

Island. This is the substance of the accusation preferred against you in the *Examiner* of the 16th May, and which you undertook to disprove, but have not done so. You betray a degree of imbecility and folly which even I would not ascribe to you, when you seek to inspire the public mind with sympathy for your injured innocence, by pretending to great indignation, by lavishing your foul epithets on me, and by vaguely threatening my expulsion from the Assembly by your glorious majority of one.

"There is no terror, Cassius, in your threats; for I am, armed so strong in honesty, that they pass by me as the idle wind, which I respect not."

That you have abandoned those political principles with which you commenced your career as an agitator in this Island, is abundantly clear from the whole course of the last two years of your political life. In the Session of 1847, your name stands in almost every division with those of Messrs. Palmer, Haviland, Longworths, Douse, &c., and opposed to those of Messrs. Rae, McIntosh, D. McDonald, Fraser, Le Lacheur, &c., who were formerly known to be your political allies. Your excuse at that time for cutting your old friends was, that they had changed, because they were known to be friendly to Sir H. V. Huntley. This was a convenient excuse at the time, but it could not, and did not serve you long. Did Mr. Rae or any of his political friends introduce any question derogatory to, or at variance with, their former course of conduct? No: if they did, it would have been blazoned forth ere this, by your prolific pen. It is true, you charged Mr. Rae and his party, in a series of letters addressed to that gentleman, in the *Islander*, (and your patronage of this paper which is known to be the organ of Tory principles, and the advocate of Compact ascendancy proves nothing for your claim to consistency\*), with a desire to work themselves into office. In this charge you were promptly seconded by men whose whole lives had been spent in official employments, and who had a direct interest in crying down Mr. Rae and his friends. Did they desert their principles to gratify the desire? No. They espoused Sir Henry's cause against the Family Compact and the Tories of the Town, when Sir Henry, as he afterwards acknowledged at the public Breakfast, had changed his views. It would be just as reasonable for the Liberals of Nova Scotia to turn round and say to Mr. Howe: 'Sir, you and your allies have forfeited the confidence of the country, because you have sought office and obtained it—because you have made friends with a Governor, who for a time submitted to be ruled by a Tory cabinet.' I have yet to learn that opposition to every Governor, whether good or bad, is the chief merit and distinction of a libe-

\* NOTE.—I confess that I am not so fastidious as you in the matter of quoting from another writer, for I have amused myself within the last two or three hours, in reading your communications published in the *Palladium*. (Find one, dated from New London, Oct. 18, 1843, and published Oct. 30, which contains the following piquant sentences in reference to the *Islander*. You say:—'My pen is itching to draw a full length portrait of the *Islander*. So soon as I shall get my feathers comfortable shaken down in limbo vile, I may, perhaps, surprise the Editor of that highly principled periodical'—(the italics are your own)—'by proving to the world from the most incontrovertible statistical data, that the course pursued by the faction of which he is an organ has a direct tendency to alienate the affections of the people of the Colony from connection with their father land, and consequently to accelerate the dismemberment of the British Empire.' This is very rich: the paper which was calculated, from its vilest Toryism, to make rebels of us all, is now the especial favourite of Duncan Maclean! Duncan will surely say, that John Ings has turned his coat. Donald Montgomery said at the Malpeque Meeting, last year, 'that Mr. Pope had changed his politics and come over to him, but he had never changed.' The same remark, we suppose, can be applied by Mr. Maclean to Mr. Ings.

In another letter, addressed to me in May, 1845, and intended for publication in the *Palladium*, but not published because of the discontinuance of the paper, I find the following remarks in reference to the *Islander*—complaining of misreporting in that journal on the Bible Question Debate: You say:—'I was informed by a gentleman of the strictest veracity, that that man of straw, John Ings, of the *Islander*, told him that he would not suffer any correction to appear in his partial and paltry print. Hence, that worthless stupid and silly tool has not only committed a very serious breach of privilege, but what is far worse, a disgraceful violation of truth and justice. That government must be fallen indeed, that squanders the public money for the support of so broken a reed as the *Islander*, which could not otherwise exist'

ral. From your abuse of Mr. Rae, one might infer that such was your belief. On reference to the *Palladium* of June 20, 1844, you will find a communication from your pen on the subject of 'Annexation,' dated 'New London, 10th June,' in which you thus speak of the gentleman whose consistency and 'integrity' you so violently assailed, from factious motives, in the letters just referred to:—

'The oligarchy, fearing the INCORRUPTIBLE INTEGRITY, universal knowledge, and ready and powerful eloquence of Alexander Rae, Esq., M. A., it became an object to oust him from the House of Assembly.'

I shall shew you now that the sin which you laid to Mr. Rae's charge, and to mine, of office-seeking, or office-snatching, if you like the term better, was committed by yourself, and openly avowed by you. Turn to the *Palladium*, Sept. 18, 1843—you, surely, have preserved the files, being so devout an admirer of the paper, which, in those days you would hardly say was conducted by a 'half-editor,' though he who then held the editorial chair holds it still)—Turn, I beg of you, to the paper of Sept. 18, 1843, and you will find your unblushing profession of the doctrine of *Snatcherism*, in a communication purporting to be a reply to a 'Tried Reformer' in the *Islander*. You say:

'I beg to assure a 'Tried Reformer' that if I could force myself into office, I would take great pleasure in doing so; but as that happens to be against the rules of the service with which I am tolerably well acquainted, he need not dread a consummation of the sort. What a contemptible, pusillanimous government we must have in Charlottetown, if, as the *Islander's* unchanged friend insinuates, it be afraid of me.'

In another communication from you, in the *Palladium* of October 30, 1843, I find the following modest display of your claims to office. It is worthy of note:

'I had almost omitted to state that my application for an office, which, possibly more than all the rest, has laid the foundation of future discord'—(what a prophet you are!)—'in the community, was not grounded in the least, on political influence, as the *Islander* insinuates, but altogether on endowments which no amount of popular favour can either confer upon, or divest me of. Being a very apt scholar, and always hearing the oligarchy and its advocates modestly insist, that the 'family compact' must necessarily exist, because men of sufficient talent are not otherwise to be found in the country—I thought there could be no great harm in turning the enemy's artillery upon themselves, and with a modesty equal to their own, claiming the office from Her Majesty, on the score of being better qualified to execute the duties of it than any man that ever filled the appointment in this Colony; and I rather think Lord Stanley is pretty much satisfied of the truth of the assertion. Old servants of unimpeached character and abilities have been cruelly voted from their academical situations—a hardship which the compact only seems to feel when the *lex talionis* is applied to one of its own links. Had I not been possessed of higher qualifications than political influence, I would unhesitatingly have used it in attacking the abuse of any office, (and claimed the office, too, if the fancy had struck me) upon the principle, that the only effectual way to get rid of the rooks is to pull down their nests, and a few more exposures of the manner in which the public service is conducted, will probably incline the British Government to annexation to Nova Scotia, which, in my opinion, is the only speedy remedy for pulling down all the nests of the tyrannical gang.'

These passages prove you, beyond all doubt, to have been, at least in '43, and '44, a Snatcher of the first class; and now that you see your own opinions brought up in judgment against you—and, mark, I have many more choice passages selected from your correspondence to garnish a succeeding letter)—you must confess that you have acted the part of a madman, or a fool, in charging Mr. Rae and his party with political inconsistency and tergiversation, because they were believed by you to entertain a wish for office, while you could prove nothing positive against them, and when, a short time before, the same wish was entertained and acknowledged by yourself.

Your excuse for deserting the Liberal party in the Assembly, was convenient, I have said, for a time—convenient so long as Sir H. V. Huntley remained in the Colony—but that excuse was wholly untenable in the Session of 1848, and this I am prepared to shew before I have done with you. The crusade commenced by the Compact in '46 against the Governor, you approved of only inasmuch as it might serve to remove the latter. In support of this assertion, I give the following extract from a letter addressed by you to me, on the 4th June, 1846, which, you may remember, was in reply to a letter from me, wherein I frankly expressed my

opinion of the character and objects of the *Constitutionalist* paper, just then issued:—

'The last post,' you observe, 'gratified me with a line from you, accompanied by a few papers, for which you have my best thanks. On the subject of our insular politics, I am becoming very listless, nor is it probable that I shall take part in them after the present summer—the bigotted stupidity that suppressed the *Palladium*, gave me a distaste, from which I have never recovered.'

'I cannot agree with you that the new paper is a pirate. If you read the prospectus you will find that the great grievance of the Colony, the land tenures, is carefully avoided. I pointed this out to the editor, or the person who, I suppose, was the editor, and frankly told him that I would not encourage the people to subscribe to it, because if they did, they would incapacitate themselves from supporting a paper like the *Palladium*, if one should espouse their cause. This I have done, unless, in cases where I knew the parties could well afford two yet, notwithstanding, I have reason to believe it has obtained the best of our folks for the next six months. This, therefore, will be a bar in the way of the *Morning News*, at least for a time, in this quarter, whatever may be its politics; and it must change very much before it ought to receive support from the agriculturists. It is emphatically the organ of a man who had prejudged the question at issue in this Colony, and who, I doubt not, for selfish considerations only, refuses to open his eyes and explain the real state of affairs, and who, it is imperatively necessary, should be recalled. To accomplish that end I would use his quarrel with Pope, in so far as it could be made to bear upon the subject; and should the people hereafter place Joe in a minority, it will be the fault of the majority if he be not kept in his place. In short, my policy was, to make these two worthies realize the fable of the Kilkenny cats, (the real interests of the people being evidently equally lost sight of by both), Pope, like Ulysses, to be the 'last devoured.'

This is a faithful transcript from your letter. The original you can see at any time.

Now, let me ask, if Mr. Pope was such an enemy to the public interests in 1846, why did you vote to put him in the Speaker's chair in January, 1847. In February, 1847, you voted, in the absence of sufficient evidence, to expel Mr. Le Lacheur, who, you are well aware, is a firm friend to the 'question prejudged' by Sir Henry Huntley, your cad, Donald Montgomery, voting with you, in opposition to Nicholas Conroy, who had the courage to enrol his name with those of Rae, McIntosh, D. Macdonald, Jardine, Fraser, Warburton, Coles, Clark, &c. In 1848, Mr. Pope's quarrel with Governor Huntley having terminated, it might have been expected that you would separate yourself from the compact party in the House of Assembly. That you did not do so, I have only to turn to your votes to prove. Your first act was to assist in expelling Mr. Coles—your second, to assist in expelling Mr. Warburton. Both of these gentlemen were strenuously opposed by the compact—they were and are known to be advocates of Responsible Government, and to be favourable to a settlement of the 'great grievance of the colony, the land tenures,' which Messrs. Palmer, Pope and Company are not.\* At Mr. Coles's re-election, your friend Donald Montgomery prompted David Simpson to offer in opposition. You professed, I believe, to be a passive spectator at that election, but it is notorious that you, in conjunction with Donald Montgomery, used your influence and exertions on behalf of Mr. Simpson, and against Mr. Coles. Moreover, previous to this election, you declared that if Mr. Coles came from the polling ground at New London with a majority of votes, you would consider the fact tantamount to a declaration of no confidence in you by your constituents, and would accordingly resign your seat. Mr. Coles thrashed you and Donald Montgomery and David Simpson as you were never thrashed before, and still you cling and cling to your seat. You were quite right in believing that the fact of Mr. Coles polling a majority of votes at New London would be proof positive of your having lost

\* As one of the many proofs which may be adduced in support of this assertion, allow me to remind you of the opposition offered by those gentlemen last Session to the plan which was submitted for establishing the rate of exchange, in all payments for Rent, at one-ninth over the Currency of the Island, instead of fifty per cent., as specified in most of the leases.

† Since writing the above, I find that I was wrong in believing that you had a wish to be considered a passive spectator at the Election. While most of your New London friends were busy in voting for Mr. Coles—your influence to the contrary notwithstanding, you were busy in moistening your clay with his whiskey; and having got up your courage to the sticking point, and a wee drappie in your eye, you mounted the Hustings and gave your vote to the hoosier candidate.