

Correspondence.

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

To the Editor of the Carleton Sentinel:

Sir,—In the Woodstock Journal, of the 5th inst., I noticed, a high compliment was paid to Protestants by the Editor, where he compared Protestant institutions of learning and the Roman Catholic Convent at St. John. I suppose the Editor of the Journal is a man of education, and well versed in history, and I am inclined to think he would not send a sister or daughter of his, under any circumstances, to a convent to be educated.

Now, the Editor of the Journal, for reasons best known to himself and those for whom he especially writes, may advocate the building of a Convent, and rejoice over the increase of Romanism; and those who read his productions will still have their own opinions, and express them, too. I believe this is a free country, and the people desire a free discussion. Why is the Editor of the Journal so afraid of things being called by their right names? I would state my opinion,—and it is the opinion of every true Protestant,—that those who think and talk in private one way, and in public act another, and, in order to obtain the support of Catholics, pretend great sympathy for them and their religion, are unworthy of confidence.

I would just remind the Journal and its correspondents that the Catholics have had their eyes opened; they have learned to judge people by their acts, not their words; and they have found that those whom the Editor of the Journal writes for and acts with are quite ready to scoff and sneer at Catholics in private, and in public profess for them great sympathy;—such are the men who in reality stir up that feeling which the Journal thinks so vile.

By the last No. of the Journal, I see that one of its Editors is at his old tricks—dropping his editorial pen, and writing anonymous communications. It seems a pity that they cannot issue a paper without some effort being made to slander Mr. Connell, one of our representatives: it is highly complimentary to the people of Carleton, and, I do not doubt, they properly appreciate it. I know Mr. Connell has received the best evidence that can be given of the high esteem in which he is held by the freeholders of the County, and it would seem like adding insult to insult to notice the continuous vile slanders of the Journal; however, I must crave your indulgence while I notice one in the last.—There it is said,

"And the Roman Catholics of Carleton will not soon forget the man who hoisted a green flag with (O'Connell for a wachword) when they had a majority of votes in Carleton (then including Victoria) and who when they became a minority, deserted his former standard of Green and joined an Orange Lodge on the eve of an Election."

Now, Mr. Editor, having made enquiries upon this subject, I am prepared to pronounce the above imputation false. Mr. Connell was first elected in '46. All the County know the course he pursued, both in and out of the Legislature, with reference to the unfortunate difficulties of '47, and his consistent conduct since. It was not till three years after that Victoria was separated from Carleton.—Mr. Connell did become a member of an Orange Lodge in '51, but it was nine months after a general election. So it would seem quite impossible for the Journal to tell the truth.

Now, Mr. Editor, the whole trouble with the Journal clique is the vast and growing circulation of the Sentinel. I assure you that your fearless and independent course has alarmed them, but is gratifying to your readers. Go on, and you will make, not lose, friends, by being manly and firm in expressing the truth. I have heard good Roman Catholics say they did not think either the Journal or the Sentinel was better than it should be, but that the Sentinel was the best, because it spoke out its sentiments. The Journal folks think the same, but have not the courage to say so openly. Let them lie on about Mr. Connell as much as they please; he is well known here and throughout the County. I am certain that if one of the Catholics was in trouble he would not go to the Editors or proprietors of the Journal, but would very likely lay his case before this Mr. Connell,—the bad man,—who, without distinction of creed or country, has ever proved himself ready to lend a helping hand to the needy. The people of Carleton are satisfied with Mr. C.; they know him; they have a right to judge him. Had he lent his influence to the party who now are in opposition to him, all would have been well; but he has ever been an admirer of equal justice—he has not submitted to the doctrine that the public offices should be confined to the few; but has advocated that they should be thrown open to all. These liberal views don't suit the Exclusives: hence their opposition.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

A. FREEMAN.

Windsor, Jan. 26, 1857.

To the Editor of the Carleton Sentinel:

Sir,—As Mr. James Edgar has seen fit to deny some statements made by me through the Sentinel, allow me to say, that notwithstanding Mr. E's denial, and his quirks to get rid of my statements, what I said was the truth; and in substance he used the language I attributed to him. The following is the conversation which took place: Meeting Mr. Edgar, I asked him if he could give me the name of the person who wrote the communication signed "Somebody." He said: I cannot give you the name; there is no way you can come on me, as I have never allowed my name to be attached to the Journal as editor, and am therefore not responsible. I then told him: Mr. Melville told me that you was the editor, and would give me the name. Says Mr. Edgar: Admitting that I and others write for the Journal, does Mr. Melville's saying so make it so?

Now, Mr. Editor, to the above, I am willing to make oath; the public who read, may judge whether I make false statements or not.

As to applying through the Post Office, it appears to me there must be some humbugging going on when the publisher of a paper don't know his editor, and when his word is not to be taken on the subject.

I remain yours, &c.

N. CHURCHILL.

Woodstock, January 23, 1857.

The Carleton Sentinel.

WOODSTOCK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1857.

Some of our Roman Catholic friends appear to feel very indignant, and censure us most severely—some few, in token of their displeasure have requested us to stop their paper,—all on account of some articles which have lately appeared in the columns of the Sentinel. We propose reviewing, very briefly, calmly, and candidly, the objections which those persons have urged against, and stating our reasons for publishing the matters referred to. First, we shall consider the "selected matter." We copied a part of the first letter of the Hon. Joseph Howe, of Halifax, on the Nova Scotian Railroad riots. Objector No. 1 says, why did you not publish the whole letter? I do not like these garbled statements! We published the most important parts; we did not omit any paragraph which gave a more favourable colouring to the whole matter, or which materially affected it; we left out the unimportant parts, because our limited space did not justify our publishing more. But, says No. 2, why did you publish the letter at all? Its publication was only calculated to stir up feelings of ill-will, create differences and jealousies, and disturb the harmony which exists in Society. Now let us glance at the facts: In Nova Scotia a Protestant very foolishly sneers at some of the members or ordinances of the Romish Church; a riot ensues; the house of a protestant is surrounded by an infuriated mob; the blood of its inmates is poured out until it presents the appearance of a slaughter-house; the perpetrators of the outrage, instead of being met with a universal scowl of disapprobation, are taken under the special protection of a portion of the community, have eminent counsel, retained for their defence; and not only so, but good care is taken that those witnesses whose evidence is most material to an investigation of the matter, and to bring the guilt home to the guilty parties, are kept out of the way, and the trial thus rendered a mere mockery. Now, without reference to names, or creeds, or parties, we say a grievous wrong was committed; without any justifying cause; and the perpetrators of that wrong—and, as well, those who would shield them from the full measure of the law—deserve, as they receive, the execration of all good men. We expect to have Railway labourers in this vicinity. The same causes may exist here, which there led to the result narrated above. Are there any members of this community who, on the same grounds, would excuse such a riot, or who, in the event of such an occurrence would be prepared to shelter and sympathise with the guilty; if there are, they should condemn the republishing of Mr. Howe's letter; they would very likely feel sore under his strictures. But all those of whatever sect or class, who would desire to uphold the majesty of the law, in the protection of the rights of all; those who, at all hazards, would help to expose, and bring to condign punishment, all violators of good order and social quiet, should learn from the occurrences in the sister Province, the necessity for closer union, and of more general oneness of determination to preserve inviolate the law.

But, says grumbler No. 3, I don't mind your extracts, but disapprove of your editorial remarks.—Well, what have we said: in the first place, we

repudiated the idea that extremes of opinion—orangeism and catholicism—could harmoniously blend, or that the present government, composed of such uncongenial elements, could be useful or permanent. The Journal, actuated by a christian desire to promote good and peaceful feelings, interpreted this to mean, that Catholics were not entitled to the same consideration as Protestants—an entire distortion of our language, and bringing into the issue a question which we had no desire to discuss; further, charging us with an attempt to disturb the "improved state of things." In reply, we penned an article, of which we published a part, (the Journal having acknowledged that a portion of his remarks were not intended for us,) in which there occurs an error of construction,—fortunately for us, although inexcusable, because it gave our remarks a very little more publicity; fortunate for the editor of the Journal, inasmuch as it gave him an opportunity to display his critical acumen and his profound pedantry; but unfortunate for him because it elicited damning applause from the low-lived creature of the Head Quarters. In that article, we very quietly, in a general reference to the affairs of the Province, intimated that beneath the apparently "improved state" a "system of error was being fostered." The Journal interprets this to mean Catholicism. Well, surely, Catholics know that Protestants all consider theirs an erroneous system; surely they do not wish to find fault with those who, entertaining such belief, express it. Catholics believe, most devoutly, Protestantism to be a most fearful error; they do not hesitate to express such belief,—we do not quarrel with them for it. That portion of the press which represents the peculiar interests of the Roman Catholics, does not hesitate to indulge their feelings in language insulting at once to every true Protestant and to every true subject of Victoria.—Take, for instance, the following, uttered a short time since by the Halifax Catholic, and reiterated, if we mistake not, by the St. John Freeman:

"The year 'fifty-six, was ushered in amidst the clash of arms, the booming of cannons, and the dreadful conflict of European powers for victory, conquest and glory. The morning of the last new year of the political world was gloomy and terrible; and no one could have anticipated aught except the dreadful and inevitable consequences of a war which threatened to bring within its range every power on the earth. The wise policy of Austria, the prudence of Napoleon III. and the conviction throughout Europe of the decline of England's power, calmed the troubled waters, and restored tranquility and peace to Europe. At this side of the Atlantic, we have had a striking illustration of the fact, that little men, under certain circumstances have the power of causing much commotion. A recruiting expedition in the United States proved to England that the Americans will sustain their laws, and that England must humble herself at the feet of the self-sufficient and boasting republic of Know-nothings, filibusters, and common schools. We had anticipated, as a good consequence of the Anglo-French alliance, the removal of English Protestant prejudices, and the suspension of the insulting interference of England with the religion of the great majority of civilized Europe. In this we have been disappointed. However, we have reason to console ourselves with the result of Palmerston's political and diplomatic attempts in Spain and Italy. Napoleon the Third is a good Catholic and the pious Eugenie is a Spaniard; this makes us hope for the once chivalrous, and always devoted, but too often misguided Spain. The King of Naples has good friends, who will empty their treasures and spill the last drop of blood, rather than permit the Union Jack to flutter over the magnificent Bay of Naples. Whilst we deplore the bigotry, and are disgusted with the inconsistency, and smile at the boasting and blundering of British statesmen, so evidently manifested during the past year, we on the other hand, have reason to glorify God, and rejoice that England is at last understood, and her power to do evil therefore circumscribed."

But, says another fault-finder, your remarks respecting the Convents were uncalled for. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. We have learned to regard such institutions with dislike. All Protestants who have read history, must have been impressed with the same prejudice—if prejudice you choose to call it; and some Catholics have told us, that they did not approve of them. Some seem to regard them as ordinary educational establishments; if name and antecedents prove anything, it is not so. Our friends have a perfect right to regard Convents as favourably as they please; our neighbour of the Journal may class them with Episcopalian, and Presbyterian, and Methodist, and Baptist institutions, and no one denies his right to express the opinion, whatever comments may be made upon it. So we, regarding the matter in a different light, express our opinion conscientiously, as being averse to such institutions.

The Journal (always deprecating anything which would disturb existing quiet,) would interpret us as meaning that Catholics should not enjoy the same rights as Protestants. A few words on this: There are certain inalienable rights which all good subjects should enjoy; those rights, under Protestant rule, all do, and will enjoy. But we would

be a very hypocritical, or a most unworthy Protestant, were we to pretend to have the wish or the will that Roman Catholic powers should predominate and rule the destinies of Great Britain, or of the Colonies; and we go not to history to find justification for these feelings. We take the testimony of our intelligent Roman Catholic neighbors, and from their expressed views, come at our conclusions. They say, we are a very sensitive people—a sneer may cause a riot; they say ours is the only true religion, & all others should be subverted; they acknowledge a higher earthly authority than Queen Victoria; they are, a majority of them, (all honor to those who are the exceptions,) as the Journal terms them, Conservatives, from the very nature of their religion. Say not we are wrong; read the following from the Rambler, a Roman Catholic journal published in London, which we find in the Toronto Globe:

"We are the children of a church which has always avowed the most profound antipathy to the principle of 'religious liberty,' and which has never given the smallest shadow of sanction to that theory which pretends that 'civil liberty,' as such, is necessarily a benefit. How insufferable it is to see this pernicious invention for deceiving the Protestant world, still so popular as it is, among us. We say for deceiving the Protestant world.—English and Irish Protestants do not for a single moment, give credit to our words, when they hear us making protestations of liberalism. When you hear a Catholic speaker, in any public assembly, solemnly declare, that he feels himself humiliated in having to take *once more* the defence of the glorious principles of religious liberty, be not so simple as to believe him. These are fine words, but they signify nothing; no more than the promises of a parliamentary candidate when canvassing for the votes of electors. The Catholic who speaks in this manner, personates Protestantism, and not Catholicism; nay, he talks nonsense!"

Here then we rest. We repudiate the statement that we desire to array any one portion of the community against another, or that we have attacked or insulted any class. We contend that we have only uttered truths which none need take offence at; we have written nothing which, upon the most serious consideration, we feel we should take back. Those who would coerce us into a different course are only fanning the fires which they would subdue. We are willing to be convinced of error of opinion; we are willing that those who think differently from us should express that difference through the columns of the Sentinel; free discussion on political matters we admire; but, while our motto remains "Our Queen and Constitution!" to preserve them upon the sure basis of the Bible and Protestantism be our humble endeavors ever given!

The Election Law will doubtless receive, during the approaching session of our Provincial Legislature, a deliberate consideration, and, under the auspices of the Government which we expect to see in office, will, we feel satisfied, be rendered a measure better adapted to the popular wants.

That the Act is at present a perfect measure, none have claimed, to our knowledge; that it contains wise provisions, and is, on the whole, a long advance in the right direction, all true Liberals must admit.

The present rulers of the Province are, we feel justified in saying, adverse to the whole scheme;—to its very fundamental doctrine, the ballot system, we believe, Wilmot and Gray, at least, are opposed; and this explains the secret of the stern opposition to the Act which has become patent to the columns of the Government papers. They would keep its unfinished parts before the public; expose all its weaknesses; leave all its advantages over and improvements upon the old system unnoticed,—and thus prepare the people, by a one-sided agitation, to allow them, when they have the power,—as they fondly hope to have,—to repeal the whole Act, and fall back upon the old system, a system which has recommended itself to their esteem, because, heretofore, its corruptions and imperfections have furthered their own selfish ends.

Our contemporary, the Journal, has, with becoming assiduity,—exhibiting praiseworthy fidelity to the Government and its mighty small coterie of supporters in this County,—labored long and hard to prove how bad the Act is, as well as its framers. In his last illuminations upon the subject, he has found that the Law of Evidence affords an accidental assistance in carrying out the provisions of the Election Law in an equitable manner! he dwells upon a discrepancy, as he thinks, in the Act, where it is provided that all persons who shall have been assessed a certain amount shall be entitled to vote. Now we imagine the Act takes up the matter where the Assessors leave it; they, having legally fulfilled their duty,—having ascertained, under the law, who were entitled to be assessed,—leave their lists in a state ready for the Revisors, who take, and from them learn, who are assessed, and who consequently are qualified. If any mistakes occur, the