

days, yet till the very morning not a stroke had been struck in order to put this boat in a fitting condition to carry down at least a hundred people, of all ranks and in very wet weather. It had neither a cover from the rain nor a seat to sit upon. These had to be hurried up at the last hour. As we went on board, they were still busy putting down the seats.

On the plank down which the passengers had to descend into the boat, moreover, stood up, a couple of inches, a stout tenpenny nail. This nail caught the skirts of every lady that went down, tore several of them, and over it several gentlemen stumbled. The American was standing to see how long it would be before any one would conceive the idea that this nail must be knocked down. He said, he expected if they were all Germans, from what he had seen of them from a year's residence among them, it would go on to the very end of the chapter. And in truth, so it appeared probable. One after another caught on the nail. Gown after gown went crash; but they were lifted off again, and the parties went forward. Gentleman stumbled against the nail, and cursed it and went on. At length Mrs. Howitt's gown caught; I disengaged it, and called to a man to bring his hammer and knock it down. Though I said this in German, the American soon after came to me, and said, 'Sir, excuse my freedom, but I know you are an Englishman.' I asked him how he discovered that. He replied, 'By the very simple fact of your having immediately ordered the driving down of that nail.' And he then related what I have stated above.

### ORIGINAL.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—Very many in this community have read with astonishment the extraordinary epistle, which appeared in the Gleaner of the 20th inst., bearing the signature of the Rev. James Hudson, who takes to himself the extraordinary title of 'the Visiting Missionary Priest for the Miramichi river.' That letter was called forth by a communication of mine, which was inserted in your paper of the 29th November, in which I objected to the unwarrantable assumption of the title of THE PARISH CHURCH, as applied by Mr. Hudson exclusively to the Episcopal Church lately opened in the Parishes of Blackville and Richibucto, respectively. I maintained, and still maintain, that there is no *Established Church* in this Province, and that the enactment by which it was attempted to establish Episcopacy in it, is *defective and inefficient*, as may be seen by any one who will take the trouble of looking into the Acts of the Province. In confirmation of my opinion, I stated, that Sir John Harvey was so convinced of this, that, in replying to an Address of the Episcopal Clergy convened at Fredericton, which was presented to him during his administration of the government, instead of calling theirs the Established Church, he calls it simply 'that portion of the Established Church of England, in the Province.' I farther gave very sufficient reasons for maintaining that the Church of Scotland, in a British Colony acquired since the Union between the two Kingdoms, stands on the same footing, and is entitled to the same privileges with the Church of England.

Mr. Hudson is quite indignant that any one should have presumed to impugn any thing emanating from him, and seems to think that he should have the exclusive privilege of putting forth whatever claims he pleases, and of asserting a supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, over other denominations of Christians; and that no one should dare to dispute his pretensions, or to expose their fallacy. In short, that the *public Journals* should be open to him, and closed to every one who differs from him. These may be his ideas of justice, and of the liberty of the Press, but they are not mine. Mr. Hudson has no cause to complain that your Correspondent has written *anonymously*, seeing that both of the communications which have led to this correspondence, were written by

Mr. Hudson, as it appears from his own admission, and were written *anonymously*. If he sees fit to *publish* *anonymously*, another may surely, without committing any offence, *reply* to him in the same way.

It is admitted on all hands that his letter is *no reply* to mine. He has neither combated the arguments I employed, nor shewed the facts I adduced to be untrue. To have done this, or at least to have attempted it, would have been the *manly* way of meeting his opponent. He has not proved that I have misrepresented the Oxford Theology, nor wronged him in imputing to him Puseyite opinions. Had he done so, I should at once have acknowledged my error, and expressed my regret at having mistaken his views. He pursues a less manly, less honorable course. Having found me out, as he *erroneously* supposes, he attempts to overwhelm me by a whole volley of abuse. With him the epithets 'schismatic,' 'slanderer,' 'fellow,' 'scurrilous,' and such like terms, appear to be 'familiar as household words.' That I may not do him injustice, I shall, with your permission, quote the *third* paragraph of his letter:

"But from the fact, that your correspondent is a Churchman, against whom he has levelled the contents of the communication referred to, and his slanderer, as yet, an *anonymous* SCHISMATIC; he (your correspondent) is therefore not permitted to enter into any controversy with him, further than this, to tell this person, for I will not call him a man, that I, the undersigned, have the strongest suspicion (reason?) to believe that this M. G. is the identical same fellow, (residing not an hundred miles from Richibucto) who sent, about this time twelve months, a scurrilous article founded on a superstructure of falsehood, signed X, to your office, for publication in the Gleaner; which article, upon its being too civilly rejected, was duly transmitted to Halifax, and immediately inserted in that miserable, misnamed print, the *Guardian*."

I say nothing of the *literary* merits of this precious piece of writing. I notice it chiefly on account of the tirade of abuse with which it winds up, and which is levelled against the Halifax Guardian. The writer was manifestly in a *rage* at the time he composed it, and he madly attempts to *belabour* and *blacken* every body, and every thing that seemed to cross his path. The Journal here so wantonly aspersed by Mr. Hudson, is well known to stand high in this and the adjoining Provinces; it has been conducted in a talented manner, and has uniformly displayed a spirit of good will, and of forbearance, towards other denominations of Christians. It is the *organ* of a very numerous, intelligent, and respectable body in these Provinces, the Presbyterians in connexion with the established Church of Scotland; and Mr. Hudson's futile attempt to calumniate it, can only be viewed as an attempt on his part to calumniate the Body whose opinions it represents.

I now address myself more particularly to Mr. Hudson.—In my former communication I proved, distinctly, that you, Rev. Sir, were attempting, through the Press, to disseminate the dogmas of the Oxford Theology, and as the publication of such tenets in the Gleaner, must lead to controversy (which I have ever been most desirous to avoid), I recommended to you the discontinuance of such publications. How you met the charge, and received the friendly counsel, may be seen from your *fourth* paragraph.

For the benefit of all M. G.'s ignorant admirers, I will also tell this person, that his late communication in the Gleaner contains as *little* truth, and as *many* if not more, wicked and infamous falsehoods, than those strung together in all his former articles, printed in the *Guardian*; and I will further add, that your correspondent, in spite of M. G.'s friendly warnings, will continue, (so long as the Editor of the Gleaner permits it), to obtrude in that paper, the Gleaner, 'his pompous announcements, his Puseyism, rank Puseyism,' and all his other 'intolerant and unscriptural notions,' and further, that he will continue to rail that building the PARISH CHURCH, (whether the religion that is taught there be established or not established by Act of Parliament, as if an Act of Parliament could make a Church!) whose Altar is served by a Priest, both Catholic and Protestant, ordained by a Bishop, the rightful successor of the Apostles?

Now Sir, when I read this, I confess I was amazed that you should have exposed yourself in the manner you have done. If any doubts existed in the public mind with respect to your Puseyism, you have effectually removed them, and you now stand before the Christian world, the avowed advocate of opinions which are sapping the foundations of the Church to which you belong. Whatever your friends may think of your zeal, they have no cause to admire your discretion.

Your determination to call the Episcopal place of Worship THE PARISH CHURCH, to the exclusion of all others, *proves nothing* but your *obstinate adherence to a point*, whether right or wrong. If you imagine that the inhabitants of this Colony will tamely submit to a *dominant* Church, or be trampled on by such persons as yourself, you are grievously mistaken. You boast of being a *Priest*, ordained by a *bishop*, the *rightful successor of the Apostles*. When you have *satisfactorily found this succession*, you may have some chance of gaining credit for your boastful assertion.—We wait for the proof. There is one circumstance which strongly militates against your claim, and it is that you appear on this occasion to have exhibited *so little of apostolical meekness and forbearance*. 'The servant of the Lord must not strive,' but be gentle with all men.' 2 Tim. II. 24. 'An Overseer or Bishop must be patient, not a *brawler*.' 1 Tim. III. 3. These passages, Rev. Sir, may not be unworthy of your attentive perusal.

But I proceed to notice paragraph fifth of your extraordinary letter.—'And now while the pen is in my hand, let me advise M. G. and his worthy Baies des Chaleurs 'helpmate', to give up *traducing* the Church and Church Doctrines, and Church Clergy, and Church Laymen; let me tell them too, that with the Bible in one hand, and the noble Old Prayer Book and *Apostolical and Catholic Tradition* in the other, your correspondent fears them not; no, nor even the whole (so called) Presbytery (?) of Miramichi. Your *zeal*, sir, seems here to have reached its *climax*, and your *courage* to have been *scarcely up to the highest pitch*. Raised in imagination on a *lofty* eminence of your own creation, and clad from head to foot in a complete suit of armour, made after the true Oxford pattern, you stalk forth a very Goliath in your own imagination, and had defiance to a whole host of Presbyters. Have you forgotten, sir, the *motto* which encircles Scotia's national crest—*Nemo me impune lacessit*. Seldom have her sons proved recreant; when the cause of their country or their church has called forth their energies; and I have little doubt you will find them *ready, eye ready* to meet you. Your vaunted courage, I am told, is likely to be put very soon to the test, by one of the Reverend Body thus boldly challenged to meet you on the field of controversy; and I have no doubt he will prove himself the *true blue stamp*. And after he has done with you, there are seven or eight others, quite at your service.

Towards the conclusion of your letter, you taunt me with living in a glass house, and attempt to confound me by informing me that two of my Canadian brethren have lately joined the Episcopal church. I was aware of the circumstance, and I believe that if the *whole* truth were known, neither the church to which they have attached themselves, nor the individuals in question, have much to boast of. It might be possible to shew that reasons of a *substantial* as well as of a *conscientious* nature, have had something to do in this extraordinary occurrence. But let the Church of England look to her *loss* on the side of Rome, and she will find that she has no cause to boast of her *gain* from the ranks of Presbytery. Many years ago she lost a brother to Earl Spencer and to the present bish. of Newfoundland. That gentleman was lately employed in labouring with the utmost zeal to convert the Protestants of Ireland to the faith of Rome. She lost also, if I mistake not, a brother to Lord King, or at least a clergyman of the name of King; and lately we read of no fewer than three Clergymen belonging to the English Establishment, who had publicly renounced the Protestant faith, of whom the Rev. Waldo Sibthorp, brother to colonel Sibthorp, M. P. was one. And if we may believe the testimony of English Divines there are hundreds of Puseyite clergymen, who are remaining within the pale of the Church, and eating her bread, who in their doctrinal views, differ in no material point from those of the Church of Rome, and who, if they were possessed of moral honesty, would cease to be connected with a church whose articles they no longer conscientiously believe. Instead of this, they continue in their livings, and labour with untiring zeal in order to bring over their people to embrace their views. These things are so notorious in Britain, that every one who runs may read. Dr. Wiseman, one of the Romish Bishops, has declared to the world, that the *difference* between Puseyites and his church is *so small* as not to be worth contending for, and on this ground, he urges them to throw off the mask, and attach themselves to Rome at once. Are you, Sir, a master in Israel, and know not these things? or does the truth offend you?

The following extracts, taken from Puseyite writings, chiefly the Tracts for the Times, will give your readers, Mr. Editor, some idea, what this new doctrine is.

As a proof that the doctrines of the Oxford School are substantially the same with those of the Church of Rome, we learn from English papers which reached us by the last packet, that in England Roman Catholics are substituting the *British Critic* and other Puseyite Periodicals for their own, and that the publishers of Romish Periodicals are in consequence complaining loudly of the loss of patronage. This is ominous!

They are in answer to the question—'what is Puseyism?'—It is to say anathema to the principle of Protestantism.—(Palmer)—'To hate the Reformation and the Reformers; men and men.'—(Fronde)—'To sigh to think that we should be separated from Rome.'—(Tracts for the Times)—and to say with the Rev. D. Atchinson, Episcopal Minister of Glasgow, 'When will men's minds be awake to the Reformation delusion. Alas! we know not how many a wretched soul now drinking the cup of eternal death, owes his agonies and torments to that Reformation. Puseyism is—to assert that Scripture is not the Rule of Faith.'—(Tracts for the Times)—that 'the oral tradition of the Church is a fuller exposition of God's revealed truth.'—(Limwood's Sermons)—That 'Scripture Tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of Faith.'—(Tract 78. p. 2). 'Your trumpety principles,' exclaims Fronde, 'about Scripture being