

## Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of Correspondents, unless editorially endorsed.

For the Carleton Sentinel.

In the *Journal* of July 3d, I read an address to Mr. Winslow, wherein my name appears among the signers; for which reason I wish to make shew a few remarks on the subject, which will why my name is there, and under what circumstances it was put there. Some time ago, a person came to me, and said he had an address to Mr. Winslow on account of his being turned out of office, which he wanted me to sign. I asked him if it was anything in the form of a petition to have him restored to office, for if it was, I would not sign it, and told why I would not; which, upon hearing, he acknowledged was a sufficient reason, but said, "we ought to forget and forgive," (these were his words) and as there was nothing of a petition in it but simply a kind of condolence with the old gentleman on his being so summarily turned out of office he hoped I would sign it. He then read a few lines of the address in which I saw nothing amiss, and I told him he need not trouble himself to read it all, but to sign my name to it, (as I had no spectacles with me,) which he did; but I did not know then, nor ever since till I saw it in the *Journal*, that there were any reflections in it upon the members of the Legislature for having Mr. Winslow removed, for had I known there was I certainly would not have allowed my name to be put to it, because a few years ago I had very just and strong reasons to wish that some other person filled that office; but as the circumstance which I allude to is a good while past, I was willing to forgive.

Lamb & Co.,

A LUMBERING FARMER.

July, 7th, 1856.

## The Carleton Sentinel.

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1856.

THE ELECTIONS for the various Counties have now been ended; and the returns are before us. From them we did intend to have made an analysis of the new Legislature; but as we find, in the *Courier* of the 9th inst., that work most admirably performed, we transfer it to our columns, having no doubt that it will prove interesting to our readers:—

Of the previous house of representatives, consisting of forty-one members, twenty-four have been reelected, seven did not offer, and ten have been ousted by new candidates. Of the twenty-four reelected, fifteen supported the late Liberal Government on Mr. Gray's want of confidence amendment, viz: Messrs. Fisher, Macpherson, Hatheway, Johnson, Kerr, Sutton, Watters, Tibbitts, Smith, Landry, McAdam, Gilmore, McClellan, Ferris and McNaughton; and eight opposed it, viz: Messrs. Gray, Wilnot, Godard, Boyd, Connell, Montgomery, J. A. Harding, and McPhelim. Mr. Allen was not then in the House, but joined the Opposition on his election; and Messrs. Connell and Boyd subsequently supported the Government, while J. A. Harding was always previously accounted a Liberal.

Of the seventeen old members not reelected, seven did not offer, viz: Messrs. Brown, Cutler, Purdy, Gilbert, Chipman Botsford, Armstrong, and Hanington. The two first named of these supported the late Government on the test above mentioned; the other four opposed it, and Mr. Hanington, being speaker, did not vote. Of the ten late members defeated, five supported the government of last winter, viz: Messrs. Tilley, Ryan, L. R. Harding, Steadman, and Lunt, and four opposed it, viz: J. A. Street, Hayward, McLeod and Stevens. Mr. End did not vote on the want-of-confidence question, but otherwise generally supported the opposition. From the above it will be seen that the late liberal government on the want of confidence amendment of last spring, have lost seven out of twenty-two, or less than one third, by the late dissolution and election; while their opponents on the same occasion, have lost eight out of sixteen (excluding Messrs. Allen and End,) or nine out of eighteen, including these gentlemen, being exactly half. If to the fifteen above named we add Messrs. Connell and Boyd, who joined the supporters of the late government after the announcement of their railway measure, it will be seen, as plain as figures can make it at least, that the Liberal party have not suffered the most by the late dissolution.

The political opinions of the seventeen new members, we cannot of course judge with the same certainty as we can the opinions of those whose politics have been previously tested, not having the same historical data to guide us; but the following we believe is a fair estimate, drawn from the antecedents of these gentlemen, and from their expressed opinions. Liberals pledged to oppose the present Government for advising the late dissolution, five—viz: Messrs. C. Perley, W. E. Perley, Tapley, Mitchel, Lewis. Liberals who approve of the late dissolution, but are not pledged to the present Government beyond that, and the appeal of the Prohibitory Law, viz: Messrs. Simonds, Gilbert, DesBrisay, and McMonagle. Conservatives likely to support the present Government on all

important political questions, eight—viz: Messrs. Lawrence, Bliss Botsford, Barberie, Reed, G. D. Street, D. Earle, Scovil, and John Earle.

The St. John *Freeman* has elevated us to a position which is quite too high for our ambition. We do not presume to be the exponent of Mr. Connell or Mr. Fisher, nor yet of all the "tee-totalers;" we merely endeavor to form a candid and unbiased opinion of matters and things, and desire to express that opinion in a like candid and unbiased manner; and while we regret if we, in our quiet way, have excited in the *Freeman* any uneasiness, it is certainly quite magnanimous in him, thus to give us, thus to give the liberal party warning of the utter discomfiture and disgrace which will attend a certain line of action.

After placing us in the position referred to above, and quoting some of our remarks from the *Sentinel* of the 28th June, the editor proceeds:—

We have not yet begun to calculate the relative strength of parties in the new House, regarding for the present only the great questions at issue, but we at once tell the *Sentinel* and its friends that if they attempt to take the stand here pointed out—to play the game here indicated, the most ignominious and disastrous defeat will be the consequence. No true liberal can, may we will go further and say, no true liberal dare avow himself for an hour a member of the same party with them. The country has solemnly pronounced its decision; has emphatically, at almost every election, declared its approval of the Governor's conduct, and it will not be trifled with. Fight out your party battles as you will, but cease to threaten the Governor because he did his duty, and no longer insult the country by your insane boastings of the great punishment you will inflict on one whose only crime is that he has in doing his duty foiled all your deep laid schemes.

Now is not all this a tempest in a tea-pot. The *Freeman* says, the Governor's conduct is approved—in other words, by extraordinary means, a small majority of men who stand pledged to approve of that act, are returned; but every member of the old government that offered, with but one exception, were likewise returned, and in the very teeth of the most powerful opposition ever brought to bear against any men in this Country. Very well, if on the one hand a majority are pledged to support the Governor, so are the minority pledged to the reverse; and all we said and say is, that if the Governor cannot find a Council which will command the confidence of the House and country, without having to apply to members of the minority, he may find himself in the position in which many as good a man has found himself, unable to carry on the business of the country, for want of a co-operating Council. In this we cannot see anything to raise such a furor in the *Freeman*; nor do we see the applicability of the terms "insane boasting," or "abusing the Governor."

But looking at the elections and their results calmly, can we take them as an approval of the Governor's course, or that a majority of the members returned have secured their election on that principle. We contend that in very many instances, personal influence has had all to do in the matter, when had it been entirely a matter of principle a very different result would have followed. St. John is the only County in which there seemed to be anything like a fair test of the principle, and there the majority was small; and certainly the *Freeman* must admit that the minority had a large portion of the intelligence of the County with them.

But take York County, and is it not idle to say, that that election was a test of principle. If Chas. Macpherson and Geo. L. Hatheway had avowed hostility to the Governor, would their election have been less certain? We think not. We suppose that no ordinary effort could have prevented their taking their seats; and so it is with the returns of many Counties. Therefore we do not and cannot see that a majority of the electors have given their approval of the Governor.

While referring to York election, we may add, that although the Government party claim three members for that County, they may be mistaken. Mr. Macpherson's personal influence would have secured his seat. In supporting the Governor, he acted consistently, as, if we remember right, he voted yea on the motion for dissolving the House last winter; still we cannot imagine that his support will extend to the Government. We know Mr. Macpherson to be in heart a liberal, anxious to promote the best interests of his native country; and we are satisfied that he will never place himself in the humiliating position of an attaché to the present government. His influence is great; his friends are numerous; but his continued influence depends upon a continuance of that manly, liberal, progressive policy which has hitherto characterized his actions, and his friends look for and expect that when the questions of dissolution and prohibition are disposed of, then he will be found on the side of the old government. The same remarks apply to Geo. L. Hatheway; and we shall be very much disappointed if the end does not prove that our views and anticipations are correct.

The *Journal* of last week devotes nearly the whole of its editorial matter to our especial benefit. Of course, as in duty bound, we feel highly gratified at the kindly feelings which prompted the article in question, and the kindly tone in which it is written; regarding us as a new hand at the bellows; they certainly have given us a most cordial welcome to the *corps editorial*. The piece is highly spiced, and no doubt very witty; but it seemed to us that the writer did not approve of the old saw, "brevity is the soul of wit." "The orient pearls, at random strung," were full numerous, but too much mixed up with the common place of language. We think that something like the following arrangement would have answered every purpose, and would have been quite as interesting to the *Journal's* readers:—"Editor *Sentinel*; new horn-blower, bellows-blower, mouth-piece, tool, &c. &c. for Charles Connell."

Now, to be serious, we have, in the first place, a few plain statements to make to the editor or editors of the *Journal*, whoever he or they may be. Perhaps the object of the article was to try what stuff our temper was of; perhaps the writer was mistaken in his notions as to whom the editor of this paper is. However that may be, we cast back with contempt and scorn, the imputations and allegations advanced. The man who advances such statements: the man who without fully and completely knowing the applicability of the epithets he uses, advances towards another abusive language—low scurrilous scandal, and charges him with being the servile creature of another, gives thereby pretty convincing proofs of the demoralized state of his own mind, suggests the belief that his perceptions of what is just and manly are fearfully depraved, and that he is a ready practitioner of those low, lick-spittle practices which he suspects in others.

It is of little consequence to us what the editor of the *Journal* thinks of us, or with whom and in what terms he couples us.

We wish the *Journal* distinctly to understand that there is but one editor to the *Sentinel*; that he writes his own independent views, advocates the principles which according to his own judgment seem correct, untrammelled either in those views and principles, or the advocacy of them, by any man or party of men; and that we will continue to do so to the end of the chapter.

Further, we never will, when our views run parallel with those of Mr. Charles Connell, hesitate to express a concurrence in and agreement with him, nor cease to promote them to the best of our humble ability—even though, in so doing, we bring down upon us the united wrath of the Legion of the *Journal*; much less will we hesitate when we cannot agree with that gentleman in the course he takes, to express that disagreement.

Now, we trust, the *Journal* understands us.—We detest personalities; we would avoid them if possible. We consider that the readers of a newspaper have a right to expect that its columns will be filled with more interesting matter than the bickering and personal quarrels of its editor. There is room for us all to live, and live peaceably; but if it is necessary in self-defence, if we must, in order to avoid the imputation of cowardice—we are not, and will not be the aggressors—but forced into it.

Lay on Macduff,  
And d—d be he who first cries—hold, enough!

We regret to have to mention Mr. Perley's name at this time, but we believe that gentleman approves of all that we have written with reference to him, and appreciates our wish to prevent the erroneous expressions of a portion of the press to go uncontradicted. We write on this subject, not because we wish to exhibit any over-officious interest in Mr. P., but we cannot submit to allow his reputation as a consistent and honourable man to be injured, as it must necessarily be, if his expressed opinions are misrepresented, and made to appear the very opposite of what they are. Mr. Perley is not only a "liberal man" as the *Journal* has it, but he is a liberal in politics; and what he means, and what we mean by that term, he fully explained in his speech at the Hustings. On that speech we based our approval of Mr. Perley politically; on that speech we believe Mr. P. bases his future action; and to that speech, as reported in the *Sentinel*, and approved by Mr. P., we direct the attention of the *Journal*, and all others who are anxious to know what Mr. Perley's political views are, and how qualified or unqualified is his approval of Mr. Connell.

The *Journal* asks why this pretended interest in Mr. Perley at the present time? There is no pretence about it. We are interested in certain great principles—principles on which our weal or woe as a people for a time depend; and in every man who at this time is a returned member for the General Assembly, who is pledged to carry out our views,

we feel a deep and active interest. Whatever the *Journal* may think, we believe in political consistency. So much for that portion of the question which the *Journal* intends to apply to the *Sentinel*.

What Mr. Connell's interest in Mr. Perley is, or what his reasons are, we have no means of knowing. The *Journal* refers to certain calumny and abuse heaped on Mr. Perley by Mr. Connell and his clique—of this we know nothing. He also adds that in this they were aided by the *Sentinel*, and directs attention to "No. 41, June 7<sup>th</sup>" Now, we take the liberty of denying and defying the *Journal* to prove, that there was in the *Sentinel* printed during the election canvass, one line which can by any means be rendered calumny or abuse of Mr. Perley.

Now, we are still unable to comprehend that the late contest was between Mr. Connell and Mr. Perley; and the continued efforts of the *Journal* to prove this, seems to imply a perfect combination of both "impudence and ignorance."

We have devoted much more space than we are justified in doing to the *Journal*; but, trusting that it may never seem necessary again, there is one other paragraph in the *Journal* which we cannot allow to pass without notice. We made, in the issue before the last, a brief reference to L. R. Harding, Esq., a reference at which, we were satisfied, no right-thinking man could take offence, and which certainly did not seem to court criticism or remark; yet one of the astute editors of the *Journal* (which we would like to know, that we might give his name to the scorn and contumely which such conduct deserves)—one of them must make that article serve the vile purpose of pouring out his spleen and bitterness upon Mr. H.; and that, too, by reminding his readers of some mispronounced words, and of some little peculiarities in his manner of expressing himself. We may sometimes smile or blush if a friend falls into an error like this; but we can only treat with profound scorn the man who makes it a matter for after jest and derision. No true gentleman will do it,—no true scholar will do it; for he "pities, if he respects not, ignorance, however small or great." Who would do it?—There is but one man in this community who would, and he is—(?)

The *Head Quarters* of the 25th June very good-naturedly applies the name "Rip Van Winkle" to the editor of this paper. For the sake of argument, we acknowledge the eorn, and admit that we have just awoke out of a sleep which has lasted nearly two years; but there is a difference between the position and surroundings in which the old veteran of Sleepy Hollow found himself on awaking, and our own. He fell asleep with his mind filled with good old ideas which he had brought with him from Vater land: when he awoke, he was bewildered, he was lost,—scenes had changed in their aspect,—no faces were familiar, no forms recognized,—all things had changed, and progress had stamped its indelible impress on everything. When we went asleep, it was lullied by the apparent security of our position,—a change had taken place in the affairs of the Province, our cherished home,—the old incubus of Toryism had been removed: progress was inscribed upon our banner; a so-called, a so professed, out and out Liberal Governor, had called unto him a Council which met the views of the country,—an efficient Government, a liberal Government, a constitutional Government,—Charles Fisher, Attorney General: he who had come up from the people, and was one of them; he who had for years stood forth in the political arena as a champion for their rights; who had ever been the consistent and unflinching foe of red-tapeism, of family compactism, of Toryism, of all these isms which pampered the few at the expense of the many,—which closed the avenues to power and place against any who were outside of the choice circle, which reversed the maxim,

"Honor and fame from no condition rise,—  
Act well your part, there all the honor lies!"

they made it,  
Money and place from our position rise;  
Act well or ill our part, it's all one price.

Then Mr. Tilley was Secretary,—a man respected and honored wherever known,—who had proved, by his talents and integrity, and his attention and success in his own business, his fitness to assume the responsibilities which were thus placed upon him; and the rest were men of similar stamp,—men to be trusted,—men who felt the wants of the country, and whose interests were directly concerned in its prosperity: such was the Council. Under such men our country seemed to enter upon a new era. Great hope seemed before us,—bright promise of coming good; and old and young were uttering songs of joy and gladness for the happy day which had dawned upon the land. And were it not pardonable if we fell asleep?—but we awoke, rubbing our eyes; and we rub them still, hardly able to convince ourselves that we are not still