

for the purpose, or they may be bruised by a mallet.

ORIGINAL.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

SIR,—As the Rev. James Hudson, late "Visiting Missionary Priest for the Miramichi River," but now "a Member of the Presbytery of Miramichi," has, in a late number of your Journal, honored me with his special notice; and as he has done this in a very courteous and gentlemanly manner, I trust you will allow me, through the medium of your columns, to express my grateful sense of his attention, and to assure him and your readers, that I shall be always ready to acknowledge any similar act of condescension on the part of "a Priest, both Protestant and Catholic, ordained by a Bishop, the rightful successor of the Apostles." At the same time, I must be permitted to dispute certain positions which the above Rev. gentleman has, with much confidence, assumed, and tell him that he himself not only is not a Priest, but that the sentiments contained in the communication referred to, are, to say the least of them, neither 'Catholic' nor 'Protestant.' And although with the Oxford Tractarians, he should answer that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is offered to God as an unbloody sacrifice—that he who offers it is a Priest—and that the Communion Table on which it is offered is an Altar; with the Bible in my hand, I should still feel called upon to maintain that under the gospel dispensation, there is but one Priest, namely, the Lord Jesus Christ; but one Sacrifice, that of the Cross, and one Altar on which that Sacrifice has been offered—namely, the Divine Nature of Him 'who gave his life a ransom for many.'

It is scarcely necessary to inform your readers, that the grand-principle of Protestantism is, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the only rule of faith and morals: and accordingly, the Church of England, in her sixth Article, teaches that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' Mr. Hudson, however, while he takes the 'Bible in one hand,' takes likewise 'Tradition in the other.'

But the Bishop, by whom Mr. Hudson was ordained, is a 'rightful successor of the Apostles?' I challenge Mr. Hudson to the proof of this assertion; I challenge him to name even the first four successive links in that chain, upon the perfection of which, according to his own principles, the validity of his own ordination depends? I tell him plainly that he cannot; nay! I go farther than this; I assert, and am prepared to prove, agreeably to the recorded conviction of not a few of the most eminent Divines, that the Church of England ever saw, that the Episcopal scheme of Church Government hath no foundation whatever in the Scriptures,—that by Divine right all the Ministers of Christ are equal,—that Scriptural Bishops and Presbyters are one and the same order; and that, while in favour of Presbyterian ordination, at which your correspondent so significantly sneers, there is direct Scriptural testimony, (witness the ordination of Timothy—1st Tim. iv. 14th), as also that of Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiii. 1—3) that, in favor of Episcopal ordination, is in no instance direct and explicit, but in all

indirect, and remotely inferential: and yet, resting upon the exclusive validity of such an ordination, Mr. Hudson has the hardihood to assert that only such as are Episcopally ordained are true and acknowledged Ministers of Christ.

In an article in the Gleaner of January the 3rd, Mr Hudson, with his usual Christian courtesy, has affirmed that the members of the Presbytery of Miramichi have just as much right to claim for themselves the title *Reverend* 'as you, Mr Editor, and the boys in your establishment.' Before Mr Hudson made such a sweeping assertion, he should have established his own claim to that honorable title. After having proved that he is 'a Priest, both Catholic and Protestant, ordained by a Bishop, the rightful successor of the Apostles,' he might, with a better grace, have availed himself of the privilege enjoyed exclusively by gentlemen of the 'Apostolic succession,' namely, that of being believed, on the ground of bold and confident affirmation, without the shadow of proof, either from Scripture, from reason, or even from boasted 'Catholic Tradition.' Until this is done, however, he must pardon the members of the (so called) Presbytery of Miramichi, if they treat his assertions as the genuine fruits of ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance.

The reproach which your correspondent administers to Presbyterian Ministers, for what he calls 'Political intermeddling,' plainly indicates a latent doubt in the mind of even Mr. Hudson, whether Presbyterian ministers, after all, be not ministers of Christ. If they are only laymen, as he would have your readers to believe, why censure them for taking an interest in the Politics of their country? Presbyterian ministers, however, may well submit with Christian meekness and humility to the censure to which I am referring, when they reflect, that it is administered unto them in common with those who, while they sit in the seat of the *Apostles*, set also on the *Bench*, and in the *halls of Legislation*, the *clerical magistrates*, and *Lords Spiritual of the Apostolical Church of England*.

No individual aware of Mr Hudson's resolution to style the Episcopal Church of Richibucto, what he himself has virtually acknowledged that it is not, the *Parish Church*, can be surprised at the charge he has brought against the Church of Scotland, of being in a state of 'rebellion against the laws of their country, and setting at open defiance the statutes of the Government.' A few remarks however, will exhibit the degree of credit to which it is entitled. At the union betwixt England and Scotland, which took place about the year 1707 an *Act of Security* was passed by the Scottish, and afterwards by the English Parliament, declaring that the upholding of the Church of Scotland, in her existing constitution, 'should be a fundamental and essential condition of the Union, in all time coming.' Five years afterwards the Jacobites, with the infamous and infidel Bolingbroke at their head, determined upon changing the *Protestant Succession*, and replacing a Roman Catholic on the throne. As the first step towards that object, it was considered essentially necessary to bind the Scottish Zion, the great *Palladium* of Civil and Religious Liberty in chains. Hence the infamous Act of Queen Anne, by which absolute patronage was restored—an Act against which the Church of Scotland for seventy or eighty succeeding years continued regularly to protest, and an Act in which, to the present time, she has

never once signified her acquiescence: and yet, because she will not meanly wear the fetters, in which gentlemen of Mr Hudson's stamp would bind her, contrary to the faith of most solemn treaties, she must be denounced as guilty of rebellion, and as having too long been supported and cherished by the state; while yet, her very enemies being Judges, there is not in Christendom a Church that has so well repaid the fostering care of the Government, in the piety, loyalty, intelligence, and morality of the Scottish people.

I am, &c.
JAMES HANNAY.
Richibucto, January 7, 1843.

COMMUNICATIONS
RELATIVE TO THE LATE ELECTION.

Mr Pierce,
When I embarked in the late contest, I determined after it was over, I would forget and forgive, and neither speak or write on the subject; and I should have kept my determination had it not been for the Resolutions of a meeting, and the very *mild, soothing, conciliatory*, and *Gentlemanly* Speech of Mr Street, printed in your last paper, in which he speaks in no no measured terms, of Mr Williston's supporters. As this speech has evidently been written under feelings of excitement, I shall make every allowance, and pass over that part of it without remark, satisfied that Mr Street does not mean what he says. But when he says he has been supported by *all* the most respectable people of the County, I must tell him he has gone a little too far, if his ideas and mine of the meaning of the word 'respectable' correspond. If he takes Walker's definition of the word, 'deserving respect,' then I will say, that among the supporters of Mr Williston, were men of as great integrity, moral worth, and honest bearing, as any who supported Mr Street. If he defines the meaning of the word to be those who possess *power, and influence, and money*, then I must yield and say 'we boast them not.'

I speak not for myself, for to the latter definition I make no pretensions, and those who know me, must determine my claims to the former.

I cannot admit that Mr Street had 'all the most respectable,' but I will admit that he had all the most wealthy and influential, which only goes to prove that the Independent Freeholders were tired of things as they were, and desired a change.

As to the Resolutions, they were evidently penned for Electioneering purposes, by men under excited feelings, and writhing under a defeat; and from the language it is evident none of 'the most respectable' were present. I shall therefore, at present, pass them over in silence, well aware that when the effervescence subsides, they will be ashamed of them—and that their violence will destroy the effect intended to be produced abroad.

Your obedient servant,
WILLIAM CARMAN, Jun.
January 16, 1843.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,
Sir,

Having hastily glanced over last Tuesday's Gleaner, immediately upon its having been issued, and more particularly over such parts of it as had reference to our Election here, it struck me then, and I have frequently been reminded since, that something of an explanatory nature would be expected from me on next Tuesday's Paper, as to the manner in which 'Mr Williston's Partizans,' of whom I happened to be one, conducted themselves through the Election.

On Wednesday and Thursday last, I was fully employed in preparing the

Overseers of the Poor's account for the past year, and yesterday was occupied at the sessions at Newcastle. It is now Saturday, noon, and I have just sat down with your last paper under my elbow, and with the intention of reviewing the speech said to have been delivered by Mr Street at the closing of the Poll, as well as the Resolutions passed at Hamill's Hotel, and Mr Street's reply thereto—but before entering upon such review, and while I attempt a slight retrospect of the state of our domestic politics for the last nine years, as of course, Mr Street and his friends cannot feel any particular interest in such *expose*. I would quietly, and in a voice scarcely above a whisper, ask them, whether they would not have been consulting prudence, instead of holding their meeting, and passing their *truly moderate* resolutions, on Friday evening, (when notwithstanding their unquestionably mild and gentlemanly bearing, they might have been laboring under some slight degree of irritation and excitement) by just taking their accustomed repose on Friday night, and when their excitement, small as it might have been, had subsided or been allayed a little bit, holding their meeting on Saturday towards evening, or even in the forenoon, and then coolly and deliberately concocted and passed their Resolutions, &c. &c. but so far as this question goes, it being intended only for those to whom it applies, I need not repeat that it is in a whisper, and 'aside.'

Now, as it respects the state of our domestic politics for the last fourteen years, or since the session of 1828-9, at which time Mr Cunard succeeded Mr Simonds on the exaltation of the late gentleman to the Council, I shall throw out a few statistics for the information of such persons as have since then arrived amongst us, and who, perhaps, have never taken the pains to look back so far, as well as to refresh the memories of others who have framed 'part and parcel' of us during that period, and are perhaps ready to judge uncharitably of us 'Cunardites' or Chathamites' as it respects our feeling a little fidgety to procure for ourselves, by legitimate means, locally a portion of the Representation of the County, or perhaps it would be more explicit to say in opposition to, or in juxtaposition with, the 'Gilmour & Rankinites' or 'Newcastle-ites,' or rather both combined. From the period 1828-9, at which Mr Cunard, as before stated, found his way into the House of Assembly, and that after a hard fought Election, at which he, *very improperly in my opinion*, was suffered to expend a large amount of his own money, which he was never reimbursed, and at which Election he was opposed by the Gilmour & Rankin interest, up to the period when he, Mr C., took his seat in the Council, being in 1833, the County generally and locally was fairly and satisfactorily represented, and its conflicting interests respected and protected; but since the latter period, the Chatham local interests, with the exception of a few favorites, residing amongst us, yet avowed 'Gilmour & Rankinites' might very devoutly bid adieu to anything in the shape of representation, respect, or protection. At this time, Mr Street was placed in nomination to succeed Mr Cunard, and notwithstanding there were some sad forebodings, which have been fully realized, yet from the circumstance of Mr Cunard's being a little more than passive, in fact having expressed his determination not to contest or assist to contest an Election with Mr Street, supported by the 'G. & R.' interest, Mr Street was suffered, yes suffered, Mr Editor, and only suffered to be returned without a contest. When Mr Street had been two years in the house, viz.—in 1834-5, and after his political conduct in reference to us had been so far tested, at the Election which took place then, there was a slight shew of opposition to his Election, and which shew would unquestionably have resulted in his defeat, had we not been treacherously dealt by, by a person who we entrusted with our secrets in addition to the opposition presented by Mr Henry Cunard in the absence of Mr J. Cunard, who was then in Halifax. The reason why I mention this circumstance is, to shew to Mr Street and his friends that even on that occasion he was merely suffered to be returned. From that period to the fall of 1837, we had a further opportunity of judging Mr Street's political conduct, and our approval was manifested in very unequivocal terms by our having placed Mr Wm. Carman in nomination in opposition to him, and by the nature and extent of the contest which at that time took place. And at that time Mr Street was indebted to the