

low, salt water lake, similar to Mal-Bay, designated on the plan 'Munroe's Lake,' but by the residents it is called 'Frye's Lake.' The gully through the sea wall, by which this lake communicated with the Gulf, was formerly at its southern extremity, but this is now filled up; and where Mr Falle's 'stage head' formerly stood in deep water, there was last season, a field of barley growing luxuriantly. The gully or outlet of the lake, is now at its northern end, very near the extremity of Point Miscon.

The grantees of this property and his agent are both dead, and it is said to be owned at present by some person in Jersey. It is not occupied as a Fishing station, and in its present position, is in the way of others who wish to carry on the Fisheries. This unfortunate and improvident grant should serve as a caution to prevent similar grants hereafter, by which valuable and desirable Fishing stations may thus be shut up and rendered useless.

Communications.

PARISH OF NEWCASTLE.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—The last effusion of your correspondent, "One of the People," is a rare one. According to his style, the term paniloquy, in one of its significations, is justly applicable. What a pity that Street, and the old upholders of Toryism, are not permitted to enlist under the banner of reform, to join that noble band in steering the little bark, and doing battle upon their daring and pugnacious foes, the Overseers! If such is to be the effects—the glorious effects of palinody—if public officers doing their duty according to their conscientious convictions, are to be held up as daring and pugnacious foes to society, the fewer that enlist under such a banner the better. I am beginning to think that 'Tax Payer' and 'One of the People' have mistaken their mission,—the true functions of a reformer are to seek the elevation of man—and use no means that may have a contrary effect. And my regard for the laws of charity induces me to hope that all and every means will be strictly avoided for the future, that may have the remotest tendency in arraying man against man—neighbour against neighbour. Surely subjects affecting the good of the public—or indeed any subject—stand a better chance of receiving justice under the mild influence and effects of friendly investigation, than if they are brought under review under the withering influence and operation of evil passion—for where they are aroused, they will cut more ways than one.

In my first response to 'One of the People,' I endeavored, as briefly as possible, to exhibit the leading features of my stewardship over a series of years; this of course was done from memory, and more liable to error than if copied from printed or written documents. And it appears that I have misquoted—that my memory has been at fault, or something worse—that I have called first last, and last first, in the order of discussion, a distinction without a difference, as the result proved. Perhaps it is so. I question not the veracity of the parties at the meeting. In my former letter I gave them credit for acting conscientiously, and from the best intentions; but I think when they seen that I had misquoted in a public print, it might perhaps have been better to have apprised me of it, so that I could correct the paragraph the following week. But they thought otherwise, and have acted accordingly, and I have no right to complain. Now, although I question not the veracity of the parties that 'One of the People' receives his information from; and although I award to them the right to act upon their convictions—I by no means relinquish my own right to act upon my own convictions, and if I were called upon to rewrite the article, not one word would be altered; a simple note would be added, declaratory of the opinion of the majority. Your correspondent proceeds upon the presumption that the only difficulty before the meeting was the proposition to withdraw the lower district. But Mr R. T. M. is of a different opinion; and to avoid a similar difficulty, he very justly applied for no advances this year, but supplied the paupers upon his list for a period of five weeks out of his own pockets. This is evidence that the proposition to withdraw was not the only difficulty, and had the proposition not been assented to, there would have been no agreement, unless Mr R. T. M. had exercised his authority, and demanded an advance of money, to remove the difficulty; but so soon as the proposition to withdraw was as-

ented to by the parties, all difficulty at once disappeared; and if the proposition to withdraw had never been made at all, the result was still the same—a result proving the expediency of the measure. I am of opinion that it was my duty to have consulted the parties that were at the meeting before submitting any account of it to the public; if this mode had been adopted, all difficulty about the paragraph would have been corrected. And upon this point alone I blame myself,—and all the allusions about sophistry, penumbra, palinody, &c. are quite harmless, and certainly pointless, and had much better been dispensed with, for assuredly they do no good—they only damage the party using them. Before quitting this part, I would request 'One of the People' to look over that part of his article where he quotes my version of the subject. Is there no misquoting there? Suppression is misquoting. Wonder if he quoted from memory?

There is part of a paragraph in 'One of the People's' article, commencing at the foot of first column, and reads thus—'is a subject which he and others may have cause to regret, in appearing at this time, as indagator and onodator of C. W.'s article. It appears from this that 'One of the People' was cognizant of the fact, that 'Another of the People' was coming out in support of C. W.'s article before he appeared in the Gleaner. How is this? The passage also appears partly prophetic, and to embody the terrorism principle, there is something like a solecism connected with it likewise, because indagator (a searcher) seems synonymous with 'One of the People,' he being the only searcher of C. W.'s article so far as I know. How is this? Is C. W. and Indagator the parties upon whose heads the threat contained in this passage is to fall? A great deal of penumbra about this quotation.

The next subject adverted to by your correspondent, worthy of note, is his syllogistical argument founded upon James Milne, and is as follows—'I do not recollect of any Overseer of that name since I emigrated to this Parish. If Milne was not an Overseer, and I am perfectly satisfied he was not, how could he grant supplies without the knowledge of C. W. at that time Overseer of the lower district. In this case supplies would not be granted without an order from the Overseer. If they were supplied according to order, then he had no cause to be astonished at the advances given by his own order. If Milne advanced on his own responsibility, then I contend they had no right to be charged to the Parish. C. W. has therefore failed to make his argument good on this ground.' Reply.—I believe it is held by the statute and common law of all civilized and commercial nations, that where a clerk is employed, and acknowledged by the employer as such, he is deemed to be held responsible by the actions of his clerk, so long as those actions are connected with the ordinary business of his employer. Such was James Milne in my employment, and consequently I am held responsible for his actions so far as they were connected with my business. Again, the reader will observe that this syllogistical argument of 'One of the People' is altogether hypothetical—a mere supposition. The old adage very aptly illustrates the principle of this argument, namely, that if—observe the little conjunction *if*—if a pig had wings it could fly. Very true, but having got no wings, it cannot fly.

The argument goes on this way—'If James Milne was not an Overseer—if they were supplied—if James Milne advanced upon his own responsibility, then I contend they had no right to be charged to the Parish.' It unfortunately happens for this argument, that the above *ifs* are a mere supposition, having no foundation whatever in fact. James Milne advanced not upon his own responsibility—never granted supplies as Overseer, but as an accredited clerk, granted supplies in the name of his employer, the Overseer, to the paupers in his district. Therefore I contend that C. W. has not failed to make his argument good on this ground.

The following observations will apply to some of the many queries of your correspondent. In 1844 the principle of competition was put upon trial, by C. W. selling a pauper at a very low figure indeed—the parish receiving the benefit. Was this not a 'Gougalon'? Yes, and had C. W. been supported at that time, the Gougalon would have been waving over that doomed district ever since, and years ago would have been in a proper state, for the application of supplies by competition. 'What,' said an official, 'are you going to introduce slavery among us?' And every person C. W.

consult-d, disapproved of it; so the subject was dropped. Last year, in the month of September, and in presence of a distinguished member of Session, I gave one of the parties distinctly to understand, that if I was continued in office another year, I would expose at public sale the boarding of all the paupers in that district. This I was prevented from doing by being suspended.

At the conclusion of my first article, I said I would return to the subject, with the view of writing one or two communications to prepare the public mind for the introduction of what was called slavery, but in reality only selling the boarding of paupers. But 'One of the People' advises me not to come out. He may keep himself perfectly quiet upon that point; with all his power, he cannot make a monopoly of the press. And if he wishes not cowardly concealment, he will doff the mask, throw aside the penumbra, and stand before the public in all the majesty of a true reformer. I reply not again to 'One of the People.' If he still wishes more information upon some points, I invite him to call, and every facility will be extended. C. W.

April 3, 1850.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—Your Journal of the 2nd April contains a communication from one of your correspondents, under the signature of Y. (a more appropriate signature would be Chambers's Information for the People, or Murray and Purdin's Enlightenment to the Present Age), animadverting on the cruelty and hard-heartedness of Overseers of this and the mother country; and showing the policy adopted by both countries in selecting men hardened by nature, and destitute of every spark of the essence of humanity. Shrewd and discerning, indeed, must our Sessions be. I was going to say that they must be possessed of the spirit of the soothsayer, and able to foretell future events, when they are enabled to select such men for office; and if I understand your correspondent right, they do so without ever mistaking their man: a high eulogy both upon the Sessions and the Overseers of this country and Briton's iron-bound shore. Not agreeing with Y., or the unmerited censure he is attempting to throw on all the Overseers (without distinction, making them all cruel and inhuman, which he well knows to be false) of this and the land of my nativity; and disagreeing with Y. on the obloquy which he is so industriously laboring to circulate about the Sessions selecting and appointing such men to office, and the instructions given by that body, is altogether too absurd to make any comments upon. I will therefore let them pass for what they and their author is worth, and allow the public to put what value they may think fit on such insane doctrines. I do not intend, Mr Editor, to enter the list as champion for the Overseers. I have no doubt but there are men among them well qualified by nature and education to give your correspondent that scourging which the nature of his slanderous production deserves, and which he justly merits.

In writing at present, my intention is purely to show that there is men running at large as much to be dreaded, and a far greater pest to society, than those very Overseers of which your correspondent treats in his effusion to the public. Mr Editor, I much fear if your correspondent was weighed in the balance with (one at a time) most, if not all the Overseers of this County, in most cases, I think, you would find him wanting, perhaps not of lbs weight, but of something more essential, that is, candour in his statements; for callous and unprincipled must be the individual or individuals that attempts to calumniate the character of public officers without the least shadow of justice. Many of the past and present Overseers are men of good standing; some of them have lost much time in attending to the unthankful office, and seeing to the wants and comforts of the unfortunates under their charge. Others of them I know, and so must Y., that give cheerfully of their own goods to ameliorate the sufferings of many of the human family. Therefore, instead of men taking the field and writing over anonymous signatures, to grieve and annoy them, it should be the duty of every well disposed person to assist them in their arduous and unthankful office. Do not misunderstand me, Mr Editor: when I say that many of the Overseers have discharged their duty faithfully, and with honor to themselves, I do not mean to assert there is none who have pursued a contrary course. I have not taken this position. I am free to

confess that a few may have done with a high hand; but taking them in general, you will find very few in this County who pursue the course laid down by your correspondent.

In rectifying the errors made by Y., I will be as brief as possible. He says that one individual, not many leagues from this parish, is allowed the small pittance of one shilling and sixpence weekly for his allowance from the parish, and at the same time he is paying two and sixpence weekly for house room and fuel, leaving him one shilling per week less than nothing to subsist upon. The merits of this case are simply as follows. First, the individual has not as yet gained his settlement in this or any other parish of this County, up to the present date, although the Overseers have been busy for some weeks endeavoring to find a legal settlement for him; and secondly, I believe the sum at present allowed him by this Parish amounts to three shillings and eight pence, weekly, and not one shilling and sixpence, as your correspondent would have you believe; and last, though not least, the man is able to do something for his own maintenance, otherwise he would not be able to walk from Newcastle to Douglstown and return in half of the same day. His complaint is a sore toe. If it so happens, when legally tried, that he gains his settlement in this Parish, the Overseers intend to set him up to competition, otherwise remove him to where he gains his settlement; there your worthy correspondent will have an opportunity, if he feels so charitably disposed, of boarding and lodging the individual in question, and showing to the public how full and freely the milk of humanity flows through his soft and tender breast; he will then let the people, and Tom Brown of cod-fish notoriety, see that he more than pities his sufferings, and that for the future it is his fixed determination that Tom shall be no longer under the weekly allowance of the cruel and hard-hearted Overseers. My civility to Y. When he exonerates the Overseers from the unwarranted charge brought against them by himself, either from prejudice or spleen, it will show the public that your correspondent has forged his first link in the chain of reform.

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Newcastle, April 6, 1850

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

"New York Theological Seminary" is the name of the Institution which answers Brother Jonathan's enigma, which appeared in your last Gleaner. It is unnecessary to trouble you with the names of cities, rivers, &c., as it would take up too much of your Journal, and as you may receive more answers than you will have space to publish.

A PADDY BOY.

Douglstown, March 27, 1850.

["A Paddy Boy" is right. We have received half-a-dozen answers to Brother Jonathan's enigma, "all of the same tenor and date."]

The Fredericton Mail.

The papers by this mail came to hand on Sunday morning. The Courier reports that the roads are in a most wretched condition. The papers thus obtained do not contain any thing of special importance, except an account of the doings of our Legislators. We copy below a letter from a correspondent, as well as a series of Resolutions passed by the house while in Committee on the State of the Province. We are gratified to see the members evince so much firmness and spirit. We fervently trust the opinion expressed by our correspondent, respecting the Legislative Council, may prove correct.

FREDERICTON, 11th April, 1850.

Dear Pierce.—The House has been some days in Committee on the state of the Province, and to-day negatived Mr. Wark's resolution and Mr. Brown's amendment. Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Partelow each proposed a series of resolutions; those proposed by Mr. Ritchie were taken and two of them passed without a division. Mr. Partelow's were then passed, a copy of which I send you. Tomorrow the Attorney General will submit a scale of salaries, and if approved of, they will be adopted, and a Bill passed in accordance. The Attorney General stated that he contended that the Province had a right to govern its own affairs, and deal with its offices as it saw fit, and if there were any enjoying higher salaries than the house were inclined to maintain, and the Home Government insisted upon their retaining, they must pay the difference.

In one of your papers I noticed some rather severe remarks on your members,