

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 11, 1848.

[No. 58.]

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

No. III.

"Now mark how plain a tale will put thee down—"

SIR;

You can put in no claim to originality in dealing with what you are pleased to call my "career in this Colony as a public journalist." The *Constitutionalist* reviewed that career in a much abler style than you have done. You have copied some of Mr. Collard's falsehoods, without being able to imitate any of his ingenuity, and special pleading. You assert a falsehood when you say I "find it pleasant to forget" any "reminiscences" connected with my career as a public journalist. I have challenged, and still challenge the most minute inquiry upon this point. I have a hundred and one times refuted the foolish calumnies with which I have been assailed since the suspension of the *Palladium* newspaper, by the adherents and scribes of the Compact party, on the ground that I had changed my politics. Who are the parties who preferred the accusation of change? Why, the very parties whom I opposed in the *Palladium*—whom I opposed in the *Morning News*—whom I still continue to oppose in the *Examiner*. The very men who are now opposed to me have been my enemies, in public and private, ever since I came to the Island. It would be just as fair for me to say, that they have all changed, as for you and them to say that I have changed. The people who slandered and blackguarded me as the Editor of the *Palladium*, still slander and blackguard me, with your assistance, as the Editor of the *Examiner*; and let me remind you, that those who patronized the *Palladium*, still encourage by their support and approval the publication of the *Examiner*, excepting, of course, such of the New London people as you and your tools are able to coerce and intimidate, and whom in your private letters to me you have often designated by the euphonious epithet of "yahoos."

It is true, there is this point of difference between the tone of the *Palladium* and that of the *Morning News* and *Examiner*: the former "consistently" opposed Sir H. V. Huntley, whilst the two latter abstained from such opposition. Was there not good reason for doing so? In 1843 and '44, while the *Palladium* continued, the Governor was a willing, though blind instrument in all the intrigues and cabals of the Compact: in assailing their influence, it was impossible not to assail him. At the commencement of the year 1846 the leader of the Compact party and the Governor were known to be at open war. I rejoiced to see that quarrel, because I was convinced, as the sequel proved, it would lead to the reformation of the Governor. I was not bound to sustain an eternal warfare against His Excellency; and I led the public to believe this in the *Palladium* of the 4th April, 1844, wherein I said: "Let him (the Governor) change his course, and do equal justice to every party—let him put an end to that system of favouritism of which all complain, and he will find that he will be treated with that respect, NOT ONLY BY OUR PEN, but by all the inhabitants of this loyal Colony—which would be due to him in the situation he holds." That Sir Henry Huntley did "change his course," was proved beyond all doubt by the hostility which the "oligarchy" displayed against him. They started a newspaper with the avowed purpose of writing him out of the Colony. On the subscription list to this paper—for the list was paraded in the Book Stores—were to be seen the names of nearly all the officials—(oligarchists)—and it was edited by a man who drudged for the Tories in Canada, the Tories in Nova Scotia, until the display of other qualities beside those of a Newspaper editor compelled him to leave those Provinces. Passing over the slanders, public and private, with which the Governor was attacked, the next overt act of opposition to His Excellency, was the Petition to the Queen praying for his removal. The *Constitutionalist* boasted that this petition was signed by all the Sheriffs, Justices of the Peace, and Commissioners

in the Island, together with such of the merchants and shop-keepers of Charlottetown as were connected by blood with the Compact, and by stronger but less honourable ties. Not a member of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly signed the Petition—not one out of the House signed it, except a few unfortunates who were under pecuniary obligations to the merchants or the officials: it was advocated, promoted, and carried to England by Mr. Palmer and Mr. Pope—a land proprietor and a land agent—two officials—both interested in maintaining the supremacy of the oligarchy—both opposed to a settlement of "the great grievance of the colony, the land tenures"—both scoffers at Responsible Government—both anti-liberal in all their parliamentary career. And what were the charges preferred against the Governor in this Petition? It did not allege that he was opposed to the introduction of Responsible Government—it did not assert that he was an enemy to the improvement of the condition of the Tenantry—to Escheat—to long leases and low rents—it did not assert that he was opposed to the jobbing in Treasury Warrants, and to the monopolizing of public offices,—it did not state that he confined the patronage of Government to one family exclusively—it did not charge him with having sent the Military to the East Point in 1843—it did not accuse him of instituting a frivolous prosecution for libel against Mr. Duncan Maclean in the same year; but it contained a string of the most ridiculously childish charges—such for example, as his private dispute with the Hon. Mr. Young, his appointment of Mr. Macintosh's son to the Magistracy; and many other things equally childish, and having no foundation in fact. Earl Grey treated the whole document with that degree of contempt which it justly deserved, and hinted to Sir Henry in a published despatch, that he believed the petitioners to be a pack of liars.

You and Donald Montgomery lent this petition the weight of your "influence and respectability." Donald had a magnificent field for his magnificent oratorical powers—and so had you, for in this respect "none but yourselves can be your parallel"—in elucidating and enforcing the charges against the Governor; and you expected to inveigle—(by the force of your eloquence, I presume)—Mr. Nicholas Conroy into an abetting of the unclean thing, when you took that disastrous trip to the West Cape, in which you well nigh lost "the number of your mess;" but here again let it be remembered to Mr. Conroy's credit, he would have nothing to do with the petition.

Now, if you and Montgomery were of the liberal party, as you still impudently claim to be, was not the style and matter of this petition, and, above all, the character of its promoters, quite enough to convince you that the Governor had "changed his course." If the change was not in the Governor, it was in the oligarchy and their friends. If in the latter, where are we to look for the fruits of change? Mr. Palmer and Mr. Pope—the ex-Delegates—have been as steady and consistent Tories since their Mission as before it. I defy you to point to one vote on the journals as proof to the contrary. The oligarchy, who promoted the petition, still say we are too feeble and too ignorant a people for Responsible Government. Though their agents, nominees, and representatives had a majority in the Assembly last session, not one solitary measure for the permanent good of the country—for the relief of the tenantry, as indicative of a change in their views, was introduced by any of them. Governor Huntley was recalled (not because you petitioned, but because his term of office had expired)—you have since voted with those who prayed for his recall—you have had a majority in the House, and I now challenge you to point to the advantages which have resulted from his recall—the improvements that have been made by you and your majority. Tell us, if you can, the benefit to the country which a change of Governors has conferred.

I could readily, if I had space at my disposal, detail further proofs of a "change" of "course" on the part of the late Governor; but these you will find published at length in the *Examiner* of the 14th August, 1847; and if you cannot borrow the paper from some of your neighbours who subscribe to it—(and in imitation of some of the Charlottetown people who are sometimes seen with the *Examiner* sticking out of their coat-tail pockets, though they profess they would not read it for the world, you have not disdained to trespass on the kindness of a neighbour for the loan of the paper), I will readily furnish you with a spare copy. In addition to these proofs, I will give the Governor's own testimony, in support of the fact of a change of policy. At the Public Breakfast which was given to Sir Henry on the day of his departure from the Island, he said:—

"You, Gentlemen, will no doubt well remember the time when the parties who have lately exhibited so much hostility towards me, were professedly my friends. For the first three years of my Government they were successful in their efforts to keep me in the dark as to the real state of affairs here; the system worked well for them, they could not therefore wish for any change, and all irregularities and evil practices were hidden from my observation. A more matured acquaintance with the business of the Colony enabled me at length to see through, and to remove the dark and poisoned curtain they had so artfully placed before me, and distinctly discern the real truth. From that moment I determined to enquire into, and if possible remedy, the grievances under which the Island suffered; and from the moment that it became evident that I had lifted the mysterious and dark curtain, my former supporters were changed into systematic opponents and untiring enemies."

Now, mark, if the Governor had not changed, he had nothing to gain by making a statement to the contrary. Had he been less frank and honest in the avowal of his sentiments, he might have tried to keep up some show of consistency, persisted that he was always in the right course, and charged his advisers with all the errors of his Government. He does not, however, hesitate to take part of the blame himself; and he thus bears me out in my assertion that he was a willing though blind instrument in promoting the intrigues and cabals of the oligarchy; and ceasing to be that instrument, he was compelled to encounter their opposition.

I will now return for a moment to your review of my "career as a public journalist."

In adverting to the publication of the *Palladium*, you find it convenient to assert that I was alone the cause of its suspension, by blazoning my Irish prejudices "in opposition to those of my subscribers" "and—(in imitation of certain Irish periodicals in Anglo-Saxon America) in railing at 'the Saxon' who supported my paper." It is scarcely worth my while to reply to such a palpable and wretchedly constructed lie, but having come to the determination to follow you through all your windings, and to show in minor as well as in major matters your want of principle, and unblushing disregard of truth, I shall call your attention to a few facts in reference to this topic.

In all your correspondence with me, public and private, I cannot find the remotest allusion to the "prejudices" which you now assert were the means of overthrowing the *Palladium*. The long and very close friendship which subsisted between us, might have assured you that any advice or suggestion you might be inclined to give me, relatively to the manner of conducting my paper, would be taken in good part by me. But the fact is, you attributed the suspension of the *Palladium* to the right cause—namely, the want of efficient support from the people whose interests it advocated. Had my "prejudices" operated against it, people would have declined taking the paper; but instead of there being erasures from my list, the number of its subscribers increased from week to week, until the issue became so large that I found it impossible to sustain the expense attending it, while the receipts of cash did not correspond with the receipts of names to my list. If my