

The Examiner.

AND SEMI-WEEKLY INTELLIGENCE.

"THIS IS TRUE LIBERTY WHEN FREE-BORN MEN—HAVING TO ADVISE THE PUBLIC—MAY SPEAK FREE."—MILTON'S EURIPIDES.

New Series.

CHARLOTTETOWN, NOVEMBER 20, 1850.

Vol. 1: No. 83

ORIGINAL POETRY.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

THE WITHERING LEAVES.

I.

The Summer is gone and the Autumn is here,
And the flowers are strewing their earthly
bier;
A dreary mist o'er the woodland swims,
And the beech-nuts fall from the waving limbs;
From bough to bough the squirrels run,
And chirp at the noise of my echoing gun,
While the hare starts up as my footstep
leaves
The rustling drifts of the Withering Leaves.

II.

The flocks pursue their southern flight—
Some all the day and some all night,
And up from our dense deep forests come
The sound of the watchful partridge's drum.
On the loftiest tree sits the mourning crow,
Clothed in his funeral suit of woe—
All nature mourns—and my spirit grieves
At the noise of my feet in the Withering
Leaves.

III.

Oh! I sigh for the days that have passed away,
When my life, like the year, had its season of
May—
When the world was all Sunshine, and Beauty,
and Truth,
And the dew bathed my feet in the Valley of
Youth;
Then my heart was all glee, and no bird of
the sky
Ever sang with more rapture and gladness
than I.
But that Youth is a fable, and Beauty deceives,
Is a Truth which I learn from the Withering
Leaves.

IV.

Now I sigh for the time when the reapers at
morn
Came in from the field at the sound of the
Horn;
Or, when dragging the rake, I followed them
out,
While they tossed their light sheaves with
their laughter about.
Then away through the field with boy-daring I
ran,
But stubbles foreshadow'd the path of the
man!
Now the uplands of life lie all barren of
sheaves
While my footsteps are loud in THE WITHER-
ING LEAVES.

OLD MAN.

Charlottetown, November 19, 1850.

THE EXAMINER.

Wednesday, November 20, 1850.

The Land Question again.

MACLEAN'S editorship of the *Islander* is every week strengthening the presumption, that its subscribers are the most indulgent of newspaper patrons, or the veriest blockheads that ever disgraced a community, since he is permitted, apparently without remonstrance, to keep perpetually dinning into their ears the vilest falsehoods that were ever yet propagated by a party hack. He has published the same lies over and over so many times, that it is reasonable to suppose, his perception of what is true and what is false is completely unsettled, and that he has come to put faith in his own ridiculous inventions from repeating them so often. If the oligarchy, who make a tool of him and his pumpkin-headed printer, were not as unprincipled as he, he would long since have been dismissed from the *Islander* office with disgrace.

The old story about the Liberals promising at the last General Election to escheat the Township lands, is made the

text for another column of twaddle in the *Islander* of Friday last. Because Maclean says such a "promise" was made, are we bound to believe him? On the contrary, knowing the unscrupulous and mendacious character of the asserter, we may fairly believe the subject was never once whispered or thought of at any of the Hustings. Why not say which of the candidates made the "promise," and substantiate the assertion by producing the testimony of some respectable electors who heard it made? He might as well tell us, that the Liberals promised to make a private road to every man's cottage—put a watch in the fob of every farmer's son—get a husband for every farmer's daughter—stop the potatoes from rotting, the wheat from rusting—give sunshine and shower just when they are wanted; or any other promise equally absurd. We want something better than the mere word of a man who can no more avoid uttering falsehoods than he can avoid the savage guttural in which he enunciates them.

He says he has "already proved most conclusively that the Assembly, under Responsible Government, would have no power" of settling the land question. The proof, however, is nowhere to be found. We are told, indeed, at the conclusion of the paragraph, that such a settlement would not be possible "if Whelan were Queen's Printer and Coles' Treasurer!" Why not possible? O, says Maclean, all they ever meant by Responsible Government was to get themselves into those offices. Truly this is a magnificent proof, and a magnificent definition of Responsible Government! Why then has he so long laboured, and laboured in vain, to make the question unpopular? Surely, Whelan's and Coles' meaning could be exposed in a single sentence, and there would be an end of it. And the entire majority of the Assembly must, forsooth, play false to their constituents, so that the pecuniary interests of two of their party may be served! And the eighteen constituencies whom that majority represent, could not discern this meaning at the General Election! Maclean, with superhuman intelligence and sagacity, was alone capable of diving into the bosoms of "Whelan and Coles," and enlightening the public as to their designs! Surely the wretched old driveller is sinking into second childhood.

The old saw which says "comparisons are odious," was never more significant than it is when Maclean compares his Land settlement scheme to that proposed by Mr. Coles in the session of 1848. We shall briefly refer to them.

When Mr. Maclean brought forward his Land Purchase Bill in the Session of 1848, Mr. Coles proposed his in amendment, because he and his friends thought its principle a sounder one. The amendment was opposed by Maclean and the

whole of the Tory party, and lost. Mr. Maclean's Bill was then moved, and the whole of the Tory party again voted against it (in Committee), and it would have been lost too, had not the Liberals voted for it. Yet Maclean strives to insinuate that it was carried by the votes of none but the "terrible Tories." He says it was thrown out of the Council by the allies of the Liberal party in that Branch of the Legislature. But suppose it had passed there, is there the least reason to believe it would have received the sanction of the Governor, when Mr. Palmer—an Executive Councillor—gave it his most determined opposition in the Assembly? Why has that gentleman escaped the censure of Maclean? Why is he not accused of hostility to the interests of the Tenantry? The answer is obvious: Mr. Palmer carried round a subscription list to realize the necessary funds to pay Maclean for editing the *Islander*.

Mr. Coles' Bill is called an *impracticable* measure, because, says Maclean, the purchase it contemplated should be voluntary—and that it would require more than a million of pounds to carry it out, to be obtained on loan at 6 per cent. interest. The premises, for the most part, being utterly false, the conclusion is false. Mr. Coles' Bill went to authorize the Government to purchase, where Proprietors would be willing to sell, at a rate not exceeding 5s. per acre. Mr. Worrell offered his lands at this price; and the Bill provided that at no time the Government should purchase more than £20,000 worth,—the tenant to have his land at cost and charges—not to be compelled to pay annually more than what he now pays as rent, and in about fifteen years to be free; but to have the privilege of paying for the whole at once. According to Maclean's Bill, the proprietors should be compelled to sell at 10s. per acre, and if a tenant would be "so obstinate" as not to purchase from the Government within the time limited by the Bill, his farm should be sold to put the Government in funds: so that if a poor devil happened to be minus, within the limited period, of the amount of the demand made upon him, Government would send him adrift, whether he was willing or no. Duncan puts a suppositious case, which looks exceedingly pretty on paper. "For example," he says, "if a farm, sold by Government under the Bill of the late majority brought £100, and only £30 due for instalments, £70 in cash would be paid over to the tenant." But suppose it did not bring £100, what then? Government must sell the tenant out, whatever were got for his land; and even supposing £100 were obtained, what mighty benefit would the tenant derive from his £70? If he wanted another farm, he would have to pay £50 for a piece of wilderness land, and would have the magnificent sum of £20

to build a house and barn, and clear his land, not taking into account his loss of time and labour, and the advances previously made to the Government, besides the severance of old ties, and the abandonment of long cherished associations.—Duncan seems to be mightily puzzled to understand how Mr. Coles would pay the loan contemplated by his Bill. Let him read it again, and he will see. The Bill authorized no greater loan at a time, as we have already shown, than £20,000, the interest on which would be £1,200, at six per cent. per annum, the lowest rate, says Maclean, upon which it could be obtained. Duncan did not, however, always think that 6 per cent. would be demanded, for when Mr. Palmer wanted to borrow £12,000 to pay off treasury warrants to that amount, and get rid of the present Treasurer's influence, Maclean contended that no more than 4 per cent. would be charged. But the interest which would become chargeable upon the Colony to carry out the principle of Maclean's Bill, would be about £40,200 annually, all of which would go into the pockets of the Proprietors. And yet Mr. Coles is stigmatised as being a fit candidate for a lunatic asylum, because his Bill would incur an annual charge for interest of £1,200! Judging of the two by their land schemes, no one can doubt that Duncan has shewn the best right to the wearing of the "caps and bells."

Now even suppose the Liberals had promised, at the last Election, to make the Land Settlement Question the first object of their Legislation, and failed to do it; still their conduct would not be half so reprehensible as that of their unprincipled antagonist. When he ascended the hustings in 1846, he declared his determination to "go the whole hog" for Escheat, as well as for Responsible Government, even unto the stopping of the Supplies. Well, having sold his wretched conscience to the oligarchy, and betrayed his constituents, (which caused his ignominious rejection from the Hustings in 1850.) he was in a majority for at least two Sessions; but during the whole of that time he did not once attempt to redeem the promise made to his constituents, respecting an Escheat. If he joined, as he says he did, a party who had the interests of the tenantry and country more at heart than the Liberals, he surely could, or ought to, have obtained the assistance of that party to accomplish his once favourite measure. Had the Liberal party been so situated during the two Sessions referred to—had they been able to outvote their adversaries on every question, they would be censurable to the last degree, if they had left unsettled the question relating to Landlord and tenant, and unameliorated the condition of the latter. But in the last Parliament they were on the weaker side, and could accomplish nothing: in the present Parlia-