

Communications.

PARISH OF NEWCASTLE.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—It has been justly remarked by the celebrated novelist Marryat, that the life of some men consists in getting into scrapes and then getting out of them the best way they can. Your correspondent C. W., ex-Overseer of this Parish, has the audacity again to appear in your valuable and independent Journal. In reviewing the rich and poignant article from the pen of your worthy correspondent, it reminds me of the sins of the Poet; fair at the top, but shocking as you proceed to the bottom or end of his evasive answers to "One of the People." He must be laboring under a slight attack of hyeanthropy, when he dictated his last epistle; for to criticise a man's language and distort his arguments is one thing, and fairly and honestly to answer them is another. How far your correspondent has succeeded in doing the former, I shall leave your readers to determine for themselves; that he has not even attempted to answer the most important of my questions, is evident on the most superficial perusal of his communication. If he had not declared in his last production that he would not appear in the field of controversy with "One of the People," I would have taken it for granted that his queer production was penned with the intention of provoking controversy, more than answering the questions put to him. There is one comfort, however, that your subtle and vain-glorious correspondent may by and bye discover, when he assumes his mask to appear before the public, as he has often done, and at present contemplates the same course—that after all he has, like Falstaff, killed fifty Hotspurs, that they rise as fast as he slays them. It would have been much better if your correspondent had never buckled on his harness and lowered his vizor to do battle with "One of the People," than now to leave the field in the disreputable manner he is doing. If he did not wish to wage war with an unknown and untalented writer, why enter the field at all? then he would not have had to beat a dishonorable retreat.

In reviewing C. W.'s article, I shall be as brief as possible. With all due respect for his satirical and elegant production, I will now endeavor to analyse it. In the first paragraph appears this sentence—"What a pity that Street and the old upholders of Toryism are not permitted to enlist under the banner of reform, to join and do battle, upon their daring and pugnacious foes the Overseers." Reply. Your correspondent must be well aware that it is the duty of every true reformer and lover of his country, be he a Street or a Cobden, to purge out all iniquities, and remove from office all Overseers or any official who stands in the way of reform (wonder if your correspondent is one of those). That he is opposed to reform, and tendering for supplies, must have been his conscientious conviction, preventing him for nine years from unfurling his gonfalon, with one solitary exception, of classifying one Pauper to board in 1844, but never put the Lower District to competition, so that the Parish might receive the benefit. This was my first query, and it still remains unanswered. I will now repeat the question—"has not C. M., ex-Overseer, and R. T. M. and P. W., present Overseers, always advertised for Tenders, so that the Parish might be supplied at the lowest figure; and has not C. W., always opposed Tendering by withholding the Lower District?" In 1849 he used not only his prerogative to withhold the Lower District from competition, but put all obstacles in the way he possibly could to prevent the Middle District coming to honorable competition. Listen to his own version. Because James Milne, his accredited clerk, run the Parish in debt, in his employer's absence, and when he returned from his travels, to his astonishment found it so—just as Tommy told him O. It is unnecessary to make many remarks upon this paragraph. It only strengthens my former argument; for Milne, being the accredited clerk of C. W., having run the Parish in debt, so that it could not be competed for, this debt should have been charged to his employer, and not to the Parish. I contend, as I did before, that he has failed to make his argument good in the position he has now taken. How will he apply his if, if now; will it be in conjunction with the schoolboy's rhyme 1—"If if and and were pot and pan, then C. W. will have a pot to boil and a pan to fry his pig in."

I trust I have said enough to show the public that the grievances have existed for nine years, and do exist at the present day in the

Lower District, although C. W. has evaded answering my questions by attempting to criticise my rare effusion, as he is pleased to term it, and by leading the uninitiated from the subject by a series of long and fancy words. I do not intend to press this question any further at present. I may return to the subject again, should circumstances require it. As Mr W. G., of the Lower District, has thought fit to remain silent, he may rest assured that he will have to answer these questions, if not before, at the next General Sessions, for I will meet him there, and demand an answer of him, I expected, Mr Editor, when I put those few plain questions, that they would have been fairly and honestly answered, but the result has proved otherwise, and the public mind is still unenlightened on this subject, and is likely to remain so until the next January term, when Mr W. G. will be called to account.

In conclusion, I express my thanks to you, Sir, for the space which I have occupied in your valuable Journal.

I remain, Sir,

ONE OF THE PEOPLE.

Newcastle, April 24, 1850.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—Your last paper contained one of the most rare and wonderful effusions I ever read, from the pen of John Chalmers, of Douglas town. I was not aware before that he was the author of Chambers's Information for the People; I always understood him to be a weaver by trade, instead of an author of such celebrity. If he would add an Essay on Codfish to his valuable works, it would be anxiously looked for by the paupers of this Parish. I never contemplated entering into controversy with Mr Chalmers, or any other individual, and I never anticipated that my few remarks would call forth such a torrent of abuse upon the heads of innocent individuals, otherwise I never would have penned them. My motive in writing was to show the public that it was the duty of every well-disposed person to assist the Overseers in the arduous and thankless office which they have to fill, gratis. The Overseers have been persecuted week after week by worthies assuming different signatures, and not one pen raised in their defence. Conscientiously believing them to be persecuted, I wrote a few remarks which have already appeared, and your readers can judge for themselves whether there was anything in these remarks which could wound the feelings of the most fastidious, Mr J. C. excepted. This talented gentleman has taken the affair in high dudgeon; the cap seems to fit him, and he is welcome to wear it. If John Chalmers is the author of Chambers's Information for the People, then his last essay is far superior to the first for setting a bad example before the people. Such captious and abusive effusions produce no good, but a great deal of harm, and generally return ten-fold upon the writer's own head. The article to which I allude is an honour (disgrace I mean) to Northumberland, as a specimen of nature (a certain man's nature). It should be bound in calf, carefully preserved, and sent to England with the other curiosities of New Brunswick, there to be exhibited at the great fair of 1851 as one of the most scandal-mongrous, gingeractious, pugnacious, ungracious, veracious, scribble-grand, cut-unkind, unrefined effusions that ever appeared in your highly valued and wide-spread Journal. O dear, O dear, what will the good old Hebrew and Latin do now, when it passes into the hands of such a master.

John will become a teacher of Hebrew and of Greek, The Latin parts to young and old he'll teach by heart complete.

Your worthy correspondent thinks I have mistaken my signature; that 'Lover of Truth' does not apply; that I am a Sabbath-breaker, a brawler, a school boy, my master a wolf in sheep's clothing, &c. &c. Mr Editor, if I have all these bad qualities, then I am a fit companion for a certain fish monger not many miles from this Parish. But for the information of your correspondent, the term Sabbath-breaker applies not to the 'Lover of Truth,' further than to all the human family. I am a sinner, but who is without sin? If your correspondent is clean, then let him cast the first stone (or codfish) at me. I am not a school boy now; it is near fifty years since I left school; my education is very limited. I am not under any master at present receiving lessons. By and bye, if I can raise the needful, I intend taking lessons in the dead languages from your correspondent. He must be very competent to teach.

The young ideas know how to shoot, and give lessons to the old, if we are allowed to judge by the specimen already before the public. J. C.'s version of Tommy Brown is a rare one, and no doubt the orders are correctly stated; but he does not state the matter as fairly as he might, to let the public know how things stand. In the first place, Mr Brown receives his order for three shillings, and is allowed over and above this five shillings for each fortnight, which will make eight shillings in all; divide this and you will have four shillings paid weekly by the Parish; 2s 6d of this goes to pay Mr Murray for house room, cooking, washing, &c, then there is 1s 6d left for Tom Brown. Add to this the quantity of damaged fish which your correspondent kindly furnished him with, and you will see what he has been receiving from the Parish, and your correspondent's charity. He is now receiving from 4s 6d to 5s weekly, which Mr Chalmers neglected to inform the public of, although in possession always of the latest news of T. B. I believe this to be a true statement of the affair. I have given it verbatim, as given to myself, to allay the public feeling, and to show that the Overseers have done their duty to T. B. I have no doubt that all those connected with the Parish affairs have done so. The people themselves can judge. Your correspondent I never injured, either directly or indirectly. I have called him no opprobrious names, or held him up to contempt in my reply to Y. If he was that worthy person, he received a mild reproof. I would not have taken notice of his effusion, if he had not made such an unwarrantable attack on individuals entirely unconnected with the writer of these few and imperfect remarks. Your correspondent will find a dish of fish well cooked for him before long, which will require a large proportion of aromatic and saline ingredients to make it palatable for his delicate taste and smell.

My respects to John Chalmers. May he ponder well over his own transgressions, so that he may see more clearly to pluck the mote out of his brother's eye.

Pardon me, Mr Editor, for occupying at this time so much of your Journal. It is the last time I shall appear on this subject. I have the pleasure of subscribing myself as formerly, and I trust I ever will be,

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

April 27, 1850.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Pray excuse, Mr Pierce, these doggerel lines, You know poetry's low these very hard times; In your paper the last, appears letter the first, From a pedlar in Gretna, dated 20th August.

In prospective it seems by that time he might cool, And his gall settle down, the consummate fool.

To imagine his Shem had acquired such repute, As be blasted afar by your Obed's sans doute.

'A Lover of Truth' looks at him with gaal. When he, like a Satan, must his ragan assail.

By his long nebed words one would almost suppose He'd all Biblical words at the tip of his nose.

We know very well Rahab's part of his creed, For who ever heard of a Rachel in Zeeb; If a wolf can get mutton, as every one knows, No fear of unne pauper with 'half frozen toes.'

If Chalmers be 'Chalmers,' he may not deny To 'A Lover of Truth' he's author of 'Y.'

That he is a Seduco appears very clear, For 'tis certain he's taken the wrong pig by the ear.

If Rahab's a schoolboy she aptly behaved, In framing a lie she Joshua's spies saved; But that she was not her sex and age tell, For some folks imagine she kept a Hotel.

If Murray and Parden enlighten the age, They probably might undertake to assuage The wrath of poor Jock, by naming the writer Of 'A Lover of Truth,' or else the the indier.

If the man that dispenses information would tell For how much a quintal of codfish would sell, In the same ratio, flavored as those fed to Tom Brown.

A Newcastle pauper of fame and renown, If poor Tom himself could very well speak, He has from the parish two and sixpence a week.

Beside his poor lodgings, and pallet of straw, He may eat the 'cheese fish' either sodden or raw.

If this little ear commence nobah again,

Let him say what he means by giving the name; He may truly assert that he is a 'Hophimus.' So I take to myself the title of 'Trophimus.' Newcastle, 25th April, 1850.

PARISH OF CHATHAM.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

A circumstance has lately occurred in this community which should be noticed, and I have no doubt, from the well-known independent character of the Gleaner, that you will give it publicity. The circumstances of the case are as follows: Mr Robert Murray, who is employed in the capacity of Overseer at the Chatham Steam Mill, being much annoyed by boys prowling about the premises, and committing petty thefts, determined to get rid of them. He accordingly ordered a lad named Coughlan to leave the wharf, when he refused, and made use of very insulting language. Murray thereupon attempted to push him away, when the boy fell down. His brother then came up, and, drawing a knife, swore he would stab him (Murray) if he touched his brother. Murray then seized the boy by the collar and shook him well, but without injuring him in the least. Coughlan immediately applied to John T. Williston, Esq., for a warrant against Murray, who granted it, without taking the least trouble to inquire into the facts of the case. Although it was proved at the trial that Coughlan was a bad boy, and had given very great provocation, the sapient justice fined Murray in the sum of one shilling and sixpence, and costs, amounting to sixteen shillings and sixpence, making in all eighteen shillings, or in default of payment to stand committed to the county jail for six days. Really, Mr Editor, things have arrived at a pretty pass, when a man must be thrown into a prison for punishing a boy who may have given every provocation. It appears to me that Mr Williston would have acted more justly had he discharged Murray and sent the boy to prison; and I hesitate not to affirm, that had the boy been able to pay the costs Murray would not have been mulct. The public will understand me, Mr Editor. Truly, it is high time that the appointment of the peace officers of the country was vested in the hands of the people. Such cases as the above furnish the strongest arguments in favor of the introduction of Municipal Corporations.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

PUNCH.

Chatham, April 19, 1850.

Editor's Department.

MIRAMICHI:

CHATHAM, MONDAY, APRIL 29, 1850.

MORE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—We have been favored with the following extract of a Letter recently received from a member of our Legislature, in answer to some enquiries respecting Emigration:

"There are other reasons which will tend to prevent any action of the House on the subject at present. There is a very strong feeling seems to prevail, that the British Territory on this continent cannot remain much longer in its present condition; and indeed British statesmen have been for some years so disposed to tamper with Colonial interests, and then to reason on the natural consequences, that it is not to be wondered at that the Colonists will reason too. All the ancient feelings of loyalty and attachment for 'weal or woe' have been long since extinguished. Allegiance now has lost its sublimity, and is a matter of mere expediency—counted with those general artificial institutions and arrangements which are, or are not, conducive to the common good. These institutions are judged by their results alone—to be supported or rejected in the same degree as mankind is happy and prosperous, or wretched and declining under them. All sides admit that we are in a transition state. What our future state may be no one seems inclined to predict. But in this condition no one will propose any very general or comprehensive system of emigration, or any thing of the sort. The House refused the Government, a few days ago, any pecuniary aid to develop the coal formations of the Province, although the sum was a trifle. The refusal was a sign of the times."

"I wish you would read the debate on the State of the Province. One could almost fancy himself in the Legislature of one of the old Colonies, before 1770—some of the 'talk' was said to resemble that of old Patrick Henry of the Virginia Legislature of 1771."

CANADA.—The following correspondence has taken place between the Provincial Secretary and Colonel Prince.—