

THE GLEANER:

AND NORTHUMBERLAND, KENT, GLOUCESTER AND RESTIGOUCHE
COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL.

Old Series]

Nec araneorum sane textus ideo melior, quia ex se fila gignunt, nec noster vilior quia ex alienis libamus ut apes.

[COMPRISED 13 VOLUMES.

New Series, Vol. XI.

MONDAY EVENING, MAY 3, 1852.

No. 28.

New Brunswick,

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY S. S.

[L. S.] To the Sheriff of the County of Northumberland, or any Constable within the said County, Greeting.

Whereas ROWLAND CROCKER, Executor on the Estate of DANIEL MCGRAW, late of the Parish of Blackville, in the said County, Farmer, deceased, hath represented to me that the Personal Estate of the said deceased is insufficient to pay the debts due by the said deceased, and hath prayed that License may issue to authorise him to sell such parts of the Real Estate of the said deceased as shall be necessary for the payment of his debts:

You are therefore required to cite the heirs of the said deceased personally to be and appear before me at a Court of Probate, to be held at my Office in the Parish of Chatham, on TUESDAY, the Fourth day of May next, at the hour of Eleven of the clock in the forenoon, to show cause why License should not be granted to the said Executor to sell all the Real Estate of the said deceased, towards paying the said debts. And you are further required to cite and require the said Executor and all and every the Creditors and other persons interested in the said Estate, personally to be and appear before me at the time and place aforesaid, with their vouchers and papers, in order that I may then and there proceed to hear and examine the Proofs of the said parties, and the validity of the debts and demands alleged to be existing against the said Estate.

Given under my hand and the seal of the said Court, this Twenty Seventh day of March, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifty Two.

W. WILKINSON, Surrogate.

GEORGE KERR, Register of Probates, for said County.

New Brunswick,

COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER, TO WIT.

[L. S.] To the Sheriff of the County of Gloucester, or any Constable within the said County, Greeting.

Whereas FRANCIS FERGUSON, of Bathurst, in the said County, Merchant, hath filed his Petition in this court, setting forth that ALEXANDER MCNEIL, formerly of the parish of Bathurst, in the said County, departed this life on or about the day of November last, at Dauphine, in the State of Pennsylvania, without having, to the best of petitioner's knowledge, made any will, leaving a widow, — McNeil, and one daughter, him surviving, which said widow and daughter, to the best of petitioner's knowledge, still reside in the said State of Pennsylvania; and that the said Alexander McNeil died, seized of certain Real Estate, situate in the said county of Gloucester, and was, at the time of his death, indebted to the said petitioner, and praying that Letters of Administration be granted to him in due form of Law:

You are therefore required to cite the Heirs, Creditors, and all others interested in the said Estate, to be and appear before me at a Court of Probate to be held at my Office, in Bathurst, on MONDAY, the Tenth day of May next, at Eleven o'clock, A. M., to show cause, if any there be, why the Prayer of the said Petition should not be granted.

Given under my hand and the seal of the said Court, at Bathurst, in the said County, this tenth day of March, A. D. 1852.

HENRY W. BALDWIN,

Surrogate Judge of Probates.

ROBERT GORDON, Register of Probates.

FOR SALE.

The DWELLING HOUSE and LANDS, on the West side of King Street, formerly occupied by the late William Porteous, deceased, now occupied by Michael Leonard. The Two Acre FIELD with the BAR thereon, fronting the South side of the Wellington Road, bounded below by Lands of M. Samuel, Esq., and above by the Peter Brown Lands; also, about nine Acres of LAND, on the James Brown Lot, lately occupied by William Crain. The Two Story DWELLING HOUSE, at the Corner of Queen and Water Streets, occupied by William Johnston. The One Story DWELLING HOUSE, fronting on Water Street, lately occupied by Mr. Andrew Mason. The DWELLING HOUSE fronting the East side of Queen Street, containing three tenements, at present occupied by Tennant. A Lot fronting 54 feet on the North side of Water Street, and extending back 70 feet. The above properties were recently owned by Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON, and will be sold in Lots to suit purchasers, and on reasonable terms. For particulars apply at the office of

KERR & THOMSON.

Chatham, 6th December 1851.

Communications.

BATHURST, April 22, 1852.

James A. Pierce, Esq.,

Sir,—In your paper of the 12th instant, I perceive in one of its editorial columns, a comment based, I presume on a statement in a letter from "your correspondent Fides," dated "Fredericton, 3d April, 1852," in which you remark "How will our Gloucester friends relish the conduct of their members on the important measure of the European and North American Railway?" and further you charge "those members shrinking from their duty." Sir, I, as one of "those members" to whom you allude, unequivocally deny the charge, as being incorrect and false. Neither in that, nor in any other instance, have I ever shrunk from my public duty, or from the responsibility of recording my vote on any subject, whilst present at a debate in the House of Assembly, since I have had the honor of a seat in the Legislature. But, as it happened, public business required my attendance in another quarter when the measure you refer to passed the House; I shall not therefore, hold myself accountable for the consequence of being absent at the time.

My votes on the various subjects under consideration of the House during the Session, will be the criterion by which my constituents will judge of my principles and conduct, and not from the bare and insidious assertion of your correspondent "Fides," nor from your unjustifiable charge either. Mr Editor, if your correspondent "Fides," had referred to, or called to his memory, the 5th and 6th paragraphs of the Address of the House of Assembly, in answer to His Excellency's opening speech, I am inclined to think he would write in a different style, as in page 23 of the Journals, he amongst others recorded his name (altho' not in the assumed fictitious name "Fides") in agreeing with and in adopting the two following paragraphs, viz:—

"5th. The House of Assembly will be anxious to learn from the Despatches to be laid before them, the grounds for Her Most Gracious Majesty, not having yet been advised to assent to the Facility Bill passed the last Session, in aid of the European and North American Railway, and trust the grounds will be removed by the Bill to be introduced by the Government for that purpose."

"6th. A Railway, uniting Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, especially in connection with a line to the United States, we believe with your Excellency, would prove highly beneficial, and we are glad to learn, that it is your Excellency's opinion, that it would produce an abundant return, increase the revenues of the Province, without imposing additional burthens on the people, lead to a speedy settlement of large tracts of wilderness land, and be the means of opening a profitable market for the productions of the Province."

Mr Editor, I therefore warn you to receive with more caution in future, any information communicated to you by "your correspondent Fides," although proclaiming his own praises; but more particularly, when he attempts to slander others.

Yours, &c.,

JOSEPH READ.

BATHURST, April 22, 1852.

To the Freeholders of the County of Gloucester.

GENTLEMEN,

To select and depute those by whom laws are to be made, and taxes to be levied, is a high dignity and important trust, and it is the business of every elector to consider how this dignity may be well sustained, and this trust faithfully discharged.

It ought to be deeply impressed on the minds of all who have voices in the Provincial Assembly, that no man can deserve a seat in that Assembly who is not a patriot. No other man will protect our rights—no other man can merit our confidence.

A patriot is one whose public conduct is regulated by one single motive—the love of

his country in general, and his constituency in particular; who, as an agent in the Assembly, has for himself neither hope nor fear, neither kindness nor resentment, but refers everything to the common interest.

Now let us see how far this applies to our representatives. They have sacrificed our interests for personal aggrandizement; and as a proof of this I would only refer you to their conduct during the present Session. They have squandered both the public time and money in the most extravagant manner, so that want of political integrity is the most prominent feature in their political character. I would refer you to their conduct on the great Railway question, which was one of the most important subjects ever brought under the notice of the Legislature. How did they act when the measure for taking the great Trunk Railway by the Valley of the Saint John was brought forward? They opposed it, it is true; but what was their object in so doing? They were aware that the Government would have a majority in favor of the measure, and their opposition to it was merely nominal, in order that they might dupe their constituency with a show of independence. Their subsequent conduct clearly proves the truth of this statement, for when the Government, at the close of the Session, introduced the Bill to amend the Act incorporating the European and North American Railway, and finding there was a probability of the Government being defeated, they ratted, or retired to Solomon's Porch, by which means the measure was carried, and the Government sustained—thus fastening an additional rivet in the chain which is to bind us hand and foot for all time to come. But had they acted with patriotic spirit, the Executive would have been defeated, the whole scheme exploded, and Major Robinson's line would eventually have been adopted.

It may be said that this is mere conjecture, but I answer no; and I will now state the reasons on which I ground my assertions. When Mr Hincks, the Canadian delegate, arrived in Halifax, his propositions were rejected by a majority of 11 to 1, but when Mr Chandler arrived a change at once took place, as he guaranteed to build the European and North American Railway, in order that the great trunk line might go by the Valley of the Saint John, thereby involving the country in ruin. But had our representatives been faithful to the trust reposed in them, and discharged their duty fearlessly and independently, the whole scheme would have proved abortive, and the country saved from ruin.

I therefore ask again, can he who allows his constituency to be robbed of their rights be a patriot. But what is to be done under the present circumstances? If called on to resign, would they respond to the call? I fear not, for I do not believe they have political or moral honor sufficient to induce them to acquiesce.

In conclusion, I would say to you—treasure up these wrongs in the archives of your memory against the day of retribution, when you will have it in your power to call these men to account for the manner in which they have trampled on your rights, and sacrificed your interests at the shrine of selfishness and personal aggrandizement.

I remain, yours, &c.,

A FREEHOLDER.

TO THE

HON. JOHN AMBROSE STREET,
ATTORNEY GENERAL AND LEADER OF
THE GOVERNMENT.

SIR,

I had hoped that I would not have required again to address you through the Press, at least for the present; but your recent reply to the second Requisition from your constituents, evinces such a determination on your part to resist their wishes—misconstrue their acts and intentions—and insult their feelings, that I, as one of the Requisitionists, cannot allow such to pass in silence, even from the Honorable John Ambrose Street. The circumstances will, I am sure, be sufficient excuse to the public for again obtruding myself upon them, and to them, perhaps, an apology may be due; but to you, Sir, I shall

offer none, as your past career scarcely merits it, and certainly not from me; and if it did, your recent insulting reply to your constituents absolves them, or any of them, in addressing you, from paying that consideration to your feelings which might be due either to a gentleman or a representative, for I regret to perceive that there may be a distinction.

I have before stated that those who knew you did not expect you to resign, and therefore in that particular your reply did not disappoint them; but there are some amongst us, who for years have been your warmest supporters, who flattered themselves that you possessed some portion of that honour which has hitherto done you such good service as electioneering capital—that the high-minded principle for which you were lauded on a recent occasion, would have prevented you from retaining the seat you occupy, contrary to the expressed wish of five-sixths of your constituents. To me your position seems an anomaly, and completely refutes the old adage of there being "nothing new under the sun"; for I do not recollect any instance in the history of the British Parliament, or any other representative body, of a gentleman retaining his seat in defiance of so large a majority of his constituents. Should, however, any such precedent exist, you, no doubt, will ere this have discovered it, and if public attention is not directed to it, we may conclude, not that you are unwilling to point it out, but that you are unable to do so.

In looking at your last reply, there are four points which seem to me to require particular observation:—

1st. Where you assert the incorrectness of the allegations in the "numerously signed requisition," in reference to your pledges to resign.

2nd. The erroneous inference you draw from the general ground taken up in the requisition.

3rd. Your assertion that it is a "most extraordinary and unjustifiable document;" and

4th. Your regret about the "trouble and expense," and your insinuations respecting the "means" employed to procure signatures.

As to the first point, it does appear to me either that your memory has played you false, or else that your desperate political position has made you reckless. It can scarcely have been the former, because your attention was recently called to one of your own published cards, written by yourself, in which the following passage occurs:

"You may rest assured that the very moment that I find, from the circumstance of non-residence or other causes, I may not be able faithfully to discharge my duty as a Legislator, that moment I will retire from the field."

Many instances of such might be given, but it is unnecessary to occupy the attention of the public with numerous extracts, as the above answers the purpose of this argument. Do you pretend to deny that in the General Election of 1850, that you did publicly assert that your object in coming forward as a candidate was not from personal motives, but simply from a desire to be of service to a County that had so frequently returned you, and that when you ceased to be of service, you would at once retire? Did you not repeat these sentiments in the election of 1851, after your accession to the Government which you a few months before pronounced to be "corrupt and rotten to the core"? Did you not, with well assumed indignation, repel the rumors (generally believed) that you had often heard, that you were brought forward and returned not by the County, but by one individual? and did you not then declare that you would "scorn to be so returned;" nor would you "for one moment retain a seat if the people were against you." "It was for their benefit, not your own, that you came forward." No, 'tis not possible for you to deny these statements, there are too many witnesses! Why then persist, in the face of this accumulation of testimony, in denying that you gave pledges to resign. Here we have them, both positive and implied, in language that cannot be misunderstood. Is it possible, with all your ingenuity, to make your constituents believe that their "Re-