

Correspondence.

AN OLD SORE ULCERATING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir,—Will you permit me to reply in your columns to the part of the Rev. George Sutherland's communication in yesterday's *Protector*, in which allusion was made to my letter on the Bible Question published in your paper last Spring.

Mr. Sutherland and his friends may accuse me of writing from a desire of notoriety, as I am aware some of them have accused me already; but I would assure them, that on this one occasion, at least, it is much against my will I am dragged on the public arena. My reluctance is based on the following grounds. 1st. My time and attention are so much pre-occupied with matters of a private and personal nature that I have not much inclination to meddle in any other matters of less interest to me. 2d. Hard experience has taught me that no event can be more annoying in its results to a layman than to quarrel with a regularly ordained clergyman, and in a special manner with the reverend gentleman who is to be the chief subject of my present strictures—the Rev. Alexr. Sutherland. Such are the bigotry and intolerance of the ignorant part of his congregation, that they will assail with the most unrelenting and violent persecution any person who is unfortunate enough to quarrel with their minister, without ever taking the trouble to inquire whether he be in fault or not. And their adeptness at slander and falsehood are such as to warrant the assumption, that a high standard of qualification in these is regarded amongst them as an indispensable prerequisite to church communion. They have from time to time come to New Glasgow in their holy zeal and endeavoured to excite a religious animosity against me in the settlement; but, thanks to the superior intelligence and good sense of my subscribers, all their slander and lies proved unavailing—and of this I had a most refreshing and satisfactory proof when, at the expiration of my first term of engagement lately, they joined, without an exception, to make me up a salary for the present year superior to that received by any teacher on the Island, Mr. Kenny excepted. 3d. The letter alluded to was written under the influence of a strong excitement of feeling consequent upon the officious interference of some clergymen in my own domestic affairs, concerning which they knew nothing, and my opinions were expressed in language which was rather intemperate, and in this respect widely different from my usual style of writing. It is with regret, then, that I find these disagreeable matters revived, which I hoped had been permanently buried amid the rubbish of the past.

But though deeply regretting anything that I wrote that tended to give offence to the Protestant clergy generally, and in particular to the clergy of the United Presbyterian body, whom I have generally found characterized no less by their superior education than by their urbanity and gentlemanlike qualities; yet I neither regret nor recant a word of what I wrote concerning the character of the Rev. Alexr. Sutherland. The reverend writer of the letter in the *Protector* quotes the following part of a sentence from my letter: "The torrents of abuse and slander which he" (Rev. Alexander Sutherland) "weekly vomitates from his pulpit." He puts the whole in capital letters, the more to attract public attention, and indeed when a minister of the Gospel is guilty of such misconduct, it is a matter that deserves a great share of public attention. Now, I CAN PROVE all that I stated concerning the reverend gentleman, and twice as much besides; and I would ask the intelligent public, which would they regard as worse, that a clergyman should be guilty of any glaring misconduct, than that I should have the temerity to tell him of it? The object for which the above part of a sentence was quoted, however, was to base thereon a charge of "infidelity" against me and the paper that published my letter. Goodness gracious! Under what influence did the reverend gentleman write his communication? By what strange process of ratiocination can he identify or ever assimilate my exposing the misconduct, either supposed or real, of a clergyman, with infidelity? If this be admissible evidence of infidelity, then not only the ministers of the Free and E-established Churches of Scotland, but also those of all other denominations, are infidels, for they continually declaim against each other. All the Protestant clergymen that censured Mr. Barker for his conduct last Spring were infidels, and he is an infidel since he censured theirs! Nay, further, St. Paul was an infidel since he censured and exposed some misconduct on the part of the Apostle Peter, and Paul and Barnabas proved themselves infidels when they quarrelled! His argument extended will lead to this as an irresistible conclusion. The reverend gentleman took good care to quote only the first part of the sentence referred to, for reasons which will presently appear. The sentence, as a whole, stands thus: "The torrents of abuse and slander which he weekly vomitates from his pulpit against orthodox denominations, and even private individuals, have already driven from his church many of the worthiest men in his congregation." Ah! Mr. Editor, the part of the sentence that I have italicized here, contains a rather unpalatable truth, which he considers it his interest to suppress rather than republish. All the members of his rev. friend's congregation that used to be considered pious men or "professors" ere he came amongst them, have entirely left him, and would now no more own him as their minister than they would a Mormon preacher. Amongst these are three of his elders and a catechist, who have borne an unblemished religious character on an average about forty years each, together with several nominated elders and many other pious heads of families. These facts speak volumes against his character, existing, as they do, amongst Highlanders—men proverbial for the love and veneration with which they generally regard their pastors. Last summer these men endeavoured to obtain a hearing of their grievances before the Presbytery. The Rev. Mr. Munro, the moderator, was favourable to a hearing of their cause; but the defendant—Rev. Alexander Sutherland—being a member of the Presbytery, and apparently dressing an investigation into his own conduct, opposed the proposal tooth and nail; and having the advantage of the complainants in some technical point of ecclesiastical law, succeeded in overruling their demand. Finding themselves thus foiled in their attempts to obtain redress in the ordinary and regular way, a delegate from the parties applied to me to put their charges against the minister in proper form, to appear either before the Synod or before the public in a pamphlet,—pledging themselves, if I would do so, to prove him guilty of a course of misconduct, the details of which would be shocking in an ordinary character, much more so in a minister of the Gospel. For some private reasons, I declined complying with their request at that time. Now, all these men would, I feel satisfied, lose their lives and property before they would even exaggerate or warp the truth, much less tell a direct falsehood. The question then to be decided in the public mind, before it pass judgment upon this man's character, is, whether it is likely that so many respectable and pious members of his own congregation would wilfully and maliciously conspire to accuse him of crimes of which he never had been guilty. If he should have the hardihood to deny the truth of my statements, I am ready at any time to produce a short written statement of the charges against him, with his accusers' names appended thereto. Although I thus throw the *onus probandi* of his vices entirely upon the shoulders of others, I have no doubt but I will be held responsible by his ignorant admirers; and will, in consequence, be assailed with the most profuse threats of kicking, horse-whipping, &c. I cannot see, however, that my remarks on him can be offensive to any other clergyman, excepting his rev. classman, who, it seems, is as deep in the mud as he is in the mire. This is the secret of the friendship that subsists between the two, and their strict and uniform adherence to

the "you-brush-the-dirt-off-my-coat, and I'll-brush-the-dirt-off-yours" principle. I cannot see what interests other respectable clergymen can have in common with this sectarian fire-brand, who seems to regard himself as the "scourge of God" to all religious sects but the one that he follows. I have often heard him railing against Baptists and Methodists—thundering against the Church of England, for her "unscriptural rites and observances"—and showering unmeasured abuse upon his old mess-mates of the Established Church of Scotland. I saw a pious and venerable old man stand before him as a criminal, subjected to church discipline, excluded from Church communion—one of the gravest charges against him being that he had presented or started a tune at divine service for a worthy clergyman of the Established Church, when there was no other person present that could do it. I can state, on good authority, that he severely reprimanded a member of his communion for expressing himself pleased with a discourse delivered, in his neighbourhood, by a talented and eloquent young clergyman of the Secession Church. No sufficient excuse can be offered for such conduct as this, unless it be that the poor man is probably subject to occasional fits of mental aberration. In that case, he is more an object of pity than of resentment.

The reverend writer, in further evidence of the *Examiner's* infidel tendency, alludes to that part of my letter in which I stated my objection to the Old Testament as a school-book, and chuckles over a fallacy which he imagines he has discovered in my reasoning. I think, however, that I'll be able to prove, in a few words, that he is in error, and that my deduction from the premises stated was quite logical. Every person that has ever gone to school knows that ordinary school-books are read in regular order from beginning to end; that sentence after sentence, and lesson after lesson, are analyzed. It was in this sense that I said the Old Testament was unfit for a school-book; and every sensible and respectable clergyman on the Island will admit that—taking this as my meaning—I was right; for I can point out a hundred passages in the Book which I would challenge any reverend gentleman to read and explain before a mixed school of both sexes. The history of Joseph is probably the chastest history in the Bible, and is the sweetest and most affecting one ever written. I would not envy a young man his feelings that had never shed a tear on reading it or hearing it read; and yet I would consider it, to say the least of it, an extremely delicate matter to read the passage in which the relation of Mrs. Potiphar's criminal love reaches the climax, before a class of tall girls, such as I have in my school at times. We have extracts from the Old Testament in our ordinary school-books, which we read and analyze like any other lessons; but no person ever thinks of calling these the Old Testament. The reverend gentleman must remember, that in my remarks on the volume in question, I spoke of God as its "Divine Author." To call a man that makes such an acknowledgment as this an infidel, is simply ridiculous. It were better, I admit, if, in the first premises of his syllogism, I had put "a book that contains records of dark crime," &c., instead of "records of dark crime," &c., as it would have precluded the possibility of any cavilling at mere arrangement.

I could easily retort upon the reverend gentleman by shewing him that his letter is from beginning to end one tissue of unsound argument; but as I am convinced that he will have been more worthy of his steel in the editors of the *Examiner* and *Islander*, I forbear. The danger is that these two ravenous sharks, seeing the very defenceless position of the poor fisherman, will make short work with him. Two of his arguments, however, are so manifestly lame that a small fish like myself cannot resist the inclination to nibble at so very alluring a bait. 1st. He grounds his charge of immorality against the *Islander* and *Examiner* on their recriminations of each other. Now this is, to say the least of it, a very unfair argument. He should have shown what they really were, and not what their opinions of each other were. We know that men will often get so impregnated with any cause that they espouse, in law, politics, or even religion, that they will honestly attribute many bad acts and motives to their opponents which are in the meantime purely imaginary; but it would be very unfair from such data to form an estimate of their respective characters. How often have we seen the editors of two very popular religious journals advocating different views, most bitter in their invectives and unjust in their accusations against each other, and yet we have been levelled them to be both good men, both honest in the expression of their opinions of each other, and both wrong in these opinions. According to his mode of reasoning we could prove nearly all religious and political papers in the world—the *Protector* included—to be immoral in their tendency, and so undeserving of public support. 2d. He accuses the *Examiner* of infidelity because it advocates Catholicism. "Till I was enlightened by his reverence on this point, I was not aware that I could call a believer in the divine origin of the Scripture an infidel, merely because he might differ from me in his views of them. Of all the Catholic tenets which he has enumerated, the most hostile to reason is the belief in the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. I, in common with all other Protestants, am of opinion that this belief is wrong, founded upon an erroneous conception of the meaning of the text. I believe that the expressions, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," are no more to be taken in a strictly literal sense than is the expression, "All flesh is grass." Yet if the Catholics entertain a different view of the text, *i. e.*, takes it in its strictly literal sense, am I to call him an infidel on that account, when we both believe alike that "the Christ the Son of the living God" spoke it? Assuredly not. The doctrine of consubstantiation is just as unreasonable as that of transubstantiation, and yet Luther believed in it, and all his followers have believed in it till this day. Are they all infidels, then? Are all the Lutheran populations of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and many of the German States, infidels? Mr. Sutherland replies, yes. God forbid he should be telling the truth!

In conclusion, I would assure the reverend gentleman that I am far from entertaining any feeling of hostility to the Church of which he is a minister—a Church founded by a body of men un-surpassed, if equalled, in piety and enlightenment—the Church of my fathers, in which I was reared and educated. Nor do I entertain any personal ill-will to him. On the contrary, whenever I find that he and his warlike classman of New London have forsaken their sins and ceased their display of petty tyranny and intolerance, which so much mars their usefulness, tarnishes their reputation, and obscures the lustre of their natural parts, which are indisputably of a rather superior order, I am their disciple. I remain, Sir, yours, &c.

JOSIAH McLEOD.

New Glasgow, October 30, 1857.

HORRIBLE DEATH BY DROWNING.—On Friday night, at a late hour, a man named Archibald Brown, holding a responsible situation in the Albert Coal Mines, by some accident, fell over the Ballast Wharf on his way down to the steamboat. He groped his way up the wharf and endeavored to climb up the inside of the wharf. In doing so, the unfortunate man got jammed in between the logs. For a long time he remained in this situation before assistance could be obtained, the tide gradually making, and death coming on him by inches. When his position was discovered, it was found impossible to get him out, and he was drowned in sight of the powerless and horrified spectators. We understand he was not quite dead when got out, but died immediately after. An inquest was held and a verdict in accordance with the above facts returned. Deceased was highly respected, and leaves a family and many friends to mourn his loss. —*St. John, N. B., Leader.*

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., NOVEMBER 9, 1857.

MR. COOPER'S LETTER.

WHEN we published, last week, the letter from Mr. Cooper on the subject of the Loan Bill, we did not give it place in our columns from any sympathy with the sentiments of the writer, or any admiration of the political ethics of the scribe of Sailor's Hope. We allowed it to go forth without note or comment, as evidencing the spirit which animates the man who has for so many years arrogated to himself the proud pre-eminence of being *par excellence* the champion of the people—the redressor of popular wrongs—the man whose voice was ever raised in denunciation of fraud—who has ever "furnished over Greece, and shook the arsenal," while he held up to reprobation the bad practices, and the evils which followed in the train of those practices, of robbers, pirates and swindlers—by which mild designations he was, and is, in the habit of indicating the proprietors of Township lands in this Island. One great reason, too, for our letting the letter appear without editorial allusion, was, that the writer was so well known—had figured before the public for so many years—had so completely exhausted every reasonable view of his subject—that the signature alone would be sufficient to take away any effect the letter itself might produce—that the fatal "William Cooper, Sailor's Hope," was the antidote to the bane of the communication.

It would appear that Mr. Cooper, having had his mind seriously impressed with the idea of the great pecuniary advantages gained by the more than insinuated dishonesty of proprietors and their agents, has conceived a hankering after the "flesh-pots of Egypt," and in his desire to participate in the plunder, has, in his old days, been impressed with the desire of getting money somewhat on the principle inculcated by the old woman, whose recommendation to her son about embarking on the voyage of active life, was, "to get siller honestly if you can, but at any rate get siller." We are sorry that any one in the Colony, especially a member of the Legislature, and that member at one time wielding considerable influence, should have expressed opinions, openly inculcating a breach of common honesty, and justifying them on the grounds of probable impunity. But so it is, in the letter to which we have referred, Mr. Cooper has not hesitated to record that his support of the Loan Bill was based upon the supposition of obtaining money under the pledge of the Provincial faith for its repayment with interest, and then repudiating the moral and legal obligation which would necessarily devolve upon the borrowers to refund the amount. Let our readers should doubt that this is a true version of Mr. Cooper's letter, we ask their attention to the following extract from it, which we give *in extenso*, that it may not be said that we have pre-terited our charges on garbled extracts—

"When the *Supers' creatures* were the Colonial Government, and had British troops at their command to overawe the tenantry, and the people's representatives having no power over, or part in the Colonial Government—were good reasons to petition the House of Commons against the Colonial Office. But when the Colonial Office gave the people their rights to choose their own Government, and withdrew the troops and even the arms from the Island—the people now have a constitutional remedy at law to settle their own affairs, if they will only believe it; and if trials of titles are refused, trust to their own strength and the justice of their cause for the settlement of the land question. Consequently they could have no grounds, but their own ignorance and cowardice, to plead in a petition to Parliament against the Colonial Office.

"Then, again, there is not that difference between my proposal and the Loan Bill, as to affect the interests of the tenantry, as you would have them believe. Both votes were for the Government to purchase the land and sell it again to the tenantry. Nor can the Loan Bill bring the Colony in debt. Because it was passed under such circumstances that no more money can be recovered from the Colony than the people think proper to pay; and as both votes were for a compromise, depending on the will of parties, either party might agree or disagree to the compromise as they pleased. Now as to the Colonial Minister had not agreed to my proposal, but he had agreed to guarantee a Loan. He was at liberty to object to my proposal, without any blame; but it would be a breach of promise to object to the Loan. Therefore, I could not expect to carry my measure for the benefit of the tenantry, by adhering to my proposal, without the support of Government; but there was a fair prospect of relieving the tenantry by supporting the Loan Bill. And although the Minister has not yet obtained the assent for that Bill, that would be no plea to petition Parliament against him, when we have a constitutional and a better remedy at law. For whenever the tenantry make up their minds that they will neither pay rent nor buy land from reputed usurers, until their titles are investigated and proved to be good in law, that will soon bring the land question to a settlement, and leave to the tenantry their rents of £20,000 a year to improve their OWN LANDS."

It needs the pen of no magician to disclose the meaning over which the writer has scarcely deigned to throw the veil of ambiguous or equivocal language. Mr. Cooper's idea, as expressed by himself, amounts to this, that the removal of the troops and arms from the Island justifies the tenantry in defying the legal processes and tribunals of the country, and conveys by implication the doctrine, that a refusal to comply with the obligations they have assumed, and to obey the laws of the land, may be indulged with impunity, since the means of coercion, in the shape of a military force, are no longer here to be called in aid of an inadequate civil force. To this doctrine, we, in common with the great bulk of the population, record our dissent *in toto*. Law, as being the deliberate expression of the will of the majority, should, and we trust, will, always be observed by the people; and the very desire which each man naturally feels, that the shield of the law protects him in his life, liberty and property, should, and we believe, does and will, induce him to consider that his neighbor is entitled to the same protection.

Mr. Cooper evidently considers it consistent with public morality that the country should borrow in the English market money for the purchase of the proprietary titles, on conditions, to be repudiated by the borrowers; and, inasmuch as the troops and arms are withdrawn, he considers it "constitutional" to swindle the capitalist who may be green enough to believe that our legislative body are not a pack of deliberate scoundrels—that "*Punica fides*" is an obsolete phrase as regards the solemn action of a British Legislature. We do most heartily protest against the right of Mr. Cooper, or any other man, in the Legislature or out of it, daring thus to vilify our character for honesty—daring to stigmatize our Legislature as a band of swindlers; and, assuming his statement to be the true embodiment of his own feelings and wishes, implying that they whom he supported by his vote on the Loan Bill, acted in the spirit which he has not blushed to avow, induced his own vote on the Bill.

Heartily sick of the contemplation of the position which he has assumed, and which we venture to predict he will hold without the fear of having any disturbing rival, we leave Mr. Cooper to the enjoyment of the fancied idea, that

"The pleasure is as great

In being cheated as to cheat."

Merely adding our own modest opinion, which we are sorry to say, differs from that of the *forlorn* Sailor's Hope man, that, in private as well as public engagements, honesty is the best policy.

THE NEWS FROM INDIA.

The intelligence from India by the English mail of Friday night is of a far more encouraging character than any which has been received since the commencement of the rebellion. It is true that the enemy maintained, at last accounts, his precarious position within the walls of Delhi; but the feebleness of his attacks on the besieging army—the frequent and numerous defeats which he had sustained—the absence of a cordial good feeling amongst the mutineers themselves, now that time had sufficed to cool the first excitement of the revolt, and to make them fully conscious of the power and increasing resources of their antagonists—clearly indicated that the crisis of this horrible mutiny had passed, and that British authority was everywhere in northern India slowly but surely reasserting its wonted supremacy. There can be no doubt that the brilliant exploits of General Havelock and his small but heroic band, in routing and cutting up the enemy against fearful odds in every encounter—have given a greater check to the progress of the mutiny than even the successful resistance offered by the European troops before Delhi to the numerous sorties of the enemy. Not the least encouraging part of the news was the reported scarcity of ammunition in the hands of the miscreants who occupied the doomed City of the Great Mogul, up to the latest dates from India. This circumstance—added to the distrust and disaffection which had sprung up between the mutinous Sepoys themselves, and in view of the very considerable reinforcements of the besieging army—leave no doubt that the successful storming of the rebels' stronghold was a question merely of a very brief space of time; and that ere now the accursed city and its horde of fiends have paid the fearful penalty of their unheard-of crimes. With Delhi vanquished and destroyed, and the little garrison of Lucknow relieved from its perilous and harassing condition—its ability to withstand the attacks of the enemy having been confidently reported at the last accounts—we may regard the great Indian revolt of 1857 as mainly suppressed, though considerable time must elapse before entire tranquility can be restored, and confidence and a sense of security inspired, throughout the vast Presidency of Bengal.

FAST AND HUMILIATION.

NEXT Friday will be the day set apart by proclamation of His Excellency in Council for a General Fast and Humiliation, to implore the blessing of Almighty God on Her Majesty's arms in India, and to humble ourselves before Him, by fasting and prayer, in atonement of our sins. We trust that the Clergymen of all denominations, whose churches we have no doubt will duly observe the day—will appeal to the generous hearts of their people for contributions in aid of the Indian Relief Fund. His Excellency the Lieut. Governor has received, we understand, a Circular Letter from the Secretary of that Fund in England, recommending an appeal being made to the benevolence of the people under his Government, on behalf of their fellow-countrymen and countrywomen in India who have suffered by the present calamitous rebellion in that country. Recollecting the prompt and spirited manner in which the people of this Colony responded to a similar call in aid of the widows and orphans of our countrymen who fell in the last Russian war, we have every reason to hope that their patriotic and generous ardour will be no less conspicuous now, when the unexampled sufferings of defenceless women and children, at the hands of ruthless savages, in addition to the usual calamities of war—cannot fail to make a touching and irresistible appeal to every human sympathy.

Let sectarian animosities and political antipathies divide us as they may—let even national prejudices intervene—we can and should all unite in heartily promoting such an object as that under consideration, the only aim of successful rivalry being who should accomplish the greatest good in so noble a cause.

ARRIVAL OF THE ENGLISH MAIL.

The English Mail arrived from Picton on Friday night. We give below such items of news as are furnished by our latest papers.

INDIA.

THE SUCCESSFUL SALLIES FROM LUCKNOW.

General Havelock, though he failed in his attempt to relieve Lucknow, yet he so far succeeded, that he drew the besiegers upon his small force. This enabled the beleaguered garrison to make a sally, which was not only successful as to the destruction of the enemy, but enabled them to bring in a further amount of bullocks—sufficient for about three weeks' consumption. It was then calculated that they could hold-out to the 9th or 10th of September, and it was hoped that reinforcements, consisting of the 5th Fusiliers and 90th Foot, would reach Cawnpore at the latest on the 1st idem, and thus easily enable Gen. Havelock to effect the relief of the garrison before the 9th. There is, however, an old adage that too many cooks spoil the broth. Sir Colin Campbell had not been allowed at that time to take his seat in Council, and he, therefore, could exercise no effectual control over the movements of the troops. These movements were, in fact, subjected to the control of men who ought never to have been allowed to meddle with them. Col. Birch, the Military Secretary; Mr. J. P. Grant, Obstructor General in the Central Provinces; Gen. Outram, and the officers commanding at Dinapore and Benares, had all "fingers in the pie," and the result was that the two regiments on reaching Mirzapore were called back to Dinapore, and then sent on again in the Mirzapore and Allahabad direction. It is but fair to General Outram to add that letters recently received assert that the recall was in no way his deed, and that he disapproved of it from the first. Happily, however, another opportunity presented itself for making a sortie. This time it was attended with greater success than ever. More than 100 of the enemy were blown into the air by a mine; and large supplies of provisions were secured. The garrison now consists of about 500 men, of whom 150 were in hospital; there are also about 300 women and children, who have gone through all the dangers and hardships of the siege, certain (for the fate of the Cawnpore garrison had reached them) of a cruel death if compelled by famine or any other cause to surrender. Gen. Outram had sent word to Gen. Havelock that he should accompany him in his civil capacity only (he was Chief Commissioner of Oude when sent to command the army in Persia). Not for an instant could he think of depriving his brother in arms of the glory of relieving the garrison, and of completing the work which he had so nobly begun.

SPRINGING A MINE AT LUCKNOW—THE REBELS BLOWN INTO THE AIR.

A telegraphic despatch from General Naill, reports, "that the besieged at Lucknow undermined a house in which a number of Gazees were located, who had given great trouble, and blew the whole of them into the air. The garrison sallied out, spiked the 24-pounder which had greatly annoyed