

ation, allowed other Members to speak for him, and certainly the defence was as good as could have been expected: a scene of shuffling. When Mr. McDonald asked those Members if they were privy to this disgraceful transaction, not one of them had the effrontery to give a pointed denial, as would have been done by innocent men, but by evasive and indirect answers endeavoured to screen themselves; one said, "he was not bound to criminate himself," but unthinkingly admitted that he was aware of the alteration, many said they did not make the alteration, and one, (if I am correctly informed,) of the party who assisted to make the change, in his tender mercy said, that "placing Mr. McDonald in the custody of the Sergeant at arms would be treating him too leniently," some said, they "did not do it." In fact, Sir, it was an illustration of the fable of the two thieves, the one who stole a piece of beef, handed it to his companion, and then said, he had not got it, and the other as stoutly denied that he took it. Mr. McDonald in order to substantiate his charge, then moved "that this House resolve itself into a Committee of Privilege," which was got rid of by one of the actors in this farce, moving "the order of the day," which as a matter of course was carried; being opposed only by Messrs. McDonald and Compton. Was this an anonymous charge? Or did the measures taken by the parties to stifle an investigation not show that they were guilty? Fortunately the Public are to judge, and not such an interested Sir Oracius as Vindicator.

Now Sir, I have made that which I never before intended "a charge against the Speaker and some Members of the House of Assembly;" and if my conjecture be correct Vindicator amongst the rest—those who are innocent will not feel annoyed, and those, who are publicly suspected, have an opportunity of clearing themselves in their power.

A few words before closing to Vindicator.—He is perfectly correct in stating that his communication is "rather different" from those which have hitherto appeared in your columns—but whether the contrast will be in his favor is not for me to determine. He says, "Crito had rather have confined himself to his natural sphere." I should be glad to know what time has elapsed, since Vindicator emerged from the insignificance for which his ideas fit him. Passing by some other compliments, he so complacently pays himself, I will tell him that his conjecture as to Crito is as blind and erroneous as the other conclusions he so madly jumps at, as to the estimation in which my communication may be held by Vindicator and his friends, I care not, but am perfectly contented that the comparative merits of Crito and Vindicator should be submitted to the Public.

I should not be at all surprised if some of Vindicator's associates feel an equal degree of surprise and grief, which he so pathetically expresses, that the House of Assembly are not allowed to act as they please without comment or remark, or that some of their proceedings are held up to the scorn and derision they so frequently merit. For Vindicator, the gentlemanly, dispassionate, and eloquent language in which he has clothed his ideas, will prevent me from disputing the palm of delicate invective with him; and now, Sir, comes the unkindest cut of all.—Vindicator says, I have some talent—I am grieved to say it, yet truth compels the avowal, I really cannot return the compliment, I trust the confession will not induce him to commit any bodily injury.

Yours
CRITO.

Charlotte-Town, 22d April, 1833.

For the British American.

*"Thou prun't a rotten tree,
That cannot so much as a blossom yield
In face of all thy pains and husbandry."*

Mr. Editor,—The one or two answers, or I should rather say attempted answers to your correspondent's remarks on the proceedings of the Assembly, have been in such scurrilous and angry language, [for abuse to the guilty conscience is easier than calm reasoning,] that perhaps they are not worth a reply; nor should I now notice either of them, if 'Vindicator' had not the effrontery to complain that he and his solitary companions (the riflemen of the troop) have had nothing tangible to encounter, and also to defy your correspondent "Crito," to produce solid and substantial proofs of a charge, which he [Vind.] contradicts, and for why? because it is the only one of some consistency! I know not Vindicator's conception of the word "tangible;" but in my construction of the term, if he will refer to almost any of your last papers, he will find enough, and more, of such tangible charges, that with all his self-sufficient talents he is not able to contradict, and surely Vind. "appears to be a man of some talent,—that is if we judge him as he does Crito,—by his scurrilous trash."

Vindicator's composition was either composed when in a high state of excitement from the tickling of his employers the Troop, or Crito must have touched his tender part, otherwise he would not have been in such a hurry to take up his cudgels to attack what certainly is not as he styles it, "a charge;" (its consistency with the general tenor of the actions of the T.—I will allow to be very apparent,) for Crito merely states the *on dits* in circulation, and requests from some of your correspondents the true story. I will give my version, without reasoning with Vindicator on his contradiction of a fact the Party themselves

will scarcely deny. I have been informed that several of the members who were in favor of the bill, declared their dissent to a conference on it with the council; and, [I am not quite positive though I believe this to have been the alteration,] the assembly having enacted in the bill that the permanent revenue Laws should be repealed immediately on the royal allowance being given, instead of at the end of 4 years when the other clauses would come in force; the council would not agree to it in that state, and the bill was handed to the speaker to be amended: and he, without taking the opinion of the whole house, which he should have done, [for it is a rule that no bill can be altered without the concurrence of each and every member, unless done in the usual manner by conference,] altered it as suggested with the knowledge of only a few of the members favorable to the bill.

Vind. may please himself with the idea that the proofs he requires cannot be forthcoming, and may fancy that fact will support him, but the public are not to be guzzled so easily, one such truth will not pass off a score of falsehoods, for *le vrai n'est pas toujours le vrai semblable*; and I would notify to him, that the more the talk the greater the exposé. It is sufficient proof that two of the members say, they know not of the alterations; and all who are aware of the proceedings of the House, know that if MacDonald and Compton had not been greenhorns, ignorant of the mode of procedure, and they had moved a resolution of accusation, then we should have had the solid and substantial proofs Vindicator requires.

It is not however likely, the Bill will receive the royal allowance, and though not inimical to it I should be sorry to see it assented to, or such underhand proceedings prosper.—Honesty is the best policy.

I am, &c.

NEMO.

For the British American.

— "Oh Heaven!
Would that a wing were on this honest hand,
To lash such scoundrels,
Naked through the world!"

Mr. Editor,—I have observed [but with neither "grief nor surprise,"] a contemptible communication in your last paper, evidently written by some old woman under the influence of the moon or the gin bottle: for no person possessed of common sense could write such miserable trash as that, to which the signature of "Vindicator" is appended. A hasty perusal of it at first inclined me to attribute such a paltry production to one of the "Troop;" but ignorant and illiterate, as a large majority of that body is, I persuade myself that not one of them (that can write) could be found to indite such a wretched piece of unintelligible jargon. I conclude then, that an old woman is the writer, and a strait jacket and