

# Page numbered

## Communications.

To the Editor of the Carleton Sentinel.

Sir,—In last week's *Sentinel* I saw a communication over the signature, "An Observer," on the "Currie Affair," as he calls it. As some of your readers may not be acquainted with the facts of the case they may have been deceived by the unprincipled misrepresentations of this "Observer." As to the merits of the case, I have no desire to remark on them further than to state what can be proved by the whole Scotch Corner district, viz.: that when the boundaries of that district were defined at two different meetings, Mr. Currie was included therein and was as liable to be taxed there as any other person in the district, and that in the presence of both the Trustees he obligated himself to assist in building a school-house there. Do you not think, Sir, that this makes him legally belong to the Scotch Corner district?

Besides, does "An Observer" suppose that after having been placed in that district, Mr. Currie had any business at the Creek district meeting.

Why, Sir, according to his silly notions of attending school meetings, Mr. Currie might attend every meeting within four or five miles of him for fear of being taxed for School purposes. None but a mere quibbler would have made such a foolish remark.

It is palpably false that Mr. Currie has been "supporting the Creek School for upwards of nine years." He supported a School at the Creek only seven years and a half at the utmost, but not the School to which "Observer" refers at all. The School to which Currie sent was on the other side of the Creek and in another parish, (Wakefield.) The School to which he so exultingly refers did not exist till about a year ago, and Currie has never supported that School. How unfortunate the Richmond Corner people have been in their school houses is notorious. Mr. Currie lost large sums of money in several buildings that were lost there, more than half a dozen of their Creek School Houses were worth altogether. When robbed of their school house—Currie was not the only one who sent his children to another district. He did as much too towards repairing the school house at the Creek as any other person in the district.—Yet your correspondent will have him guilty of "meanness." Your correspondent "disremembers" the names of the persons employed to measure the distance between Mr. Currie's and the centre of the Creek School District. Poor fellow his memory like his character, I fear is a little out of repair. He "disremembers," too, I suppose, that to the injustice of the Richmond Corner district those two measures both belonged to the Creek district and were quite interested in having Mr. Currie there. He "disremembers" that the school house in that district was not placed in the centre but built nearer Currie for the sake of including him and that the people in the other end of the district remonstrated at the injustice done them. Some of my remarks in my first communication, I suppose have touched "Vindicator" on a raw spot. But the dastard dared not come out over his first signature, he has stooped to the meanness of skulking under a new name "An Observer," and dating his article at Woodstock instead of Richmond, where he actually resides. But it is characteristic of the man. He well knew that his first exposure might be the prelude to an infinitude of others. But the public will not be deceived, for no one who has ever seen any of his low bungling ungrammatical effusions can find any difficulty in identifying their author. Every one will see that instead of getting his information at Woodstock as he pretends, he is personally acquainted with the whole affair. A sorry subterfuge indeed to slander a respectable man.

But your correspondent would play the critic, for after making the Trustees "wish to settle the dispute as amicable as possible," he "disremembers," &c., &c. Admirable!! I fear Mr. Editor I have fallen into bad hands, for with such extraordinary literary talents as "Vindicator" alais "An Observer" evidently possesses I shall certainly get a sad scourging. His logic too is equally keen; for he says, "because if he (Currie) had been taxed there he could not have been taxed in any other districts in the county, because none can be taxed for school purposes but resident rate payers." That is; Currie after having been by the Trustees made a resident rate payer in the Scotch Corner district, could not be taxed in any other in the County but the Creek!

I see too, by his reference to Mr. Bedell's communication that your correspondent is making up to the Trustees. Yes, although he is well aware

of the detestation in which he is held by both of them he would now crouch and lick their very feet, but his fabrications are harmless.

Respectfully Yours,

A RICHMONDER.

Richmond, Feb. 6th, 1854.

To the Editor of the Carleton Sentinel.

Sir,—My attention has been drawn to several anonymous communications which have appeared in the *Sentinel* in which the late Trustees of Schools for this Parish are accused, of improper conduct. Though I by no means regard it as the duty of any public officer to notice charges preferred in the manner in which your correspondents present theirs to your readers, yet as several persons have requested me to state the facts relative to the circumstances on which these charges are based, —I will do so.

If I understand some of your correspondents aright, it is their intention:—

1st, To assert that the Trustees unjustly caused a Mr. Andrew Currie to be assessed in two School Districts.

2ndly, That they gave him a false Certificate.

3rdly, That by this Certificate they intended to deceive Mr. Currie and Mr. Bedell.

None of these statements are sustainable.

The charges which they were intended to support must therefore fail, nor can I believe it possible that any of them have proceeded from, or are in any way sanctioned by Mr. Currie.

The circumstances connected with Mr. Currie's being assessed for School purposes, are briefly as follows:

Sometime since the Trustees were requested to attend a meeting which was called for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of assessing a District known as the Creek or Maduxnakik District. The first thing required to be done at this meeting was to define the boundaries of the District—as those only within the prescribed limits would be entitled to vote at the meeting or become liable to assessment therein. In accordance with the usual practice of the Trustees on such occasions, they told the rate-payers present, that as far as their own sense of justice would allow, they should be guided in defining the limits of the district by the opinion of the majority of rate payers present. The persons present at this meeting unanimously (I think,) agreed with regard to the position of these limits, and the Trustees having described the District, as I believed, in the mode they desired—the description was read to them—with which they appeared to be perfectly satisfied.—Owing, however, as it will be seen hereafter, either to an erroneous impression as to their wishes with regard to one of the bounds of the district, or to a misapprehension on the part of the Trustees, as to what these wishes were, the District was not defined exactly as they desired it should have been:—Mr. Currie's North line having been made one of the Boundaries, whereby he was excluded from the district, when it was intended that his South line should have been the boundary, whereby he would have been included.

Matters stood thus, until sometime subsequent to these proceedings, the Trustees were called upon to attend a School Meeting in the district adjoining that referred to above—at which meeting Mr. Currie was present and voted. Shortly afterwards several of the inhabitants of the Maduxnakik district applied to the Trustees to know how it was that Currie was allowed to vote out of their district and asserted that he was placed in the latter district and assessed in it. On reference to the written description of the District, the Trustees pointed out to those persons that by the terms of it, they were mistaken. Upon this, they expressed great dissatisfaction and stated, that every rate-payer present at the meeting held in the Maduxnakik District intended and understood that Currie should have been placed and taxed in it. They reminded the Trustees also of their declared intention of defining the district in accordance with their wishes, and stated that great injustice would be done to them if Currie was not included in their district. The Trustees told them that they much regretted that any mistake should have occurred but as they the Trustees had the power by law to alter the bounds of the district at any time, they would do so in such a manner as to include Currie in the Maduxnakik district, if justice plainly required that he ought to be placed therein. After much deliberation and enquiry the Trustees satisfied themselves that Currie ought to have been included in the Maduxnakik district.—For some 10 or 12 years he had sent his children to the school in that district, and his property was some three quarters of a mile nearer its School House than to that of the district in which he now wishes to be included. I will not now state any other of the reasons which induced the Trustees to arrive at the conclusion they had, than that which is to be found in the fact, that as the Maduxnakik district was much smaller than that adjoining—

the poorer of the two would have been oppressed by removing Mr. Currie from it.

So much for the circumstances under and reasons for which, Mr. Currie was included in the Maduxnakik district, and thereby made liable to assessment in that district alone. I say in this district alone, for in no other has he been taxed.

Now with regard to the 2nd charge brought against the Trustees, viz.: that they have falsely certified Mr. Currie was not assessed in the Maduxnakik district. They certified this; but not falsely. They at the earnest solicitation of Mr. Currie, certified to a fact which will be acknowledged probably by every man of common sense who will take the trouble to read the Law which authorizes assessment for school purposes. That in justice and equity he ought to have been assessed in that district is obvious, but that he was assessed legally, perhaps no sound lawyer would pretend to say. Certainly in the opinion of the Trustees he was not so agressed—and upon his urging them to state that he was not assessed they did so.—The assessors, properly enough, assessed all persons within the boundaries of the District as last described and as that district was by them found defined on record, and a Magistrate was bound to proceed under their assessment list until legal evidence was offered and legal cause shown that he had no right so to do. Whether such evidence could be adduced or such cause shown, it was not the proper business of the Trustees, to enquire.—My opinion as a Lawyer with regard to his liability to pay the tax imposed upon him in the Maduxnakik District has never been asked for by Mr. Currie. It might have been given to him, had I not been informed by those whom I had reason to believe, that he had a legal adviser, and that the chief object of his employing that gentleman was to involve men in difficulty who have always treated him not only justly but kindly.

With regard to the 3rd charge made against the Trustees, the letter of Mr. Bedell, published in your paper some time since, makes it unnecessary for me to say anything further respecting it, than that it has been shown to be false.

Towards the Trustees, some of your correspondents are insolent. The ignorant are unfortunately too often disposed to be so. When the insolent and petulant man becomes positively offensive—so much so, as not only to attract notice, but really to cause pain, the interests of society demand that his bad passions should by some wholesome remedy be restrained and calmed. As yet the bows pulled by the assailants of the Trustees—though long enough, have not had strength to send one arrow which has pained, much less seriously harmed them.

I deem it unnecessary, Mr. Editor, to take at present further notice of your scurrilous scribbles, who have only to be known to be despised, and soon to be forgotten.

I am, Sir,

Your Ob't Servant,

EDWIN J. JACOB.

Woodstock, Feb. 1854.

To the Editor of the Carleton Sentinel.

Sir,—I am aware that I owe you an apology for again trespassing on your patience, nor would I have done so, were it not that I wish to mention a few facts for the benefit of our *ci-deavant* author.

I would begin, then, by informing him that I actually reside in Fredricton, nor have my feet ever touched the classic soil of Woodstock, nor was it my desire, (as he meanly insinuates,) to revive old differences between yourself and your contemporary; I can assure him that I did not consider his production of sufficient consequence to effect any such object, and my sole design in noticing it at all, was to offer him a few words of wholesome advice, which, if we may judge by his recent lucubrations, he is no way disposed to profit by.

As his "affecting story" is not yet concluded it is perhaps hardly fair to pass an opinion on it, but judging by appearances I have not the least doubt but that it will fully sustain the character earned by its famous predecessor. I cannot however forbear directing attention to that part of it where, in speaking of the erection of a splendid tavern, he says, "in less than a fortnight after the frame was first up the printers had completed their work and the whole house was thoroughly finished!" What a comfortable tenement that must have been; I should think it must have fully equalled "the house that Jack built." If buildings can be erected with such astonishing rapidity, is it not a pity, Mr. Editor, that you cannot have a lunatic asylum in Woodstock?

As it is evident that our Author intends acting buffoon for the amusement of the public generally, it is useless to multiply words on the subject, to use a vulgarism he is afflicted with the "scribbling itch," and it would be a pity to deny him the

privilege of scratching. I cannot conclude without quoting the oft repeated lines of the immortal Burns,

"Oh wud some power the giftie gie us,  
To see ourselves as others see us,  
It wud frae mony a blunder free us,  
And foolish notion."

JUVENIS.

Fredericton, March 8th, 1854

## ADVERTISEMENT.

To JOHN HRA, Way Office Keeper, P. W.

Sir,—After my return to Prince William I ordered my newspapers to be directed to your Way-Office, which was done regularly. I have sent and called repeatedly for them, but never received but about 7 out of 16. On the evening of the 14th inst. I again called—you were safely housed. I walked in and politely requested you to open your office and let me have my papers, &c. Your snappish and hog-like treatment to me after we went into the office, I pass over, believing it to be one of your greatest characteristics. One thing however, you told me that none of my papers were there. Relying upon your word, and perhaps thinking you had a spark of the man about you I interrogated you no more. But observe I purchased some small articles of you, and one of those articles you wrapped up in a part of the "Saint Stephens Banner" and "Provincial Patriot." I have strong reasons to suppose that was a piece or part of my paper. In further confirmation of it I think no other paper of the kind comes to your office.

Sir, I think you do not do as you should with my papers. You have manifested your dislike to me on several occasions—totally without a cause!—Do you think I either fear or care for you? No—I do not. You are like a nettle, you only have a sting for those who fear you. But why do I complain of your insolence, and your inattention to the Way-Office? The cry is universal! The fact is you have not common civility enough to use women well who come to your shop. You are neither a man nor a gentleman. Oh! how you have grown since you came to Prince William.—What a pity you did not succeed in obtaining the Magistracy! If you had, you would have grown so in your own estimation you would have required hooping e'er now. If you are a sworn Way-Office Keeper all the emetics in a Druggists shop would not make thee throw up thy oath, or clean thy conscience. Being thou art impotent to inflict—unwilling to do good! It is said you mean to offer as a Candidate at the coming Election.—Vain man thou wilt be pelted with—eggs!

I suppose you thought you could insult me without fear? Stand forth now thou inflated mortal and defend thyself. Say one word in reply to this if you can.

Yours, uncompromisingly,

JOHN GILCHRIST.

Cedar Swamp, Prince William, Feb. 25, 1854.

A GOOD HIT FOR A YOUTH.—An old chap in Connecticut, who was one of the most niggardly men known in that part of the country, carried on the blacksmithing business very extensively; and as is generally the case in that State, boarded all his own hands. And to show how he envied the men what they ate, he would have a bowl of bean soup dished up for himself to cool, while that for the hands was set before them boiling hot. One of the boys was rather unlucky among the hot irons, frequently burned his fingers. The old man scolded him severely one day, for being so careless.

"How can I tell," said the boy, "if they are hot unless they are red?"

"Never touch anything again till you spit on it, if it don't hiss it won't burn."

In a day or two the old man sent the boy to see if his soup was cool. The boy went in—spit in the bowl of course the soup did not hiss. He went back and told the boss all was right.

"Dinner!" cried he.

All hands ran; down sat the old man at the head of the table, and in went a large spoonful of the boiling hot soup to his mouth.

"Good Heavens!" cried the old man, in the greatest rage. "What did you tell me that he for, you young rascal?"

"I did not lie," said the boy, very innocently—"You told me I should spit on anything to try if it was hot, I spit in your bowl, and the soup did not hiss, so I supposed it was cool."

Judge of the effect on the jaws. The boy was never in want of a friend among the journeymen.

Advertising is on the increase. We observed in the weekly *Tribune*, the other day, a single advertisement which occupied a whole page of that paper. The cost of this advertisement, for one insertion, was nearly five hundred dollars. It described the establishment and the publications of Mason Brothers, of No. 23 Park Row.