

these men are far from being ignorant, and have both heard and read of what was passing in Spain in the old time. I was once conversing with a Moor at Madrid, with whom I was very intimate, about the Alhambra of Granada, which he had visited. 'Did you not weep,' said I, 'when you passed through the courts, and thought of the Abencerrages?' 'No,' said he, 'I did not weep,—wherefore should I weep?' 'And why did you visit the Alhambra?' I demanded. 'I visited it,' he replied, 'because being at Granada on my own affairs, one of your countrymen requested me to accompany him thither, that I might explain some of the inscriptions. I should not have gone of my own accord, for the hill on which it stands is steep.' And yet this man could compose verses, and was by no means a contemptible poet.

ORIGINAL.

For the Gleaner.

Sir,—It is high time that your readers should be informed why I have been repeatedly assailed by the Rev. James Hudson, in several virulent and violent articles, which recently appeared in the pages of your journal. About twelve months ago, the above Reverend Gentleman, in giving an account of the opening of the enlarged and improved Church at *Bates des Vents*, told your readers that the above Church was originally 'plain, if not mean, in internal appearance, and therefore but ill calculated to beget in the heart of man, those high and holy thoughts which should always present themselves whenever he is permitted to enter, as it were, the very presence Chamber of God upon earth.'

On this ground, I charged Mr Hudson with broadly insinuating that the improved and enlarged building at *Bates des Vents* was calculated to beget in the heart of man 'high and holy thoughts,' and hence, all the courteous epithets which that gentleman, as your readers know, hath with his characteristic modesty applied to me. Whether the words above quoted will bear the construction which I put upon them, I leave an intelligent public to decide. One thing, however, is certain, namely, that in no other article written by me for the *Halifax Guardian*, did I ever make the most distant allusion to Mr Hudson, or his flock, or to any other Clergyman, or member of the Church of England whatever; and yet, notwithstanding, I have in common with others, been represented by Mr Hudson as traducing *Church Doctrines, Church Clergy, Church Laymen, &c.* I trust that I know too well the duty which I owe to myself, as well as to the community in which my lot is cast, to traduce any body of professing Christians, and much less so respectable a body as are the members of the Church of England, merely because they unfortunately have been placed under the pastoral care of a Clergyman, who, to say the least of it, is a disgrace to civilized society, and much more so the clerical office.

To *Puseyite*, or Tractarian doctrines, I avow uncompromising hostility; and it is for those by whom they are maintained to meet me on the field of argument in their behalf. Allow me, however, to observe that I deprecate such arguments as Mr Hudson has hitherto employed. I freely confess that they are quite unanswerable, excepting indeed, in the purview of Dublin, or the atmosphere of Billingsgate; and I venture to predict, that by using them a very little longer, he will triumphantly assert his claims to *Apostolical descent*. Mr Hudson has repeatedly charged me and my brethren with the sin of *schism*, which, in his estimation, is 'as much a sin as murder, drunkenness and adultery.' And who, after all, is guilty of this sin? Unquestionably Mr Hudson himself. Schism is properly a division among those who stand in one connexion of fellowship, whereby that internal union, at least, which subsists amongst brethren, is violated or destroyed (1st Cor 12, 24, 26). At the Reformation the Churches both of England and Scotland came forth from Rome, not however in one connexion, but distinct and separate from each other. The former however, it is well known, adopted the *Episcopal* form of Church Government, believing it to be Scriptural, while the latter conscientiously adopted that which is commonly styled *Presbyterian*. It is true that King Charles the Martyr, assisted by Archbishop Laud—a bigoted and barbarous monster, exhausted all his energies, in endeavoring to obtrude upon the Scottish nation, prelacy, and the *Lauden* Liturgy; and with what success, even Mr Hudson is not altogether ignorant. And yet, in reference to the Church of England, Presbyterians are denounced as *Schismatics*, although they were never once

within her pale, and never once acknowledged her authority. But Mr Hudson, outwardly in connexion with the Anglican Church, and having solemnly subscribed her articles, is the avowed advocate of opinions which are sapping her very foundations, as the Bishop of Landaff's late charge but too plainly shows. If this be not *Schism*, I now not what Schism is. Permit me in conclusion, to congratulate the Rev. James Hudson, on the assistance he is likely to receive from the Editor of that 'Noble Journal' (the *Toronto Church*) to whom the papers were sent.

I am, yours, &c.
JAMES HANNAY.
Richibucto, Feb. 4, 1843.

Mr Pierce,

Allow me, Sir, through the medium of your columns, to call the attention of the public, and more especially the Magisterial portion, to the highly censurable and wicked practice, whenever an opportunity offers, of playing at Hurly upon the ice, immediately in front of this town, on Sundays. Yesterday, my attention was most forcibly attracted to an exhibition of this kind, wherein upwards of Fifty individuals—both men and boys—were actively engaged on skates, accompanying their evolutions with imprecations only fit for evil spirits.

Such transactions, as above, in a civilized community, ought not to be allowed; and I question much, Mr Editor, if the laws of our land sanction such disgraceful proceedings on the Sabbath. If there is not a law to protect the sanctity of the Lord's Day in our community, the sooner our Magistrates in Session enact one the better, for the honor and respect of our little Town.

Yours, &c.

OBSERVER.

Chatham, Monday, Feb. 6, 1843.

COMMUNICATIONS

RELATIVE TO THE LATE ELECTION.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,
Sir,

I fully expected to commence this letter with the opening of the Poll at Chatham, 4th day, but most unavoidably occupy a few minutes in another way. I have from the commence, ment of my narrative courted enquiry into, and challenged contradiction of, any thing that I stated; and I now extend the enquiry, and challenge to any thing that I may hereafter state in reference to the subject, until I close it. Under these circumstances I have no idea of treating any contradiction that may be offered, having a proper name attached, with silence, and with these views take up Mr Alexander McBeath's letter in your last paper, and shall endeavour (for I assure you that it requires an effort, at least from me) to elucidate what he would be at; and to place the subject matter in the shape of propositions under different heads, and attach my answer to each.

I. Not one decent person from Boies-Town to the Bar, would give the slightest credence to my statements.

Answer. That is with the Public.

II. His conduct in Carman's Election was straightforward and independent.

Answer. The Black River, and Bay du Vin people, know better. He was told of his treachery at the time.

III. His resistance at that time of a proposition made to oust Alex. Rankin, Esq. may, by such men as me, be deemed mean or unmanly.

Answer. Refer to my letter in the Gleaner of 17th ultimo. I was of the majority of Mr Carman's committee. McBeath, and all the other members of that committee know it.

IV. He acted the part of the 'Good Man' when at the commencement of Mr Williston's Election, 'on the discovery of evil' to wit— an underplot to come in collision with Mr Rankin,—'he flew from and forsook it.'

Answer. Mr Rankin himself, Mr Street, and every man in the County knows better. Please refer to the following:

We, the Subscribers, acted as friends and canvassers to John T. Williston, Esquire, during the late Election; and having before subscribing this paper, had our attention directed to the plan to be adopted in our canvass, as explained in John Hea's letter in the Gleaner of the 24th ultimo, do hereby declare that, to have been the plan faithfully adopted by us, individually, throughout the late canvass and election. In no one instance did either of us, the subscribers, canvass against Mr Rankin, and in favor of Mr Street,—nor did we hear, nor do we believe, that any individual connected with Mr Williston did.

Miramichi, 8th February, 1843.

Phineas Williston,	John Townly,
Don. McLaughlin,	Alex. Fraser,
Wm. McRae,	Corn. McCarthy,
Barnab. Stapleton,	William Williston,
Michael Dunn,	Perce Butler,
Henry Wise,	David Goodfellow,
John Noonan,	Malachy Dwyer,
George Letson,	Robert Blake,
Daniel Cremons,	William Rafter,
James Scott,	Stephen Fall,

John Peters,	John Goodfellow,
William Tobin,	Henry Getchell,
John McMahon,	R. J. Pattison,
Daniel Balman,	William O'Brien,
Benjamin Williston,	E. Williston,
John McRae,	

Quere. Would it not have been as well for Mr McBeath to have also given the following reasons, in addition to that of flying from evil, like a good man as he no doubt is, (?) for his having acted as he did through the late Election? viz.—Mr Williston not having opened his house?—a friend and countryman of his in Chatham, will perhaps remind Mr McBeath of his having given expression to an idea of this kind. Or better yet,—would it not have been as well for him, good man (?) as he is, to have spoken out boldly,—to have attributed it to its interference with his conscience (?) and said that it was because that the Roman Catholics had joined Mr Williston? This would have been only confirming the reason given by a Reverend Gentleman, a very intimate acquaintance of his, not quite 30 miles from Chatham, for his, McBeath's, conduct—and as coming from McBeath. Let Mr McBeath please question this, and I shall furnish references.

V. He sent Mr Williston notice *timeously* that he had resolved to withhold his support from him.

Answer—

Northumberland, } Phineas Williston maketh ss. } Oath and saith, that a letter from Alexander McBeath, addressed to J. T. Williston, Esq. and this Deponent, the substance of which is given in John Hea's letter in the Gleaner of the 24th ultimo, was handed to this Deponent, with the *wafer wet upon it*, on the night before the Poll opened at Newcastle, and not before; and that up to the time of the said letter having been handed to this Deponent, he had no notification whatever from McBeath, nor does he believe his Brother, or any person in his Brother's interest, had, of McBeath's having deserted, or having any intention to desert, his Brother, J. T. Williston's interest in the late Election.

PHINEAS WILLISTON.

Sworn before me, at Chatham, }

this 8th day of February, 1843. }

WM. LESTON, J. P.

In addition to the above, Sir, I beg leave to state that the letter therein referred-to is stated to have been handed to Mr Williston in Layton's Hotel—opened and read in presence of the following persons:

James Cameron, Hugh McDonald, Donald McRae, William Williston, George Letson, Donald Cameron, young Archey's son, Peter McDougald, and some members of Mr Layton's household.

VI. I have grinned out the truth, in stating a fact or two, to screen a hurricane of lies.

Answer. Which, or where are they? If he wish references with regard to his offers and promises of support to Mr Williston throughout the Election; as to these made in Mr Williston's drawing room by McBeath as a member of Williston's committee—I refer him to Messrs. Shepherd J. Frost and Henry Wise—as to those made at the preparatory meeting at his own house—to P. Williston, Esq., George Letson, Richard J. Pattison, W. Williston; and as to declarations to support Mr Williston since he suffered himself to be placed in nomination, I beg leave to refer Mr McBeath to George Letson, Shepherd J. Frost, Alex. Cameron, Benjamin Williston, Charles J. Peters, Esq., Phineas Williston, Esq., Benjamin Stephens from Kouchibouguac, and others.

VII. He persists in saying that the Roman Catholics, and they only, and led by me, broke his windows.

Answer. My declaration, as to that matter is before the public, see Gleaner of the 31st ult. The Roman Catholics will of course, for they are a grateful people, set a due estimate upon his undivided compliment—as will his esteemed friend the Rev. Mr Egan. As to my being a *Turncoat*, I do not know what he means, consequently cannot answer it,—as to the tide of vengeance that he speaks of, whenever I act as he did, and continues to do, let that tide 'recede' with all its violence, and richly shall I deserve it.

Now, Sir, as I hope Mr McBeath's letter is answered, I shall resume my narrative—and in doing so, it has just occurred to me, that before my Chatham, Napan, and Richibucto Road neighbours come to the Hustings at Chatham (4th day), and commence polling, it may be just as well for me to relieve their minds, and set them to rest as to how their old friend Mr Rankin feels as it respects this Election. Several of them will remember how Mr Rankin acted, and what he said on the Hustings on the 1st day, when Mr Williston, in addressing the audience, told them that Mr R. was determined to carry Mr Street in with him. Mr Rankin said it was false, and asked for proof. He was referred to neighbours John McLean and David Steel, of Napan, and to John Bergin, of the South West; to each of whom he, Mr Rankin, said what amounted to this:—if they, his friends, left or turned either (meaning himself or Mr Street) out, to turn himself, Mr Rankin, out. This I give as the substance of what passed, without any trick, or cavelling about particular forms of expression or words—and the reference above given is what gave neighbour Steel so much offence—and caused him to vote against Chatham it appears. The manner in which I propose relieving their minds is by referring them to the following, being a

copy of one of Mr Rankin's Election Cards—and the original of which I shall submit for your inspection, on handing you my manuscript: The Note is addressed to *Roman Catholics*.

Miramichi, 14th Dec., 1842.

Dear Sir,

There being a New Election on the 27th instant, Mr Street and I intend coming forward again, and in the event of a contest, I trust I may depend on your rendering us all the assistance in your power.

Your very obedient Servant,

ALEX. RANKIN.

Now, Sir, I would not for a large apple, dare to say, that the above Note contradicts what Mr Rankin said upon the Hustings. The matter is before your readers—and before my neighbours in particular, and they will judge. By the bye, it appears that Messrs. Rankin & Street, and their friends, have been industrious in circulating that the opposition and defeat they met with was one of *feeling*, and not of *principle*, viz. from the Roman Catholics! Pray, I would ask them, what particular feeling could the Roman Catholics have had in favor of Mr Williston? If they cannot answer, Sir, neither can I. This, however, I do not hesitate to answer for—that the Irish Roman Catholics on this occasion had their senses about them—could not be bought or sold with Rum—Green Flags, or any such baubles; could not be persuaded to tear each other's eyes out; knew perfectly well what they were about: acted like rational beings—acted from *principle*, and not from *feeling*; and merely assisted their neighbours of other nations and denominations in achieving a conquest—onequaled in the annals of Northumberland, if not of New Brunswick. Further, if Messrs. R. & S. did not want the Roman Catholic interest, why did they solicit it? And if they did want it, why did they not learn to merit it? These questions may apply to Mr Street more particularly. I think I shall also give a copy of one of Mr Street's Election Cards, and I do not know of a better place for it than just here. I shall shew you the original, Mr Editor, on handing you this manuscript. It is addressed to an Irish Roman Catholic—and is as follows:

Miramichi, 12th Dec., 1842.

Dear Sir,

There will be a new Election for this County on the 27th inst., and in case of an opposition I hope you will support Mr Rankin and myself, as we both intend coming forward again.

Yours, faithfully,

J. A. STREET.

I feel satisfied, Mr Editor, that your readers have quite enough before them now, to satisfy them as to the nature of the canvass of, and for Messrs. R. & S., and shall not add any thing further upon that subject.

Saturday was the day on which the Poll opened at Chatham; and on that day, Mr Street, before and after the opening of the Poll, contrived to canvass me very warmly, and to engage my services to accompany the Poll thenceforward, thro' the Election. On that day I pledged myself to him; and how far I have redeemed my pledge, I believe will not be questioned. I acknowledge that I had been under obligations (?) of several years standing to Mr Street, which a reference to the files in the Provincial Secretary's Office in Fredericton will prove, and which Mr Street's treatment of, and conduct towards me on the 4th day, refreshed my memory with the recollection of, and such recollection of what had almost become dormant, had some little effect upon myself personally. I should have remarked, that on poor John McAlpine's coming to the Poll on this day, I took occasion to remind him that Mr Street having declared at Bay du Vin on the day before, that he, Mr Street, had never injured a poor man—it may be as well for him, McAlpine, on coming to the Poll, to acknowledge Mr Street's kindness and attention to him.

McAlpine governed himself accordingly, and in acknowledging the attentions of Mr Street and Mr Rankin, Mr Street took occasion to remark that McAlpine was a tool in my hands, and that I was his bitterest enemy. This led to the utterance of terms not the most courteous, and formed a part of Mr Street's canvass of me.

How did Messrs. R. & S. come to Chatham on this day? attended by a force? or not? If yes—then I shall not press the question. If nay—then who were the people that Mr Rankin dispatched, his own man, horses and sleigh for, to Douglastown after he, himself, had reached Chatham? and that the said establishment had made repeated trips for—the distance being about two miles? And who were the groups of such men, as described in my letter, (see Gleaner of 31st ultimo) as having accompanied Messrs. R. & S. to Bay du Vin, both from Newcastle and Douglastown, who were to be seen at the Hustings, and about Chatham Streets and Taverns on that day? With regard to the manner in which the people conducted themselves at the Hustings, and in the Town generally on that day, with the exception of *Boosing* at Mr Street's, if I may say, how happened it that a *Magistrate* belonging to Chatham, who had, as the 'Chatham minority' say, been applied to by them on the day before, in anticipation of violent conduct at Chatham on this day, how happened it that the Magistrate in question (who, by the bye remained neutral thro' the whole Election) was not called upon any time