S. Barrett, (old)

KENT—Not yet heard from.

The Portland Advertiser states that Epraim Paulk, Esq. of Bangor, and a gentleman in Boston, have recently purchased the fee of two old French Seigniores, amounting to about one hundred and eighty thousand acres on the rivers St. Lawrence and Restigouche in the British province of Canada East.

Several of our citizens have, within the past year, made very large purchases of land and timber limits in the British provinces, from which they will probably reap large fortunes.

To the Editor
SIR,—The
in this Paris
members, an
course hithe
appreciate
of the villag
nobly susta
to the reside
will do well
One of the of
nor of the of
its members
the Council.
Metropolit
fluence to
clared to be
by an impro
the outside
The qual
the office is
as the prop
his course b
Has he not
rights, and
abstained fr
to create a
mortifying
The offic
number of
which he i
gent Govern
ral charact
ness, is a
siders," tha
course will
give a star
Council, w
education,
It is inde
of interme
should be
fluence the
could be
long and in
safely affi
are against
rather indu
by which
gious peop
I hope no
the Count
of the affa
they will
pect for th
Wardensh
Woodsto
To the Ed
SIR,—I
a person s
dicts the
Mr. Andre
only asse
in the "S
in suppor
what I sta
says he h
hended M
of his art
teral than
scarcely u
to be for
something
would stri
I would a
to know w
and then
I can say
rie, but s
further, an
man's stat
to contrad
time befor
cution, he
tees, whic
him of hi
Mr. Hunt
John Bed
they attac
the Madoc