

Communications.

To J. A. Pierce, Esq.,

Sir,—I presume you remember that the Editor of the Times, when threatening you with his respectable correspondent Fidelity, stated that he had got one eye opened, leaving the impression on the minds of your readers, that he must yet have another, and who, in case you allowed any one to attack him (the Editor) through your paper, would open a crossfire on you, in which he said his safety lay. Having just discovered this sharpshooter, disguised in that article which appeared in the Gleaner of 11th inst., and signed A. B. C., and who seems totally unconscious of his danger, I am inclined to think that I have made my approach on his blind side, and as it is hardly to be expected he will stand his ground, when once started from his ambush, it is not easy to tell where I might find him again, you will I trust, be good enough to allow me a space in the columns of your paper to have one shot at him, and I guarantee to you that I shall either close that eye again or open the other to facts that he never expected to be apprized of in Miramichi. Poor man—how fervently might he apply these lines of the Poet (Burns) to himself—

"Oh! wad some power the giftie gie us,
To see ourselves as others see us—
It wad from monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion."—

Yours, respectfully,

P. F.

To A. B. C., or Thomas O'Kane,

Sir,—On looking over that elaborate article of yours which appeared in the Gleaner of the 11th inst., and signed A. B. C., I at once discovered in you the champion of the Times, and terror of the Gleaner, nicely stowed away behind the screen, in the security of your might and theatrical disguise, which disguise I shall soon shake off you, or at least convince you that you are safer in your own humble character, than any other you can assume. You—like Saint Ruth at the battle of Aghrim, (I presume) thought your name sufficient to intimidate the foe, forgetting perhaps, that that same foe was fully aware of all your weaknesses, faults, and foibles, which you may be willing to acknowledge when I have done with you. So now, Mr Thomas O'Kane, First Class Teacher, and thunderer of the Times, shake off that ugly rag from about your shoulders and answer me a few questions, which the public will, I trust, consider me justified in asking, after having received such a drubbing at your hands through the Times. First—I ask you, could the Editor of the Times say nothing in his own defence, to whose Editorial career Prompter's letter was strictly confined, or if you are now acting under his instructions, and why you have on this occasion left aside that warlike device or family crest, representing crossfiring? (your title, to which I may, probably, have to question you on one of those days) and above all, why you attacked Mr Pierce, being in possession of my name?

The reason is obvious. It is quite evident that the Literati of the Times, in their united strength, were not able to frame a reply sufficient to rebut the letter of Prompter, and hence the only resource, the discharge of your vile though futile invectives through its columns, but which, the contemptuous breath of an indignant public has loathingly blown back in your own face. And then, thinking to evade the punishment justly due, and which seemed to threaten your ass-like conduct, you drop into yourself, to be, what Scripture forbids me calling you, and just what your vain and meaningless letter would represent you to be; which in fact contains nothing but quotations from Prompter's letter, your own shallow opinions, conjectures and suppositions, together with the late proceedings in the House of Assembly, with which the public are thoroughly acquainted: and to show your extensive acquirements, you quote some passages from Scripture, and drag into your worthless effusion the illustrious name of Daniel O'Connell, but not one sentence of my letter refuted: so far from that—you applaud my abilities, and mode of attack, and to crown your absurdity, you boast that many of the public, yourself (probably) included, were capable of doing what I accomplished, if they chose to be equally explicit, which, of itself, should be sufficient to show, that all you could say, amounted to nothing, except to further insult Mr Howe, who deemed you his invincible guard: and the only contradiction you offer to my letter is, that a Family Compact does exist, or at least the effects of it which you compare to the dregs of a glass of wine. A powerful illustration, that—indeed.—But you, however, told us one truth, that your subject was too long for you; but when you dared to assert that you would not stab me in the dark, you trusted too much to your incognito. What must Mr Pierce think of you now? and what a lesson may you not learn from the charitable reply he has made to the scurrility in the Times of the 9th, or what can any person having read Prompter's letter, infer from your reply, but a desire on your part, of making yourself conspicuous; but in what light, and to what extent you have succeeded, rests with the public to determine, and when cured of your vanity, you may, I think, boast of having been your own Doctor, without a single compeer in the practice, except the Editor of the Times.

And now Sir, to your challenge, calling on me to sustain my part, which I consider consists in my qualifications as a Teacher, as does your part also, and the qualifications which the

Laws require you to possess, as a First Class Teacher, these are Spelling, Reading, Writing Arithmetic, English Grammar, Geography, History, Book-keeping, Geometry, Mensuration, Land Surveying, Navigation, and Algebra. Well Sir, although I have never been to a training school, I can prove you deficient in seven of the above branches, (I might say ignorant of) and you cannot say I am taking advantage of you, when I confine myself to the qualifications you are supposed and ought to possess, and I care not before whom I am called, to make good my assertion, and I am willing to allow you the assistance of the Editor of the Colonial Times, as it may give him a chance to revenge that rap he introduces in Theatrical to which I may have occasion to refer at another time. And as you have introduced Arithmetic, I give you below one Question in that branch, to be solved by the rules of Practice, and another in Algebra, as you pretend to know something of it.

1st., In Arithmetic—At 22.2s. per cwt., how many cwt. will £529 17 6d. purchase?
2nd.—In Algebra. What two numbers must I take, whose sum and product 75 will make, that the difference of their squares may be seen to equal 315?

Now Sir, I will give you until ten o'clock A. M. on Wednesday next to solve them. But remember the work must be shown. If you succeed I will give you credit, and advance you to something higher: if you fail, I shall descend to something more simple, always publishing your failures, and before I am quite done with you, I have no doubt but you will pray that I might become silent for another quarter of a Century, or may perhaps, like Horner, be seen some morning making an early start for Richibucto. I remain yours, &c., &c.

PATRICK FLANAGAN.

Chatham, April 15, 1857.

James A. Pierce, Esq.

Dear Sir,—I wish your readers to understand distinctly that I have resigned the office of Prompter, not having been successful in that capacity, I therefore will not notice any anonymous articles that may come through the press. I am yours respectfully,

PATRICK FLANAGAN.

Chatham, April 15, 1857.

Mr Editor,

You will much oblige by inserting the following scraps among your local items.

NOTICE.

The Grey Coats and Button Tearers will meet at Tory Corner, around Pallen's building, this Saturday evening, at the usual hour.

N. B.—It must be distinctly understood that the Grey Coats and Button Tearers have no connection whatever with the Black-Guards next door.

GREAT CASUALTY.

Wrecked on Scurrility rocks, off Old Serpent Bay, the Colonial clipper-built Ship "Clap Trap," "Boo," Master, on voyage from Chatham round the World. This splendid Ship was owned by Messrs. Goose, Goslin, & Co., and built and launched under the special superintendence of Radical's Agent, and classed Z. O., for one year. Lives all saved; but cargo consisting of molasses puncheons, theatrical scenery, and garrotting machines, partly saved, and will be sold at an early day for the benefit of *underwriters* and all concerned; but as the materials have received much damage, it is expected they will realise but little for the parties interested.

Rumour states that the loss of this fine ship was occasioned by the imbecility of the master and the stupidity of the crew.

SABBATH BREAKING.

Mr Editor,—Allow me through you to enquire whether the Law respecting Sabbath Observance is still in force, or has passed into the list of obsolete, though unrepealed Laws. It is painful to see the amount of Sabbath desecration that prevails in our land; to see men engage, not only in the ordinary amusements of driving about our streets and taking pleasure excursions into the country, but even in the more serious employment of brook-driving, fishing, &c. When men are so sunk as to be beyond the reach of the gentler influences of society, are they to pass unnoticed? allowing them all the liberty they can demand to set at defiance and violate the laws of God, are they to be allowed to violate the laws of their country and insult the feelings of their fellow-men with impunity? If there is still a Sabbath Law, which our Magistrates are sworn to enforce, why do we see it so openly and wantonly set at defiance? angling may be defended on the ground of its being a pleasing amusement, and brook-driving may in some instances be regarded as a "work of necessity," but we cannot see how either the plea of amusement or necessity can be urged in favor of the oyster fishery in our river. Would the delay of a day be attended with any serious risk? We do hope that if the force of law cannot, the force of enlightened public opinion may be brought to bear upon those who unnecessarily engage in it on the Sabbath, and that the feelings of christian men and christian women on the way to and from their respective places of worship, in a professedly christian land, may not again be harrowed up by such exhibitions of reckless disregard of Divine and human law, as well as of the conventional decencies of civilized society as were witnessed at the Bridge last Lord's Day. Yours

Kingston, April 13, 1857.

OUR REPRESENTATIVES.

To the Editor of the Gleaner,

Sir,—I now resume my remarks on the sayings and doings of the Liberal Representatives of this County. There is no doubt they have pursued a course which cannot fail to alienate from them every high-minded, honorable, and independent man.

On their return from Fredericton, they immediately commenced operations—without waiting for the people to take any action in the matter, they at once invited their most able and influential supporters to meet them at Bowser's Hotel.

The course they resolved upon there, shows plainly that they knew their conduct would not bear investigation; but in order to make all sure and slip in quietly, they determined to invite Mr Kerr to come out on their ticket, to prevent Mr Street from being brought forward, and thus avoid a contest.

If, as they state, this County is the stronghold of Liberalism, why are they afraid of a contest? Why invite Mr Kerr to run with them? The reason is obvious.

They knew that if the Conservatives brought out four Candidates, their chances (the Liberals) would be small indeed—but if they could succeed in preventing a contest, all would be right—but in this object they failed. Mr Kerr declined the invitation. He did not fear an appeal to the people—he felt that his conduct had been so independent and correct, that he could come before his Constituents and abide by their decision.

The next movement was made by posting handbills on the 1st of April, (all fools day) calling on John M. Johnson, Richard Sutton, Peter Mitchell, and George Kerr, Esquires, to attend a Political Meeting, at the Sons of Temperance Hall, and explain their conduct during the late Session. These handbills had not a single signature attached to them. By whom then was the meeting called? It was evidently a preconcerted movement between the Liberal Candidates and their friends. The proper mode of calling such a meeting would have been by a number of Freeholders signing a requisition to that effect. Had such a course been pursued, there is no doubt Mr Kerr would have attended, and given the most satisfactory account of his conduct in the House.

But under the circumstances he was perfectly right in not taking any notice of the April fool placard. The meeting took place, and we were sorry to find there was some difficulty in getting a Chairman, which however was obviated by a gentleman saying, if no one else would take the Chair he would, and suiting the action to the word, placed himself in it. The fact is significant, showing that even among their own supporters it was difficult to find a Chairman. Having at length got the matter straight, Mr Sutton commenced, and gave the meeting an account of his sayings and doings, and the reasons why he had opposed the Government.

The charge he brought against them was that they had not expended as much money upon the Public Works, &c., in Miramichi as they had in St. John; but it was easy to perceive that this was not the real cause of his opposition—a desire to turn out the Government, no matter whether they were right or whether they were wrong. He concluded his remarks by stating that, if returned, he would pursue the course he had hitherto pursued.

Mr Johnson next took the floor, and commenced by making a savage onslaught on the Editor of the Head Quarters and another individual that was nameless, and whom he declined naming though repeatedly called upon to do so. We care not to repeat the expressions he used in regard to those gentlemen. He pronounced the account (given by the Head Quarters) of the proceedings, on the last day of the Session, a tissue of lies. This is somewhat singular, as the statement given by that paper is corroborated by several gentlemen who were in the House on that day, and who declare that the statement given by the "Head Quarters Extra" is substantially correct.

Mr Johnston carefully abstained from going very deeply into a justification of the opposition on their motion of Want of Confidence; but gliding over that he attacked the Government on the Election Law, Railway bills, &c., &c., well knowing at the time that it was owing to the attitude assumed by the factious opposition that compelled the Government to act as they did. He referred to his incorruptibility in not accepting office, which he declared he might have had while in Fredericton. This contrasts strangely with the declaration made by Mr Allen, the Solicitor General. He declares that if Mr McPherson and himself had resigned, Mr Johnson and Mr Smith were both ready and willing to take their places. Mr Johnson spoke at great length going into a great deal of matter that was foreign to the subject, and concluded by saying, that if he had behaved badly while in Fredericton, he would (if sent back) behave still worse.

Mr Mitchell next addressed the audience.—This gentleman laboured under considerable disadvantage, as Mr Johnson had occupied so much time that the people began to get fidgety, his remarks therefore were brief—his opposition to the Government seemed to be based on the ground, that from the political antecedents of the Attorney General, and Provincial Secretary, he had no confidence whatever in them, nor could he have any in a Government of which they were members; and concluded by declaring (like his fellow labourers) that if sent back he would act still worse than he had done.

After Mr Mitchell had concluded one would have supposed that as the meeting was com-

posed (with few exceptions) of Liberals, a resolution would have passed approving of the conduct of those Gentlemen, and pledging themselves to support them at the approaching Election. But nothing of the sort was attempted, evidently showing that the meeting was not satisfied with the explanations given by the Honorable Gentlemen. Finally Mr Johnson expressed his regret that some of the opposite party were not present, the sincerity of which we very much doubt.

A vote of thanks was given to the Chairman, and some one proposed three cheers, whether for the Queen, or the great Liberals, did not appear, and the meeting dispersed.

Since that time a requisition has been in circulation, calling upon Messrs Johnson, Sutton, and Mitchell, to come forward again; and by whom gentle reader do you think this requisition has been circulated? Why by some of the Candidates themselves! Is it not melancholy to think that these men have fallen so low that there are none now to do them reverence—none to relieve them of the degrading task. How are the mighty fallen!

And when we find that Mr Fisher has resigned the Leadership of the great Liberal party who can only arrive at the conclusion that he thought of the opposition, as Falstaff did of his ragamuffins, that they were such a pitiful set, that he would not be seen at their head.

"Prompt in revenge, and rancorous in hate,
"Resolved to ruin or to rule the state."

More anon.

I am, Sir,

A FREEHOLDER.

Chatham, 15th April, 1857.

To the Freeholders of Northumberland,

GENTLEMEN,—We are accustomed, in the common affairs of life, before committing ourselves to any decided course of action, to give matters our serious consideration. We consider the policy of the step proposed to be taken, weigh the advantages and disadvantages, and decide accordingly. For example—if we are about to engage a mechanic or laborer to do a piece of work, we will first ascertain whether he has the capacity and integrity to perform it well and faithfully.

The Elective Franchise is one of the most important privileges we enjoy under the British Constitution. A few days hence we shall have to select four members to represent us in our Provincial Parliament—and it becomes our duty to see that the Franchise is wisely exercised—that we put "the right men in the right place."

In the coming struggle no great Political principle will be involved. The battle of Constitutional Government has already been fought, and so far as the responsibility of the Executive to the people is concerned, Responsible Government is a settled fact. No Government can now exist contrary to the "well understood wishes of the people."

It is assumed that the Candidates at the approaching Election will be Messrs. Street, Kerr, Johnson, Mitchell, Sutton, and the question for our consideration is—what four of these gentlemen are the most fit and proper persons to represent us in our Legislative Halls.

Now, these gentlemen have all been returned for the County before, and by their past political career we must judge what their future is likely to be. No man deserves to be thanked for doing his duty, and it may therefore be assumed that whatever good they did while our representatives, was no more than they had a right to do. In judging then of their fitness to represent us, we have simply to enquire, what are the objections that may be urged against them?

We will first deal with Mr Street.

Objection 1. He resides in County of York—his business, his property, his interest lie on the other side of the Province—"Where a man's treasure is there will his heart be also." It is then but fair to conclude, that Mr Street feels a deeper interest in the Counties of York and St. John than he does in the County of Northumberland. But it may be replied to the objection under consideration—Look at Nova Scotia—the Hon. Joseph Howe resides in the capital, and represents Windsor, and in our own Province, Mr Watters resides in St. John, and was returned for Victoria. We are willing to admit there might be nothing in the objection, could we not find within our own borders, a man as fit and proper as Mr Street to represent us. It is patent to the country, that that gentleman, in his political capacity, was never popular in this County, and that he was always returned through the influence of our most influential firm. The last Election fully proved that fact, for when on that occasion the support of that firm was withdrawn from him, or very feebly exercised in his favour, he was defeated. 'Tis true that on his being made Attorney General, he was returned by show of hands—the man who would have opposed him under the circumstances would not have risen in our estimation. On that occasion he met with no opposition. Had it been a General Election, the case might have been otherwise. As to Mr Street's ability as a Statesman, is it not patent that while he was leader of the Government his colleagues had no confidence in his judgement, and actually trembled whenever he opened his lips on the floors of the House, lest by his rashness he might place the Government in a dilemma. But have we not many men within our County just as fit to represent us as Mr Street. They may be met with every day on our public streets—they are the men who are doing extensive businesses in the country, and whose personal interests are identical with the prosperity of the County.

Objection 2.—Mr Street sacrificed the interests.