

The Examiner.

AND SEMI-WEEKLY INTELLIGENCER.

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

NEW SERIES.

CHARLOTTETOWN, APRIL 27, 1850.

VOL. I.—NO. 25

CORRESPONDENCE.

FURTHER FACTS IN REFERENCE TO "THE CONFERENCE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—Although I feel persuaded that the course pursued by the majority of the Assembly and the position finally assumed by them, in consequence of the very unsatisfactory result of "the conference," are already fully understood and approved by the people, and that it would amount almost to an insult to their understandings to attempt any further elucidation of the matter, with a view to their satisfaction; yet, having a few leisure moments at command, I cannot resist the temptation I feel to expose the fallacy of argument contained in the last apology for His Excellency the Governor, from the pen of "Moderatus," as published in the *Gazette* of the 16th instant.

"Moderatus" allows that there is inherent in the British House of Commons a legitimate power to refuse to grant Supplies for the prosecution of a war of which they do not approve; and he, at the same time, besides admits that they may also constitutionally refuse to grant Supplies for any other purpose for which they may be demanded.

If "Moderatus" does not regard the Constitution of this Colony as nothing better than a delusive mockery of the people, how does it happen, let me ask, that he asserts the same power is not inherent in our Assembly? Does he not perceive that the power to withhold Supplies is constitutionally claimed and exercised by the British House of Commons, solely as a means by which to prevent a Government from acting, that is ruling, in opposition to their wishes, which are or ought to be the wishes of the people? Are his "lights of reason" so dim, that he cannot perceive the motive of the Assembly in refusing the Supplies, to have been simply the restraining of a Government, in whom they had no confidence, from acting or ruling in opposition to their wishes? The Government, it is due to them to admit, would have retired from office, soon after the Resolution expressing a want of confidence in them had been agreed to in the Assembly, at least immediately after the Responsible "Extract" was laid before the House—as ministers usually do after suffering a defeat in the House of Commons—had they been permitted to do so. And who was it, let me next enquire, who prevented the Government from laying down their power, in conformity with British precedent? Was it not His Excellency? Yes, it was His Excellency who, with all his avowed respect and veneration for British Parliamentary and Government usages and practices, stepped forward to interpose his authority to prevent his Government from taking a step which would have been more acceptable to the people, and, perhaps, more constitutional, than any originating with themselves, which they have ever taken. Yes, Sir, His Excellency not only refused the tendered resignations of his Council, but actually sent the Sergeant-at-Arms to compel the attendance of two Gentlemen who had resigned their seats at the Council Board, under the authority of the Mandamus by which they had been constituted Executive Councillors. Does His Excellency suppose that Her Majesty the Queen would have dared to interpose her authority to thwart the wishes and nullify a decision of the House of Commons, as he has done to traverse the desire and render nugatory a vote of the Assembly? Surely he does not; and why he dared to assume to himself the right to exercise a power which his Royal Mistress would doubtless, in the extreme case, have hesitated to recognize as coming within the bounds of her prerogative; is a question which, to his confusion and detriment, he may yet be required to answer.

It is very clear that when His Excellency had refused to reconstruct His Government, or to allow the members of it to make way for its reconstruction by their retirement from office, that the only constitutional remedy to which the Assembly could then have recourse, was the withholding of the Supplies. The House justly thought that to afford a Government in which they had no confidence, the means of sustaining themselves in power, would be quite as foolish as it would be in a British House of Commons to grant Supplies to an Administration for the maintenance of a war which they, the representatives of the people, disapproved; and they evinced no inconsiderable degree of firmness and wisdom in acting accordingly.

After having thus unintentionally—I had almost said stupidly—admitted the constitutionality of the very measure which he was labouring to prove worthy of

nothing but condemnation, "Moderatus" next, with the same unlucky result that has attended his arguments throughout—which, notwithstanding all the care he has bestowed upon them to give them power and authority, have "in his hour of need," like ungrateful dependents, perversely set themselves in array against him—enquires whether it would be constitutional in the British Parliament to refuse to provide for the payment of the interest of the national debt. To this, Sir, I reply that were the British House of Commons, after having passed a vote of want of confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers, on a division bearing the proportion of 18 to 3, to receive such an answer from Her Majesty as that returned, after such an occurrence, by His Excellency Sir Donald Campbell to the Assembly of this Island, she would soon perhaps—since nations are beginning fully to comprehend that the sole end and aim of Governments ought to be the prosperity and happiness of the people—find that they were not only prepared to refuse all Supplies, but even to relieve Her Majesty, in a constitutional manner, from all the responsibilities which attached to her as their Sovereign. That this, however, should ever be the fate of Britain's well-beloved Queen, may God forbid! whatever severity of justice an arbitrary assumption of unconstitutional power by Colonial Governors may draw down upon their heads.

In putting his question as he has done, concerning the payment of the interest of the national debt of Great Britain, "Moderatus" has shown that he is not, by any means, a man gifted with such powers of mental vision as enable him to discern the signs of the times; otherwise, he would have been aware that few great national and political events are or can be more probable, than that the British House of Commons should recognize and repudiate the great, the grievous injustice of burthening and oppressing the people by taxing them for the payment of the interest of an enormous debt, incurred, not for the preservation and advancement of their liberties and happiness, but to secure the wealth, and perpetuate the power of the titled and untitled land aristocracy.

I have just said, Sir, that I think it highly probable that, at no very distant day, the people of Great Britain will be so truly represented in the Imperial Legislature, that the Commons House of Parliament, strengthened and supported by the true might and majesty of the nation, will, at one bold and patriotic stroke, free the oppressed and groaning people from the intolerable load of the national debt; but, from this my opinion, I do not wish it to be inferred that I think it would be just to endeavour to annihilate, in a similar manner, the debt of this Colony, which has been contracted under circumstances widely different from those which gave rise to that of Great Britain. On the contrary, I maintain that nothing in the circumstances of this Colony can justify a breach of faith with the public creditor; although it may not always be practicable for the Legislature to meet his just expectations in due season. I am, Sir, I feel certain, quite as anxious as "Moderatus," or any other person, can be, that due provision should be made for the satisfaction of the public creditor, for the relief of the poor and destitute, for the support of the officers and ministers of Justice, for the aid of the instructors of youth, and all other necessary and justifiable purposes for which a Colonial Revenue is usually granted; and I lament, as sincerely as "Moderatus," or any other individual can, the interruption to the proceedings of the Assembly in their last Session, in which is involved the absence of a due provision for such constitutional and legitimate purposes: but, unlike "Moderatus," I have not unjustly ascribed the abrupt termination of the unfinished proceedings of the Assembly, to any but the true cause, and that is the inability or unwillingness of His Excellency, Sir Donald Campbell, to recognize and pursue the path of his peculiar duty; and I maintain that, if any evil consequences result to the people at large from the measure, unwillingly, but justifiably, adopted by their representatives in Colonial Parliament, they must, in fairness, be attributed solely to the incapacity or obstinacy of the Lieutenant Governor.

Whether "Moderatus" would base or build up his arguments upon statements, support them by comparisons, or strengthen them by precedents, he is equally unfortunate in his dependence upon his materials; for they all, like sand, slip from beneath the structures which he would establish upon them, and only serve, in a manner, to ensure the demolition of the incongruous specimens of architecture raised upon them; which, one after another, as soon as completed, tumble heavily about his ears, and astound him with their fall. How absurdly, for instance, does he compare the conduct of the present representatives of the people with that of

the Spaniards, when they first landed in Mexico; who, availing themselves of their superior powers and means to work mischief and destroy, did not scruple to rob the awe-struck natives of their gold and silver, to reduce them to slavery, and to put them to torture or to death. According to the insane perception of "Moderatus," the Assembly represent the Spaniards, and our Colonial officials, the barbarous aborigines of Mexico. Nothing surely, can be much more ridiculous than this; yet it is evident that "Moderatus" had in his head materials for a just comparison, but unfortunately was not possessed of either sufficient wit or honesty to use them aright. Had he compared the officials to the well-armed, cruel, and mercenary Spaniards, and the people to the robbed, enslaved, insulted, and murdered Mexicans, his similitude would not have been either extravagant or unjust; and would, I think, have been allowed among the people as some evidence of the rationality of his mind. The people, or "the mob," as "Moderatus" insultingly styles them, are not so undiscerning in their judgments as he seems to think they are; and they can clearly distinguish between the would-be robbers of the public purse and the protectors of it. The Government and the Government officials have, the people plainly perceive, sought, with impudent boldness, to rob them of their money and to divide it, as a spoil or booty, among themselves, in despite of the public voice, which says the public Revenue shall not be appropriated in any other way than as the people shall direct; and the Assembly, faithful in their stewardship, have greatly won upon the public confidence by the noble and disinterested stand which they have made in withholding the Supplies.

But from the first to the last of his *Gazetted* political essays, the progress of "Moderatus" has been like that of some benighted horseman, who, having in the dark got into an extensive bog, and unconsciously urging onwards in a wrong direction, has floundered and floundered on from bad to worse. In his last essay, he seems to have bestirred himself with all his might; but, blindly proceeding in his luckless course, he has actually at length stuck fast in the political "slough of despond"—completely to extricate himself from which will, I imagine, require more ability than he is possessed of.

I am, Sir,

A LOOKER-ON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—I have been reading a letter or sort of declaration published by the Editor (not Mr. Ings) of the *Islander* in a late number of that paper, wherein he gives a flat contradiction to the report so currently believed that he is the chosen and paid employee of the "Family Compact." Now, I do not mean to make any remarks here, as to how far a man's word may be taken who has publicly professed his disbelief of the Bible, but I take it, there is one thing very evident, and about which there can be no mistake, that his employers are getting heartily ashamed of their defender, and doubtless have compelled him to give a public denial of this "great fact" not only on account of his infidel opinions, which are calculated to bring discredit on themselves, but for the broad vein of intense vulgarity running through the whole of his writings in the *Islander*, whether as leading articles, or in letters from imaginary Correspondents; but I need go no further than the article in question, signed with his own name, for a delicate specimen of his refinement.

A NATIVE.

Who has a thorough contempt for the Editor of the *Islander*.

PUBLIC MEETING AT BELLE CREEK AND MURRAY HARBOUR ROAD.

Mr. Davies, M. P. for the Third District of Queen's County, having been informed by several persons (his constituents) that a public meeting had been held at the Back Settlement, near Belle Creek, convened at the instigation of certain Tory Magistrates; the object of this Meeting, Mr. Davies was further informed, was to obtain signatures to a Requisition addressed to Mr. D., calling upon him to resign his seat, inasmuch as that he had deceived his constituents, and pursued a line of conduct adverse to their wishes and opinions. This requisition received a few signatures, but the people of Belle Creek generally refused to entertain it, until they had an opportunity of consulting Mr. Davies personally, and ascertaining from him the truth or falsehood of the allegations put forth against him.

Immediately on receipt of this intelligence, Mr. Da-