

# The Examiner.

"THIS IS TRUE LIBERTY, WHEN FREEBORN MEN—HAVING TO ADVISE THE PUBLIC, MAY SPEAK FREE."—EURIPIDES.

VOL. II.]

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1848.

[No. 57.]

TO DUNCAN MACLEAN, Esq., M. P. P.

No. II.

"So keen thy hunter, and thy scent so strong,  
Thy turns and doublings cannot save thee long."

SIR;

Of all things it is the most amusing to find two such men as you and Donald Montgomery claiming the virtue of consistency, and sighing for applause, as though you were the most immaculate patriots alive. As for Montgomery, I believe it would be difficult to find either in or out of the Island a man of so small an intellect so full of political connivance. You and Mr. N. Conroy did occasionally, in the session of 1847, give a liberal vote, as though you seemed to be anxious to cast "a longing, lingering look behind" to the sessions of 1843, '44, and '45, when with Mr. Cooper at your head, and Messrs. Rae, McIntosh, D. McDonald, and Fraser at your side, you confronted the Tories in every division, and when you were looked upon as the most obstinate of the Liberals; but as for Montgomery, I cannot find his name in a single division, during the sessions of 1847 and 1848, on the same side with the liberals, when any question involving political principle was at stake. You will ask, who are now the liberals? Not Mr. Heath Haviland—not Mr. Edward Palmer—not Mr. William Douse—not Mr. Francis Longworth—not Dr. Conroy. With these gentlemen I find Montgomery invariably voting—sometimes you, and sometimes Mr. N. Conroy. What excuse can you offer for voting on party questions against Mr. Rae—THE INCORRUPTIBLE, according to your opinion—against Messrs. McIntosh, D. McDonald, Fraser, &c.? You have accounted for my political conversion in a curious manner—in reference to which I shall have an opportunity by and bye, of addressing you a *polite* word or two, when you say that my having received £60 will be taken 'as a sufficient reason for my rattling.' I have never stood opposed to Messrs. McIntosh, Rae, Fraser, Le Lacheur, McDonald, &c. Will you dare to tell us that they likewise received sums of money to change their views, which long years of persecution, imprisonment, and calumny could not alter? When you come to these names you are obliged to fly back to your old hobby, which was well nigh ridden to death by Pope in the Assembly, by the *Islander* and by the defunct *Constitutionalist*—namely, that they had taken part with Sir Henry, and therefore must have changed!

Throughout the session of 1847, your opposition to the liberals was strongly marked by hatred of Sir Henry, and to gratify that hatred you joined with Pope and his party. You assailed the Government in 1843 and 1844, in your letters in the *Palladium*: Messrs. Pope and Palmer were members of that Government then; and yet you joined their secret councils and voted with them in 1847. Your hatred of Sir Henry continued whilst he remained in the Island, because he ordered a prosecution for libel to be commenced against you; yet that prosecution, as I shewed in 1846, whilst conducting the *Morning News*, was undertaken in compliance with Mr. Pope's repeated advices and importunities, who would say to the Governor, 'the only way you have of putting down that man (Duncan Maclean) is to touch his pocket.' Notwithstanding, you became the political associate of this man who pronounced you avaricious and instigated the prosecution against you.

It was intimated in the *Examiner* of the 16th May, that you, Messrs. Montgomery and Conroy have not promoted, as you should have done, and as your constituents were led to believe you would, the question of Responsible Government: After Messrs. Little's and McDougall's removal from the Assembly in 1847, you, Messrs. Conroy and Montgomery, voted, in opposition to the liberal party, to postpone the consideration of Responsible Government till two members for the Third District of Queen's County should be returned; and you were well aware, as every body else was, that those two

members would be Messrs. A. McLean and Douse, who were not favourable to the question. But when the question did come before the House, on motion of Mr. Rae, you sought to strangle it by introducing, as an amendment, that most ridiculous of all propositions, namely, that at the commencement of a new Parliament, members of the Assembly should not hold private conversations with the Lieutenant Governor; and this proposition was offered in a full House not two months after the Speaker claimed from His Excellency in the Council Chamber, on behalf of the members of the Assembly, and according to ancient usage, 'free access to the Lieutenant Governor upon all occasions.' In support of this unstatesman-like and silly proposition, you had the votes of all the Tories in the House, including, of course, that 'humble and obedient servant' of the Compact, Donald Montgomery, all of whom had a direct interest in casting censure upon any of those gentlemen of the Assembly who were intimate with the Governor, whilst they themselves were not. To Mr. Nicholas Conroy's credit, be it remembered, he did not vote for this resolution; and to your credit, it can be said, you did not vote for Mr. Pope's address to the Queen on Responsible Government, which was moved in the House by Mr. J. Longworth, whilst Messrs. Conroy and Montgomery did vote for that Address, which, if its principles had been carried out, would be as different from the Responsible Government understood and practised in the other Colonies as day is from night. A few days after the debate on this question, I find Mr. Montgomery voting for Mr. Palmer's resolution to recommit the address on Responsible Government, when Messrs. Douse and A. Maclean had taken their seats for the third District of Queen's County, so that if the address had been recommitted, it would, inevitably, have been lost; and some praise is due to you and Mr. Conroy for your firmness on that occasion. On the resolutions respecting the 'ambiguous' clause in the Act 6th Will. 4, cap. 24, you and Messrs. N. Conroy and Montgomery voted with the Tory party in the House; and your votes were given on that occasion, lest any of Sir Henry's friends might be honoured with a seat in Council without being subjected to the expense of a new Election.

Another question on which Montgomery betrayed his party was that relating to the appointment of Sheriffs. An address was presented by Mr. Warburton which passed the House, praying His Excellency not to select the same individual for the Shrievalty two years in succession. It was necessary for the Chief Justice, in whom is vested the power of nominating the Sheriffs, to understand the wish of the Assembly in reference to this subject, and accordingly on the 13th April, Mr. Rae moved, 'that a message be sent to His Excellency, requesting him to cause to be transmitted to the Chief Justice a copy of the Address of the House of Assembly, in relation to the appointment of Sheriffs.' This motion was defeated by Mr. Palmer moving the previous question. Mr. Rae again moved the following resolution:

'Resolved, That the House of Assembly cannot fail to be aware that the Lieutenant Governor could not reappoint the same individual as Sheriff, year by year, consecutively, unless the Chief Justice put down his name as one of the three eligible to office; and as there are now in all the Counties many individuals qualified to fill that office, it appears contrary to the spirit of the Statute of this Island, and diametrically opposite both to the letter of the law in Britain, and to the practice there, to insert as one of the three individuals eligible to the office of Sheriff for any County, the name of the individual whose tenure of said office has not ceased when such list is made out.'

Mr. Palmer tried to evade this resolution in the same manner as he did the former one, and thus defeat the object contemplated by the address before alluded to; but he did not succeed, although Mr. Donald Montgomery voted with him.

From these votes, to which I have hastily turned in the Journals of 1847, the change in your conduct, and

in that of Mr. Montgomery, particularly, is most clear and indisputable. That you even admitted this change, is evident from a remark made by you at the close of the session to Mr. Coles—who will, I have no doubt, readily substantiate it. On returning from the Legislative Council to the Assembly Room, and alluding to that part of the Governor's Speech in which he pronounced his adhesion to the doctrines of Responsible Government, you remarked to Mr. Coles: 'Had that Speech been delivered at the beginning of the Session the conduct of some members in the Assembly would have been different from what it was.'

But in the following session, 1848, when Governor Huntley was not here to afford you a pretext for your recreancy—when Governor Campbell pronounced no opinion on Responsible Government—if there was any difference in your conduct, the difference was for the worse and not for the better. Your first acts, as I pointed out last week, were the expulsion of Mr. Coles and of Mr. Warburton. In reference to these matters, I cannot refrain from expressing my belief that had Mr. Nicholas Conroy been uninfluenced, his vote would have been given in favour of Messrs. Coles and Warburton, for, as he himself said in a conversation at Mr. Pleadwell's, a day or two before the discussion, 'if he voted to retain Mr. Warburton and Mr. Coles, he was sure he could not give a more popular vote.'

The next act in which you shewed your abandonment of Liberal Principles, was in advocating and voting for Mr. Palmer's Bill providing pay for such members of the Legislative Council as might reside 20 miles out of Town. This was a very clumsy and ill-directed blow at the independence of the Legislative Council, in which there is a majority opposed to Mr. Palmer's politics; and that Body acted with becoming spirit when, after the first reading, they disdained to notice the bantling.

Your next act of importance was to assist the Tories in creating a new office, and burthening the country with a salary of 500l. a year to an assistant Judge, which will probably be the means of putting a Land Agent on the Bench, and a Land Proprietor in the office of Solicitor General.

Your next scheme was a Census Bill, which, although it may be a useful measure, was not necessary, and should have been postponed till some other year when the Revenue could better afford the expense attending it.

The next vote in which you betrayed the principles of the party to which you formerly adheared, was in favour of the addition of Five Hundred Pounds to the Salary of His Excellency the Lieut. Governor. You will not have the hardihood, I presume, to tell your constituents that this was a popular measure—that His Excellency's Salary was too small, and that the resources of the Colony were most abundant. Pope was said to have quarrelled with Governor Huntley on the subject of an increase to His Salary—Mr. Palmer is said to have defeated a similar appropriation on a former occasion by his vote, and was much applauded by his constituents for so doing. Had you and they been always in favour of the grant, no one would have doubted the purity of your motives in advocating it; but that you were not always in favour of it, is a fact too notorious to be denied. The reason which you assigned for your own change of opinion upon this point, was the most ludicrous that any man in his senses could offer. Your argument was, I believe: Had Sir Henry Huntley received the additional Salary, he would not have been so bad a Governor; therefore you offered it to Sir Donald, as a bribe, to keep him from imitating Sir Henry's evil deeds! Sir Donald ought to be, and I am sure he is, heartily obliged to you for the compliment. It is not, however, with your arguments, which are never worth much—that I have to deal. My object is to shew a change of principle on your part; and this vote for the 500l. is a remarkable case in point. From the