

Correspondence.

THE PROTECTOR ON THE UNION OF BRITISH AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—While glancing over an Editorial headed, "Union of British America," in the *Protector* of the 12th inst., my attention was particularly arrested by the following unwarrantable remarks.

"We regret that the proceedings of last winter, (in the House of Assembly, we surmise,) should have made the neighbouring Provinces entertain an unfavourable opinion of our School System."

How have you ascertained, Rev. *Protectors*, that those Provinces have entertained such an opinion? No doubt men of your kidney among them have; but are you sure that such constitute a majority of the inhabitants of those Provinces. As proof to the contrary, vide their several School Acts, which, like ours, expressly state that no child shall be asked to read in any religious book which its parent does not approve. But you, would-be-*Protectors* of the Education of all Protestant children, would, by Legislative Enactment, enforce the reading of a certain religious Book in many schools attended by children of parents who do not approve of the reading of said Book. Suppose the political scales inverted, and the opposite party, being the majority, apply for an Act to force a religious book of which you don't approve, into schools attended by your children, would you think it just that their application should be complied with? I trow not. Ye, reverend preceptors of the Golden Rule, learn also to practise it. You say, "The Government that would for a moment consult the pleasure of the Romish Hierarchy rather than the interests of the country, and the vast majority of its intelligent and loyal citizens, occasioned all the disturbance and incurred all the odium." With what show of truth or justice can the Government be said to have occasioned disturbance by a measure which they have never introduced? or by what new mode of equivocation can you, the actual introducers of that measure, exculpate yourselves from the charge of having disturbed the general peace of our generally peaceable country? "Incurred the odium!" Of whom? Of your coercive party? But time will reveal whether they have not won the approbation of a more numerous and intelligent party.

In the event of the contemplated union you say, "Nor would we fear the consequences to religion. Let truth and error grapple,—give the former fair play, and dread not the result." Had you substituted *both* for "former" in the above quotation, we could cordially adopt it. What do you mean by truth? Is it your hydra-headed and anomalous Protestantism? And by error? Is it the obnoxious Romish Hierarchy?

Again you promise Canada to "relieve her of her ponderous chains by bearing it with her." What 'it'? Her chains? Strange that gentlemen who flaunt their College Diplomas would so glaringly violate the rules of English Syntax. What a pity for Canada that the tiny mouse of the *Protector* did not come into existence while she was fettered by *real* chains, instead of now proffering its diminutive tusks to nibble imaginary ones off her lion paws? But we much mistake her, Messrs. *Protectors*, if she is not too proud in the consciousness of her superior might to crave or accept the futile services of your tiny tusks.

Again you predict, "The Protestants would be brought together—they would know their strength—their ratio of increase—while their fidelity to their trust in spreading truth, (?) and their untiring zeal in the cause of God and man, (?) with the blessing of Heaven, would establish them in perpetual supremacy."

So you still adhere to your old doctrine of "Might is right." But does it not strike you as just as probable that Catholics also would be brought together, and know their strength and their ratio of increase? Do you expect them to be less faithful to their trust, &c. But why seek an amalgamated Protestant supremacy by the union of the neighbouring Provinces, while you boast of having "a vast majority of our intelligent and loyal citizens" here on your side.

By giving insertion to the above cursory strictures you would, in some degree, correct error, and much oblige

A FREE CHURCHMAN.*

Bedford, August 21st, 1857.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—I see, in looking over the *Protector* of the 12th instant, that one of the editors has been wounded by some remarks from a "Free Churchman," which appeared in the *Examiner* of the 10th instant, before he had recovered, I believe, from a shock which he had suffered from some observations which previously appeared in the *Islander*. I had hoped he was on the stool of repentance, when he appeared at the Temperance Hall at a Missionary Meeting as presenter for the very missionaries whom he had so lately termed impostors, for coming to this City, although they only came to look after the sheep of their own fold. I suppose the rev. gentleman will remember having spoken very disrespectfully of two rev. gentlemen of that body, and also what he said of the Rev. Henry Crawford, who was so kind as to baptize a child who was at the point of death. He did not hesitate to say on that occasion that the ordinance was profaned; nay, more, he wrote a letter to that gentleman containing statements which are absolutely untrue, which letter I have in my possession, and can prove the fact as here alleged. Again, on the 25th of January, he stood in his own pulpit and told falsehoods to his own people, instead of feeding them with the "sincere milk of the word." He subsequently went from door to door asking the people if they had heard that man Allan say anything that could come as a witness against him (Allan). I believe, Mr. Editor, I am well known in this City, and I have never shrunk from the investigation of truth. But the rev. gentleman might well be ashamed to lie under such charges as have been brought against him without the power of refuting them. In his remarks in the *Protector* of the 11th, he, without regard to truth, says a man who "never was an Elder sent a document to the Free Presbytery bearing a falsehood on its very front." Sir, I have to inform you that all that was contained in that document was true, and of this fact he is well aware. I have no confidence in the Lower Court of which he speaks. It sat in judgment and tried to disparage the character of a woman who was not a member of the Free Church, though her husband was. * * * He speaks of Duncan Maclean not being able to find a back door. I think that his brother editor will hardly be able to find one for himself. 'Tis true he read me out of the Church, because I went with Mr. White to get his child baptized, but that circumstance gives me very little trouble. What I have said and written about the rev. gentleman is all true, and until he comes from behind the screen of the Presbytery, and proves that I have alleged falsehoods against him, I shall not trouble myself or the public any more on the subject.

I am, Sir, your very humble servant,

GEORGE ALLAN.

Charlottetown, 19th August, 1857.

* This is not the same "Free Churchman" who recently published in this paper a stinging letter on the subject of Maclean's quarrel with the *Protector*, and who has a second letter in this No. We have good reason to know that nearly all the intelligence and talent of the Free Church, and a great deal more—are opposed to the views of the zealots who are labouring so hard to stir up a religious fanaticism by a constant display of bigotry and intolerance in the columns of the *Protector*.—Ed. Ex.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—In the last *Protector* I noticed some reverend editor's remarks upon my communication to the *Examiner*. Instead of containing anything like a reply to my arguments, every candid reader must admit that the whole article is nothing more than a tirade of foul and violent abuse of me—the only mode of argumentation in which the *Protector* excels. It must be peculiarly galling to these voracious, but pious vultures of public and private character, to find that after their appetite had been whetted by the anticipation of fresh game, they are evidently on the wrong trail, as I cannot comprehend their meaning, when they state that I "figured rather conspicuously last spring," &c. Nor do I see how my having found fault with the conduct of some of the clergy of the Free Church can afford valid grounds for denying my having any connection with that Church. I was baptized by a clergyman of the Free Church—the most distinguished divine in the north and west of Scotland—and, now, in reviewing my past life, I cannot call to recollection one act of mine which would warrant my exclusion from the communion. The reverend gentlemen have charged me with falsehood, and I in turn charge them with the same, in their having brought such an unfounded accusation against me. Were not their characters more tenacious than those of ordinary mortals, on account of their position in society, it would be hardly worth while for any person, whose own character can bear investigation, to notice any charge against him emanating from such a source. Such is the moral depravity and total disregard for truth, which they have manifested in the late quarrel with the Editor of the *Islander*. Every respectable person would wish to see them freed from the odium which attaches to them in consequence of the grave charges so clearly and ably stated—*proved* indeed—against them by Mr. Maclean, before he could feel much inclined to enter the lists against them. It seems that I was misinformed regarding the office held in the church by Mr. Allen—that he was not an Elder, but a Church Trustee—but elder or no elder the man was equally entitled to justice. The writer (or writers) [says (or say) "that he (or they) has (or have) never urged compulsion in religious matters." Now, I contend that some of the reverend gentlemen *did*, in direct and unequivocal terms, recommend the adoption of compulsory measures against Catholics, and I can prove it. I am sorry the reverend writer would expose his ignorance so far as to argue that there is no difference between expressing a thing as a belief or an opinion, and laying it down as a fact, principle, or rule of conduct. If I state that the Rev. George Sutherland wrote the article referred to, I may be in error; but if I say merely that it is *my belief* he wrote it, who will dare tell me that I state a falsehood. It no doubt grieves the *Protector* to be told of the baldness of its editorial articles.

I have no time at present to expose the inability of the reverend editors, but I purpose next week (D. V.) to show that they are able to write neither sense nor grammar.

Yours, &c.,

AUG. 18, 1857. A FREE CHURCHMAN.

P. S.—ERRATA.—In my last communication, instead of "the small portion of the general enlightenment and liberality of the age which have," read which *has*; and instead of "sublimed pinnacle," read *sublime* pinnacle.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., AUGUST 31, 1857.

ARRIVAL OF THE ENGLISH MAIL.

LATER INTELLIGENCE FROM INDIA.

THE English Mail arrived here on Thursday last, having reached Halifax on the morning of the previous day in the steamship *America*. We regret to learn that the intelligence received via New York a few days before, with reference to the fall of Delhi—is not confirmed by our later dates. It appears that the rebellious Sepoys still held that city against the authorities as late as the 27th June—the officer in command of the European troops not having sufficient force to make a vigorous attack upon it, although some sharp encounters had taken place outside the walls. The besieging army was, at the latest dates, in hourly expectation of reinforcement; and there is no doubt that long ere this the murderous villains who had taken refuge within the walls of Delhi, have paid the penalty justly due to their diabolical crimes. Aware of the melancholy interest with which every intelligent reader regards the progress of the Bengalee mutiny—howsoever distant from the scene of disturbance—we make no apology for devoting a considerable portion of our present sheet to the insertion of such reliable extracts from late journals as tend to throw a light upon the subject, although in doing so, we necessarily exclude much interesting local matter and general intelligence. In our next issue we shall offer some observations of our own on the causes of this Indian rebellion, and at the same time shall endeavour to give further details of some of the atrocities to which it has given rise.

The other intelligence by the English Mail is comparatively unimportant. It will be seen that the Emperor and Empress of France had paid a visit to the English Queen; and it is surmised that the object of the Imperial visit had reference to the Indian mutiny.

THE BENGAL MUTINY.

LATE AND IMPORTANT NEWS BY THE STEAMER "ARABIA" FROM EUROPE.

THE Royal Mail Steamship *Arabia* arrived at New York on the 19th instant, with four days later news than furnished by the last Steamer from England to Halifax. The most important part of the news has reference to the affairs of India.

RUMORED CAPTURE OF DELHI, WITH THE SLAUGHTER OF SEVEN THOUSAND MUTINEERS.—The intelligence of the capture of Delhi is stated as a fact in the overland summary of the *Bombay Telegraph and Courier*, of July 1. We give the passage in full below:—

"Since the publication of our last summary great events have transpired. Delhi has fallen, and upwards of 7,000 mutineers have been put to the edge of the sword. The army of retribution, under General Barnard, arrived before Delhi on the 8th ult. On reaching Caidlee Serai, the English General found the mutineers strongly posted in an entrenched position, completely protected by a strong park of artillery. After reconnoitering the position of the enemy, Gen. Barnard at once brought up his columns to the attack. The insurgents fought with the most determined bravery, their guns were well served, and they seemed to be under the guidance of leaders well versed in the science of war. All their efforts however to maintain their position, were unavailing; it was carried at the point of the bayonet, and they were ultimately driven within the walls of Delhi, with great slaughter, and the loss of twenty-six guns. The loss on our side was, comparatively speaking, trifling—only some forty or fifty of our men having fallen. Amongst this number was Colonel Chester, the Adjutant-General of the army, an

officer of whom Gen. Barnard said "he was esteemed by all for every qualification which could adorn a soldier." Peace be with his manes. The conduct of the troops, European and Native was most praiseworthy. They vied with each other in daring, and they seemed to be actuated by but one feeling—a thirst for vengeance. The Native Contingents also fought well.

The interval between the 8th and the 12th—the day upon which the city was stormed—seemed to have been occupied by General Barnard in cannonading and shelling the city. As soon as practicable breaches had been made in the walls. The town was carried by assault. Full particulars, however, have not yet been received; but it must have been a gallant affair. From news which we have received from a private source, we learn that the mutineers fought like fiends. The streets were blocked up with their dead and dying, but they still maintained an unbroken front, until a miserable remnant took refuge in the Palace.

This, however, offered them but a momentary refuge; the guns were brought to bear upon its massive walls, and the miscreants were driven out to meet death on the points of thousands of avenging bayonets. The slaughter was terrible; upwards of 7,000 of the mutineers are said to have perished. Our loss is, no doubt, great; and England may expect to hear that many of her sons have fallen; but the turning point of the revolt has been gained; and its entire suppression will be surely and speedily accomplished. With the fall of Delhi all hopes of eventual success must have been extinguished in the bosom of the most sanguine."

There are various statements made with more or less confidence of the fall of Delhi. The following circumstantial account purporting to be an extract from Shergotty, June 14, is published in the *Bombay Times*:—

"Delhi is captured. Thirty thousand lives lost, consisting of men, women and children. The British forces gave the mutineers only 24 hours' time to clear their families out of the Delhi fort; but they would not listen; they said that the English were speaking lies. 'Couch dur naye hey hum o k ke couch kurna sukaganye' (there is no fear; they cannot harm us.) After the lapse of twenty-four hours, the British commenced firing till they razed Delhi to the ground. Everything is now quiet round about Delhi; but there are risings in small forces. Gya is expected to rise on the 15th inst. A detachment is ordered to proceed there to guard the treasury, containing nine lacs of rupees. The 1st Fusiliers, on their march, met a number of the mutineers on the Allahabad road, and cut up a great many of them."

The Bengal Hukara of July 1, says that a similar statement had reached that place.

The *Liverpool Mercury* says: "The passengers from India think that the mutiny is not considered in England so serious as it really is. They give some frightful details of atrocities committed by the mutineers. In Delhi six European ladies had taken refuge in a room; one of them, very young and beautiful, concealed herself under a sofa. The other five were subjected to outrage by the mutinous soldiery, and then beheaded. The blood trickled under the sofa, and the young female concealed there betrayed herself by uttering a shriek. She was seized and taken to the harem of the King of Delhi. This is considered a proof that the King is in league with the mutineers."

The *Delhi Gazette Extra*, of June 15, recounts some of the atrocities of the mutineers:—

"Give full stretch to your imagination—think of everything that is cruel, inhuman, infernal, and you cannot then conceive anything so diabolical as what these demons in human form have perpetrated. On the 2d we marched from Paniput to Race. At this place some of the poor fugitives from Delhi met with most barbarous treatment. We burnt four villages on the road and hung seven Lumberdars. One of these wretches had a part of a lady's dress for his kamberband—he had seized a lady from Delhi, stripped her, violated and then murdered her in the most cruel manner, first cutting off her breasts. He said he was sorry he had not an opportunity of doing more than he had done."

"Another lady who hid herself under a bridge was treated in the same manner, then backed to pieces, and her mangled remains thrown out on the plain. We found a pair of boots, evidently those of a girl 16 or 17 years of age, with the feet in them. They had been cut off just above the ankle. We hung many other villains and burnt the villages as we came along. A man who witnessed the last massacre in Delhi, where he had gone as a spy, gives a horrid account of it, stating that little children were thrown up in the air, and caught on the points of bayonets, or cut as they were falling, with tulwars."

(From the London Times, August 3.)

"The Bengal Native Army has ceased to exist." We repeat the summary of the Indian news in the same form in which we gave it on Saturday. The list of disbanded and revolted regiments is undoubtedly portentous and can only be described in this way. And now what is the conclusion we are to gather from this fact? It is a melancholy one? Are we to begin trembling for our Indian Empire? We think the natural conclusion from this fact is quite the contrary to a melancholy one. The truth is, the very extent of the mutiny is the most satisfactory evidence we could possibly have that this is a military mutiny, and nothing more. Had there been the slightest wish on the part of the population at large to rise up against our government, there must have been some popular outbreak before now, with so wide-spread a mutiny as this to elicit and encourage it. The revolt of the whole native army of a Presidency must have awakened the embryos of a national rebellion if there were any to awake. We know that news travels very rapidly in India, and that the mass of the people is speedily informed of such passing events as interest them. With so large a number of mutineers, then, let loose among the mass of the population, there must have been by this time full knowledge of the mutiny and of its extent. Well, then, the watchword of rebellion has been raised, and it has fallen dead upon the native population. This is a military mutiny. It is nothing more. These soldiers stand alone with their flag of revolt, and nobody joins them. In this state of the case the greater the number of mutineers, the weaker is their ground; the more successful this movement is as a military revolt, the less it approaches to a national one. We have the data before us for a diagnosis, and we know now the nature of the disease. Had the mutiny been less wide we might have thought that the native population was waiting till it became wider; but, having come to such a head as it has without producing any effect upon the native population, it tells its own history, and we have only to repeat that it is a military revolt, and nothing more.

It is satisfactory then, to find that this is a military mutiny and nothing more, because we know that a military mutiny is a mere affair of ambition, and no result of those honest natural motives which have so often excited just and patriotic rebellion, and therefore no evidence of any cause in our own administration to excite such motives—no evidence against the justice and benevolence of our own past government in India. But it is also satisfactory to find this out, because a military mutiny is a decidedly manageable thing. Whatever difficulties a national revolt might occasion, a simply military outbreak is a thing we can put down. There can be no doubt about that; and for that reason we say that even the news of the wide-spread character of this movement is satisfactory, as deciding the question of the nature and character of it. The great question to be asked about it, is, is it a national revolt or is it a military one? If it is the latter our minds are so far relieved, and the news of its wide

growth, without any accompanying response from the people, stamps it so much the more clearly as a military revolt only.

This is satisfactory in many ways. Every reader of history knows what sort of thing a military revolt is, that it is a totally different thing from a national one, totally distinct in its motives and object. The ordinary motive of a national revolt is indignation at oppression; it is the wish to shake off some grinding yoke, which interferes with happiness, and which can be borne no longer. Had this revolt in India, then, sprung from the people in the first instance, there would have been, at any rate, a strong *prima facie* ground that we had been maltreating them, and that our government had been oppressive and unjust. But the motive of a military mutiny is ambition. Large bodies of men awakened on some occasion to the knowledge that they have arms in their hands, that they know how to use them, and that they outnumber their masters. They are well-fed and well-clothed, accustomed to a comfortable life, and have not to work much for it. Their courage rises some fine morning as they look down their lines and see that they have all the military externals that their masters have. The idea occurs to a few restless spirits: "Why should we not try our chance of a new position? It is a shame that such fine fellows as we are should have neglected our opportunity so long. There is a strong place there; let us seize it, set up some ruler of our own, and govern India in his name. There is the old Mogul there; he is just the man for us, he is the centre of a wide circle of national and traditional associations, the people will catch at his name, and anticipate a return of old times and old triumphs." This military revolt has exactly the look of such a movement as this. A number of soldiers seizes Delhi, set up the old Mogul, and raise the standard of rebellion. The object of the whole affair is transparent. Were they successful, these men would, of course, form the new rulers of India. They would make their puppet in Delhi sign what edicts they pleased, and instantly put themselves in possession of the whole power and patronage of the empire. There would be so many satrapies vacant, so many grand places at court and camp to be distributed among the Indian Praetorians.

The native princes evidently regard it as such. They feel no inclination to join, and very naturally, because, in the first place, they do not think it will succeed; and, in the next place, they cannot wish it to succeed. They know well enough what the first act of their new masters at Delhi would be—viz: to oust them from their thrones and substitute some new made men and rough soldiers of fortune in their places. A rebellious nation in a victorious contest with a dominant stranger retains its native princes, but a rebellious army unseats them, as a matter of course. But even as a military outbreak this mutiny has its weak points. It is confined to one Presidency. It has secured no great leader. If Scindia or Holkar had put himself at the head of it, we should have thought worse of it than we do. All that we see at present is that the native nobility and rank of India stand aloof from it.

Reinforcements have before now begun to pour in in rapid succession, and in a short time a much larger force will be collected to keep India than was even used in conquering it. We are sending a steam fleet unexampled, except in the Black Sea three years since. The Chinese war, as it happens, has fitted in most harmoniously with the emergency, and has already supplied our Indian army with a ready-made reinforcement. The Government at home, too, is acting with an energy equal to the occasion. It is impossible to suppose that a country which a hundred years ago conquered Hindostan should now, with resources multiplied indefinitely, and with all the weight of intermediate prestige, be unable to maintain it—that a power which is at least ten times greater than that which gained an empire, cannot quell a mutiny in its own army. It will require great sacrifices, of course. We do not dissemble our conviction that the cost both in men and money will be great, but for this the country is prepared, and with these success is certain.

On the authority of "Bazar intelligence," which is said to fly faster than government agents, it was stated that Delhi had fallen. We do not credit the report, which is doubtless the same as that mentioned in the beginning of the letter which we printed on Friday last, afterwards contradicted by the writer himself. An emute was daily expected at Madras, where the Europeans had taken arms. The East India Company made a requisition on the government for 6000 more troops, and preparations were making for the speedy embarkation from Southampton of several regiments of artillery and cavalry, for India service.

NEWS BY THE LAST ENGLISH MAIL AT HALIFAX.

THE MUTINY IN INDIA.

THE REPORT ABOUT THE FALL OF DELHI. A report has been current for some days, that Delhi has fallen; and although it is not in the nature of things that the report should be confirmed until the arrival of the next message by the electric telegraph, it does not stand altogether without support. The report is this:—On the 17th of June, Sir Henry Barnard made a storming attack, which was successful. A number of the natives, comprising, it would appear, some of the towns-people, as well as women and children, had collected in some enclosed place; the number is stated at 30,000, or more probably, at 13,000. When the town was captured, the party which held this place refused to surrender it, or to evacuate it; and it was blown up; but whether by the occupants or assailants is not stated. Such is the report. The authentic accounts from Sir Henry Barnard come down to the 16th of June, and nothing later appears to have been received by the Government. According to the account, however, this report had been received in Bombay after the mails were made up, and just as the steamer was coming away. The story has been communicated to persons in this country through some few of the private letters, the closing of which was delayed to the last moment. The receipt of intelligence to the 17th was not impossible; and it was by many thought probable that Sir Henry would attempt a movement on or about the 16th. One account describes him as likely to retreat about that time, after "striking a blow;" and the "blow" might be more effectual than he expected. There is no doubt that the story comes to this country vouched by persons of the highest respectability in Bombay—European as well as native. We are not able to add our own voucher; but since it was likely to reach some of our readers, we have thought it our duty to explain exactly to what it amounts, and on what grounds it rests.—*London News of the World*, Aug. 9.

THE INSURRECTION IN INDIA.

DELHI STILL HOLDING OUT—MORE BATTLES WITH THE MUTINEERS—FURTHER SPREAD OF THE MUTINY.

Delhi has not fallen up to June 27. There had been a good deal of fighting outside the Fort walls. The rebels were repulsed with loss on every occasion. The city was reported to be full of sick and wounded, and cholera prevalent.

General Van Courtland, marching upon Thansi and Hissar, had two engagements with the rebels near Sirsa. The rebels fled in disorder, leaving two hundred dead on the field, besides prisoners.

The Punjab remains quiet. General Woodburn's columns crushed the rebellion at Aurangabad.

Intelligence had been received of the mutiny of the troops at Morandabad, Tyrabad, Secotopore, Sangor, Nowgong, Bandar, Futtyghur, Mhow, and Indore.

The Governors of the provinces are at their respective seats. The Money Market is in a very unsettled state. Money is difficult to be had on any terms.

Government Securities had given away considerably. First batch of China troops arrived at Calcutta, per Simoom, about the 2d of July.

Our force before Delhi is stated to be from 7,000 to 8,000 Europeans and 5,000 natives. The native portion of the force is proved to be trustworthy.