

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., JULY 26, 1858.

THE GEORGETOWN ELECTION.

The *Monitor* of last week manifests its disappointment and indignation at the High Sheriff of King's County, because that officer did not think proper to favour the designs of the Tories by returning on his writ one of the candidates at the late election at Georgetown, who had a minority of votes at the close of the poll. Our cotemporary declares, with more anger than discretion, that in returning Mr. McDonald the Sheriff has set "all law and evidence at defiance," and that in doing so, he has "been impelled by a mandate from head-quarters." We need scarcely stop to characterise this latter assertion as a deliberate and malicious falsehood, for those who know any thing of the determined and upright character of the High Sheriff of King's County are well assured of the fact, that he is the last man in the County who could be influenced in the discharge of his duty by a mandate from any quarter. With respect to our cotemporary's dictum, that the return in question is contrary to all law and evidence—the writer of the splenetic attack on Mr. Underhay only displays his own ignorance of the law, as well as his utter disregard for decency, truth, and common sense. If Mr. Sheriff Underhay had made any other return than that complained of, he would have well deserved the imputation of setting the law at defiance. His duty, as is clearly prescribed by the Statute, is to return the names of the candidates having a majority of votes on the poll books. A scrutiny, if demanded, is held totally irrespective of the return; and the Sheriff is wisely precluded from pronouncing any judgment on the evidence taken at such scrutiny. The law directs him to return the minutes of the evidence to the House of Assembly, and it is for that body alone to decide whether it is sufficient to invalidate any of those votes which were the subject of the scrutiny.

The *Monitor's* calumnious attack on Mr. Sheriff Underhay, which, by reproducing it, the *Islander* has endorsed—can be regarded only as evidence of the disappointment and mortification which the Tory faction are doomed to suffer—after all their boasting to the contrary—from the contemplation of the inevitable fact, that the new House will be opened with a clear majority in support of the Government, on whose overthrow they had so fondly but so prematurely calculated.

THE CIVIC ELECTIONS.

On to-morrow week the citizens of Charlottetown will have the privilege, which, like Christmas, comes but once a year, of conferring civic honours on those high functionaries whom they may deem most fitted to assume the responsibilities and discharge the duties of Conscript Fathers for the great City of Charlottetown for the ensuing year. To the aspirants for those honours we cordially wish a period of haleyn dignity, undisturbed by anything more grievous than the reflection that the state of the times in Charlottetown, while it necessitates their abstinence from the historical turl of civic feasts, renders the Lord Mayor's office in our little Municipality truly a Lord Mayor's show, and a holy one. In fact, it has been for some time apparent, from an inspection of the personnel of our Common Council, that instead of the whilom characteristic,

"Justice,
In fair round belly, with good cap lined,"
our civic rulers present rather the appearance of
"The lean and slipper'd pantaloon."

With the honourable exception of Mr. Councillor Duchemin, their Worshipships seem pre-eminently qualified to go down a pump with a message. We call attention to this circumstance merely to show the degree to which the business of a City Councillor affects the corporeal (it were offensive to say mental) organization of a gentleman who has the misfortune to have civic dignities thrust upon him. The City finances are said to be in a very embarrassed condition. Can the chosen guardians of the City, while this is the case, manifest the outward and visible signs of personal comfort and material prosperity?

"Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat,"
and we hold the converse of the proposition to be equally true, at least to this extent, that he who rules an impoverished community should be the representative, outwardly at least, of the adverse fortune of his constituents, as physiognomists tell us that the expression of the human countenance is varied and modified by the thoughts on which the mind of the individual is engaged.

We perceive that the Political Alliance, having had the reins of our civic government so long, and having landed the citizens in so comfortable a haven of insolvency, has, like the doctor at the funeral of a deceased patient, decided on carrying home its work by seeing the victim consigned to its mother earth, and has consequently resolved to assume the management of the city for another year, provided the salaries of the officials can be wrung from the hard earnings of a people struggling against the pressure of adverse circumstances of an unprecedented nature.

We believe the Liberals, as a party, will offer no opposition, deeming it unwise to carry partizan politics into a question so small as the local administration of Charlottetown, and believing that they who have tied are best fitted to loose the knot which has been tightening for so long a time.

Candor compels us to say, which we do with regret, that the Act incorporating Charlottetown has not realized the benefits anticipated from it. This failure we attribute, not to the principle of incorporation, for which we have long been and are still advocates, but to the combined influence of depressed commerce and injudicious and unnecessary expense in the management of the details of our city government. We shall on a future occasion more particularly refer to these matters, with a view to the more economical administration of our civic affairs. Meanwhile we hope that, no matter who may be elected on Tuesday week, some prompt and energetic measure may be adopted to relieve the City from its present state of financial depression.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—"W. H. McKay," in reference to a complaint respecting inattention to the Light at Fish Island, will appear in our next.

JEROME BLITZ, the great Magician, who has been performing, with the most brilliant success, in St. John, Halifax and Pictou, intends giving a series of entertainments soon in this city, where, we have no doubt, he will be liberally patronised.

Council?" This is true to a certain extent, for what authority had the present Mayor and that part of the Council elected in August last to authorise the payment of one penny during two years before they were in office? On the other hand, the remainder of it is not true, for besides many small sums ordered to be paid by the Council since August last, there have been fees to witnesses, costs refunded, moieties of fines, awards and advances to the Recorder, all which have been paid by me under the sanction of his Worship the present Mayor, and which are charged in the very accounts that this veritable committee have been so long auditing; yet they have the hardihood, in the face of what they know to be positive facts, especially the advances to the Recorder that they made considerable talk about, to say that I have "not had the authority of the present Mayor or City Council for doing so!" Is there any wonder that my feelings would be stirred when falsehood, insult and defamation are thrown broadcast at me, and not resent them, especially when they have been made with a design to injure me? That person must be either an idiot or a slave who would not show fight under such circumstances. The committee very modestly say "they have dealt very leniently with me." How very charitable they are! It was my right to preach such doctrine under the provocation and not theirs, as I defy them to show one particle of authority for their ungentlemanly and unchristian conduct towards me. I have hitherto treated them in the same respectful manner as I have all the other Councils, and I am bound in honor to state that from the day I entered upon my duties as City Clerk, I have sojourned with the whole Councils on the most friendly terms possible; in fact, I candidly confess that I have been treated by their Worshipships and the Councilors, with the present exception, as an equal more than as a servant.

The committee say that "no balance had been struck in the cash account for two years and a half." Why did they not see to this before? And that "£12 13s. 4d. was posted to the credit of the Police Court over and above the amount actually received." Both these assertions are palpably false, as the committee well know, and as the books themselves testify. Balances were struck in the cash account, and the money was actually received for the Court; and their own conduct in this particular goes to refute their assertion by showing their dishonesty, for if they saw and knew that this sum had been crowded into the Police Court account, when it had not been received, why did they not say so in their report? Why did they not then expose the fraud which they now, by a side wind, try to make appear as such? Does not this circumstance alone show the committee have acted dishonestly, both towards you and me, in attempting to cover up such iniquity in the first place, and in now trying to stab me with it? Who will believe such men in future? It has been for some time currently reported that Mr. Morrison's sole aim is to stir up a prejudice against me to obtain my office, and I am almost uncharitable enough to believe it, as he certainly has shown himself throughout this affair thoroughly competent for anything! He may fancy himself fully entitled to the soubriquet, which has been bestowed on him, of "prince of book-keepers," but he is not so shrewdly correct as he imagines, for he has made only £3 6s. of an error in the small sum of £12 4s. 6d., while auditing some bills placed before the City Council, although these bills are noted in his reports as "audited and found correct!" and this wonderfully honest chairman has had the audacity to dictate, and his colleague the temerity to subscribe to assertions respecting me which they have shown themselves totally incompetent to bring authority for, or to adjudicate upon honorably.

The committee also say, with respect to the reception of their report, that when "Mr. Duchemin moved that the report be adopted and printed," "Barard moved, in amendment, that it be not received." This is decidedly untrue, the latter gentleman moved that the report be laid on the table till the next meeting; and if the committee possessed but a tittle of modesty that they have of assurance to vilify and try to injure, without the least shadow of authority, one who never knowingly insulted or injured them, they would have submitted to lay their report on the table, even without a motion, and have it fully discussed, especially when matters of very far less moment have been laid over for weeks for discussion, at the instance of Mr. Morrison; but this gentleman's object in this instance was to damage me instantaneously, by crowding the report into print, which, if left to free discussion, with a full Council, might have been thrown under the table. This, I am bound to believe, from his subsequent conduct about the report (which may form the ground-work of another communication), and from having been inadvertently cautioned by his intimate friends of his propensity to find fault with and slander some party or person in almost every society to which he has been attached; and further from the fact that the committee, not satisfied with insulting and endeavouring to degrade me, must needs take all the Councilors, both in and out of office, to task for taking particular care of the streets and neglecting the wharfs. What part of the duty "to examine and balance the City book" had to do with the Councilors or with spending the money in this particular? The committee, by their charter, were not authorised in any way whatever to scandalize either the Councilors or me; but having forced themselves into stirrups, and overlooking their duty altogether, they determined to show fight "all round the board," and ride roughshod over every body who might be easy enough to let them do so.

Now that the committee have delivered themselves of their spiteful, pointless epistle, what does it amount to? Have they, by it, shown any diplomas or presented any legal or lawful standard by which to measure my work or my competency? or have they dared to say, what is of most importance to you, that the accounts have been dishonestly kept? "Aye, that's the rub!" Whether your money has been honestly or dishonestly expended in so far as I am concerned with it; and if you are satisfied that the accounts have been honestly kept, there ends the matter. You are the judges; and the committee should have had the common honesty to say whether the accounts were honestly or dishonestly kept; and though they may write till doomsday, if in their future scribbling they cannot produce any more evidence against the honesty of the accounts than they have done in either of their epistles, the sooner they "put their light under a bushel," and sit on it, the better it will be for themselves.

I have the honor to be your humble servant,
W. B. WELLNER, City Clerk.
Charlottetown, 10th July, 1858.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir:—The *Islander* is becoming more and more notorious for having its columns filled with communications utterly unworthy of publicity in a journal having any pretensions to truth or respectability; instance, the intercepted letters and other contradictory matter published each successive week in that paper. My mind was forcibly impressed with this fact upon reading the *Islander* of the 21 inst., in which appeared a communication, signed "Alexander McEachern," purporting to be a report of the doings at the late Election in this District, but the real object of which was to show the inconsistency of Mr. Warburton's conduct. Any person who takes the trouble of reading Mr. McE's letter cannot fail to perceive that he has completely failed in his attempt to show this.

It is not my province, at present, to treat of the merits or demerits of the successful or rejected Candidates; I mean simply to review this letter of Mr. McEachern's, and perhaps, in showing the fatality of his attempt to prove Mr. Warburton's conduct inconsistent, may also prove his inconsistency. First of all I will remark, that was Mr. McEachern's signature not attached to the letter in question, I could scarcely

believe that a production so ambiguous and novel in its style, could have emanated from the pen of so practised a writer. Mr. McEachern says that Mr. Warburton used all the means in his power to secure the return of Mr. F. Gaudet. Did Mr. Warburton act otherwise, he would be a traitor to himself and that Government of which he is a member; because the other Candidate, Captain Hubbard, publicly declared his intention, if returned, not to support the present Government. Mr. Gaudet pledged himself to support it. In such a case, Mr. Warburton could not hesitate for one moment to "use all the means in his power" to secure the return of Mr. Gaudet.

Mr. McEachern next states that he heard Mr. Warburton, at a meeting at Casumpee, express his determination not to canvass the district in conjunction with any other candidate, there being so many in the field, and that on the same evening he went to Tignish and "took the blind man by the hand," and gave him his interest. Now, Mr. McEachern, you surely must have known, when you penned the above statement, that it was not correct. The facts are these: Mr. Warburton held a meeting at Casumpee on the 31st May, and on the day following at Nail Pond. There were three candidates then in the field, all professing their intention of supporting the present Government. Under such circumstances, Mr. Warburton could not consistently make choice of either of the three, but very justly left that with the electors. Now, sir, at the meeting at Nail Pond, Mr. Warburton did not "take the blind man by the hand;" on the contrary, he made use of the same words which he did at Casumpee,—expressed his intention, under the then existing circumstances, to stand alone, but called upon the people to make choice of a true Liberal. But you forget, sir, that Lord Mansfield has said, that "as circumstances alter cases, cases themselves should alter." A few weeks ago a writer in the *Islander*, under the signature of "Amicus," in giving a report of Mr. Warburton's meeting at Casumpee, would not deign to call Mr. Warburton a Liberal, but designated him a "Snatcher," because—so Amicus says—he expressed his principles to be in accordance with the present Government, and his intention of supporting it. But at the nomination and subsequent public meetings, Mr. Hubbard thinks fit to "come out" in opposition to the present party in power. Now I ask you, Mr. Amicus—I beg pardon, Mr. McEachern—if Mr. Warburton was not perfectly justified in coming forward and using "all the means in his power" to secure the return of the candidate pledged to support the present Government? When Mr. Warburton expressed his intention of standing alone, Mr. Hubbard was one of the three Liberal candidates above mentioned; but so soon as he opposed the Government, Mr. Warburton would not be true to the principles which he has espoused did he not come forth and oppose him. With regard to Mr. Warburton's prevailing on Mr. Conroy to resign in favour of Mr. Gaudet, I have only to say that it evidenced the sincerity of Mr. Conroy's principles, inasmuch as he would not endanger the return of two Liberals for the district, by having the votes divided among three. I have reason to believe that Mr. Warburton would rather that Mr. Gaudet should resign, but he left it entirely to the candidates and the people. As regards Mr. Warburton representing Mr. Gaudet at one of the polling divisions, and getting another person to stand for himself, which "Alexander McEachern" has intimated, I can only say that it goes far to show Mr. Warburton's popularity, and that even were he absent from the district, he would be returned with a large majority of votes.

I have thus shown, Mr. Editor, that Alexander McEachern's attempt to establish a charge of inconsistency against Mr. Warburton has been a failure; and as I have very good reason to believe that "Amicus" and "Alexander McEachern" are synonymous, I do not see the great consistency in Amicus calling Mr. Hubbard a "Snatcher Liberal," and Alexander McEachern eulogising him so greatly.

In conclusion, I would remark that if Mr. McEachern cannot establish a better point in the "long letter of the doings of the Snatchers," which he has promised to treat the readers of the *Islander* to, than he has in that of the 25th ultimo, I would advise him to devote the time which he intends for the writing of his long letter to

That delightful task,
To teach the young idea how to shoot.

I am, Mr. Editor, yours truly,
Kildare, July 8, 1858. DOMO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir.—I see by the last *Monitor* I am the subject of an article in that paltry paper, the editor of which informs the public I have displayed not only a considerable amount of bad taste but also a defective judgment in publishing my card. In answer, I beg to say, I have followed a similar course to that adopted in other cities, and where there is to be found persons with quite as much taste as the editor of the *Monitor*. As to there being those in the city who have prior claims upon the inhabitants, I will not deny the question: Has the Political Alliance nominated such men? My friends say, no! For my own part I will leave that knotty point to be unravelled at the hustings. The *Monitor* further insinuates that I have not been sufficiently long to warrant my sitting at the Council Board. That may be his opinion now, but what would have been his opinion provided I had joined the Political Alliance, as so often requested, and then came forth as their nominee? I am at a loss to understand why the Civic Election should be the mind of the individual; but that may arise from my want of judgment, which, I am sorry to say, I am sometimes deficient of, as a certain individual in the vicinity of the *Monitor* office, can testify from the fact of my letting him, some year or two since, slip so easily through my fingers, when he gave leg bail to so many of his creditors, and no doubt, in his own opinion, displayed not only a considerable amount of good taste and sound judgment, but also a smattering of domestic economy, by leaving his wife and family to the care of the liberal inhabitants of this city. In conclusion, I beg to state, that I was requested, full two months since, to offer for the election of Councillor for No. 2 Ward, and then stated I would do so, provided Mr. Melsaac withdrew from the Council; and upon hearing he had so acted, I published my card, which course, in my humble opinion, will prove far more acceptable to the electors than being nominated at a secret and political association, and afterwards approved of at a hole-in-the-corner meeting, where the proposer, in lieu of others, had to second and carry his own proposition—the nominee of the Political Alliance and his proposer being the only electors present belonging to No. 2 Ward. I remain, sir, yours truly,
July 24, 1858. WM. MURPHY.

"TRUTH IS GREAT AND WILL PREVAIL."—Protector, July 7.

That "truth is great and will prevail,"
An ancient author wrote,
And they who now the truth assail,
The self same maxim quote.

What means the oft-repeated tale,
Urge'd by corruption's tools,
The bare-faced falsehood, trite and stale,
That "godless" are our schools?
That those who govern still withhold
The Bible from our youth?
A lie so often preach'd and told,
They almost deem it truth.

But time will soon disclose the cheat,
And reason's sway return;
And new-edged Tories from defeat
An useful lesson learn.

Then thanks to those whose generous aid
Upheld the Liberal cause,
And to the tried and true conveyed
The right to frame our laws.

The *Presbyterian Witness* of the 17th instant contains another article in reference to the affairs of this Colony—political, social, and religious—which far exceeds preceding ones in the amount of falsehood, bigotry and scurrility, for which the pages of that journal have obtained an unenviable distinction. The article under notice appears under the editorial head, without date or signature, and the extracts from which are of such a nature as to require little or no comment. The writer begins by stating:

"A fortnight ago I said something to the readers of the *Witness* about P. E. Island politics; this week I wish to say a little concerning a great variety of things on and in the Island. I am sorry to say that the elections were not quite so peaceful as I was at first led to believe. There was a 'bloody row' between the Irishmen and Highlanders near Georgetown on the afternoon of the election day. I obtained the following particulars from the Rev. A. Munro:—The Irish voters were in the proportion of three to every one Highlander; there being fifty of the latter and one hundred and fifty of the former. The Highlanders, knowing their own numerical weakness and anticipating foul play on the part of the Irish, stood shoulder to shoulder all day till all of them had polled their votes. (Of course they voted for an honest Protestant member, who was pledged to oppose the Government and the Priests.) They then retired in a body, and were proceeding to their homes, when they were chased by the Irish with stones and sticks. Still the Highlanders were very unwilling to begin a fight. They bore with the insults heaped upon them with exemplary patience. At last the stones were coming fast and heavy. A venerable and feeble Highlander was struck in the thigh and knocked down. Others also were seriously injured. The Highland blood was thoroughly roused. Their most powerful young men stepped forward to the front, formed into close column, and rushed on the Irish with irresistible fury. The Irish fled (one hundred and fifty of them!) in terror and dismay; but alas, not till one of them was killed and eight others disabled for life! This was a fearful chastisement, but who will venture to say that it was not justly merited? I am sure that the Highlanders used every honourable effort to avert a fight, but in vain. They were utterly unprepared for a fight. The Irish were clearly the aggressors, and their punishment and disgrace, though terrible, are justly deserved."

It is quite immaterial to us whether it is the "Rev. A. Munro" or the rambling editor of the *Witness* who has drawn the long bow, and shocked his pious readers by the above tale of a "bloody row" at Georgetown; all we have to say is, that a more "bloody" lie was never printed in the columns of any journal. That there might have been a little fracas at Georgetown on the day of election, as is usual at all elections, is not unlikely; but from all our enquiries we have been unable to learn that there had been anything like a "bloody row" or a riot of any description; and we think if there had been one man killed, and eight others disabled for life, the circumstances would be known all over the Island long before they were communicated to the readers of the *Presbyterian Witness*. But such occurrences as these are unknown to the people of Prince Edward Island.

We notice, in the next extract, a further recourse to the use of the long bow; but the arrow, in this case, is aimed more directly against our brother of the *Islander* than ourselves; and we leave him to return the shot. We shall reply to the first sentence by stating that it contains two falsehoods: 1st, "The Government party" have not sustained a defeat; and, 2d, they are not "writhing" under that or any thing else.

"The Government party are writhing under their recent defeat. They descend even to scurrilous personal attacks on private individuals. Indeed the political press of Charlottetown is far below that of Halifax in its style of warfare. The *Examiner* and *Islander* could only be paralleled by the old *Star* and *Colonist*. The *Islander* is a most injurious and unprincipled journal. Its politics may not be bad, but its tone with regard to things religious is absolutely dangerous. It also truckles to popery, and aims at bringing about a coalition between the papists and conservatives of P. E. Island, such as now disgraces Nova Scotia."

The next passage, which treats on the religious aspects and characteristics of the Colony, displays, in addition to the deep-rooted propensity of the writer for falsehood, such a degree of impudence and envy as would make his testimony on any subject absolutely contemptible and worthless. We are not at all surprised that he should have ranked the Catholics after the Mormons, Quakers, and Jews; but we do marvel at his candor in admitting that there are thirty-three thousand of them on the Island—nearly as many as all the other diversified, conflicting and quarrelling sects put together. The impertinence respecting the Catholic Chapel in this city is a mere ebullition of envy and mortification, more likely to excite the laughter and derision of the Catholics than their indignation. If the appearance of that proud edifice is insulting to such fellows as he of the *Witness*, we should like to punish them by making them gaze upon it every day in the year; or at all events until they can manage to build a church of their own that will rear a prouder head. In that case we think their punishment would be likely to extend far beyond the term of their natural lives.

It will be seen by the asterisks that we have omitted a passage in reference to the Convent. We can only say that the writer who was capable of penning a calumny so foul and atrocious, must have one of the most depraved minds and corrupted hearts that ever polluted a tabernacle of clay.

"So much about politics. Now a little about things ecclesiastical. There are in P. E. Island about 22,500 Presbyterians, subdivided as follows:—Established Church of Scotland, (including 5,000 *McDonaldites*) 9,700. Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, 6,800. Free Church, 6,000. The Presbyterians of P. E. Island are not fond of quarrelling. They live like good christians, and near friends and brethren, as they are. Episcopalians number 6,700; Methodists, 4,700; Baptists, 3,000; Brethren, 1,750. In 1854 there were 22 Universalists, 7 Mormons, 1 Quaker, 1 Jew, 4 Unitarians, and 33,000 Papists."

"The Episcopalians of the Island are in the main evangelical. There is a small section of them extremely High Church and Puseyite. The Wesleyans are very strong and active in Charlottetown; they have not made great progress elsewhere. The Brethren have done them some injury. The ministers of this sect are very active; but like most errorists, they are plant in their creed. They aim at securing people. A church for this people is half built at Charlottetown, but the 'sinews of war' having been exhausted, operations had to be suspended. There is a very handsome building in course of erection for the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia. It will probably be the most elegant in Charlottetown. When the Free Church and the Secession unite, this Church will do them both very well indeed. The Papists of P. E. Island are a bold set. They thought, a short time ago, they were to have everything their own way, inasmuch as they had a Popish Governor and a very Popish Cabinet. But Protestants are still too strong; and there are still too many honest men among them to permit Rome to rule the roost. The Babylonian Chapel rears its head proudly above all the Churches in the town. This is an insult which should not be permitted in a Christian land—the temple of Antichrist more imposing, and in a more prominent position than the temple of Christ. Babylon has a Nursery and a College here also. I learn that the former does not flourish well."

A splendid Cathedral is in course of erection at Tignish—in a very poor neighbourhood. The poor wretches have to pay—hard as the times are—and many of them will be ruined by the heavy tax levied of them by their ghostly advisers."