

THE SENTINEL.

AND NEW BRUNSWICK GENERAL ADVERTISER.

VOL. III

FREDERICTON, SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1840.

No. 19.

THE SENTINEL.
PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING
By **Edmund Ward.**
Office.—Phoenix or Tank House—Fredericton.
AND CONTAINS,
The Decisions of the Executive, and Notices of
Sales of Crown Lands.
During the sitting of the Legislature THE SENTINEL is published twice each week, and in it are inserted
The Debates of the House of Assembly.
TERMS.—15s. per annum, exclusive of Postage Half in advance.
No Paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding twelve lines will be inserted for four shillings and sixpence the first, and one shilling and sixpence for each succeeding insertion. Larger in proportion.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.
CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—W. J. Bodel, Esq. President. Saml. W. Babbit, Esq. Cashier. Discount Days, Tuesdays and Fridays. Bills or Notes offered for Discount must be left at the Bank, enclosed and directed to the Cashier, before two o'clock on Mondays and Thursdays. Director next week, J. ROBINSON, Esq.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—Fredericton Branch. Archd. Scott, Esq. Cashier. Discount days, Mondays and Thursdays. Hours of business from 10 to 3. Notes or Bills for discount to be left at the Bank, enclosed to the Cashier before three o'clock on Saturdays and Wednesdays.

BANK OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—Fredericton Branch.—Alfred Smithers, Esq. Manager.—Discount days, Wednesdays and Saturdays. Hours of business from 10 to 3. Notes and Bills for discount to be in before 3 o'clock on the days preceding the Discount Days. Director next week, J. F. Taylor Esq.

SAVINGS' BANK. Trustee for next week, P. FISHER.
CENTRAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—B. Wolhaupter, Esq. Office open every day, at Mr. Minchin's Brick House, opposite the Parade, (Sundays excepted), from 11 to 2 o'clock. Committee for the present Month, C. McPHERSON and C. FISHER.

ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE.—Commissioner, till Thursday next, L. A. WILMOT, Esq.

FROM LATE LONDON PAPERS.

The Tory re-action goes on merrily. The seventh election has just been decided, and a seventh election to the liberal party has been achieved.

A vacancy for the Inverness burghs having occurred, the candidates were Mr. Fraser, a highlander, who had all the kindly sympathies of his countrymen in his favour, and against whom nothing could be said, except that he was a Tory, and Mr. Morrison, a London merchant, who had no local influence whatever, and who was only known to the people of Scotland as a Reformer.

At the former election for the same place the liberal candidate was returned by a majority of nineteen. So great however has been the Tory reaction in those parts, that Mr. Morrison has been elected by a majority of Forty-six.

This success had been obtained in spite of the utmost efforts of the Tory party, and in spite of the attempts of the Tory papers to mystify the electors, with respect to the intention of the Tories upon the non-intrusion question—the question which is now the all-absorbing topic among Scotchmen, and upon which they are united as one man.

The non-intrusion question is a quaint term, employed to signify the right of the heads of families in Scotland to interpose a veto upon the appointment of any clergyman, whom they may think unqualified to perform his spiritual duties with advantage among them. In the vindication of this right, which has been recently invaded by a decision of their civil courts, they are so enthusiastic, that we have heard Scotchmen declare that they would rather turn out upon the hill side, as their fathers did of yore, than see this great privilege lost to them and their children.

We envy the natives of this division of our island their unanimity and their enthusiasm in such a cause, and we envy them also the certainty they have of succeeding. Had such a right as this been obtained by our laity, and guarded with watchfulness and spirit, how much heartburning, how much tyranny, how much scandal to religion would it have saved, and how different a Church of England should we now have had?

The parliamentary reports are silent upon the corn laws as if no such question agitated the country. Six weeks has the House now been sitting, often has it omitted to sit at all; weeks of debate has it expended upon a trumpery question of privilege, in which the country feels no interest whatever, or if they do feel any interest, it is somewhat equivalent to the indignation which the master of a house would feel when he found his house in confusion, and his study without a fire, because his servants were quarrelling with the servants of his next door neighbour,—six weeks, we say, has the House thus consumed, and yet the corn laws have never been mentioned. This one topic of public interest, this great question of questions, upon which alone the public mind is concentrated, is absolutely tabooed in the house of representatives, and the Speaker would at once interrupt the member who would venture to say a dozen words upon it.

We are not ignorant that there is a notice of motion upon this subject upon the books, or that a grand corn law field-day is approaching. We had one of these last session, and we may have one for a hundred sessions to come, if this is the only way in which the question is to be treated in Parliament. These great debates, these grand salvos of oratory, are worse than useless. It is not thus that the Reform Bill was agitated, nor was it thus that it was carried.

To repeal the corn laws we must have a parliamentary as well as an out-of-doors agitation. And never was there an act of Parliament passed so favourable to Toryism as is that simple sessional order which now forbids all discussion upon petitions. It shuts out all parliamentary agitation; it in effect destroys all the efficacy of the constitutional right of petitioning; it is an injustice and an insult to the constituency, and the present state of the House shows that it is as unnecessary as it is noxious.

But for this unconstitutional order of the House, not a night would have passed without a full House and a corn law debate. A continual running fire would have been kept up, petitions would have poured in in thousands, and the debates of the House would have borne some analogy to the feeling of the country.—But what use is it now to get up petitions, which are thrust under the table in silence, and are cut up the next day to make tailors' measures?

What are the corn law delegates about?—Surely they will not be satisfied that the subject should be disposed of by a single debate, or that it should occupy a less portion of the consideration of the House than a disputed railroad bill, or Mr. Packington's beer bill. If the corn laws are to be repealed, we must have fifty debates and fifty motions every session; we must agitate in Parliament; we must never let the House relax one single night from the contemplation of the subject; we must also watch; we also must harass; we also if necessary must obstruct; but we must be continually heard. It was thus that the Test Acts were repealed, it was thus that the Emancipation was carried, it was thus that Reform was gained; and thus—and thus only—shall we ever emancipate our countrymen from the degradation and misery which they hourly suffer from this atrocious impost.

Every anti-corn law constituency should now closely watch the conduct of its representative, and teach every member that the first question which he will be asked upon the hustings, will be, "What have you personally done towards the repeal of the bread tax?" It is in forwarding this great cause that the leisure moments of our House of Commons should be passed, not in thin attendances, early adjournments, and "no house."

We are perhaps unfortunate or singular, but we have no sympathy with the present pursuits of Parliament. When we say Parliament, we mean the House of Commons. The Lords are nonentities, and do nothing. The long discussions on the privilege question seemed to us, in the present condition of the country, a miserable mockery of the public feelings and public expectations. Again, when so much is demanded of the House of Commons, it has occupied two nights with a debate on a Bill of Lord Stanley's concerning the registration of voters in Ireland, and is as intensely interested with the subject as if the fate of the empire depended on it. We have no sympathy with the pursuits of the Commons. The Tory journals complain of the Liberals because they oppose the bill on the ground that it is Lord Stanley's. If they were to do so we should praise them. To snub that arrogant changeling, who fancies himself a great statesman because he is a great talker—"the heir of all his mother's tongue," is the duty of every reflecting moderate member. Whatever such a Hotspur proposes should always be looked on with suspicion. Of Catholic Irishmen he is the open and declared enemy, as he is the open and avowed servant of the Anglican bigots. All the members for Ireland therefore, should rise against him when he interferes with its concerns. He has merited the suspicion and the enmity of the Irish, and common sense cautions them not to trust their opponents. They do right, therefore, in resisting Lord Stanley's Bill.

It is proposed by Lord Stanley's bill to remove from the registry the names of those who by death, or removal, or other non-qualification, ought not to remain on it; so that the list of voters may be really a list of those and of those alone having the right to vote at an election. The opponents of the measure object to this; they say, "we will not allow the number of names on the register to be diminished," "it would be almost a total disfranchisement," &c. Now we contend, that this objection being reduced to plain English can mean only this—"we do not like the names of those who ought not to be on the register to be removed from it, because that would deprive those interested of the power of bringing up fictitious voters to the poll," (this is what they call "disfranchisement") Here then, we have the main argument against the principle of the bill, and the reason for it.—*Courier.*

FROM THE LONDON ATLAS MARCH 28.

Lord Stanley's Bill for repealing the Irish Reform Act—for such, in effect it is—has been read a second time in the House of Commons by a majority of sixteen! Thus falls the favourite figment of the finality of the Reform Act. Such is the first practical commentary upon the often repeated vows of allegiance to the present state of the representation, which the Tories have been so loudly ejaculating ever since they found that they could use the English Reform Bill for their own purposes.

When this Bill was introduced by Lord Stanley, artful as was his account of it, and carefully as its object was attempted to be concealed, it was yet so clear, that the public generally marvelled at his audacity, and censured the attempt as a gratuitous impertinence. To change a constituency because it declares against a particular faction of the state, to abolish a system of registry because it enables too many qualified persons to register, to hem round the franchise with continual contests, to fetter it year after year with a long series of forms and notices, which would employ all the acuteness of a special pleader to be drawn so that no objection could be taken to them; to harass, oppress, and impoverish every one who insists to remain upon the register against the will of his richer neighbour; to make an elector hold his vote at the expense of an intricate and yearly law-suit—these were the objects of Lord Stanley and his party—these must be the effects of his bill if ever it should become law.

The bill itself is worthy of its object. It is the most clumsy piece of embryo legislation that has been lately laid before the House. It is couched in the old and now obsolete verbiage, in which the meaning of our Acts of Parliament was accustomed to be concealed from the vulgar ken. It is inconsistent in its provisions, vague and wordy in its enactments. There is not a clause which would not admit of many doubts as to its contents. But hold! Perhaps the very faults which we are urging against it are its chief excellencies in the eyes of its partisans.

No one knows better than Lord Stanley that there is a vast difference between the English and the Irish bench of judges, and that topics of politics, which are excluded from Westminster Hall, find ready admission in the Hall of the four Courts. Toryism has already gained much by the kind aid of the Irish judges acting upon the election law; what might not be expected from them if the whole law of registration were enveloped in a cloud of incongruities, and they were left to pick what they pleased out of them? Lord Stanley is a clever and acute tactician, and who so able to undermine the Reform Bill as he who laid its foundation?

It would be easy to show, from the language of this Bill, and from collating its clauses, that all we have said of its clumsiness, verbosity, and ambiguity, is entirely true. Such an attempt, however, would carry us far beyond the limits of a newspaper article, and we shall be satisfied if our notice of the fact should call the attention of members to the details of this most dangerous measure.

The hypocrisy of Lord Stanley was more offensive even than his object. He tells us that this is a remedial and not a party measure. Not a party measure! what then is it? Is a measure to disfranchise one-half of the electors of Ireland an indifferent measure, upon which Whigs and Tories are agreed? Not a party measure! Why, then, were the Tory benches so thronged?—why was the House so numerous?—why then, were the cheers so deafening when the result of the division was announced?—why then, was the great economical leader of the Tories, the illustrious Sibthorpe, so loud in his triumphant buoyancy, and so earnest in his hope that after this division Lord John Russell would "lumber the country no longer?" Not a party measure! Why, then, was Lord Stanley obliged to tell us that this question detained him from the bed of a parent, helpless from recent paralysis? And why was his brother-in-law, Mr. Bootle Wilbraham, hurried from the death-bed of his mother? Surely, a family under such complicated afflictions might have been forgiven if they had forgotten, for a space, the evils of Irish registration! We should be sorry to suppose of Lord Stanley that the immaterial question of a month's more or less, existence of a grievance which has already endured eight years, if a grievance it be, could draw him from duties so sacred as these. We do not suppose any thing of the sort. It was the demand of faction; the summons of his party; the stern discipline which, in factions as in warlike contest, admits of no excuse; it was these which called him to London and kept him here when he should have been elsewhere. We are not inclined to speak harshly of him for this, but we do strongly condemn the bold contempt of truth with which he exclaimed, while the Tory whipper in was languid from his labour, "This is no party question."

The majority upon this Bill is unpardonable, and it should at once seal the fate of the present Parliament. We have no hesitation in saying that from a House of Commons which would suffer such a bill as this to be read a second time in their House, the country has nothing whatever to expect of a beneficial kind, but has every thing to dread. In the custody of such a House the liberties of neither Britons nor Irishmen are safe.

Mr. Hume's motion, having for its object to suspend the payment of the King of Hanover's pension was negatived by the House of Commons on Friday night, by a majority of thirteen the numbers being 75 to 62.

This decision and the debate which preceded it, exhibit in glowing colours the character of the new Tory mania for economy. If we were to search throughout the whole list of the items of public expenditure for the most unpopular article of the whole, we should put our finger without hesitation upon the quarterly payment of £5,250 to the King of Hanover. If we were asked, which, of all these pensions, had been the least deserved, we should keep our finger still upon the same spot; if it were demanded to point out the item which was the least warranted by public principle or public policy, which pension was most dishonest towards the nation that pays, and most dishonourable to the person who receives, we should still have no further to seek—the pension of the King of Hanover would still be our answer, and the response would be echoed by every man of every party among the middle classes of our countrymen.

The fact of an independent sovereign receiving a pension from a foreign country, cannot admit of even a colourable defence. The only precedent which we remember is that of Charles II. who is well known to have received a large annual stipend from Louis XIV. The charges however, received this pension as the price of services to Louis, and of treason to his people. It has stamped his memory with an immortality of infamy. We know no case in which a pension was ever before granted to a reigning monarch without some return being expected by the people who paid it, and we do not conceive that the destruction of the constitution of Hanover, and the establishment of a despotism, is precisely what the British people would be inclined to purchase by a large annual payment. In the employment of their foreign pension we admit that the cases of Charles II. and Ernest of Hanover are identical—they both employed the foreign gold to enslave their own subjects. How a constitutional Sovereign, a liberal government, and a people jealous of freedom can reconcile to themselves the acting the part of the plotting despot of Old France, and paying their money for a similar purpose, is a matter which it is for them to consider.

It is too clear to admit of controversy that this pension was granted to a prince of the blood who had nothing of his own, in order that he might maintain that station among us to which his birth entitled him. It was never granted in order that the same person, when he became a foreign prince, might use it to wage war against us, or might enjoy it to oppress his people. But it would be useless to argue so clear a point—the subject no more admits of adverse argument than does a correct mathematical demonstration.

Here, then, was a profligate expenditure of public money, which not only the dictates of economy, but the higher dictates of honour, humanity and freedom required should be at once put an end to. Yet the same men who are stern and severe economists, whenever provision for the Consort of their Queen is mentioned, and who are loud in denunciation of any increase in the public allowance to an English royal duke, rise as one man to defend and to vote for the subsidizing a foreign King.

We put the merits and demerits of the King of Hanover as Duke of Cumberland, entirely

out of the question. We need no aid from such topics in order to hold out these hypocritical Tory economists to the contempt of all honest men. The conduct of the King of Hanover in this matter serves to illustrate an old truth, that tyrants are always among the meanest as well as the most haughty of mankind.

From the *New York Morning Chronicle.*
GREAT BRITAIN—AMERICA—RUSSIA—CHINA—ETC.

At a time when rumour with her hundred tongues cries war from one end of the world to the other, we are naturally anxious to learn what may be the upshot of this general clamour—who are to suffer—who are to be benefited, and so forth. Providence in mercy to mankind, has drawn a veil over the future. Were it not so we should be the most miserable of beings. The cry of war is now loud on our North Eastern frontier, and the brave, fiery citizens of Maine, "in arms and eager for the fray"—that is, eager to go to loggerheads with their neighbours, the British, about a portion of territory, the possession of which, as regards Maine, is of trifling advantage to her to what it is to Great Britain.

The obstacles as regards the settlement of this long disputed line of territory, are unquestionably on the side of Maine—Great Britain having for many years past expressed her willingness and desire to accede to anything like an equitable adjustment of her claim—a claim which, under certain conditions, the Federal Government of Maine, very wisely we must say, does all in her power to frustrate, on the principle of self-interest. This is precisely the situation in which we at present stand with Great Britain on the everlasting, belligerent, sickening theme, the North Eastern Boundary question—the political incubus of the two countries. This important question, however is not to be settled otherwise than by the cool deliberation of the two powers nationally interested on the subject. Therefore, the good folks of Maine and New Brunswick would do well to shake hands together in brotherly amity, and patiently await the result of the decision of their respective governments; a decision which we sincerely trust will be such as to bind more strongly together the union of commerce and friendly feeling existing between the two countries, and alike necessary for the prosperity and happiness of both.

It is amusing to hear your would-be-politicians talk about England and her resources. That England is in a ruined state, at her last gasp. As if for sooth the seeds of dissolution were sown in the formation of States as they are in that of the human body. Were it so, then are we in a rapid consumption, and fast approaching dissolution. That England cannot find money to go to war—that Russia waits but an opportunity to pour her myriads into England, and drive all her subjects before her "like a flock of wild geese." That such is the rebellious state of the working classes, Great Britain dare not impress further taxes on her people. That in the event of a war with America, a rebellion would most assuredly break out in England, and that Russia would attack the English territory in India. That a war with China would so divide the forces of England and cramp her resources, that she could not provide a sufficient force, &c. to carry on a war in America. That Great Britain dare not go to war with America; and a great deal more to the same tune.

What Great Britain dare do has been pretty well proved, we think, in India, Spain, France, Belgium, &c. within the last fifty years. What she can do and may do, time will show. She is a restless power, and must be doing something. The flag that has braved the battle and the breeze for a thousand years, may be tattered and torn, but so long as a shred shall remain, her millions of brave sons will rally round it.

It is not our intention to enter *seriatim* into all the above premises; we shall confine ourselves at present, to Great Britain and her resources, with which to wage war, should she think proper so to do, with all the world. Next to the honor of our own country, we are the most jealous of that of Old England; so intimately is the welfare of the one connected with the other. Our limits compel us to stop here. We shall resume this subject in a future number.

DRESS THE MIND.

On a Sunday morning before going to church what a dressing there is among all classes, and what a stir to appear gay and pleasing! It is quite sufficient for the great purposes of our existence to wash the outside of the platter? Curly may be arranged, fine tortoise shell combs fixed, sparkling earrings hung, splendid garments displayed, and yet perhaps the gay fair one's mind may be poisoned with conceit, troubled with rivalry and kept on the torture by ignorance and vanity. Windsor soap does not wash the stains of the heart; Cologne water cannot throw a fragrance over an impure mind; nor will all the rubies of Golconda dazzle the recording angel into a forgetfulness of filling up the leaves of the book of retribution.

Works for the Farmers.—One of the most encouraging "signs of the times" to us—out of politics—is the increased attention which is paid, all around us, to the agricultural interest—a great national as well as individual policy, in regard to the importance and dignity of which, our convictions are so lively that our readers will still probably have to "put up" occasionally, hereafter, as they have done heretofore, with our allusions to the subject, and our attempts to make it in some degree available to their entertainment and edification alike.

Meanwhile we shall probably be doing some of them a service by pointing out the merits of publications, with which they are not already familiar. Mr. Skinner's "American Farmer" still continues among the best of the weeklies, and should be looked up, at

least by those who want to know all the science and practice of the Baltimore latitude. Judge Buel's "Cultivator," at Albany, (at \$1 a year) is also continued by his son, and may be deemed indispensable to a northern farmer—to which list we shall only add, for the present, the "Visiter," published at Concord, N. H. by Governor Hill.

DIFFICULTIES IN NOVA SCOTIA.

From the *Toronto Christian Guardian.*

From the intelligence under the head of Nova Scotia, it will be seen that the Lieutenant Governor and his Executive Council, supported by the Legislative Council, are in direct collision with the House of Assembly in that Province. Our readers have, from time to time, been informed of the affairs of Nova Scotia. The loyalty of the Assembly of that Province is above suspicion; amongst the leading reformers there or in New Brunswick there are no Mackenzie or Hinckses to deal in outrageous personal invective and abuse, or to urge the extremes of suicidal violence; the majority of the members of the Assemblies of both the Lower Provinces—especially the leaders—appear to be men of great coolness and moderation, but of great intelligence, inflexible firmness, and persevering energy.

Sir John Harvey acts harmoniously with the Assembly of New Brunswick; and without any reference to the theory, practically illustrates the declaration of the Governor General, in his Message to our House of Assembly on the question of "Responsible Government"—"The Governor General has received Her Majesty's commands to administer the Government of these Provinces in accordance with the well-understood wishes and interests of the people, and to pay to their feelings, as expressed through their Representatives, the deference that is justly due to them." The leading members of the House of Assembly of New Brunswick have been appointed to public situations under the Crown, and the difficulties which formerly agitated that Province have been removed; the former party distinctions and hostilities have been annihilated, and peace and harmony prevail throughout that Province, together with a state of unprecedented prosperity.

Her Majesty's Government recommended the adoption of the same policy in Nova Scotia.—The House of Assembly had made representations to Her Majesty's Government on various matters, and sent home a delegation. The Legislative Council did the same. Among other representations the House of Assembly complained of the bigoted and exclusive character of the Executive Council. Referring to the Executive Council, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a despatch to Sir C. Campbell, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, dated August 21st, 1839, says—"I feel strongly how desirable it is that it should be composed in a manner, to command the co-operation of the popular branch of the constitution, and although I do not desire to fetter your discretion upon this subject, yet I shall be glad to learn that you shall have thought it expedient to offer, as the occasion for so doing may present itself, seats in it to some of the leading members in the House of Assembly."

A proper regard on the part of the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia to the timely and conciliatory advice of Her Majesty's Colonial Secretary of State, would have anticipated and prevented the further discussion of any theoretical questions in the Province of Nova Scotia; but Sir C. Campbell appears to have determined to be the head of a high church clique, instead of the impartial Governor of the province. He pushes the undefined prerogative of the Crown to the verge of absolute despotism. The consequence of such a course of proceeding is well stated in Lord John Russell's despatch on "responsible government." His Lordship says—"The Sovereign using the prerogative of the Crown to the utmost extent, and the House of Commons exerting its power of the purse, to carry all its resolutions into immediate effect, would produce confusion in the country in less than a twelvemonth." It was thus that James the Second exercised the prerogative of the Crown, and the British nation took it away from him, and placed a new family upon the Throne. The House of Assembly of Nova Scotia in the session of 1839, did adopt resolutions [before the publication in the colonies of Lord Durham's report] embodying its complaints and wishes; and appointed its delegation to England, but it did not—like the late House of Assembly of Upper Canada—"exert its power of the purse." It voted the supplies for the administration of the civil government; and even placed at the disposal of the Lieutenant Governor one hundred thousand pounds to meet any exigency which might arise out of the aggressions of the State of Maine.

But the Lieutenant Governor has it seems, in connexion with his clique, preferred taking his stand upon the prerogative of the Crown, to "paying to the feelings of the people, as expressed through their representatives, the deference that is justly due to them"—a people and representatives who had, a few months previously pledged their treasure and their lives for the maintenance of British supremacy and British honor. Lord John Russell says—"The Queen's Government are earnestly intent on giving to the talent and character of leading persons in the colonies, advantages similar to those which talent and character employed in the public service, obtain in the United Kingdom."—But Sir C. Campbell, it appears, has no relish for such doctrine; he has preferred doing what Lord John Russell deprecates—"thwarting every legitimate proposition of the Assembly."—In support of what the Queen's Government has admitted to be just, and politic, and wise in administering the government of the colonies, the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia have insisted upon Lord Durham's theory, in which their opponents will, of course, hope to gain an advantage;—but such an advantage can be but temporary at least, and the gain of it will doubtless prove an ultimate loss.

Sir C. Campbell has not only not offered seats in the Executive Council to leading persons in the Assembly; but he has actually called Mr. A. Stewart to the Executive Council—a man who was formerly even an extreme reformer in the Assembly, but who changed his politics on being appointed to the Legislative Council—one of the most odious men in all Nova Scotia to the House of Assembly—a man who is now actually in England, and therefore cannot be elevated to assist the Governor, but to annoy and insult one of the most confessedly intelligent, patriotic and loyal Houses of Assembly in British North America.