

subscribers had paid me promptly, I should not have been compelled to discontinue the paper. The Palladium, however, continued to spread, until in the space of 19 months I had the barren gratification to find Prince Edward Island indebted to me about four hundred pounds, a large proportion of which is yet unpaid. When so much was due to me in so short time, it could not be expected that I would be clear of debt and difficulty. My creditors demanded payment of their accounts faster than I could realize money from my subscribers to meet the demand: and thus, whilst difficulties and embarrassments stared me in the face out of doors, treachery assailed me within. What bad subscribers and relentless creditors could not do to stop the publication of the *Palladium*, was promptly done by false and treacherous friends. Although there is anything but pleasure in reverting to these things, thank God there is no incident or circumstance connected with them discreditable to me. I neither wished nor attempted to fly from my difficulties; nor from the malice of my detractors: I lived to see the storm break over my head, and to watch the slow approach of sunshine, though none of those who encouraged me to trust to hollow-hearted scoundrels who assumed the mask of friendship, came forward to shield me from its violence. That any peculiar prejudices of mine did not cause the suspension of, or operate against, the *Palladium*, is evident enough from those facts; and I have the good fortune to be able to fortify my position in this instance, by quoting from your own published correspondence. In a letter addressed to the editor of the *Palladium*, dated "New London, Nov. 1844," you wrote as follows:—

"It is lamentable to learn, from the columns of the *Palladium*, the *indifference* and *apathy* with which the people of this Colony view the continued existence among them of the only able and independent press they ever had the good fortune to possess—an *apathy* which I can attribute to *nothing* but *ignorance* of the immense moral power of an engine without which no people may hope, or deserve, a redress of grievances."

In this passage you do not give me the remotest hint respecting the prejudices which you assert were put in opposition to the views of my supporters: the declining fortunes of the paper you can attribute to *nothing* but ignorance of the moral power of the press, on the part of its subscribers: this testimony was written more than a year after the paper was in existence: it was "able and independent" then,—it could not have been pronounced worthy of such praise, had I made it the vehicle of my own national prejudices. In 1846—long after the *Palladium* had stopped, you wrote to me, that you were so disgusted with the people whose "bigotted stupidity suppressed the *Palladium*," as to induce you to retire from public life after the summer of 1846! Now, supposing that I had infused some of the spirit of my country into the columns of the paper, I would have done no more than what was due to the feelings and opinions of a majority of my subscribers, who, like myself, cherished the remembrance of their native soil; and on this head, I would have been, I believe, a far better judge than such a person as you, having greater facilities to learn the disposition of the public mind. It was not my wish, however, to make the paper peculiarly Irish or Catholic in its tone; but to communicate through its columns, as any unbiassed newspaper editor is bound to do, such information upon Irish affairs as might be relied upon, and honestly put in opposition to the hideous lies and atrociously vile misrepresentations which were, and are yet, constantly flooding some of the English Tory journals, and which continue to be reprinted even in this Island by the publication you now patronize. It would, no doubt, have pleased you well, to read from week to week extracts from the *Evening Post* or *Times*, in which the Irish would be denounced as "a nation of savages," and her priests "a horde of surplised ruffians"—"repeal a humbug and a lie"—O'Connell and his friends and fellow-workers in the cause of Irish nationality, "a set of unprincipled impostors;" and because I left these and similar things to be dished up afresh by the "man of straw" in the *Islander* office, as food for the morbid appetite of such people as you, I am, forsooth, to be accused of putting my "prejudices" in opposition to those of my subscribers! I hope I may never so far forget myself, as to yield those honest "prejudices," if they are such, and become a panderer to the hatred of Ireland which rankles in the bosoms of men of your stamp, or assume the hypocritical

cant that would leave me the weak and spiritless slave to your intolerance.

EDWARD WHELAN.

September 8, 1848.

#### COLONIAL EXPENDITURE.

The following speech by Mr. HAWES, Under Secretary for the Colonies, was delivered in reply to Sir Wm. Molesworth's speech—which we reprinted in last Monday's *EXAMINER*—on the subject of Great Britain's Colonial expenditure.

Mr. Hawes said that whether he regarded the importance of this debate, or the magnitude of the subject and the multitude of details it involved, he might venture to solicit the kindness and indulgence of the house whilst he drew somewhat largely on its attention.—The hon. member for Gateshead (Mr. Hutt) had impugned, not the colonial policy of the present day, but of England itself; reproaches had been heaped on the Colonial-office, and on the noble lord now at its head, of which he humbly begged to take his share. Without presuming to defend all the errors and defects that might have characterised the colonial government of past times, he would say that, taken as a whole, that government had been the most successful and free that the world had ever witnessed. (Hear, hear.) Where, amongst the colonies of foreign powers, could there be found the same success, the same progress, the same establishment of free institutions and equal laws, a free press, and trial by jury, as existed in the whole of our colonies? (Hear, hear.) Could any foreign possession be named where the personal liberty of the colonists was secured to the same extent as in our colonies? Much had been said on the system of the first American colonies ought to be taken as models for modern colonisation. He thought very differently. He hardly knew one of those colonies which had not for years been exposed to the most violent vicissitudes and misfortunes. As to their being composed of every grade of society; when and where did any of the aristocracy, or any men of great eminence, go out for the purpose of colonising, and not for the simple and sole purpose of obtaining wealth? There was not one of our modern colonies to which he would not point as a most triumphant contrast to the old American colonies—whether in New Zealand, South Australia, Port Phillip; wherever in late years we have attempted to found a colony, success the most marked had attended that effort. Not a single colony could be named amongst the old American colonies whose success had been so rapid as that of Australia. The hon. member for Southwark had said that the patronage of the colonial-office was distributed amongst needy adventurers, and the poor relations of those having parliamentary influence; but he might have recollected name after name of those who were colonial governors at present which would have given the most decisive answer to that imputation.—Under the past and present governments men of the most distinguished ability and the highest character had been called to these offices; amongst them he might name Lord Metcalfe, Lord Durham, Lord Elgin, Lord Harris, and Sir W. Colebrooke, about to go to Barbadoes. Were these men having parliamentary influence, or were they not marked out by their own fitness and ability for the situations to which they had been appointed? Remarks in that house were addressed, not only to this country, but to the colonies; and it was important to show that the appointments had not been made from the sordid motives assigned. He might refer to Sir More O'Ferrall, in Malta; to Sir C. Grey, in New Zealand; and to Lord Harris, in Trinidad. Could any man impugn these appointments, or say that they had proceeded from sordid motives? The hon. member would confer on all the colonies self-government, and would make it the rule. To a large extent he (Mr. Hawes) concurred in the propriety of this rule, where the colonies were fit for its application. But the general maxim admitted of a great qualification. In Canada self-government was carried to the utmost point: could the system be extended to the little island of Nevis, or even to Mauritius, which partook of the character of a military possession, as well as that of a colony, and where imperial interests had to be consulted quite as much as those of the colonists?—Moreover, where there existed hostile races, and the European population were in a great minority, representative government might place a tyrannical power in the hands of the majority. Here the moderating influence of the crown came in, and had been more beneficial in maintaining harmonious action between the different races than self-government could possibly be.

Our colonies might be grouped into four great classes: territorial possessions—possessions where we sought to extend emigration and to diffuse the British name, race, and language, as the colonies in North America, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand. Another class were our plantations, the great object of which was trade and the supply of this country with tropical produce; and here again were great anomalies and some difficulties to deal with in applying the doctrine of self-government. Next came our trading possessions held as depots, Hong-Kong, Lahore, and the settlements on the west coast of Africa. These great possessions were placed under very different circumstances, and established for very different purposes, and did not admit of one

uniform system of government. Then there were our great military stations, to which the hon. baronet did not mean to apply the principle he had laid down. In colonies so varied, it was impossible to establish a uniform system of government; the system must vary with the varying circumstances and necessities of the colonists. Local self-government ought to be the general rule; whenever the colony was morally and physically fitted for it, it ought to be the first duty of the government to confer it. The hon. baronet would not abandon any of our colonies; but how was it possible to govern them without some central home authority? That authority must exist in some form or shape very similar to its present one. What was meant by the "despotic authority of the Colonial-office?" Where could such authority possibly be exercised? The colonial minister was amenable to parliament; he, a very humble individual, was there to explain and defend, as far as he deemed it right, whatever had been impugned in colonial policy. If a judge was displaced, he soon found an advocate to bring his case before that house. He might refer to the discussion on the past government of New Zealand; that had been brought repeatedly under its notice; and great good had been the result. He utterly denied the existence of any "despotic authority," or "occult influence," such as had been alluded to, or of any action or principle of action which he should be ashamed to avow and defend in that house. He utterly repudiated all the unworthy insinuations which had been cast on the proceedings of an important department of the government, rather, he supposed, to give a zest to speeches, than for any good and useful purpose. (Hear, hear.) But these attacks tended to undermine our authority in the colonies; and, therefore, a case ought to be fully capable of proof before it was submitted to that house. (Hear, hear.) Canada possessed the largest measure of self-government; she had her own parliament—made her own laws, with scarcely any interference from the imperial authority; she imposed her own taxes, and expended their produce; in fact, she had the most large and comprehensive measure of self-government that any colony could by possibility possess. Not only had she a local self-government, but a responsible government. The present governor general had succeeded in fully conducting the government on the principle of responsibility, which was not done until he held the reins. He had acted as the governor of a great colony, without reference to one party or another, and the ministers he had appointed had been those in whom the majority of the house of representatives had confidence. (Hear, hear.) At a time when the greatest changes, apprehension, and anxiety were going on in Europe, Canada was perfectly tranquil and content; there was no attempt either to promote revolution or stir up excitement; the colonists relied on the government they had, which was a government in conformity with the majority of the House of Assembly and of the electors. (Hear, hear.) Again in New Brunswick, the most complete measure of local self-government had been conferred. On the 23rd June last, Earl Grey had addressed a despatch to the governor of that colony, recommending him to "endeavour to form such a council as he thought would command the greatest confidence of the inhabitants and their representatives, and thus secure a general support in carrying on the government; and, at the same time, carefully to abstain from committing himself to the leaders of any one political party, in such a manner as to place him under difficulty in obtaining similar constitutional support from their opponents, should any change of circumstances give them the majority." (Hear, hear.) In Nova Scotia a change of administration had taken place; the province was satisfied with the change, and the new government were now conducting and receiving the general support of the assembly. In a despatch to the governor of New Brunswick, of 3d Nov. 1846, Lord Grey said, "The object with which I recommend to you this course is that of making it apparent that any transfer which you may authorise of political power from the hands of one party in the province to those of another, is the result, not of an act of yours, but of the wishes of the people themselves, as shown by the difficulty experienced by the retiring party in carrying on the government of the province according to the forms of the constitution. (Hear, hear.) Thus New Brunswick enjoyed self-government and responsible government. Our North American colonies generally possessed largely the benefit of the British constitution, and they also had the minimum of interference by the Colonial-office. Some hard observations had been made on the bill passed by the government for New Zealand. That bill would have conferred a good constitution on the colony; it made, for the first time, a most important provision for enfranchising the natives themselves, of whom a great number would soon be qualified to claim the franchise, for a more intelligent set of men and better subjects he did not believe existed anywhere. (Hear, hear.) It was said the bill sent out to Australia had created the greatest dissatisfaction; but it had only been sent out to elicit the opinions of the colonists. Those opinions were adverse, and there was an end of it; but in all probability the result would be to establish a representative constitution in New South Wales, with full provisions for altering and amending it from time to time as the colonists might see fit. (Hear, hear.) This was surely no despotic interference. (Hear, hear.) It was said the Cape of Good Hope ought to have a representative government; and the hon. member had attempted