

no other designation. To assert a different authority would be a falsehood; and falsehood is now piety. It does not follow that because the Prussians do not formally recognize the act of Providence in the political election of King Frederick William, they therefore deny the supernal authority over all, King and people. There is no special act of Divine interposition in that political appointment, more than in any other; and Englishmen are not blamed for omitting to designate the Right Honourable Charles Shaw Lefevre as Speaker by Divine grace, or Mr. Hume as Member for Montrose by virtue of the permission alluded to.

Theology does not enter into the distinction between the Parliamentary and Kingly offices, but only politics; the distinction is functional. The obsolete form is retained among us precisely because we are quite satisfied that it is so obsolete as to do no harm; but in Prussia the form begot a mischievous delusion in the minds of princes, who have hitherto been thought to imagine, like Alexander of Macedon, that they really did derive some authority from above, of a kind to render them irresponsible to men for their actions. To our limited monarchy habits of mind, the abolished form violated pious decencies as well as political common sense.—*Despatch.*

THE EXAMINER.

CHARLOTTETOWN, FEBRUARY 13, 1849.

THE LATE APPOINTMENTS.

At this particular moment we have a higher duty to perform than to split straws upon the comparative eligibility of one or the other gentlemen named to fill the vacant seats in the Councils; neither would it be an easy task, because who can say on whom the choice of the alliance between certain Members of the House of Assembly and the Clique may yet fall, or how many may yet be named by His Excellency the Lieut. Governor who may receive the veto of their organ? What we have to do in the absence of Responsible Government, is to lament that Her Majesty's Representative has so managed or has been so managed; that he is neither armed with the powers of Government as delegated to him by the Crown, nor relieved from his high responsibilities by their being shared with a constitutional Government. We are truly sorry for His Excellency, and he may be assured, that, though of all things, we long for constitutional, that is, Responsible Government, until it comes we will raise our voice against his being trampled on; and though, indeed, we cannot but say that it is his own fault which has placed him in this irksome predicament, we can appreciate his difficulties, and lament their consequences, as well as his want of foresight. His Excellency will not fail to see how hollow is the support of those in whom he has relied—how he has mistaken the real relative worth of parties who have been brought forward into his notice; that, in fact, the one seeks for nothing but a just participation in a constitutional system for the benefit of the people, whilst the other seeks to arrogate to itself all the functions of the Executive, even those which at present are assigned exclusively to the Crown; and having succeeded in blasting the prospects of one Governor, will not scruple in submitting his successor to the same process, the instant he refuses to yield his delegated prerogatives into their grasp—a thing, indeed, which he cannot without a flagrant dereliction of duty and principle even contemplate to do. But a word in sober seriousness, as to Captain Cumberland—what right has any one not a supporter of Responsible Government, to object to that gentleman's appointment? Is every man to be driven out of this Island by the envy and spiteful animosity of the Clique, who has sixpence to spend, or a position to occupy? Is such a man to have a license to live from his own Attorney? Certainly he would not have been the object of our selection, for we are an advocate for Responsible Government—we venerate the constitution of the Mother Country—we languish for its enjoyment, and think the representations which cause its being withheld from us are most unjust and most unworthy, and nothing but the consequence of successful intrigue. No, we could not be supposed to relish the appointment of Captain Cumberland, because he is not in the Legislature, nor has he ever served the country in any capacity; and if we are in the ascendant we must confide in those who have already not only fought the battles of the People, but displayed some share of official or legislative capacity. But if Capt. Conroy, whilst from the Agents, we have Messrs. Douse,

Pope, Thornton and Yeo,—not on that score rejected by the people; but because we would not have selected Captain Cumberland is that any reason why he should be insulted, or having been appointed, that he is to be cashiered? Is there or is there not evidence overwhelming of a fixed practical determination to get rid of every person who has any independence in the Island?

But Responsible Government is at present undergoing all the thimble-rig vicissitudes that a pea does in its transitions from one cup to another! Mr. Warburton is to be expelled the Council, because he is its advocate. Mr. Coles is a little time after to be placed in a predicament which no man having any regard for his own honour can be in without resigning, because he does not support the Government on responsible principles at an election, he himself remembering the weight of the animosity just before brought against him by his fellows in the Executive Council, in defiance of the existing Government and responsibility; and then the plea of Responsible Government is to be used against Captain Cumberland! Why, really, the poor element is bandied about from one cup to another as it suits the moment much faster than a juggler ever transposed a pea at any fair. But at a table at a fair there is but one juggler; here every man sets up in the cabalistic office who has the ear of the Government—an end to compass, or a wish to gratify: Hocus-pocus, no Cumberland, it is not consistent with responsibility—Hocus-pocus again, no Warburton, for he is a responsible man. We do most respectfully assure his Excellency that this Island will never be prosperous or even fit to live in till he recommends the adoption of real responsibility, and that he was quite gulled when he represented those whom he governs as unable to conduct their own limited business. For his own comfort, for the honor of Her gracious Majesty, we implore him to dissolve the Assembly and throw himself on the People, in whose loyalty and in whose dutiful disposition he may most implicitly rely. We know not, in a party sense, what would be the result, but we know this, that a wholesome principle would be established, one that is withheld from us alone amongst all Her Majesty's dutiful North American subjects, and that His Excellency himself would be placed in a position of comparative ease, and would never again be subject to such an insult as has been just offered him, nor compelled to submit to it in the person of his friend.

D. MACLEAN, ALIAS "MASTER BROOKS."

THERE is no character so utterly despicable as the anonymous libeller. He merits the odium of society, not so much for the injury he may seek to inflict upon the objects of his attacks, as for the degradation which the publication of his libels attaches to the legitimate business of Journalism. We hate him, not perhaps, because he is a liar, but because we know him to be a coward. If what he publishes were true, he would not be ashamed to put his name to it. Exceptions may, indeed, be made in favour of purely literary compositions, which may not affect either public or private character; but if the writer be a man who is in the habit of appearing in print, over his own proper name, he has no excuse whatever for using an anonymous one in political discussion.

If "Master Brooks" be Duncan Maclean—(and the evidence in favour of the assumption is almost conclusive, for the letter bearing that signature, and inserted in the *Islander* of the 2d inst., abounds with expressions and observations peculiar to no other writer than Duncan Maclean) we assure him that we deign no reply from any apprehension of sustaining an injury in public estimation from his ribaldry, but because we are convinced that the exposure of his falsehoods will help to put the public on their guard, if they are not already so, against the imposition of a man who appears to be lost to every sentiment of honour.

The very first sentence of the letter signed "Master Brooks" is an atrocious lie. It asserts "that the *Examiner* threatened any one with the direful wrath of Messrs. Warburton and Coles who should presume to stigmatize their public conduct, according to its deserts." In which No. of the *Examiner* is this threat to be found? If "Master Brooks" could substantiate his assertion he would have quoted from the *Examiner* the language of the alleged threat. But there is not one particle of proof adduced. In the next sentence it is

asserted that Mr. Warburton accepted a seat in the Executive Council from the minority of the Assembly—that Mr. Coles likewise accepted a seat in the Council from the minority of the Assembly. Both assertions false.—It is well known that Mr. Coles was appointed at the close of the first Session of the present Parliament—that Mr. Warburton was appointed to a similar post in the Summer or Autumn afterwards—that during the first Session Messrs. Coles and Warburton stood in a majority—that out of at least thirty-two divisions, they had a majority in twenty six—and that only by the rating of Mr. Nicholas Conroy and the absence of Mr. Fraser at the commencement of the second or last Session, were those gentlemen placed in a minority.

The disingenuous reasoning adopted by "Master Brooks" in reference to the question of Responsible Government, is precisely such as might be expected from a person of Duncan Maclean's mental, moral, and political character. Because he has acted the part of a most shameful apostate from the Responsible Government doctrine, he would fain blacken with the crime of apostacy the character of every one of his political opponents. Messrs. Warburton and Coles are accused of having outraged the Responsible principle by remaining in the Council after they were left in a minority in the Assembly. Now every body knows that Responsible Government was not only not recognized by the Administration and Legislature, but that it has been positively discountenanced by the Head of the Executive. Then Messrs. Warburton and Coles should, according to "Master Brooks," act upon a principle which the Lieut. Governor declared would not and could not be put in practice!!! Why should those gentlemen, in this case, resign, any more than Mr. Haviland, Mr. Lane, Mr. Goodman, or any of the other members of Council? Mr. Maclean openly and unblushingly sided with the enemies of Responsible Government in the Legislature—Messrs. Warburton and Coles did not so. "It is utterly incredible," says "Master Brooks," "that Mr. Warburton and Mr. Coles were advocates for Responsible Government, because its adoption would have been accompanied by the instant expulsion of themselves" from the Council. This is not true. Before its "adoption," an appeal should be made to the people, and the Lieut. Governor should cease from representing to the Home Government our unfitness for the new principle. If the country returned to the Legislature the same gentlemen who now compose the Majority of the Assembly, Messrs. Warburton and Coles would no doubt have to retire from the Council—not otherwise.

"Master Brooks" asserts a lie, when he declares that Messrs. Hensley and Holl have been mainly instrumental in "juggling" Mr. Coles out of his seat. Those gentlemen knew nothing of Mr. Coles's intention to resign. He never uttered a syllable to them on the subject; and it is very well known that immediately after Mr. Coles sent in his resignation, Messrs. Hensley and Holl tendered theirs, but the Governor, fearing, perhaps, to thrust more power into the hands of the Compact, or believing, that there were no gentlemen of that party who were fit to supply the places of Messrs. Hensley and Holl—begged of the latter to remain in the Council, and they, not wishing to embarrass His Excellency, yielded to his solicitation.

"The writers of the *Islander*," says "Master Brooks" again, "are cautioned that if they allude to Mr. Coles's 'illiteracy,' some of its subscribers will be retaliated upon." This is another falsehood. Mr. Coles's name was not mentioned in the matter. A general observation was made, to the effect, that if the indecent practice were persisted in by the *Islander*, of arrogating to its own party all the talent, respectability and education, and of charging its opponents with illiteracy and ignorance, we were prepared to shew that some public men, whose principles and conduct were advocated by the *Islander*, were just as remarkable for the scantiness of their information—their want of talent, and, in short, their perfect freedom from educational training, as any others in the community. We said nothing about the "subscribers of the *Islander*"—we made no allusion whatever to "unobtrusive private characters;" we were well aware then as we are now, that in the ranks of our adversaries there are public characters enough who are neither great geniuses nor scholars.

It is generously observed by "Master Brooks," that if Mr. Coles had limited his ambition to his cattle yard, he