

INFORMATION FOR THE PEOPLE.

REVIEW

OF

The Attorney General's Speech,

AT BRIDGETOWN.

“ Six hours to sleep, to law's grave study six,
Four spend in prayer, the rest on lying fix.”

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED AT THE NOVASCOTIAN OFFICE.

1845.

LETTER I.

To MAJOR CHIPMAN, Esq.

CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE PINE GROVE, COUNTY OF
ANNAPOLIS, ON THE 27TH SEPT. 1844.

SIR—

Mr. Attorney General Johnston having published 26 columns of comment on the proceedings of the Meeting at the Pine Grove, over which you presided, and upon my public conduct and personal affairs, I feel myself called upon to review this production, as I did his Speech at Mason's Hall in 1840, in order that all those who take an interest in the topics discussed, may be enabled to judge for themselves how much disingenuousness and false logic a Crown Officer may crowd into a Pamphlet, and how constantly the oracles of truth may rest upon the lips, without sinking deeply into the heart.

Mr. Johnston's pamphlet may be divided into 4 parts: 9 columns relate to the origin of the Pine Grove Meeting, and to the doings and sayings thereof; 8 to general politics, and the proof of the strange assertion, that the principles of Colonial Government, which now obtain in Nova Scotia, differ essentially from those I have advocated, and are identical with those professed by the learned gentleman himself; 6 columns are devoted to the defence of his vote upon the Parish Bill, and four to a criticism on my conduct, in reference to the controversy about the publication of the *Christian Messenger*.

Upon each of these topics I shall have something to say—and I shall be much surprised if I do not prove, that, upon each and all, the Attorney General had better have held his peace.

With reference to the Pine Grove Meeting, it appears to be the aim of the learned gentleman to show,

1st. That there was something irregular and wrong in the manner of calling that Meeting.

2dly. That it was a thinly attended and contemptible demonstration.

3dly. That disingenuous and unfair statements were made there, by those who addressed the audience; and by the Liberal Press in commenting upon the proceedings; and

4thly. That those who were present were wanting in manliness, in not attending the Meeting afterwards called at Bridgetown.

I shall deal with these charges in their order: and first let me enquire, was there anything irregular or wrong in the manner in which the Pine Grove Meeting was assembled? To decide this question, I shall quote, first, the example set by the people of Britain—next, the precedents accumulated by the Tories, and other friends of the Attorney General, in this Province; and lastly, the examples furnished by the learned gentleman himself.

In the Mother Country two modes of eliciting, or shewing the strength of, public opinion, upon political, or other questions of general interest, are adopted—both have been sanctioned by thousands of precedents, and either may be followed by any portion of the People of Nova Scotia, without any body having the right to complain. By one of these, all the inhabitants of a County, a Township, a City, or a Ward, may be assembled by public notice, for free discussion, and for the decision of any question, upon which those who are invited are supposed not to have made up their minds. This mode has generally been preferred by the Liberals of Nova Scotia, nearly all the meetings called by them having been of that character, within the last ten years.

Meetings may also be called, of those only who have made up their minds upon a question, with a view to mutual counsel and combined action for the advancement of that question, or the promotion of the object in which all, or nearly all, are supposed to have agreed. This is the mode which appears to have been chiefly in vogue among the friends of the Attorney General, as far back as my memory extends. It was adopted by the gentlemen who called the Pine Grove Meeting. Those who fancy that the Attorney General's complaints on this head are well founded, have only to take up the English papers, in which they will find a Meeting of the Free Churchmen of Edinburgh—of the Chartists of Birmingham—of the Repealers of Dublin—of the Corn-Law Agriculturists of Yorkshire—of those who are friendly to Sir Robert Peel at Farnworth, or to Tom Dunscomb, at Westminster, advertized or noticed, if not in the same sheet, certainly in the same file. Nobody thinks of attending these Meetings who is not included in the invitation—if any do, and attempt to interfere, they are generally turned out. According to British precedent, then, the Liberals of Annapolis, who assembled at the Pine Grove, did nothing irregular or wrong—the individual who violated all rule, was he who came there without an invitation, who disgusted the people with his frivolous complaints and manœuvres to break up the Meeting; and who, when overwhelmed with a simultaneous burst of feeling, called forth by his petulance of temper, was suffered to go foaming down the aisle, without any body proposing, (as that individual's friends did, at the Hotel Meeting last spring, when a person interfered,) “to turn him out.” By assembling in the mode which pleased them best, it is clear, then, that the Liberals of Annapolis followed the practice of the Mother Country, and that Mr. Johnston, by intruding himself upon them, courted, if he did not deserve, worse treatment than he received.

Let us try the question now by the example of those who are the Attorney General's very particular friends.

In March, 1840, when the Tories of Halifax saw the old system of Government, which the Liberals had laboured to destroy, and the Attorney General to uphold, tumbling about their ears, they put forth placards calling a Meeting at Mason Hall, on the 28th, of “all those who did not concur with the Assembly in the late Address to the Throne;” and, under that notice, which necessarily excluded the four Members of the Town and County, and all the Liberal Members of Assembly, they met, and passed Resolutions and Addresses condemnatory of their conduct, and “thousands of copies,” says the report of the period, “were immediately printed and circulated throughout the country, chiefly through the agency of persons holding commissions under Government, or most decided Tories, calling upon the people to condemn the Assembly, before the Address to the Queen, or the debates upon which it was founded, had been read by the population who were called on to pronounce an opinion.” Here was an attempt at deception, by a party with which the Attorney General was then, and is now, entirely identified, calling for his most indignant reprobation—an attempt to forestall public opinion, and deceive the people, before the means of judging fairly were in their hands—but this was done against, not by the Liberals, and of course Mr. Johnston thought it was all right. Those who called the Pine Grove Meeting, waited till the people had had the debates of the Legislature for six months in their hands, and then met, not to forestall public opinion, but to express sentiments calmly and deliberately formed.

The same system was followed by the same party throughout the summer of 1840. At Yarmouth, if I remember right, a Meeting was called, in the absence of the Members; and wherever they were afraid to convene meetings, Addresses were circulated, which, being signed by a few Tories and officials, were trumpeted forth to the world as conveying the opinions of the people. Has Mr. Johnston forgotten the spirit and the acts of that period? when this “newly arranged machinery of addresses,” was put in motion—when parties of the people were “artfully assembled, and skillfully managed”—when “their sympathies were enlisted by pathetic tales” about republicanism and rebellion—when to these Addresses, “privately circulated,” signatures were obtained by “fraud”—when the Germans in Lunenburg were told that they would be

marched to Halifax to defend the country, and the Acadians to the westward were told that all who did not sign would be shipped out of the Province, as their forefathers had been in 1755.

These were the tricks and "frauds" of 1840, and with these the whole party which sought to sustain the old system, at the head of which stood the Attorney General, were completely identified. Then, when the House of Assembly was "insulted, lampooned, and vilified"—when fourteen columns of defamation appeared in one of the Papers, now supporting the Attorney General, in a single week—when the Province was agitated to its centre, who ever heard this canting lawyer whining about "the ingathering of the harvest" being an employment "much more appropriate for the peasantry than political controversies?" When the Legislature was asking, by constitutional means, for Responsible Government, and Johnston & Co. were seeking by "agitation" to put it down, who ever heard of "artful demagogues"—of the evils of "fostering a spirit of excitement"—or of "creating the occasions for political meetings, without just cause, being an evil injurious in its immediate effects, and deeply and permanently mischievous in its ultimate consequences?" All this was right when the British acorn, just appearing above the fresh soil of Nova Scotia, was to be crushed with an iron heel; yet the people of Annapolis have no right to assemble in open day, and express their feelings constitutionally, without being lectured by the Attorney General, when an attempt is making to tear the young sapling up by the roots. Have they not? let us see who shall hinder them, till the vigorous and umbrageous Tree adorns these noble Provinces, and until this "artful lawyer" is remembered but as the worm, which defiled with its slime the virgin leaf, and broke its fangs against the roots which it could not destroy.

Having shown that the Liberals of Annapolis did nothing more than Britons in the Mother Country do every day; and that they did nothing half so bad as the supporters of Mr. Johnston and the old system did in 1840, let me now shew that all the "agitation" which has disturbed the tranquility of Nova Scotia, during the last eighteen months, is attributable to him; and that all the meetings attended by him in 1843, and called by his supporters previous to the Wilmot Meeting, were of an *exparte*, and not of a public character.

After the general Election in 1840, I publicly declared my desire to have no more agitation; and called on the people to peacefully develop the new principles, without reference to the angry feelings and animosities of the past. I faithfully kept this pledge. For three years, though frequently invited to festive or political gatherings in the interior, I invariably declined—and attended but one public meeting, assembled to prevent an Ex-Mayor, and the Halifax Tories, from wresting the prerogative, and the freedom of his own table, from Lord Falkland; and at which I was called to confront nearly every man, in Halifax, who now aids him to trample upon my public character, and the principles of the Constitution.

Who commenced the agitation which still continues? Mr. Attorney General Johnston.

The House of Assembly, which had steadily supported Lord Falkland's Government, had expressed an opinion adverse to that of this "artful lawyer," upon the question of education. What was the consequence? Hardly had the Session closed, when Mr. Johnston commenced a tour of agitation, attending meetings at Yarmouth, Onslow, and Bridgetown, at all of which he abused the House of Assembly, and at some moved resolutions aimed at myself, at that time his colleague in the Government. You will observe that none of these meetings were open and public, called by Sheriffs, in Court Houses, for fair, manly discussion—they were all *exparte* meetings, ostensibly of the "Education Society," convened in Baptist Meeting Houses, and chiefly attended by those who had already made up their minds. At but one did the gentlemen assailed venture to appear, and at that one they were beaten, although afterwards, when the feelings of the people came to be fairly expressed, they were triumphantly returned to the Assembly. These meetings, then, were the commencement of the new agitation—they were *exparte*, and all attended

by the Attorney General; and yet the speeches were put forth, in newspapers and pamphlets, as conveying the sentiments of the people in the districts where they were held.

These meetings necessarily led to other movements on the opposite side. With the express permission of the Lieutenant Governor, I subsequently attended seven, six of which were public meetings, for free discussion, open to all, and at every one the enemy was beaten.

You will perceive, therefore, that Mr. Johnston's friends set the example, in 1840, of *ex parte*, or exclusive meetings, while all those held by the Liberals in that year were of an opposite character. You will also perceive that, while I avoided all scenes of excitement for three years, the "artful demagogue" who now complains, commenced a new "agitation" in 1843, and called his meetings in an *ex parte* and exclusive manner.

But let me show you now, that the very first meeting held in Nova Scotia, after the retirement of the Ex-Councillors, was of this character. Hardly had we retired, when the Tories of Halifax assembled at the Hotel, under an exclusive notice, and while professing to address the Governor General, broadly insinuated, if they did not charge, treason against those whose motives Lord Falkland had declared "he would take care should not be misrepresented." Yet, with such an example before him—nay, with such a long series of examples, set by himself and his friends, to teach him modesty and moderation, the Attorney General has the impertinence to complain of unfairness and injustice at the hands of the independent Freeholders of Annapolis.

But we are told that another breach of decorum has been committed—that "opposition Addresses" have been got up, and presented to the Lieutenant-Governor. They have, but who is to blame for this? First, Lord Falkland himself, who thought proper, at Pictou, to construe a mere personal compliment, into an approval of the policy of his Administration; and secondly, the members of his Government, who are said to have sent Addresses into the Western Counties, to be signed by their partizans, with the deliberate design to misrepresent the real sentiments of the people. Had Lord Falkland gone into the country, and been contented to receive the usual official courtesies, the Liberals, as well as others, would have been content to pay them; but when they saw that his unpopular advisers were seeking to cover themselves with the robes of royalty, they gently and respectfully drew them aside; and told His Excellency plainly what they thought of the men by whom he was surrounded. The opposition Addresses, then, like the opposition Meetings, grew out of the folly of the members of Government and their supporters, who only have themselves to blame.

We are told that "men without stake in the country" signed these Addresses, and that "minors and children fill up the lists." The Attorney General once called 50 witnesses to prove that I had not fairly stated a fact—and I now call 1500 witnesses in Colchester, 1000 in Hants, 800 in King's County, and 700 in Annapolis, to prove that he has told a grave, deliberate, and contemptible falsehood—an untruth so flagrant, notorious, and unfounded, that the poorest wretch that ever perjured himself in a witness box, would blush to lie in the presence of testimony so overwhelming.

I do not deny that some young men, and some old ones, not freeholders, may have signed these Addresses—but this I will say, let the Attorney General produce the Tory Addresses of 1840, signed by the boys of the Windsor College and Academy—or the Tory Addresses of 1844, and I will pledge myself to furnish, from these, just two for one, who are minors, or have no stake in the country. I am assured that a more respectable body of yeomanry than those who presented the King's County Address, never appeared in a Governor's presence—I have the declaration of men who would scorn a lie, that the Colchester Address was signed by a large proportion of the most respectable and intelligent landholders in it, twenty three of whom were Magistrates—you know the description of people who attended the Pine Grove Meeting; and I know, from personal observation, that the Att'y. General dare not put his foot in the County of Hants, and try the fate of an Election, against any prominent member

of the Opposition. It is true that the Attorney General read to his audience a letter from his "Windsor Correspondent," who told him that "the meeting there was a failure—that Howe did not dare to move any resolutions." What a pity his correspondent had not told him, that one of the members did not make his appearance at the Windsor meeting, and that another was laughed out of the Court House before the proceedings were over—that "no Resolutions" were moved at Newport, where there was not a shade of opposition; and that in Maitland and Nine Mile River, where Resolutions were moved, in presence of the Members, after a week's notice, they were carried by triumphant majorities. All this might have been written, and might have been told, but it would have "removed the scales" from the eyes of the auditory in the barn at Bridgetown.

Having quite settled the point, then, that the Pine Grove Meeting was selon la règle, and that the Attorney General violated well established rules by interfering with it, let me deal as briefly as I can with the vain attempt which he makes to misrepresent the real origin and character of that demonstration. He more than insinuates that the Meeting originated with "Halifax Demagogues, Grocers and Lawyers." This insinuation, like dozens of others, scattered over these dreary columns, is without a shadow of foundation,—the offspring, not of a spirit which thinketh no evil, but of a heart in which ingenuousness, and a fair appreciation of the motives of others, never had root.

Not a soul in Halifax had the least suspicion that the Liberals of Annapolis contemplated holding any meeting, when I received letters and requisitions requesting the attendance of myself and other gentlemen in Wilmot. I immediately wrote to say, that, although I should have no objections to meet the Attorney General at a general meeting in the midst of his Constituents, yet that I doubted the utility of calling an *ex parte* meeting.—that, as a day had been fixed, I would attend, but that I thought some of the other gentlemen invited, would not. This was all that was known, done or said, about the meeting, previous to our leaving Halifax. Mr Young, from the first, informed me, that he would not be able to attend without much inconvenience, in consequence of his brother's absence from the Province. During all the time we were in King's County together, Mr Young held the same language, down to within an hour of my leaving Kentville; and then only yielded to the representations made by parties, who had been led to believe that an active canvass, to defeat the objects of the meeting, had been set on foot, and that all the leading "agitators" of the West, lay and clerical, were to assemble at Wilmot to give us battle.

The Attorney-General complains that Mr. Young changed his mind; but yet he tells us that he changed his own. He first 'wrote to prepare his friends to attend, and he would be there;' then, when he saw the nature of the notice, "he determined not to attend, and sent forward letters to that effect." But, after a restless night at Sheffield's, he finally determined, at Gibbon's, to go after all. He changed his mind twice, as circumstances changed around him—he wrote two sets of letters: Mr. Young changed his but once, and wrote no letters at all—yet Mr. Young is to be blamed and abused, and Mr. Johnston is to have neither fickleness nor deception attributed to him.

If I were to give a latitude to my imagination, as the Attorney General has done to his, I might be pardoned for suspecting that something like the real state of the case was this: that the learned Leader meant, from the first, to be governed by circumstances—that when he first wrote to Annapolis, his hope and intention were to muster his forces and overwhelm us—that when he got his letters thence, he found that that could not so easily be done, and then he determined not to attend. But a lucky or unlucky after-thought was probably this, that if the meeting-house could be closed, and the people compelled to assemble in the open air, the presence of the learned gentleman on the ground, with a few technical objections and plausibilities, might possibly throw the meeting into confusion, or procure an adjournment. To sound the people, and watch the chances of the game, an emissary was sent forward to Sheffield's—but he found the Liberals more staunch and determined than was probably expected, and hence the perturbed slumbers of the "chief actor" in the piece, when

he arrived near the scene of exhibition. "The night I spent at Sheffield's," he says, "was anything but comfortable." I have no doubt it was as uncomfortable, as that which a great friend of Responsible Government spent in his tent before the battle of Bosworth: I heard a good many moans myself, and I came to the conclusion, either that his speech was not quite prepared, or his plan of operations was not yet arranged to his satisfaction.

The Atty. General seems to think that gentlemen, respectfully invited by the Yeomanry of Annapolis, have no right "to meddle with the concerns of a county with which they have no connexion." He might as well aver that they have no right to accept an invitation to a dinner in any County where they do not reside. To whom does the County of Annapolis belong: to the Atty. General, or to the sturdy Yeomanry who have improved it by their industry, and vivify it by their intelligence? To the latter, I presume, and what right has he to dictate to them who they shall invite, or where and when they shall assemble? What right has he to restrain Mr. Young or myself from mingling with any portion of the people of this free Country, whenever we choose, either by invitation or at the dictates of our own minds, whether questions of public policy are to be discussed, or scenes of social intercourse and friendly communion are to be enjoyed? For the general interests, and political elevation, of the People of Annapolis, both Mr. Young and I have toiled for many years; and I have yet to learn that they are the "miserable serfs" of the Atty. General, or that I, a native of Nova Scotia, am to ask his permission to exchange opinions with any portion of my fellow Countrymen.

The Attorney General tells us that he knew Mr. McNab's "sense of propriety, would prevent that gentleman from making an exhibition of himself at the Pine Grove meeting," and that Mr. Uniacke was also restrained from appearing there by "feelings of gentlemanly courtesy." Now may I not ask where was his own "sense of propriety," when he intruded himself among Mr. McNab's constituents at Mason's Hall, and hopped about the table, foaming at the mouth, when they resented his intrusion? Where was his sense of propriety, when he told the people in the Barn at Bridgetown, that Mr. McNab's attempt to turn him out led to Mr. Almon's appointment, when that gentleman spent some days, after the Elections, in aiding Lord Falkland to retain his old Council, Mr. Johnston being of the number? Where were the feelings of gentlemanly "courtesy," and non-intermeddling with other people's Counties, when the Attorney General's own co-adjutors in the work of agitation, wrote letters to Mr. Uniacke's County, to stir up opposition to his return, putting him to the expense of £600 or £700?

We are told that the demonstration at the Pine Grove was "poor and ineffective"—that it was "fruitless, abortive and insignificant," that a fifth of the people went off with the Attorney General, and that not more than 250 remained. This is the amount of his statement. His friends, who write for that veracious miscellany, the Christian Messenger, have declared that the meeting was composed of the "scrapings of the County," and that "not more than 30 Freeholders were present." Now, it does so happen, that I have in my possession, Requisitions signed by 600 names, and that, including others not forwarded to me, the whole number of signatures is 720.

Those who know the County well declare that among these are 500 Freeholders, including many of the most extensive Farmers, wealthy Capitalists and Traders, and a very large proportion of the public spirit and intelligence of the County of Annapolis. I believe that these documents, and those who have examined them, tell the truth, and that the Attorney General and the Christian Messenger do not. Judging from what I saw in Wilmot, I do not hesitate to say, that a more numerous or respectable body of men I have rarely seen assembled, at any meeting in the rural districts of Nova Scotia—and that, if it be true that the Attorney General's friends, assembled, after ten days' canvass and solicitation, in the Barn at Bridgetown, did not exceed 250, he would have been shamefully beaten at Wilmot, if every man of them had been at his back. When duly "exaggerated and misrepresented" by the Tory and Messenger Press, these 250 people are magnified into a "great mass meeting"

decisive of the standing of the Attorney General in his own County, after ten days spent in drumming up his forces; but when two strangers meet, by invitation, double the number at the Pine Grove, oh! that is quite another thing, and those who tell us that "truth is powerful and will prevail," call it an abortive and insignificant affair.

All this may seem strange to simple people—to you, who *know the truth*, it will seem passing strange; but I must confess it does not much surprise me. Men of a peculiar organization, long hackneyed at the Bar, are accustomed to defend, almost indiscriminately, right or wrong, provided they are paid for it. I have heard the learned Attorney General just as eloquent when his brief embodied a case of flagrant injustice, as when he was upholding the soundest principles of law. I am aware that there is a species of forensic morality by which all this is justified to a tender conscience. We would have less reason to complain, however, if this species of morality were confined to the Courts; but, unfortunately, except in minds of singular expansion, (and the Attorney General's does not happen to be one of these,) the habit is apt to become so inveterate, that "artful lawyers," even when they become legislators or "agitators," rarely regard truth in the abstract, or state fairly both sides of any question; but ask themselves what is expedient? what will make in favour of our side? how little truth will do, to make the public swallow a volume of misrepresentation? This vice of his profession (for it is happily not an essential quality in the advocate) runs through the whole of the Attorney General's Bridgetown Speech, and disfigures it, to a greater extent than any former production, even by the same author, which it has been my fortune to read. When he turns to Bridgetown, or to the sayings and doings of his own party, in town or country, he looks through the small end of the Telescope, and all is magnified to the proper dimensions; when he looks towards the Pine Grove, or to the doings and sayings of the Liberals, he puts the large end to his eye—sees every thing diminished, or, what answers his purpose quite as well, sees nothing at all.

The Attorney General tells us that he saw 100 Freeholders, who were not at the meeting. Who doubts it? But when he tells us that, "deducting his friends, who, from curiosity, continued at it," he doubts if there were an equal number remaining"; you and I know, that, in a meeting crowded to overflowing, which must have included some hundreds of Freeholders, there was but a single dissenting voice when the Resolutions passed.

The learned gentleman complains that Mr. Young and I went to his County to "dictate to the people," to sow "discontent and suspicion." Now what are the facts? That we went there by the spontaneous invitation of the inhabitants; and that, when we got there, we refused to interfere or address the people, on the topics of the day, until they had expressed their own opinions, and passed Resolutions complimentary to the Ex-Councillors, and the Members who had sustained them.

Mr. Johnston complains that we proclaimed "that the whole County was converted;" but he knows that I frankly told him, in presence of the meeting, "that, as he was the Representative of the County, I was bound to assume that he had a majority to sustain him." I never said, and do not now say, that there was a majority of the Freeholders at the Pine Grove; neither do I believe that there was in the barn at Bridgetown. It is not improbable that the same amount of expenditure, and the free use of the same means, backed by all the influence of Government, may secure him a majority at the next Election, against a comparatively poor man, who is not a practised speaker. But what will this prove? Not that 700 people did not sign the Wilmot requisitions, or that there are not 500 or 600 Freeholders, who do not approve of his public conduct.

But, we are told that one old gentleman signed the Requisition, because he was assured that there was nothing political in it. The old gentleman, it appears, can write; and all I have to say about his case is, that I presume he can also read, and that he ought to have read what he signed, and judged for himself. Then it seems that some wag of an Irishman hoaxed an acquaintance, by telling him a story about fish; when it turned out that the object was to bring

some odd fish from Halifax, instead of some herrings from Digby. This was certainly wrong, but I doubt if there have not been more falsehoods told, to get signatures to Tory Addresses, and College Petitions, than ever were told by Jemmy White.

It is amusing to remark the coolness with which the first Crown Officer turns to his friend Morris, and tells him, of course "it would not become me to sanction any breach of the Queen's peace," but if you kick White, I don't think the Jury will give heavy damages.

A great deal of merriment, it appears, was created by a paragraph from a New Brunswick Paper; but any body who reads it can see, either that the Editor was hoaxed by some person from Annapolis, or that he was turning the whole affair into ridicule, by some whimsical exaggerations. What a pity it is that the learned gentleman cannot "muzzle the Press" of New Brunswick.

The Attorney General asserts that sixty people followed him from the Wilmot Meeting. I have the authority of a highly respectable friend, who declares that there were not twenty. As to what the learned gentleman "laughingly said" outside, I know nothing, but my friend asserts he was foaming with rage; and certain it is, if he did laugh, it must have been on the other side of his face, from that which was turned to me, when he went raging down the aisle, for I doubt if a smile illumined that side for the next four and twenty hours.

The learned gentleman is very indignant at his Constituents, for hissing him at the Pine Grove; and we are favoured with a column of declamation against hissing in general, and in his own case in particular. I cannot say I approve of the practice, and the Attorney General knows that I did my best to restrain the sibilant propensities of his audience—but hissing is one of the rights of British Subjects, and unless Mr. Johnston can muzzle the people as well as the Press, I cannot see how he is to prevent it. How are people to rid themselves of bad actors, or uninvited intruders, except by some harmless expressions of disapprobation? He calls it a "polite accomplishment"—no doubt the Annapolis people thought it so, when they had heard that a friend of his once set the example of hissing Lord Falkland, at a festive, not a political entertainment; and that his good friends, the Halifax Tories, had exhibited their proficiency, on several memorable occasions. And yet we hear the person, who, at this moment, is sustained by these very Tories, and could not hold his political position one hour but for their support, declaring that "he hails" the people who never hiss—"the men of correct principles, and decent manners, as his friends." The Attorney General's ear trumpet is something like his telescope—it has a big and small end—when the Tories hiss he turns "the small end of the horn," and fancies he hears soft music; but when the Liberals take part in this "polite accomplishment," he turns the other end, and the effect is so overwhelming, that he suddenly warns the people of "threatening dangers that may yet overtake their best and dearest interests." If it has really come to this, that the people of Nova Scotia cannot hiss a cross grained Attorney, who thrusts himself into a meeting uninvited, and loses his temper before he has spoken twenty words, then the British bull dogs are muzzled sure enough.

The Atty. General seems to complain of the speeches made at the Pine Grove Meeting, but he has failed to prove that any personal attacks were made upon him—that anything was said there which ought not to have been said—that would not have been said if he had been present, or that cannot be fully substantiated. Falling back upon some alleged private conversations of Mr. Young, he attempts to be witty and satirical; and, referring to the triumphs of the Government over the Opposition, he makes this extraordinary assertion, "beaten they were, I repeat, on every occasion."—This is another grave and unparalleled falsehood. Let me first frankly record the Ministerial triumphs, and then shew that Mr. Johnston was defeated on several occasions, of so much importance, that few but himself, in the face of such defeats, would have clung to office.

During the three Sessions that the Liberals sat in Lord Falkland's Council, 10 Government measures were introduced, and all but one were carried through both branches. Almost every sum of money asked for by the Government was voted, and while a vote of want of confidence was rejected by a majority

of 42 to 6, a vote of approval of the principles and policy of the Government was carried by a majority of 40 to 8. The formal answer to the opening Speech rarely occupied more than a single forenoon. Contrast this state of things with the Government legislation under Mr. Johnston's leadership.

The answer to the opening Speech was carried by a majority of *one*, after a fortnight's debate, in which a system of Executive canvass and intimidation was resorted to, unparalleled in the history of this Province;—the unconstitutional threat of dissolution being most indecently employed.

On the Resolutions, for affirming the principles of the new system, the Government were defeated in Committee, and only got their amendment on the Journals by an ultimate majority of 2, the Speaker being in the Chair.

A direct Vote of Confidence in the retired Councillors was only rejected by a majority of 3, the Speaker being in the Chair; while the Resolutions which declared that, in retiring, they had asserted no "pretensions" which the house disapproved, was carried by a unanimous vote.

In the Summer Session, the Cape Breton question was taken out of the hands of the Government by a decided majority, and a vote of want of confidence was staved off by a prorogation.

These are the triumphs, of which the Attorney General boasts; let me now notice the defeats which he has failed to record:—

On the Parish Bill, for which, though not a Government measure, both Mr. Johnston and Mr. Dodd voted, they were defeated by a majority of 21 to 18.

On the general principle of the Civil List Bill, the preserving to present incumbents the whole amount of salaries received, and which was tried on the first division, they were beaten by a large majority.

The motion made by the Attorney General, to give to Sir Rupert D. George £1250 per annum, in addition to his fees as Registrar, they were compelled to abandon; and, on a subsequent motion to give £937 instead of £700, for which Mr. Dodd and the Attorney General voted, they were again defeated.

The motion to add £125 to the amount which Mr. Nutting receives in fees, and of which I shall have something more to say by and bye, the Members of Government were compelled to abandon.

On the Registrar's Bill, a measure repeatedly defeated by the Atty General, while in the Legislative Council, and upon which both he and Mr Dodd voted, backed by most of the inveterate Tories in the House, they were defeated by a decisive majority of 29 to 15.

You will bear in mind that the Civil List Bill was the only Government measure introduced by the Administration, during the Winter Session, and that, on the general principles and chief details of that, they were defeated. In the Summer Session, no Government measure was introduced.

It is also worthy of remembrance that Mr. Johnston clung to office when he was unable to carry the salary pledged to the Lieutenant Governor before he left England; and never ventured to move for a large amount of arrears, claimed by the public officers—Lord Falkland himself being included among the number. Yet his Lordship's Leader boasts of his triumphs, and ventures to tell the world that "the Opposition was beaten on every occasion." I think you will agree with me, that any schoolboy, caught in such a series of palpable misrepresentations, if not positive untruths, would be horsed before his fellows, and whipped into some regard for the ninth commandment.

But, we are sneeringly told that Mr. Young, often "emptied the red benches." If this were true, the Attorney General should have been the last to notice the desertions; for he ought to have remembered clearing the benches himself, on several memorable occasions—he ought also to have spared the feelings of at least three of his own supporters, who rarely rise without producing a rush to the lobbies of the House. I do not mean to insinuate that the art of being tedious is confined to either party; but, from what I have seen of his own performances, I am led to hope that the learned Attorney General took the precaution to "lock the barn door" before he began his five hours' speech.

Mr. Young, we are told, was ambitious "to fix the wondering gaze of a country audience." What took Mr. Johnston to Yarmouth, to Onslow, to Bridgetown? To "fix the wondering gaze of a country audience,"—to figure in the Christian Messenger as a "great Lawyer," and a "great Liberal." But then what is right in Mr. Johnston, is wrong in Mr. Young—the leader can see the mote in his neighbour's eye, but cannot see the beam in his own.

I come now to the triumphant vauntings of the Attorney General over my absence from the Bridgetown Meeting. These may have been in good taste, but I can scarcely think so. During fifteen years of public life, seven of them passed in the Legislature, I am not aware that I ever shrunk from fair and manly encounter, either in the Press, at Public Meetings, or on the floors of the Assembly, whenever any man, however elevated or able, chose to question the soundness of my opinions, or the correctness of my public conduct. It has been my fortune to differ and contend with men who need never veil their plumes to Mr. Johnston. It was my duty in 1840 to measure weapons with him more than once; and, in the Sessions of 1844, I believe that, whether the assailant, or standing on the defensive, he had even less to brag of in the debates than he had on the divisions. Mr. Johnston knew then, right well, when he was making his boasting harangue at Bridgetown, that if I had had notice, I would have been there—nobody who knows me can doubt it for an instant.

Why was I not there? For this simple reason, that I was standing in the Court House at Amherst, confronting his colleague Mr. Stewart, before the people of Cumberland, ere I knew one word of the Bridgetown Meeting—the notice of which had only appeared in the Morning Post of the previous Tuesday, and which was to come off that very day. But, says Mr. Johnston, the mails that reached Halifax on Friday night, might have brought the intelligence—if so, why did not the notice appear in Saturday's Morning Post, or even in the Recorder of Saturday afternoon? Answer this, to the satisfaction of the public, thou "artful" lawyer. No such notice appeared—no such intelligence reached Halifax. I saw fifty citizens on Saturday, who knew nothing of the Meeting, or I should have heard of it. I left on Saturday afternoon for Cumberland, was detained by bad weather at Horton on Monday, where I met 20 persons, not one of whom had heard a syllable of the Meeting at Bridgetown. By Monday's Mail the notice, no doubt, arrived in town, as it appeared in the Post of the following morning, some 48 hours after I had left Halifax; and before the Post could have reached Horton on Tuesday afternoon, I had crossed the Bay, and was addressing the people of Parrsborough. Yet the Attorney General tells me I had "abundant notice." Two years ago I should have said that the learned gentleman was mistaken, now I am compelled to acknowledge that I believe he has deliberately asserted what he knew to be untrue.

But we are told, that I ought to "have kept myself disengaged." My answer is very simple. I waited eight days after the Pine Grove Meeting, and hearing nothing from Mr. Johnston, or any body else in Annapolis, I concluded that he had, as I have expressed it elsewhere, "either found himself so strong that a meeting was unnecessary, or so weak that he deemed it impolitic to hold one."

May I not here observe, that, if a Meeting was contemplated, a day, or two, or three, after the adjournment at the Pine Grove, public notice should have been given; and eight days ought not to have been suffered to elapse, leaving barely time for the gentlemen challenged to reach Bridgetown by coach, the challenger being all the time on the ground mustering his forces. Notwithstanding the disadvantages which must have arisen from the unnecessary delay, had I been in Halifax when the notice appeared, on the Friday I should have been in the Barn at Bridgetown; and although my Speech might not have been as long as that of the Attorney General, I think I may venture to say, that, like an Irishman's Shillelah, what there was of it, would have been very much to the purpose.

We are told, however, that the Attorney General offered to meet us on the

Monday after the Meeting at the Pine Grove. He did, but I had formed other engagements as I came along, which would occupy all the time I could spare, and Mr. Young was compelled to be in town by Sunday night. Besides, would it have been fair to the 600 or 700 people, who had given up a Friday in Harvest, and many of whom had travelled long distances, to have asked them to turn out again on the following Monday? It would have been most unreasonable, not to say cruel, to have done so: many might have come, but many more could not, and the knowledge of this probably influenced the Attorney General in making the proposition.

Being most desirous to meet the Attorney General, face to face, before any audience, not packed and held together by the influence of government, on the 4th November I addressed to him the following note:—

HALIFAX, NOV. 4, 1844.

Sir—

I have waited, with much patience, for the concluding portion of your speech, delivered at the Bridgetown meeting on the 10th October, before addressing this note to you. As three weeks have elapsed, and the whole has not appeared, I feel that a longer silence on my part, with reference to what has already been printed, may be misunderstood; and I now beg to express my regret that I had left Town for Cumberland before the notice of that meeting was published, and to declare my readiness to review your speech, in your presence, at any meeting you may choose to call, at any central place, in any County of Nova Scotia, Annapolis included, at any time between the 15th and 30th of this month.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

JOSEPH HOWE.

To the Hon. Attorney General Johnston.

This challenge, you will perceive, was not to meet me, at Musquodoboit, or in any part of my own County, after I had had ten days to muster forces—it left the time, and place, to be fixed by the party invited, and it gave him the range of 17 counties, his own included. No answer having been returned to this invitation, and the Bridgetown Speech having dragged its slow length along over twenty six columns of the Morning Post, I am compelled to take the open ground which the public Press affords, and to address, in this mode, an audience, to whose deliberate judgment I have never been afraid to appeal.

Notwithstanding the advice given in the Nova Scotian, I think the "Woodberries, Fitzrandolphs, and Baths," did right not to attend the Meeting at Bridgetown, for this plain reason—that many of the questions were to turn upon facts and references, with which it was not to be expected that even intelligent men, residing in the interior, could be sufficiently armed to unravel the sophistries of the Attorney General. Had they gone, and outvoted him, the "practiced libellers" who write for him in the "debased Press" which the Government supports with the People's money, to abuse the People's friends, would still have claimed the majority, as they did at the eight meetings in Hants and Cumberland, at every one of which the supporters of the Government were fairly beaten. The affair stands very well as it is—the Attorney General has glorified himself on the barn floor, and thrashed every body that was not there; and, depend upon it, before I am done with him, I will give the public the benefit of the few grains of wheat that I find in his 26 columns of chaff.

Yours truly,
JOSEPH HOWE.

Halifax December 9, 1844.

LETTER II.

SIR—

I think it is Seneca, who says, that “not only the frequent hearing and seeing of a wise man delight us, but the very encounter of him suggests profitable contemplations.” If this be true, and the Attorney General really be a wise man, I am likely to be largely benefitted; but I must own, that at every step I take, in wading through his Bridgetown argument, I am led to doubt his wisdom, however much I may discover of that small cunning, which Statesmen often want, and are always better without, though mere special pleaders have it in great abundance.

Mr. Johnston complains that I repeated, at Wilmot, a great many things which he refuted last winter—and told a great many old stories, which he had already explained. He assumes, with great complacency, that all his explanations in the Assembly were satisfactory, and that no distinct charge has ever yet been preferred against him, which he has not triumphantly refuted. This was the language he held on the floor of the Assembly, when he made an attack upon the Liberal Press last July, and what was the consequence? That Mr. Annand, whose Press had been assailed, immediately preferred against him 17 distinct accusations, not one of which has been satisfactorily answered to this hour.

That Mr. Johnston made a long speech last winter—that he was frequently interrupted—that he attempted to explain away a great many things, and to make out a case for himself and the government, is most true: that he produced conviction in any body's mind, not previously prejudiced in his favor, or operated upon by the influence which his position at the moment gave him, I never knew until I read of it in the pamphlet.

The Attorney General cautions his audience not to be ‘misled and affected by my artfully arranged sentences.’ This is excellent advice, coming from an old Attorney, notoriously the creature of preparation and arrangement; and applied to a Mechanic, who rarely copies any thing he writes—as rarely studies what he is to say, and whose only care about his sentences is, that each should contain the truth.

The Attorney General has favoured the world with a sort of Historical Sketch, illustrative of our relative positions, principles, and claims to public confidence. The objects in view appear to have been various:

1st.—To show, that he and his friends were wise, consistent, and admirable politicians, down to the arrival of Lord Sydenham in this Province.

2d.—To show that Lord Sydenham, after due enquiry into the past, approved of the acts of the old Administration—disapproved of the conduct of the Reformers, threw overboard my principles, and adopted those of Mr. Johnston.

3d.—That Lord Falkland's Administration was conducted, from 1840 to 1842, upon those principles, adopted by Lord Sydenham from Mr. Johnston; and that it has, since then, been conducted upon other and different principles, embodied in the Doddean Confession of faith.

4th.—That the principle of Responsible Government, as advocated by myself, was abandoned when I took a seat in Council.

5th.—That some heterodox opinions, which I had agreed to modify, in order to obtain a seat in Council, are still cherished, in violation of good faith.

6th.—That Lord Falkland's Council was broken up, in consequence of a series of attacks, by the Liberal Press, and Liberal Members, to all of which

I was a party, in violation of the faith I owed to my colleagues and the head of the Government.

7th.—That I gave, in the Spring of 1843, notice of a motion, “aimed at the Government of which I was a Member.”

8th.—That I made the assertion, that Lord Falkland had promised to fill up “all the vacancies in the Executive Council” from the Liberal party—an assertion to which His Lordship gave a flat contradiction.

If I understand what Mr. Johnston has been at, in all the speeches he has made, for the last twelve months, and what his friends have been essaying, in the wearisome lucubrations with which they have deluged the Tory and Messenger Press, the object has been to prove these eight charges. I rejoice that they have at last been brought out before the Country, in a shape that admits of my dealing with them, without any chance of their being withdrawn by bold denials, or frittered away by subtle evasion. The Bridgetown Speech has been reported with great care—two months having been spent in the process—the accuracy of the report has been publicly acknowledged, and I am at liberty to deal with it, as I would with a formal indictment, drawn up by a Crown Officer, in discharge of his official duties. Now, if I take these eight charges, and show that the whole have been reared upon a superstructure of falsehood—that there is not a single one of them that is not only untrue, but that has not its origin in a base and unwarrantable perversion of all the facts of the case, what will the public think of the man, who has been twelve months sewing these rotten leaves together, to cover his political nakedness?

In order to show whether Mr. Johnston, and the party which now sustain him, or Mr. Howe and the Liberals, established, by their conduct, previous to 1841, the fairer claim to be regarded as rational, consistent, and useful public men, it will be necessary to refer to a few facts which the Attorney General has not recorded.

The first time that I ever heard of Mr. Johnston figuring upon the stage of public life, was when he attempted to “wrest the prerogative” from the Bishop of Nova Scotia, and to appoint a Rector to St. Paul’s Church: thereby taking from the head of the Church a power, in the matter of patronage, analogous to that which he has lately accused the Liberals of wishing to take from the head of the Government. The Bishop, and the Governor, for the time being, resisted “his pretensions,” and this reckless innovator rushed out of the Church, declaring that owls and bats would roost in it; and, after floundering about for some time, adopted another creed—turned a theological battery, called the Christian Messenger, upon the Church of his fathers, for a number of years; and finally, when it suited his interests, or when his passions were to be gratified in another line, became the champion of the Church—the political ally of the highest Tories in it, and the advocate of their Parish Bills. Yet this man has the modesty to prate of “existing institutions,” and a regard for the “peace of the country”—when his first act was the disturbance of the public peace—an attack upon existing institutions; and his consistency is exhibited in returning to the Bishop’s side, like a beaten hound, after a vain attempt to undermine his authority.

The next time I marked Mr. Johnston, figuring beyond the purlieus of the Courts, was in 1836, when I saw him addressing a meeting of the Constituency of Halifax, and acting with the official and old Tory party, who had met for the purpose of concerting how they might defeat Forrester, Bell, and Annand, at the elections then in progress, and return Messrs. Lawson, Murdoch, and Starr. Neither of us were in the Legislature at that time—he was then earning the honors which he afterwards received from the local Government, and I was just entering upon the discharge of those duties which secured to me the confidence and support of my countrymen, from 1837 down to 1840. This was the first time that Mr. Johnston and I ever confronted each other. There he stood, at one end of the room, surrounded by nearly all those who, during the subsequent four years, stoutly resisted the introduction of almost every change which the Reformers advocated—and there stood I, backed by those who, in the coming struggles, were to carry me forward, from victory to

victory, in spite of the determined opposition of the men we there opposed. Now, let us suppose that Mr. Johnston and his allies had succeeded on this occasion: that Bell, and Forrester, and Annand, had been defeated; and that similar defeats, by the efforts of the same party, had thinned our ranks in other parts of the Province, and the Tories had obtained a majority, does any body believe that the changes which have taken place—the improvements which have been secured—the principles which have been introduced, would have been ours in 1840, or that Responsible Government would at this moment have been established in British America? No—had Mr. Johnston and his party succeeded in their plans, the Liberals would have struggled for the next four years, as some of them had struggled for the previous six, in a powerless and almost hopeless minority—Responsible Government would have been indefinitely postponed—Nova Scotia would have been in no position to avail herself of Durham's Report—or of Russell's Despatches, and the Governor General would never have set his foot upon our shores.

Yet this man, whose Country is only benefitted when he is beaten—whose defeats have produced a harvest of good, which would have been lost had he been victorious, has the assurance to claim for himself and his party the merit of what has been done, not only without his aid, but in spite of his teeth. I start, then, with this assertion, that when Mr. Johnston first appeared on the stage in 1836, it was in connection with that party in Halifax, who, from that time, down to the arrival of Lord Sydenham, upheld the old principles and practices of Administration—resisted almost every improvement; and, had they obtained a majority, would have thrown the influence of Nova Scotia into the wrong scale, in the struggle for Responsible Government.

Now, what was the state of Nova Scotia at this period? The House of Assembly shall describe it. In what spirit did the Liberals of that day, who then, as now, were accused of "needlessly agitating a peaceful Country," of sowing "sedition and rebellion, with all their fearful consequences,"—in what spirit did these men, (who had beaten, at the Elections, Mr. Johnston and his Mason Hall confederates,) approach the Throne? "The People of Nova Scotia," says the Address of 1837, "turn to their Sovereign, as to the Father of all his People—who rears, wherever practicable, Institutions favourable to freedom, and fosters that love of justice—that nice sense of the relative duties of the Government and the governed, which distinguish the Parent State." In this spirit, and looking to the Mother Country as their model, the Liberals commenced their work.

The Executive and Legislative Councils were one and the same—holding seats for life—legislating with closed doors, but one member residing in the interior, and none of them depending upon public confidence, local or Parliamentary, for their positions. "The practical effects of this system, have been," says the Assembly, "in the highest degree injurious to the best interests of the Country," "the efforts of the Representative Branch," in many instances, "being neutralized, and rendered of no avail." In praying a remedy for these, and other evils, which they variously illustrated, the Liberals, (who had just beaten the party with whom Mr. Johnston was identified—with whom he was associated at the Meeting I have described—by whom he was shortly after promoted—with whom he continued to co-operate till the summer of 1840—by whom he has been backed and upheld since last December,) thus shadowed out the nature of the changes they desired:—

"While this House has a due reverence for British institutions, and a desire to preserve to themselves and their children the advantages of that constitution, under which their brethren on the other side of the Atlantic have enjoyed so much prosperity and happiness; they cannot but feel that those they represent but slightly participate in these blessings. They know that *the spirit* of that Constitution—the *genius* of those Institutions, is *complete responsibility to the People*, by whose resources, and for whose benefit, they are maintained. But in this Colony, the People and their Representatives are powerless, *exercising upon the local Government very little influence, and possessing no effectual control.*—In England, the People, by one vote of their Representatives,

can change the Ministry, and alter any course of policy injurious to their interests; here, the Ministry are your Majesty's Council, combining Legislative, Judicial, and Executive powers—*holding their seats for life*, though nominally at the pleasure of the Crown; and often treating with indifference the wishes of the People and the representations of the Commons."

This showing up of the old system, and demand of "responsibility to the Commons"—the spirit of the English constitution, the genius of British Institutions, was made in 1837, before Mr. Johnston had entered the Government, *three years before he made the speech he boasts of*, at Masons' Hall, and but a month or two after he stood in full conclave with the Halifax Tories, *who did their best to prevent the return of the very men who urged that constitutional demand.*

The question here arises, is Mr. Howe, who was thus associated, and thus employed, when our Institutions were confessedly so defective, the safer guide and the truer friend to the people of Nova Scotia; or Mr. Johnston, who, in 1836, voted and acted with the Tories; who stood with his arms folded, and did nothing, down to 1838—and then again openly acted with those by whom the introduction of these constitutional principles was stoutly opposed.

But, says the Attorney General, Lord Sydenham formed the Government in 1840, *not upon the principles put forward by the Liberals*, but upon those enunciated three years after in my speech at Mason Hall. This I distinctly deny, and I marvel at the powers of face with which the assertion was hazarded in the Barn at Bridgetown.

For what did the Liberals ask in the Address of 1837?

For "responsibility of the Council to the people and their Representatives"—for "influence and control over the acts of the local Government"—for "power to change the Ministry, and alter any course of policy injurious to their interests." This is what was claimed by the Liberals three years before Mr. Johnston made his speech—*this was obtained, in spite of his exertions*, but a few months after that speech fell still born from the Press.

These guards, securities, and privileges, yielded by Sydenham, sanctioned by Falkland, *were proclaimed by me on the Hustings in 1840*, were announced by every member of Government in the Lower House in 1841, were established by Lord Sydenham himself by formal Resolution, in the summer of that year—were reiterated again, by the members of Lord Falkland's Government, in the Confidence debates in 1842; and yet *were denied, and attempted to be frittered away, by Messrs. Johnston & Stewart, for eighteen months after the people of Nova Scotia were in full possession of them*, and were never distinctly acknowledged, until, *in order to hold their places*, those gentlemen were compelled, sorely against their will, to swallow the Doddean Confession of Faith. Yet we are told that *the Government was formed upon Mr. Johnston's principles*, and that the Liberals had to abandon theirs, in order that they might be included in the arrangements! Here are ours, clearly enunciated in 1837, and I think it will puzzle Mr. Johnston to produce any speech of his, prior to 1842, *a year and a half after Responsible Government was fully established in North America*, that bears the faintest resemblance to the system; if he can let it be produced, if he cannot, let him "hereafter hold his peace."

The labours, and struggles, and perils of 1837, the people of Nova Scotia have not yet forgotten. They have not forgotten that the men who sought these improvements were branded as rebels and infidels—that they were compelled, at the hazard of the Revenue Bills, to rescind their Resolutions—and they will not soon forget that Mr. Johnston, having, before the Election, lent himself to the Tories, to prevent the return of a Liberal majority, throughout the anxious and trying year which succeeded, *never raised his hand to aid them in the contest in which they were engaged.*

The Liberals, however, did their work, and reaped their reward, without him—for they were assured, by the venerable William the IV. "That the greater part of the measures suggested in their Address, were conducive alike to the honor of his Crown, and the welfare of his Majesty's faithful subjects inhabiting this part of His Majesty's dominions." Mr. Howe may well con-

sole himself with a compliment like this, from Lord Falkland's illustrious patron, for the imbecile and unconstitutional denunciation recently aimed at his head, and attempted to be justified by the Atty General. In this work, "conduive alike to the honor of the Crown, and the welfare of His Majesty's subjects," Mr Howe was a prime mover, and Mr Johnston had no hand—yet the latter is a safer guide, and greater benefactor, to the Crown and Country, and the former a dangerous demagogue, "seeking only his own interest and advancement."

Let me trace the history of these two men, in connection with subsequent arrangements, and see who showed a disposition to grasp at office—to sacrifice principle—to secure party objects.

"Some time in the Summer of 1837, (says Mr. Howe, in his explanations on the floor of the House, in 1841), Sir Colin Campbell did me the honor to ask my advice respecting the formation of his Councils. I furnished a sketch of two Councils, on the principle of not giving a triumph to any party—placing in the Legislative Council men who represented all denominations and interests, one to come from each County where that was practicable—it also provided honorably for each Member in the old Councils, by seating them at one of the two Boards—the plan gave no unfair preponderance to any party, and of the seats in the Executive Council, only appropriated one to those with whom I had been accustomed to act, that one was in favour of Mr. Huntington."

"When the sketch was handed in, Sir Colin Campbell did me the honor and kindness, that he (Mr. H.) had taken no seat for himself. His answer was, that changes had been pressed by the party with which he acted, and he was anxious that they should be shielded from any suspicion of interested views in so doing. If he took a place himself, he would be charged with having that in view, while he was urging changes. He felt it his duty to stand aloof, doing justice, as far as he had influence, to all the interests and parties of the Country, and aiding the Government in trying the experiment fully and fairly."

Thus acted the man who, for years previous, and years after, was charged in the "degraded Press," maintained by the Tories, with ambition and selfishness; and whom Lord Falkland and his leader have, for the last twelve months, been representing to the British Government, and to the People of Nova Scotia, as a grasping and exacting partizan. He "provided for all the old Members honorably"—"he gave no triumph to either party"—he claimed for his friends but one seat in the Executive Council, and he declined a seat himself, lest his motives might be suspected, and his usefulness impaired. The man who did this, may smile at the wily attorney, who, "when the whole thing was shifted and changed, and so contrived as to leave the old party aspect around the boards," took a seat in the Council, and the Solicitor Generalship, and, down to 1840, defended those Tory partizan arrangements, until the Governor General arrived, and knocked their card houses about their ears.

Connected with the "historical parallel" which the Attorney General has compelled me to institute, there is one point to which I must refer, growing out of the transactions of this period. The Attorney General sets himself up as a great patron of Dissenters, as a great advocate for civil and religious equality—as "a warm hearted Dissenter," whose "boldness" in the cause may be "approved," though, so zealous, that "his prudence may be questioned." I am not one of those who can be dazzled by fine phrases and bold assumptions—one vigorous act, in the advancement of a principle, or the establishment of a common right, is worth a cart load of speeches, though each of them were, like that of the Attorney General, forty feet in length.

Now, what was the condition of Dissenters in Nova-Scotia, when Mr. Howe, surrounded by the Liberals, whom it is Mr. Johnston's object to depreciate and defame, struck the first decisive legislative blow at the monopoly by which they were degraded, in the following Resolution:—

"Resolved—That, representing the whole Province, peopled by various Denominations of Christians, this House recognizes no distinctions; and is bound to extend, not only equal justice, but equal courtesy, to all."

Where was Mr. Johnston, the "warm-hearted Dissenter," when this blow was struck?—the first of a series, of which the crushing of his Parish Bill

forms the last; and by which Dissenters have been raised to an elevation, but they have attained not only without the aid of the Attorney General, but in spite of the bitter opposition of those with whom he was acting in 1836, whom he again joined in 1838—whose acts and policy he defended down to 1840, and with whom he stands completely identified in 1844.

To illustrate still further the position in which the Dissenters were left by Mr. Johnston, and found by Mr. Howe, 10 years his junior, let me copy a passage from the Address of 1837:—

“While the population of this Province is composed, as appears by the last census, taken in 1827, of 28,659 members of the Episcopal Church, and 115,195 Dissenters, which proportions may be assumed as fair at the present time, the appointments to the Council have secured to the members of the Church, embracing but one fifth of the population, a clear and decided majority at the Board. They have now in that body nine members: The Presbyterians, who outnumbered them by about Nine Thousand, have but two—the Catholics, who are nearly equal, but one—while the Baptists, amounting by the census of the same year to 19,790, and the Methodists to 9,498, and all other Sects and Denominations, are without any of their members in a Body whose duty it is to legislate for all.

“Your Majesty will readily perceive that, whether designed or not, the mere circumstance of one body of Christians having such an overwhelming influence in the Legislative and Executive Council, has a tendency to excite a suspicion that, in the distribution of patronage, the fair claims of the Dissenting population, founded upon their numbers, respectability and intelligence, are frequently overlooked.”

By the arrangements of 1838, consequent on the receipt and violation of Lord Glenelg's Despatches, *the old rule of systematic injustice to Dissenters* was pertinaciously adhered to. The Address of 1838, moved by Mr. Howe, and sustained by the Huntingtons, and Youngs, and Doyles, and most of those men who have been driven by the appointment of Mr. Johnston's Brother-in-Law into opposition to the Government, contains this passage:

“One point to which the attention of the Crown was called in the Address of last Session, was the preponderance in the Councils of the Country, given to one religious body, embracing but a fifth of the population, over those of which the other four-fifths were composed. The reasonableness of this complaint was fully acknowledged. “It is impossible,” said the Colonial Secretary, in the Despatch of the 30th April, “that distinctions so invidious should not be productive of serious discontent.” The directions given upon this point were clear and explicit. Recommendations were to be “altogether uninfluenced by any considerations of the relation in which the proposed Councillors might stand towards the Church of England, or any other Society of Christians”—care was to be taken “to avoid, as far as possible, such a selection as might even appear to have been dictated by motives of this description”—and “even the semblance of undue favour to any particular Church” was to be avoided. These commands, founded in justice and sound policy, were reiterated at the close of the Despatch of the 31st October, in which your Majesty directed that the new Councils should be composed, “not only without reference to distinctions of religious opinions, but in such a manner as to afford no plausible ground for the suspicion that the choice was influenced by that consideration.” Such being the gracious intentions of your Majesty—intentions, which, if once fairly carried out, would forever remove from the Province those jealousies that the apparent preference, given by the local Government to one class of Christians over all others, is but too well calculated to inspire—your loyal subjects observe with surprise and regret, that in the new Executive Council, as lately remodelled, five of the nine Gentlemen of which it is composed, are members of the Church of England—and that eight out of the fifteen who form the Legislative Council, are also members of that Church, his Lordship the Bishop being one.”

If it be said that Mr. Johnston was not bound to attack the system of exclusion, by which Dissenters suffered, previous to 1837, because he was not in

the House, my answer is, that, if he had felt as "warmly" as did Huntington, and others, he might have gone there; or he might have attacked the abuse as Mr. Howe did, in the Press; at all events, from the moment that these men evinced a fearless determination to abate the nuisance, they should have had the cordial and ardent sympathy and co-operation of this "warm hearted" if not rash Dissenter. What had they? *While combining their majority*, they saw him *playing openly into the hands of the Halifax Tories*—in 1837 he stood aloof from them, and in 1838, when a most determined party aspect had been given to both Councils, they found him taking office and a seat in one Council, and becoming the defender of another, *in both of which Dissenters were left in minorities*, while in each the Liberals had but a nominal representation.

The conduct of the two men whose history the Attorney General has drawn into contrast, may be thus illustrated:

Mr. Howe recommended a fair arrangement, *just to Dissenters*, representing all interests, *giving no party triumph*, but declined office himself, that others might be provided for—*Mr. Johnston took office*, under an arrangement notoriously unfair, unjust to the Liberals, and to Dissenters degrading. Yet the man who did this, has the assurance to accuse the person who *waived all personal claims* for the general good, with disregarding the commonweal, and "seeking his own interest and advancement."

"In 1839," says Mr. Howe, in the Speech already referred to, "being in England, after the transmission of the second Address, Lord Glenelg did me the honor to express regret that I had not accepted a seat in Council, and *pressed me to do so*; but I stated my objections to him as I did to Sir Colin Campbell." Yet the person, thus a second time declining, has lived to be accused, on a barn floor, of sacrificing his principles to obtain a seat in Council. "In the fall of 1839, the Delegates of the House returned; and in consultation with them, it appeared, that the general impression was, that the Home Government would not concede what was called Responsible Government. Sir Colin Campbell sent for him (Mr. Howe) again, and *offered him a seat*, vacant by the death of the Hon. J. Allison. He stated to his Excellency, in accordance with the views of the Delegates, that if two or three persons of the Reform Party were placed in the Executive Council, and two or three there were struck out, he would go in and assist to carry on the Government—but that *he could not go in without the recognition of any general principle*, or being accompanied by any of the popular Party."

Here, *a third time*, Mr. Howe *declined a seat*, under the Administration which Mr. Johnston was then sustaining, unless his principles were adopted, or an arrangement made satisfactory to the Liberal party. This proposition was made to the Tories with whom Mr. Johnston was acting in 1839. It was rejected—now what happened in 1840, when Lord Sydenham arrived?

Mr. Howe obtained *three seats* in the Executive Council for the Liberals, *five* of the old Members were turned out, and he *got the general principles of Responsible Government*, as avowed and acted upon ever since, by four Governors and Governors General, into the bargain; and yet the Attorney General tells us that Mr. Howe abated his pretensions—and abandoned his principles, in order to obtain a seat in Lord Falkland's Council.

But, it has been said, Mr. Howe had written a Pamphlet, and he had to throw that overboard. This said Pamphlet has always been a sad stumbling block in the way of our Nova Scotian Tories, notwithstanding it was received with general favour by the Colonial and British Press—notwithstanding that the people of North America saw in it a faithful portraiture of the evils which afflicted them, and a hopeful foreshadowing of the remedies by which health and vigor were to be ensured hereafter. It is just because Mr. Howe wrote this Pamphlet, and because, without pertinaciously adhering to every detail, or raising an argument on every phrase, he has endeavoured to give a practical application to the leading principle which runs through the whole, that such men as Ryerson and Buchanan, *who stoutly defend the Governor General*, have called him "the father of Responsible Government," a title which he

never aspired to, and does not deserve; and to which he only here refers, to show that others, who are quite as good judges as the Atty. General, sometimes say civil things, which are a fair offset to the compliments paid him at Bridgetown. But let me now see *what is the main principle, running through this Pamphlet*, in order that we may ascertain how much of it was abandoned, and *whether the real pith and vital principle has not been preserved*, in the system of Responsible Government sanctioned and carried out by Sydenham, Falkland, Bagot, and Metcalf:—

“In England,” says Mr. Howe, addressing Lord John Russell, “the Government is invariably entrusted to men whose principles and policy the mass of those who possess the elective franchise approve, and who are sustained by a majority in the House of Commons. The Sovereign may be personally hostile to them—a majority in the House of Lords may oppose them in that august assembly, and yet they govern the Country, until, from a deficiency of talent, or conduct, or from ill fortune, they find their representative majority diminished, and some rival combination of able and influential men in condition to displace them. If satisfied that the Commons truly reflect the opinions of the constituency, they resign—if there is any doubt, a dissolution is tried, and the verdict of the country decides to which party its destinies are to be confided. You, in common with every Englishman living at home, are so familiar with the operation of the system, and so engrossed with a participation in the ardent intellectual competition it occasions, that perhaps you seldom pause to admire what attracts as little attention as the air you breathe. The Cabman, who drives past St. Paul’s a dozen times a day, seldom gazes at its ample outline or excellent proportions; and yet they impress the Colonist with awe and wonder, and make him regret that he has left no such edifice in the west.”

Here we have very distinctly shewn what it was the Nova Scotians wanted—*it will be for Mr Johnston to show that we have not got it*; nay, that we had it not, on the very day Mr. Howe went into the Council, although it took the former eighteen months of gropings, and reservations, and denials, before he found out, or would tell the people, what they had got.

“As a politician then, your Lordship’s only care is to place or retain your party in the ascendant in the House of Commons. You never doubt for an instant that, if they are so, they must influence the policy and dispense the patronage of the Government. This simple and admirable principle of letting the majority govern, you carry out in all your Corporations, Clubs, and public Companies and Associations, and no more suspect that there is danger in it, or that the minority are injured when compelled to submit, than you see injustice in awarding a cup at Epsom or Doncaster to the horse which wins rather than to the animal which has lost the race. The effects of this system are perceptible everywhere. A Peer of France, under the old regime, if he lost the smiles of the Court, suffered a sort of political and social annihilation—a Peer of England, if unjustly slighted by the Sovereign, retires to his estate, not to mourn over an irreparable stroke of fortune, but to devote his hours to study, to rally his friends, to connect himself with some great interest in the State, whose accumulating strength may bear him into the counsels of his Sovereign, without any sacrifice of principle or diminution of self respect. A commoner feels, in England, not as commoners used to feel in France, that honors and influence are only to be attained by an entire prostration of spirit—the foulest adulation—the most utter subserviency to boundless prerogatives, arbitrarily exercised—but that they are to be won, in open arenas, by the exercise of those manly qualities which command respect, and by the exhibition of the ripened fruits of assiduous intellectual cultivation, in the presence of an admiring nation, whose decision ensures success. Hence there is a self-poised and vigorous independence in the Briton’s character, by which he strangely contrasts with all his European neighbors. His descendants in the Colonies, notwithstanding the difficulties of their position, still bear to John Bull, in this respect, a strong resemblance—but it must fade if the system be not changed; and our children, instead of exhibiting the bold front and manly bearing of the Briton, must be

stamped with the lineaments of low cunning and sneaking servility, which the practical operation of Colonial Government has a direct tendency to engender."

Has the "system been changed?" Are we entitled to the Briton's privilege, and to his "bold front and manly bearing," or, have we only got "Responsible Government of some sort," with its majorities of one—its personal likes and dislikes, fostering "low cunning and sneaking servility?" When Mr. Johnston answers the question, I will shew him what was abandoned and what retained.

"Under the old system," says the author, "I never knew an instance in which a hostile majority could displace an Executive Council, whose measures it disapproved—or could, in fact, change the policy, or exercise the slightest influence upon the Administrative operations of the Government." This was the system upheld and defended by the Attorney General, down to Lord Sydenham's advent.

But, says Mr. Johnston, Mr. Howe wrote an article, while the Governor General was here, in which he was compelled to modify his opinions, in order to obtain a seat in Council. Now Mr. Howe wrote an article, at his own suggestion—and anybody who reads it will find, that while the few points of difference between the Liberals and the Governor General, are frankly stated, *no essential principle of Responsible Government was yielded.* What said Mr. Howe, with the Governor General at his elbow?

"What, then, are the views, and what are the principles, upon which the Government is to be hereafter conducted? Our readers will, perhaps, be surprised, when we state, that the system which is to be enforced by His Excellency, is exactly what the friends of what is called Responsible Government would have created, could they have acted without reference to the pre-existing positions and claims of those already in office, and at the Council Board, and whose feelings and emoluments they always endeavored, if possible, to spare. There is a slight difference between what we contemplated, and what his Excellency is about to form, which we shall frankly state; but this is more than compensated by other admirable features of the plan, for which the majority never ventured to stipulate—but which, while they make the system complete, will, or we are much mistaken, be more acceptable to the Reformers, and more distasteful to their opponents, than any form of Responsible Government that our Assembly ever offered for their acceptance."

What said he a month after, in answer to some criticisms of the Canadian Tories?

"Some of these papers do not seem to understand the causes of the rapid subsidence of popular excitement, which followed the Governor General's visit to Nova Scotia; and, for lack of knowledge, or with some more mischievous design, are endeavouring to propagate the idea that he came into the Province like a stern conqueror, and that Reform and Responsible Government fell before him. The Montreal Gazette has written a good deal of nonsense, in the hope of making this apparent—but its Editor evidently either does not know what he is writing about, or is anxious to mislead his readers. The fact is, that had the Governor General come into Nova Scotia, in any such spirit, or with any such intentions, he would have found men here just as stern and determined as himself—men who would never have furnished, by the violence of their conduct, the smallest pretext to the people to desert them, or to the Government to suspend their constitution, but who would have continued to embarrass and oppose every administration that persisted in upholding the old system of Government which 'public opinion condemned.' But Mr. Thompson came in no such spirit—and with no such objects. He came to prove to the Nova-scotians that the Representatives of Sovereignty 'have their duties as well as their rights.' He came to vindicate, not only the power of the Imperial authorities, but their justice—their knowledge of constitutional usages and requirements—their appreciation of the loyalty and intelligence of the British Americans. The moment that the leaders of the people were assured of this—the moment that they found they had to deal with a man who felt as keenly as they did themselves the absurdity of the old system they had laboured to over-

turn—who did not pretend, for a single instant, that it was to be continued—who admitted, to the fullest extent, the truly British principle, that there should be stringent responsibility pervading every operation of the local Government, they felt that they also had ‘their duties as well as their rights’—and that agreeing in the main, as they did, with the Governor General, the first of these duties was to sacrifice any mere personal feeling which the previous struggle had occasioned, and, without standing pertinaciously upon points of detail, or contending about different modes of arriving at the same thing, they were bound to aid a man, sincerely labouring to improve their institutions, in carrying out Responsible Government in the way in which Her Majesty’s Government had determined to concede it.

“To say that Responsible Government has been surrendered by the Nova Scotia Reformers, or that it has been put down by the Governor General, is to do injustice to both parties, and to assert what is not true. The Governor General found, on enquiry into the past, that for much less than he was prepared to concede, a receipt in full would have been given Sir Colin Campbell, over and over again, for and on account of all claims upon what is called Responsible Government—and the Reformers found that, though differing a little in theory, the Governor General’s system was essentially the same as, and in some respects better than, their own.

“A mutual good understanding, without any compromise of principle, or forfeiture of political advantage, on either side, was the inevitable result of mutual explanations—and nothing can disturb the harmony which has been produced, but some piece of bad faith, of which no person suspects that either is capable, except perhaps those who dislike or fear them both.”

This was written fearlessly by Mr. Howe, in a paper which he knew the Governor General regularly read, on the 27th of August, only a month after he had left Halifax, and when, *if there was any mistake*, Mr. Howe’s contemplated promotion could have been stayed by a single line.

But did Mr Howe receive any reprimand? No—though in the autumn of 1840, he received a letter from Lord Sydenham, thanking him for the manliness and candour he had evinced throughout the whole affair.

Fortunately I have an authority better than anything that was ever said or written in Nova Scotia—and having hung this artful Lawyer in a chain of evidence, let me now break him upon a wheel, every spoke of which is furnished by Lord Sydenham himself:—

In 1841, in order that the new principles and policy should be rationally explained, previous to the meeting of the Canadian Parliament, a “Monthly Review—devoted to the Civil Government of Canada,” was brought out in Toronto, *under the immediate patronage of the Governor General*. The political articles in this work, if some of them were not written by his own hand, were, I have been assured, prepared by those in his confidence, and submitted for his inspection. I take from these one or two passages :

“The question, then, now is—how are the interests of the People to be ascertained? Partly through an honest desire in the Executive to learn and promote them—(we may certainly presume so much)—but chiefly through the People’s Representatives. The Executive is to be kept in harmony with them, partly by the action of the public mind, as through the Press, public meetings, private representations, &c. but also chiefly through the action of the Representatives of the People on the Executive. The mode of that action is well known, as by vote, petition, address, remonstrance, stopping the supplies, refusing to proceed to business. But what concerns us here, is, that action of the Representatives on the Executive, by which, through a vote of want of confidence, they can change its character and action, by producing a change of Ministry—in other words we are conducted to the question of Responsible Government.”

“The resignation of the Government officers, or their change of policy, when in a settled minority in the Legislature, will follow as a matter of course, from

the new position they sustain—for they cannot keep it unless they can command a majority.”

Here then is Colonial Responsible Government, explained under the authority of the Governor General, in January, 1841; and yet it was not till the spring of 1842, that Mr. Johnston and Mr. Stewart could be induced to thus explain it. Why did they do it then?—because, after 18 months of miserable evasion and misstatements, *either they or Mr. Howe would have left the Council*, if the question had not been satisfactorily set at rest.

Though I have shown to you, my old and valued friend, that I thrice declined seats in Council, previous to 1840—let me now show you that the covert and “artful” insinuation, that I modified my opinions in order to obtain a seat, in that year, is a bare-faced untruth, made out of whole cloth.

In the Session of 1841, I gave this account of the matter: “I owed many grateful recollections to the party with whom I had acted, for the kindness and confidence they exhibited, and felt that if any was to make personal sacrifices it should be myself. As there might not be seats for all at first, I advised the Governor General to appoint Mr. Huntington and Mr. Young, and leave me out, pledging myself, while they continued members of the Government, it should have my active assistance. More I could not do, and I now make these statements, *that they may go abroad, and be contradicted if possible*. This mode of arrangement was pressed, but *His Excellency expressed a positive wish that I should take a seat*, and I felt that to refuse might put myself and the party I acted with in a false position. *With some reluctance I consented to go in, IF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES WERE TO BE CARRIED OUT*, and with the understanding that one or both of the Gentlemen mentioned should be placed in the Council, &c.”

This speech was made in the Session of 1841, while Lord Sydenham was alive, and watching all our proceedings with lively interest. At the close of that Session he bore honourable testimony to my services, and when I went to Canada in the spring of that year, received me with a warmth and cordiality which I shall never forget, though he is in his grave: had I lied, or meanly compromised or misrepresented him, I should have stayed at home, for I should have been ashamed to have looked him in the face.

Yet when I went into the Council, “with some reluctance, at Lord Sydenham’s express wish, stipulating before I went that the general principles were to be carried out,” and having thrice before declined, Mr. Att’y. General Johnston “degrades” himself by proclaiming the monstrous falsehood, that I gave up my principles to obtain a seat in a Council, where his own (which no human being to this hour can understand) were to be the rule of Administration. His principles!! Sir Richard Steele tells us, that he remembered, when all England was shaken by an Earthquake, there was an impudent Mountebank who sold pills, which he told the Country people were “very good against an earthquake”—yet I doubt if this man is not beaten all hollow by another Mountebank, who puffed his principles among the “Country People,” on a certain barn floor, until they were made to believe they were the only preservative against the internal convulsions with which Nova Scotia was threatened. They may be “good against an Earthquake,” but certainly, so far as I have ever been able to study them, they are good for nothing else.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH HOWE.

LETTER III.

SIR—

I trust I have shown, that the Attorney General, having commenced life as a reckless agitator and innovator, is the last person who should use hard terms to those, who, whether right or wrong, happen to follow his example.

That, had he and the Tories succeeded in their plans in 1836, there would have been no Liberal majority from thence to 1840—no reformatory Resolutions—no Addresses—no Delegations—no Governor General reviewing our political history, or improving our Institutions.

That though Mr Johnston may have shown a splenetic hostility to the Church, when his passions were inflamed, and a subserviency to its requirements when a political alliance was the object, that nearly all the steps by which Dissenters have advanced from a degrading and unjust position, to an honorable and fair equality, were gained without his assistance, and all of them in spite of the determined opposition of those with whom he has been associated, and is, at this moment, principally sustained.

That, however much the language may have varied, in which the Liberals pressed their views, or whatever diversity of mode may have been suggested in the discussions of a series of years, the objects aimed at in the speeches and Addresses of the Liberals, from 1837 to 1840, and in Mr. Howe's Pamphlet, were—

“RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COUNCIL TO THE PEOPLE AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.”

“INFLUENCE AND CONTROUL OVER THE ACTS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.”

POWER “TO CHANGE THE MINISTRY, AND ALTER ANY COURSE OF POLICY INJURIOUS TO THEIR INTERESTS.”

That *none* of these *fundamental points* of Responsible Government, were yielded by Mr. Howe in the negotiations with Lord Sydenham, or in the explanation of his policy, written while his Lordship was here.

That, on the contrary, in that article, it was boldly proclaimed, that “*more* was to be given, than had ever been demanded;” and, in another, written before the new Council was formed “that Lord Sydenham felt as keenly as the Liberals did themselves, *the absurdity of the old system* they had laboured to destroy—that he did not for a moment pretend that it was to be continued—that he admitted, to the fullest extent, the truly British principle, *that there should be stringent Responsibility pervading every operation of the local Government.*”

That the leading principles of Responsible Government, as now recognised and acted upon in British America, were laid down in a Review, published under the immediate patronage of Lord Sydenham, in January, 1841; and,

That, so far from Mr. Howe having sacrificed principle, to obtain a seat in Council, in the Session of our Legislature which immediately followed Lord Sydenham's visit, Mr. H. declared in his place, that he had gone in “with reluctance, at the Governor General's express wish,” it being understood “that the general principles were to be carried out.”

These points, I trust I have made, my dear Sir, so plain, that any boy on the Wilmot Mountain may carry the chain of facts in his head, as easily as he would carry a Surveyor's chain in his hand.

I feel that I might here leave this part of the case, and that no man would require any further evidence to prove that when Mr. Johnston sought to justify

himself by the strange assertion that Mr. Howe abandoned Responsible Government in 1840, in order to obtain a seat in Council, and did not obtain it till 1842, he was attempting to "fix the wondering gaze of a country audience," not as Signor Blitz would fix it, by an ingenious deception, but after the fashion of Munchausen, by a bold violation of the moral law. Here I might rest the case, and here I would rest it, only that it gives me pleasure to take this Attorney General, accustomed to disport himself in the Courts, with friendly Judges before him—Conservative Jurors beside him, and admiring juniors and clerks behind him—it gives me pleasure to take this man, and sifting him before the *enlarged tribunal* to which he has ventured to appeal, teach the boys of Nova Scotia to laugh at his "pretensions."

The first witness that I shall call, to prove that the leading features of Responsible Government were secured, and not abandoned, in 1840, is

Sir JOHN HARVEY, who, speaking of Lord John Russell's Despatch, (which Sir Colin, aided by Mr. Johnston's advice, would not act upon, but which Lord Sydenham and Lord Falkland did)—says, "I hail this Despatch, as conferring a *new*, and in my judgment, an *improved Constitution* upon these Colonies."

We got this new and improved Constitution in 1840, yet Mr Johnston says, we got nothing but what was in his speech at Mason Hall, made in defence of the old Administration which was swept away, and the old practices, which the Governor General "did not for a moment pretend were to be continued."

My next witness is CROFTON UNIACKE, Esq. who, after a deliberate review of all the Despatches and public documents then before the Country, thus expressed his views of the fundamental and complete character of the contemplated change:

"Has not every thing which a loyal and enlightened subject of Her Majesty can require, been granted by the Government of the Mother Country? *Is not Responsible Government*, in the rational sense of the term, *here granted to the Colonies?* *It would be puerile to dispute about terms*—whether it is to be called Responsible Government, a Cabinet, or a Ministry, is of no importance: *the essence of the British Constitution* has been infused into the system of Colonial Government by these Despatches, and the local affairs of the Provinces will be hereafter administered in the purest spirit of *British liberty*."

This is Mr. Crofton Uniacke's view of what was gained in 1840; yet Mr. Johnston, who had, from 1836 to 1840, acted or sympathized with those who opposed every concession, and *who made his speech to crush the Liberal party*, in the spring of 1840, tells us *his* views, and not *ours*, were approved—that we did not get what we had been asking for in our own Addresses and Pamphlets, but only got what he had recommended in his speech. If so, then Sir John Harvey and Mr. Crofton Uniacke must have been grossly mistaken; but the public will not believe they were, till Mr. Johnston shows *in what part* of his speech "a new and improved Constitution"—"Responsible Government"—"the essence of the British Constitution," and "the purest spirit of British liberty" are recommended. We think he will be puzzled to find them: none of these things were in the "artful" Attorney's head, and I am not much surprised that none of them came out of it.

I come now to the explanations, made on the floor of the Lower House by the members of Lord Falkland's Government in the session of 1841, while Lord Sydenham was still alive, that we may ascertain whether, in their opinions, the fundamental principle of Responsible Government was, or was not, then in operation:

"Formerly," said Mr. HOWE, "no vote of the House could displace Members of Council, now it was admitted that the declaration of want of confidence would cause immediate resignation. That was a great change, and it would operate in producing the harmony which ought to exist between the Government and the Legislature. He was proud to declare on the Hustings that his constituents had the double privilege of electing a member of the House, and of the Council, for without their suffrages a seat in neither could be obtained. He now said to the Assembly, that *in their confidence and support rested the claims of all in those branches, to the honor which the Crown thought proper to confer.*"

Here the extent of the change was broadly explained, and *the great principle* propounded in the Address of 1837, and in the *Pamphlet of 1839*, declared to have been secured, and to be in full operation.

Mr. ARCHIBALD, then Attorney General, described the change, as "a different mode from that hitherto in operation, of carrying on the Government. * * * A change had been made in the Administration for the purpose of carrying out constitutional principles, in the new spirit that had been infused. * * * At the recent Election he told his constituents that *their votes gave the double honour of a seat in the House and Executive Council*, and he now told the House that *if they withheld their confidence*, as far as he was personally concerned, he would willingly resign."

Mr. B. SMITH asked, "if the House passed a vote of want of confidence, whether the members of Government would feel bound to retire—was that the principle on which they accepted office?"

Mr. UNIACKE described the old state of things, and the "deficiency of the old Constitution, which was apparent," from the absence of responsibility to the Legislature. "The responsibility now understood, and recognized, was a Government carried on according to the well understood wishes of the people." "Respecting a vote of want of confidence, if he felt that he had lost the confidence of those with whom he usually acted, he would state to His Excellency the fact, and his inability to serve in the manner that was to be expected when he got his seat, and should tender his resignation. * * * If measures were urged by the Executive which he and his colleagues could not approve, they would not attempt to defend them, but would retire. * * * If the House would give a friendly support to the existing Administration, it might be enabled to advance the interests of the Country—if they withheld support, the Government should be changed, or the representatives of the people sent back to their constituents."

Mr. DODD said "that, if a resolution passed at the present time, similar to that of last year, he would not hesitate what course he should pursue as a member of the Council. He would call on His Excellency and say that he had not the influence which His Excellency reckoned on, that the confidence of the Assembly had been withdrawn, and he should tender his resignation."

Mr. DEWOLF was "not under responsibility before," as a member of Sir Colin's Administration—he was now "acting under a different form of Government." "He would be sorry to hold his seat, if he thought such occupation would be in opposition to the wishes of the Assembly."

Mr. HOWE, towards the close of the debate, again stated, that "a false position, followed by a resolution of that House, withdrawing their confidence, would be followed by the resignation of the whole Council. The Governor might say that he would not accept the resignations till he had tried whether the Assembly had expressed the well understood wishes of the people, and then that final appeal should be made. * * * The patronage was spoken of, and it was allowed that the Governor appointed to every office, but the members of the Council had to defend his appointments, and thus became responsible for his making such as could be defended."

Here, then, we have all the Members of Lord Falkland's Government in 1841, (their first Session) explaining Responsible Government in the Assembly exactly as it was explained in June following by the members of Lord Sydenham's Administration—as it was subsequently explained in the Doddiean Confession—as it has since been explained by Sir Charles Metcalf, and the best writers and speakers on both sides in Canada. Yet the Attorney General tells us that it was abandoned in 1840, and was not established till 1842. If so, then was he acting with colleagues, a majority of whom either did not know what they were about, or were practicing upon the country a barefaced deception.

But, it may be said, the Attorney General and Mr. Stewart explained it after a different fashion, in the Legislative Council. They did, and it would have been much better had they been compelled at once (as they were in the following year) by some open public declaration, to conform to the opinions of their

colleagues. But there were various reasons why it was most desirable that the futile efforts of a minority in Council to impede, by vague generalities, the onward march of the Government, should be treated with indifference.

Mr. JOHNSTON, in his place in the Legislative Council, took a world of pains to show that the British Government, so far from intending to yield the Responsibility claimed by the House over the Members of the Executive Council, were very hostile to the principle. He took occasion to tell us that Lord Glenelg had negatived the opinion "contained in the Address of the Assembly, that that body should exercise a controul corresponding to that of the Commons over the Ministry." Who denied this? or who ever said it was granted in 1837? But the question is—had not our House, and the Parliament of Canada, this controul in 1841, and have they not had it ever since?

We were told that in 1839 the Minister again "put his hand on the dawning of responsibility," as developed in our Resolutions. Perhaps so, but Lord John Russell's Despatches, and Lord Sydenham's visit, followed in the train of events, and by that time it was *broad day light*.

Referring to the Assembly's reading of Lord John Russell's Despatch, Mr. Johnston said, "they considered that *that Despatch* gave power to change and remodel, so as to produce harmony between the branches. * * * By the Address, the Governor was called upon to dismiss his advisers as the result of a vote of want confidence; that would be a recognition of direct responsibility. Would anything justify his Excellency in conceding such a request?"

Now it does so happen that, under this very Despatch, Lord Sydenham, Lord Falkland, Sir Charles Bagot, and Sir Charles Metcalfe, have claimed and exercised this very power "to change and remodel," which Mr. Johnston had the hardihood to declare *it did not give*—and that this "result of a vote of want of confidence" was clearly recognized in Lord Sydenham's Review, in the previous January, by Mr. Johnston's colleagues in the House the week before he made this Speech, by the Canada Resolutions in June following, but was never recognized by Mr. Johnston till 1842.

In referring to recent changes, he declared that "responsibility, as developed in the Assembly's Address of 1840, had not been conceded." Now let us enquire how it had been developed—the document shall speak for itself: "The chief cause," say the Liberals of that day, "of the evils of which the North American Colonies have complained, has been the want of harmony between the Executive and Representative Branches of the Government." "Your Majesty will therefore readily conceive with what delight and satisfaction the House read the Despatch of Lord John Russell, of the 16th October, by which the power was given to the Lieutenant-Governor to shake himself free of the influences by which he had been trammelled. They recognized in that document no new and dangerous experiment, but a recurrence to the only principles upon which Colonial Governments can be safely carried on. They saw that while great powers were to be confided—while an unlimited range of selection was to be given to the Lieutenant Governor, in order to make the exercise of the prerogative most beneficial to the People, he was to be held responsible to the Sovereign for the tranquility of the Colony committed to his charge, and for the harmonious action of the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Government." These were our views of the principles "developed" in Lord John Russell's Despatch—the correctness of our reading was denied by Mr. Johnston in 1841—who in British North America will deny it now?

To take such a view of Lord Falkland's position under it, was "inconsistent with Colonial relations"—yet this was the view Lord Falkland took himself—that all the Members of his Government, in the Lower House, took,—that was boldly propounded in the Doddean Confession of Faith, and the Canada Resolutions; yet, Mr Johnston, deeming that view for 18 months after he entered the Government, "inconsistent with Colonial relations," did not resign.

The right of dismissal by votes of want of confidence, was not directly negatived, but strangely obscured in the following passage—"the change simply was, that it became the duty of Her Majesty's Representative to ascertain the wishes and feelings of the People through their Representatives, and make the mea-

tures of Government conform to these, as far as was consistent with his duty to the Mother Country. *This was not to be effected by any declaration that he should do so, not by any power of the Assembly to say that it was not done.*" &c. * * "Some such power" as passing votes of want of confidence, "existed," but "the system was not that sought last year," when the Assembly passed one. "The power of the Executive Council was, heretofore, very indefinite. How far they would be now considered responsible, *would depend on the discretion of those who administered the Government,*" the House of Assembly and the People having no discretion in the matter.

These were Mr. Johnston's notions of Responsible Government in 1841. Let any man contrast them with the expositions of the new policy given by Mr. Howe in July and August—by the Canada Review in January—by his Colleagues in the Lower House, by Sir John Harvey and Mr. Crofton Uniacke, and the miserable spirit of grudging equivocation in which they were conceived, will be apparent.

Sir John says, "a new and improved Constitution has been given." Mr. Johnston says there is no such thing.

"Responsible Government, in the rational sense of the term, has been here granted to the Colonies," says Mr. Crofton Uniacke:—To grant it, says Mr. Johnston, would be "incompatible with Colonial relations."

"More has been granted than was ever asked of Sir Colin Campbell," said Mr. Howe, with Lord Sydenham by his side. "They asked for the dismissal of the Council," said Mr. Johnston, after Lord S. had gone away, "and no such power has been given."

"Through a Vote of Want of Confidence, the Representatives of the People can change the character and action of the Executive, by producing a change of Ministry," says the Governor General's Canada Review. "The House is to have no power to say that anything has not been done, or shall be done," says Mr. Johnston; "everything depends on the discretion of those who administer the Government."

Now, my dear Sir, let me ask you, and through you, my countrymen, whether I, *who agreed with all these authorities*—or Mr. Johnston, *who differed with them all, and agreed with nobody but Mr. Stewart*, misunderstood or misstated the principles upon which we entered the Government in 1840?

Mr. Stewart's dislike of the new changes, to which he had conformed much in the same spirit that a Jacobite conformed to the Bill of Rights in 1688, was less artfully disguised. "No change," he said, "had been made in the Constitution of the country, and the principles of Responsibility had not been conceded. Responsible Government in a Colony was Responsible nonsense—it was independence. If the Responsible Government aimed at elsewhere, supposing the Debates were correctly reported, were granted by a Minister, he would deserve to lose his head."

These strange avowals of ignorance, or "antagonism," as you may readily suppose, weakened the new Government,—and, it is not too much to say, that they engendered distrust in many minds whose cordial support would have been much earlier given to Lord Falkland. My belief is, *that they would have shattered the Administration* in its first Session, but for the promptitude with which they were met, and *directly negatived* in the Lower House. The moment the Reports appeared, having taken the proper steps to ascertain, that, on my part, there was no mistake, I made the following Speech in the Assembly, in the presence of my Colleagues:

The SPEAKER (Mr. Howe) "wished to ask indulgence, while he corrected some statements which had gone abroad from another place. He stood in that House to maintain his position against insinuation or attack, come from what quarter it might—he considered his station there, and as a member of the Government, honorable, but his character as a public man, able to maintain his consistency before the world, was far dearer to him than any other consideration, and he trusted it would always continue so. An impression which had gone abroad from another place, was, that he, as one of the majority of the last House, was anxious to establish a form of Government, characterized under

the term Responsible Government, which had been described as 'responsible nonsense,' and which differed widely from the system now established. Other views were also given of the objects of that majority. In his place, that day, in behalf of that majority, he demanded proof of the assertion. In no document issued from the last Assembly were the words Responsible Government once used. *The very form of Government which that majority pressed for, was the precise form which had been obtained.* He held the report of a debate that occurred elsewhere in his hand, and there it appeared that the majority had been charged with seeking some chimera, described as "direct responsibility"—the fact was, that *the responsibility strove for they had now secured.* A vote of that House now, might place the Governor in this position: he should discharge his Council, change his policy, or dissolve the House. *That was the system which every man of the majority had in view, and it was truly British.*—Sir Colin Campbell would do neither of the three. He evaded the despatch by which the new policy was announced. His Council would not resign—he would not dismiss them—he shrunk from dissolving the House; and finally all parties in the Colony shifted the responsibility off their own shoulders to those of the Secretary of State. *That system was at an end.* The responsibility now rested on the Governor and his Council, and whether it was called direct or indirect, it was sufficient to ensure good government. Then followed a reference to an individual opinion, on a point of detail, not involving the main principles here laid down, which had been corrected by the Governor General's experience, the "responsibility" being declared, however, to be "nearly as great in the one case as in the other."

Here then, were the principles *under which Mr. Howe took office*, broadly, distinctly, and fearlessly stated, and a challenge given to Messrs. Johnston and Stewart, to contradict him upon authority if they could—to dismiss him if they dared. Neither the one nor the other was attempted—the question was set at rest for the year; and a few months after, I had the satisfaction to hear the Governor General's own Ministers, *with his entire sanction*, make similar declarations in the Parliament at Kingston.

Previous to the meeting of the Legislature in 1842, the Honourable Wm. Young, the present Speaker of the House, was sworn in and took his seat as a member of Lord Falkland's Administration. Mr. Young's opinions were well known—he had been for many years a staunch supporter of the leading principles of Responsible Government. Was he told that he *must modify or throw aside his principles* and adopt those of Mr. Johnston, as propounded in his speech at Mason's Hall? No—and I if he had been, he would have stared—bowed, and declined the proffered honour in 1842, as *Mr. Howe would have done in 1840.* In the course of the debates upon the Confidence Resolution, Mr. Young said "that he had toiled with the Liberal Party—he had suffered not a little with, and for it—he had not sacrificed his principles—he was there to carry them out as he had ever held them. His opinion was, that the Constitutional Government introduced into the Province was a vast and wholesome change on the old system." "A Vote of Want of Confidence would lead to a tender of resignation—that had been conceded by all."

I might quote many other passages from Mr. Young's Speeches to prove that he felt that he had taken a seat under the obligation to carry out his own principles, and those professed by the Reformers down to 1840, and by the Administration up to the moment when he joined it, and not those put forth by Mr. Johnston in the Speech at Mason's Hall. Enough, however, has been said to show, that the less the latter says hereafter, in his rack and manger orations, about his Speech and his principles, the better; unless he can show that any of his Colleagues had a copy of the former, or really understood what the latter were, from the time they entered the Government with him till the formal promulgation of the Doddean Confession of Faith; which ratified and confirmed those they had openly avowed for 18 months, in the very teeth of his varied attempts at disguise and reservation.

How came this said Confession into existence? A combination of Tories and Liberals deferred the Bankrupt Bill, and taunts were thrown out which led to

the moving of a Resolution, with a view to determine whether the Administration had or had not the confidence of the House. A spirited debate arose, during which the *principles and policy* of the Administration were explained by the members of Government in the Assembly, *as they had ever explained them since its formation*. Thereupon the House resolved, by an immense majority, "that the principles and policy of the present Administration, as explained by the members of Government, (not a word having been said about the Mason Hall speech, and neither Mr. Johnston nor Mr. Stewart having explained anything) were satisfactory; and, if adhered to, would entitle it to the approbation and support of the Legislature and people of Nova Scotia."

The passage of this resolution was decisive of the standing and position which the Government had attained; and Lord Falkland rose to a political elevation, in the Province, in Canada, and in England, of which any nobleman might be justly proud. Had all parties acted from this moment with discretion and good faith, there would have been an end of his difficulties. But hardly had the members of Government in the Lower House secured the confidence of that body, by *their* explanations of principle and policy, when Messrs. Johnston and Stewart gave another version, in the Legislative Council, and the Government, in one day, was divested of every honorable attribute, and lay like a wreck on the waters, shattered, in mid career, by the ignorance or treachery of her own crew.

A vote against the Government would have been moved, and would have been carried, but for the prompt assurances given by Messrs. Uniacke, Young, McNab, and myself, that some *decisive step* should be taken, *to determine the question whether the people of Nova Scotia were to have Responsible Government, as explained by us, or by the Attorney General, and Mr. Stewart*. One newspaper extract will be sufficient to show the state of feeling at this moment:

"These palpable contradictions, on a point in which so many are interested, are very unfortunate. They keep alive agitation and bitter feelings, they cause distrust of those who should enjoy confidence; they unsettle men's minds, and give the painful feeling that where all was supposed just, and simple, and established, there may be juggling and vagueness. A member of Government in the popular Branch stands up, and describes the responsibility of Lord Falkland's Administration, in local matters, to be similar to that of the British Ministry to the Commons. Another member of Government at the other end of the building, declares, as solemnly, that there is not, and cannot be, more responsibility than we had under Sir Colin Campbell's instructions. What are the people to think of this? What steps should the Executive take to explain their position, and rid their body of the chameleon character it is made to assume?"

"Under Mr. Stewart's mode of Government the Country might prosper, under that of the Hon. Speaker, we think better grounds of prosperity would exist; but let us know which *is the mode*;—a state of uncertainty, and conflict, and distrust of the Government, is incompatible with well being. If Coalition is to mean contradiction, and vagueness, and difference of opinion, on the most important organic points, then all parties must rally for something more certain and respectable."

And all parties would have rallied, and the Government would have been rent in pieces in less than a week, or been overwhelmed by a vote of want of confidence, had not the crisis been promptly met. What "step was taken?" What restored confidence? What rid the Administration of its "chameleon character,"—of its "contradiction and vagueness" on "important organic points?"

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

What transpired behind the scenes, in the preparation and discussion of this document, need not be drawn into this argument, but what is palpable and known to the public, I am quite at liberty to deal with.

The first question then, that arises, is—*what drew forth this authoritative and official declaration?*

And the answer is, that it could not have been elicited by the explanations of principle and policy, made in the Lower House for the previous eighteen

months, for these were generally approved, and had just won to the side of the Government 40 men in a House of 51; and therefore it must have been rendered necessary by the "contradiction and vagueness" of some persons *new vamping an old Speech made at Mason Hall.*

The next question is—*what principles did this document affirm and confirm?*

And the answer is—those of the Reformers and Responsible Government men; those recognized by Lord Sydenham, Lord Falkland, Sir John Harvey, Mr. Crofton Uniacke, and the Members of Council in the Lower House—and not those developed in the Masons' Hall Speech, and so pertinaciously adhered to by Messrs. Stewart and Johnston.

I trust I have now, my dear sir, conducted your mind, by evidence, clear as a sun beam, resistless as an avalanche, to the inevitable conviction, that while Mr. Johnston, *to retain his place in the new Council*, saw five of his Colleagues deliberately "sacrificed," and *gave up all the difference between the old system and the new*—I entered the Administration *securing every essential element of Responsible Government*—that, for eighteen months, *I explained its principles*, in presence of a majority of my Colleagues, in one simple uniform manner; and that *my explanations were ultimately confirmed by the official declaration of the whole Council*, which bears as much resemblance to the Masons' Hall Speech, as the healthy new-born Babe, passed all danger, does to the foul drug intended to produce abortion.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH HOWE.

LETTER IV.

SIR—

Having disposed of five out of the eight counts of the Attorney General's political indictment—those which remain may be less elaborately dealt with. Let me begin with the attempt to fasten upon me the odious charge, of a participation in the attacks of the Liberal Press, and Liberal Members, on the Government, during the time I held a seat in the Council. I meet this at the very outset, with an indignant and flat denial—and I assure you

That I not only never wrote a line, attacking the Government collectively, or one of my Colleagues individually, until I retired from the Council; but

That, while in the Government, I wrote more in defence of it, and in explanation and justification of its acts and policy, than all the other Members of Council, the Attorney General included.

As dates, and facts, relative to these Newspaper attacks and controversies, have been artfully mystified in the Western Counties, I may as well avail myself of this opportunity, to show, that *all the jealousy and ill feeling which they occasioned, are clearly traceable to Mr Johnston and his friends.*

Lord Falkland's Council was formed in October, 1840. I edited the Nova-Scotian till the end of 1841, and, during the whole of that period of sixteen months, steadily supported, with my pen, the Government of which I was a member. Did one of my colleagues, now in the administration, do as much? Their pens have been busy enough for the last twelve months—*not one of them, with my knowledge, wrote a line during the previous three years and a half, to defend either the Governor or the Government*, although the Tory Papers, which since have patronized them, teemed with virulent abuse of Lord Falkland and his Administration. Mr. Johnston says *I accused him in the House*, and at Wilmot, of writing in these papers. *This is untrue.* What I said, and what cannot be denied, was this:

That I defended the whole Government in the Press for fifteen months, repeatedly palliating or justifying his own conduct.

That, after I sold the Nova Scotian, I occasionally defended or explained the policy and acts of the Government in the Newspapers.

That, although the Editors of the Recorder, *against whom Mr. Johnston had brought some frivolous and vexatious libel suit*, might have attacked him personally, the Nova Scotian, for two entire years, gave a steady support to the Government; and that, after the vote of confidence, and down to the summer of 1842, all the Liberal Newspapers—the Recorder, Nova Scotian, Eastern Chronicle, Register, Yarmouth Herald, and Spirit of the Times, however much they may have indulged in fair criticism, generally upheld the Administration. That, down to this period, *while the Messenger gave little or no political support*, the Tory papers, *confessedly maintained and directed by the party with which Mr. J. was identified from 1836 to 1840, and by whom he has been supported for the last twelve months*, violently assailed the Government as a whole, and the Liberal Members of it in particular.

That while the Times and Pictou Observer attacked Lord Falkland, his Secretary, his servants, in the most indecent manner, and poured forth weekly libels against his Council, *Her Majesty's Attorney General suffered the writers and publishers to go unscathed*, although his aid was afterwards not wanting to crush *Liberal papers* by libel suits, and *imprison Liberal Printers*. This may have been all right, but yet it seems to involve some inconsistency, and to require explanation.

What I said in the House—repeated at Wilmot, and what cannot be denied, was, that *all* the later attacks of the liberal papers, (favourable, and friendly, and supporting the government, down to the autumn of 1842) were *courted, provoked, and occasioned, by the folly of Mr. Johnston and his friends*. You ask me how?

In the spring of 1842, seven severe, covert, and *personal attacks*, upon Mr. Wm. Young and myself, were printed in the Christian Messenger, a paper edited by two intimate friends of Mr. Johnston, one of them an officer of the Government. These letters appeared in the official organ of the Baptist body, months before either Mr. Nugent or I had written one line offensive to any Baptist:—thus commenced the Baptist quarrel in the newspapers, and it is clear that Mr. Johnston's friends began it themselves.

But, what struck away from the Administration the support of nearly all the Liberal Papers, and openly proclaimed to the whole Province that there were *jealousy, and ill suppressed hostility, in the Government*, was the publication of the Attorney General's gratuitous, uncalled for, and insidious attack upon myself, in the Recorder of Oct. 1842.

The moment that letter appeared, the signal was given for all the Attorney General's friends to attack me, and for all mine to attack him; and neither were slow to shower their blows upon the wedge which he had so recklessly planted, and to *widen the rent* to which he had so indecently called their attention. From that moment, Lord Falkland, who, but a few months before, had stood elevated and secure, with a united Council, and "troops of friends," was surrounded with distraction, suspicion and doubt, and saw those upon whom his Administration had rested, openly warring with each other.

What I have said, then, and here repeat, is

1st.—That I wrote for two years in defence of my colleagues and the Government, while not one of them took a single step to stay the torrent of misrepresentation, which, during all that time, descended on Lord Falkland and the Members of Council, from the press which now sustains Mr. Johnston.

2d.—That the Editors of the Messenger defamed Mr. Johnston's colleagues for many consecutive weeks, before a line was written or sanctioned by me injurious to him, or offensive to any Baptist.

3d.—That, down to the time when his own attack upon me appeared, I had generously defended him, and the whole Government, for upwards of two years; and that, by that act, the support of the only six Newspapers which had ever sustained Lord Falkland was stricken away—our mutual friends set by the ears—

and jealousy and dissension sown broadcast among the population, whose steady aid and confidence the Administration might have enjoyed. *His Letter*, in the Autumn of 1842, just did for the Government what *the speeches* in the Legislative Council had done in the previous Spring, only that *the blow was irreparable*—there were no means by which the damage could be repaired.

So much for my interference or influence with the Liberal Press. When Mr. Johnston produces *any public attack* of mine on *any Baptist*, until after I had been *eight or ten times attacked* in the official organ of the Association, I will admit that I, and not his friends, *began that dispute*; when he produces a line written by me, to *his prejudice*, either before I left the Government, or for months *after his gratuitous attack upon me*, I will admit that in these newspaper controversies I was the first aggressor, but not till then. *He will search in vain for either*, and until he finds them, I think the country will decide that the less he says about this branch of the argument the better.

But the Attorney General would insinuate that I weakened the Administration by giving countenance to the attacks and intrigues of the Liberal Members in the House. This is another dastardly and contemptible insinuation, at variance with all the facts of the case. The learned gentleman says, “the origin of the disunion and want of confidence spoken of was, that the hon. gentleman and others continued looking back on parties, with whom, if they had no immediate and direct connexion, their influence and intercourse continued.”

Now let me just ask the Attorney General if his “intercourse and influence” were not kept up with half the Tories in Town and Country, (a fair proportion of whom were his personal friends and clients,) during all the time that they were in rampant hostility to the Lieutenant Governor and the minority of his Council? Did he cut Mr. Morton, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Wilkins, or the Bishop, neither of whom allowed an opportunity to escape of opposing the Government in the Upper Branch? Did he throw off the relative who publicly hissed Lord Falkland? Did he cease all “intercourse” with Messrs. Blackadar, Creighton and Marshall, who outvoted the Government on the Bankrupt Bill? Had he no influence with Messrs. *Beckwith* and *Thorne*, who also swelled the ranks of the opposition? Did he break with Messrs. *Ferguson* & *Nutting*, who were defaming his colleagues, one of whom for years before, and months after, was honorably sustaining him? Was he not, even after Mr. Dewolf had retired from the Government, and led up an opposition to it, seen in close and confidential communication with that gentleman almost every day? Yet this man, who thus “looked back upon,” and continued his “intercourse” and strengthened his “influence” with, his own friends, thinks that I should have broken old ties of friendship, and cast aside Huntingdon McLellan, and Annand, who were not always pleased with the Government.

I would not have done this, for twenty seats in Council. But was it necessary or wise, under the circumstances? certainly not—a thousand opportunities occurred, in the unrestrained social and personal intercourse which always subsisted among the Members of the liberal party, for explaining and justifying the conduct and policy of the Lieutenant Governor, and there is not a man of all that party, who will not acknowledge that these opportunities were ever frankly and honorably embraced. The suspicions and jealousies which had at first arisen, and which were often most inopportunately revived by the misstatement, or grudging acknowledgment, of general principles, in the upper House, were, partly by this very intercourse, and partly by the liberal acts and policy of the Government, *almost entirely removed by the Summer of 1842*, when there was not a Liberal Newspaper, or five Liberal Members, but steadily supported the Administration.

My looking back upon, and associating with, these men, *strengthened* instead of weakening the Government—what weakened, and ultimately destroyed, it, *was the miserable intrigue*, which commenced in the Spring of 1842 with the assault upon Mr. Young and myself, in Mr. Johnston’s Newspaper; was further *developed* by his Recorder Letter, and the movements of his friends, in town and

country, a few months after; and which *closed* with the wedging out of the Liberals, and the appointment of his Brother in Law to both Councils, towards the end of the following year.

The rule of my intercourse with old friends, as all of them well knew, was this—while all the better feelings of our nature were called out, by the memory of old scenes, and old companionships, in which we had borne honorable labors, and had a right to honorable pride,—the character, the strength, and the permanence of the Administration, were paramount to all other considerations. How was this shown, *by a series of public and private acts*, so consistent and notorious, as to overwhelm this artful slanderer with shame and confusion of face?

Hardly had I taken a seat in the Government when I came in contact with Young, Huntington, Forrester and Goudge, and passed through an ordeal which certainly would have been less severe, if there had been any “looking back,” in the sense in which the phrase is used by the Attorney General—if there had been treachery to my colleagues, and a secret understanding with old friends. No! it was just because the Liberals were *as honest and as much in earnest* when they *differed*, as they were *when they agreed*, that these collisions were so painful—but each and all took conscientious views, and acted upon them without shrinking, and without disguise.

Did I weaken the Government, when, after defending and explaining its policy throughout the Session of 1841, a vast majority of these same old friends came to its aid, and rejected a vote of want of confidence?

Did McNab, and Young, and I, desert our colleagues, when we brought *nine* of these old friends to support the Bankrupt Bill, and all those who make the charge, brought but *three*—Mayhew Beckwith and Stephen Thorne, *men over whom the Attorney General is known to have no influence, voting against us?*

Did we desert Lord Falkland, or combine with old friends, when, finding *all the Halifax Tories at work, stirring up a Parliamentary opposition*, and our Colleagues with but *three* supporters at *their* backs, we threw ourselves into the front of the battle, and grappling with the opposition, Tory and Liberal, brought the Government off with a vote of Confidence, sustained by nearly all our friends?

Did we desert Lord Falkland, or betray our trust, when, in the Press, the Societies, the Corporation, we sustained the former against Mr. Binney, who had the active and open support of every man, with one or two exceptions, over whom our Tory Colleagues were supposed to have “influence?” Did we desert them, at the Mason’s Hall, when the extraordinary spectacle was presented, of almost every Liberal in Halifax standing by the Governor, while almost every Conservative, with whom the Members of the present Council had “influence or intercourse,” backed and sustained his Aid-de-Camp?

Did we weaken the Government, or compromise Lord Falkland, in 1842, when the Attorney General’s particular friend, Mr. Dewolf, with whom he had and has so little “intercourse” and “influence”—upon whom he was mysteriously “looking back,” or “looking forward” (the country will judge which,) retired from the Council, and opposed a measure announced in the Governor’s Speech? No—while there were sundry consultations, and much friendly “intercourse,” going on every day between the Ex-Councillor and the Queen’s Attorney General, we were straining every nerve to carry the Bill, and brought just 21 of these old friends, and staunch liberals, to baffle the opposition.

Did I seek to weaken, or strengthen the Government, when, in Lord Falkland’s presence, towards the close of the session of 1843, I used every argument that private friendship, or public considerations, could suggest, to induce Mr. Huntington to accept a seat in the Council, and give us the weight of his character and experience? These facts, which no man can deny, prove that I acted in the same spirit, and with a single aim, from first to last—defending the Government in the Press, defeating the Opposition in the House, and courting the fair support of old friends to strengthen the Administration.

Let me now examine Mr. Johnston's next charge, "that I gave, in the Spring of 1843, notice of a motion, aimed at the Government of which I was a Member:"—a few simple explanations will set this matter in its proper light.

In the exposition of the Governor General's policy, written while he was here, and revised by him—it was distinctly stated, that, with a view to carry out Responsible Government, "the Executive Council was to be composed of Heads of Departments, and leading Members of both Branches of the Legislature,"—holding their seats and offices on the tenure of public confidence. Lord Sydenham formed his own Council of Heads of Departments, removing those who stood in the way. Lord Falkland, as Mr. Stewart avowed in the Legislative Council, had full power to send his chief officers to the Hustings, or oblige them to retire. This was not urged on Lord Sydenham, but it was understood then, and was the declared policy of Lord Falkland, that, as vacancies occurred, or the exigencies of the Government rendered it desirable, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the Surveyor General, and the Halifax Collector of Excise, should be brought into the Government, holding seats in the Legislature, to make the system complete.

The Collectorship of Excise fell vacant. Following out the new system, and with the assent of my Colleagues, the office was given to me; it being distinctly understood, and so avowed in the House, that it was to be held by the tenure of public confidence, while I retained my seat in Council. Towards the close of the Session, I have reason to believe, that all hope of my abandoning my principles, or the interests of the Country, had faded from the minds of certain persons; and it was believed that, if I could be shelved in the Excise Office, two good things would be done:

1st. That I should be forced out of the Government and the Legislature, and my influence in both be crushed.

2dly. That my retirement to an official position, in violation of the rule laid down, would destroy Responsible Government in Nova Scotia.

This was the scope of Mr. Marshall's notice of motion, a few days before the close of the Session of 1843. I have no copy of it, but if I remember aright, it went to declare, that in future no Collector of Excise should hold a seat in the Assembly. The moment that this notice was given, I saw clearly that it could only be met by a general Resolution, raising the question whether the new system of Responsible Government, conducted, as the Canadian Resolutions of 1841 express it, by a Provincial Administration, or the old, advocated by the Tories, and which Mr. Johnston has of late done his best to restore, should be carried on in this Province. Having heard that some movement was contemplated, I had prepared a notice; but not knowing what the Resolution was, or from what quarter it was to come, I neither thought seriously about it, nor had such definite information as would have formed the subject of consultation with my colleagues, or the Head of the Government. When Mr. Marshall rose, and gave notice of what he intended to move, a year afterwards, I rose on the spur of the moment, and gave notice that I would meet his Resolution in the way I have described—that the House might decide the broad question between the old system and the new, a whole year being left for my colleagues and Lord Falkland to determine the exact terms of the motion, if, on a critical examination of it, they saw anything to disapprove; and nobody, in the meantime, having a copy but the Lieutenant Governor. Out of this trifling affair a world of mischief was sought to be made at the time; and, when driven to his wits' end to attribute to some other cause than the appointment of his Brother-in-Law, the perplexities in which *that act* has involved the Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General invariably fastens upon my unfortunate notice of motion, nine months before. But there shall be no longer misrepresentation and doubt on this point: and I now call upon him, (as my copy has been mislaid) to publish the Resolution itself, to shew a line in it which conflicts with the system we were pledged to carry out, or with my duty to the Government—and I further require, that the correspondence between myself and the Head of the Government, on that subject, may be given to the public. On this, as on every other point of the controversy, I ask no more than the most ample and searching investigation.

I come now to the Attorney General's "contradiction, by authority," of an assertion which I never made, viz.—that Lord Falkland had promised to fill up "all the vacancies in the Executive Council" from the Liberal Party. Now, I never said this at Wilmot, or any where else. What I did say, what I here repeat, and let Mr. Johnston deny it if he can, was this—that, when, at the request of Lord Sydenham, I consented to go into the Council, it was with a promise from his Lordship, that he would use his influence to give to the Liberal Party a representation of three or four of its prominent members at once, or on the first vacancies occurring, and that thereafter justice should be done to them. This arrangement was acquiesced in by Lord Falkland, who for three years acted up to it—never hesitating to express his opinion, not that the Liberal Party were to have "all the seats," but that they were to have "justice."

The question is, then—was the arrangement entered in 1840 violated by Mr. Almon's appointment—when the Liberal Party, embracing half the new House and a friendly majority in the old, had had but one member elevated to the Executive Council in three years, and would have stood, after that appointment, represented but by Mr. McNab and myself?

It was; if Lord Sydenham were to rise from his grave, he would declare that neither the letter nor the spirit of his assurance were respected last December. Lord Falkland cannot look the country in the face, and assert, that Mr. Almon's appointment did not give

To the Party that had opposed the introduction of Responsible Government, 7 seats in Council.

To the Party which had advocated, and still maintained, the new principles, 2 seats in Council.

The best proof that faith was violated, and pledges broken, is the simple fact, that the Liberal Members resigned with the approbation of the entire Party. The best evidence that justice was not done, is, that Lord Falkland had to offer the Liberals five seats in July, though he thought two or three were enough in December. If Mr. Johnston can disprove either assertion, "on authority," he will be quite as well employed, as in contradicting what nobody ever said.

I think I have now fairly met, and answered, every charge referred to in my second letter. That I have sadly taxed your patience, I know and feel, for the very reverse of Falstaff's boast may be said of the Attorney General—he is not only tedious himself, but the cause of tediousness in others.

We have now to deal with the Parish Bill. The five columns which the Attorney General put forth on this subject, have been so ably and triumphantly answered by Mr Annand, in the Novascotians of the 11th of November, and 2d of December, that I need do nothing more than give a brief view of the question, as it lies in my mind.

The policy running through our early legislation and administration, assumed that a majority of our People either belonged to the Church of England, or could, by the legal establishment of that Church, and the open patronage of its members, be included within the fold. In the first Session of our Legislature, 1758, a Law passed establishing the Episcopal Church—and the year after another Law, incorporating the Parish of St. Paul's. Any body who takes the trouble to examine these Statutes will find a spirit running through them, which is directly at variance with the settled determination of the People of Nova Scotia, as expressed in all the public acts of their Representatives since 1836. Neither of these Acts would be passed by our Legislature, if introduced to-morrow—why, then, should either be indirectly recognized or sanctioned, by any new enactment?

This was the first fundamental objection to the Parish Bill—the new parish, to be created by it, would have come at once under the operation of, and been clothed with, all the powers given to the Church and its Parishes by these two Laws.

The Attorney General argues that there could have been no harm in this because the new Act would only have applied to old Parishes—but, by cutting

an old Parish up into three or four, and giving to three or four setts of Church-wardens the same power that the Act of 1759 gave to the Churchwardens of St. Paul's, is it not clear that the House, which would not pass that Act at all if it were not in existence, would thus be indirectly creating Parishes, and doing what directly it would not dare to attempt? To simplify this matter, so that the boys can understand it, let me show how the Township of Halifax, in which I resided, would have been affected by the passage of such a law, and how my consistency as a Legislator would have been damaged, had I sustained it. Such a bill was handed to me some years ago, when I looked into the matter, and made up my mind that it ought not to pass, for these reasons;

Because the creation, by the Legislature, 86 years ago, of one religious Corporation, with peculiar privileges, and powers, that might or might not be abused, could form no justification for my voting to create another, and setting a precedent, by which new life and efficiency would be given to a law that I would have voted against had I been in the House in 1759, and would vote to-morrow to repeal.

Because, though these powers might be used with comparative forbearance and discretion, in a large town, like Halifax, where there are Methodist, Baptist, Catholic, and Presbyterian places of worship, to which all may go, or pay—and where there is an active public opinion to keep the over-zealous in check, I could not answer for the discretion of the Church-Wardens at Hammond's Plains, where there are no Presbyterian or Methodist Chapels—for those of Musquodoboit, where there are neither Baptist, Methodist, nor Catholic Chapels—or for those of Sambro or Margaret's Bay, where the scattered Members of one or two dissenting Congregations, are too few and too poor to protect themselves, by the erection of Churches, and payment of stipends, from the right of taxation which the Act confers.

But, says the Attorney General, the Law, as it stands, gives no such power of taxation, because it enacts that "Dissenters shall have liberty of conscience—may erect Meeting Houses, and make Contracts—that all such Dissenters shall be relieved from taxation towards the support of the Church of England." I pass over the pages of grammatical quibbling, with which this position is sought to be fortified, and shall give a simple illustration of my reading of the law.

Suppose a clause were upon our Statute Book, by which it was declared, "that Irishmen should have liberty to cart up sea weed upon the Common, to dig, and remove the stones, and that *all such* Irishmen should have liberty to pasture their cows there," would anybody be simple enough to assert, that the right of pasturage was conferred upon Irishmen in general, and was not confined to those who could show that they had dug and carted up sea weed? I think not; and I should like to hear Mr. Attorney General Johnston, with a good fee from the Corporation funds in his hand, laying down the law to an unfortunate trespasser, who was simple enough to plead that "all such" meant "all."

The meaning of a passage of Scripture is often decided by the practice of the Apostles and Fathers, who lived in, or immediately subsequent to, the period in which it was delivered. Applying this rule to the clause in question, what do we find?

That all the Crown Officers and Lawyers, for eighty six years, who preceded the Bridgetown orator, construed the Act to mean just what the Liberals say it means, and the very reverse of the meaning given to it by the Attorney General.

That under this very law, goods have been repeatedly seized, and persons sued, in Halifax, and Mr. Johnston may have the names if he wishes.

That one man in Halifax had to protect his property by a threat to shoot the officer, which, so strong was his hostility to the obnoxious law, he probably would have done. His name the Attorney General may have if he desires it.

That, several respectable persons in Halifax, have had to produce to the Churchwardens of St. Paul's certificates of payment of stipend, before they could be released from the operation of the law, that Mr. Johnston, to escape from an awkward position, violates law and grammar to make us believe had no power over them. The names of these parties are at his service.

That a Church of England Minister acknowledged, before a Committee of the House of Assembly, that he had collected the tax in Lunenburg. The name can be given in this case, if the Attorney General dare deny the fact.

That the Bishop, the Head of the Church, declared on the 11th of March, 1843, in Mr. Johnston's presence, "that the practical effect of the present mode of assessment of Church Rates was—that any person belonging to a Dissenting denomination, and PAYING RATES for its support, was not called upon to pay to the Established Church"—and that all the Clergy, for eighty-six years, maintained that construction, and maintain it now, although they may question the policy of attempting to put forth the powers, which, it has never been doubted, are possessed by the Church.

That while Mr. Johnston has declared his disbelief that "any Lawyer," whose opinion is of value, would dissent from his construction of the law, the Hon Mr. McDougall, (a very sound one) in his place in the Legislative Council, "referred to the Statute Book—and read laws of 1758, for excluding the Catholic denomination from the Province. It was true these had since been repealed, and so ought Acts which are now in force for compelling persons not belonging to the Church of England to pay for its support. Continuing these ancient Acts—which he admitted were acted on with all leniency by the Church of England, and *perpetuating them by measures such as the present Bill*, was ridiculous in an age of intelligence and public liberty." Did Mr. Johnston deny Mr. McDougall's construction—or was his own a bright afterthought, inspired by the smell of clover, in the Bridgetown Barn?

That Mr. Fraser, a respectable Lawyer who supports the Attorney General, gave a legal opinion directly in his teeth.

Here then, is a chain of evidence on the Parish Bill, that exhibits the Attorney General in the peculiarly amusing position of the person, who declared that there was a slight difference of opinion between himself and the rest of the world—they thought he was mad, and he thought they were—he knew he was right, but unfortunately he could get no person to agree with him. For eighty-six years there is a steady stream of authorities, confirming the right of the Church, by usor under the law; and here comes the same eccentric individual, who could get nobody, from 1836 to 1842, to adopt his political principles, and cannot find a single soul to agree with him in his construction of law.

Yours truly,
JOSEPH HOWE,

LETTER V.

SIR—

The Attorney General asks, with well feigned surprise, "Why was a great portion of the time engrossed, at the Wilmot meeting, with the old story of Mr. Howe's quarrel with the Editors of the Christian Messenger." My answer is—because the Nictaux Meeting House stands near the Pine Grove; and because Mr. Howe had been defamed there, eighteen months before, by Mr. Johnston's friends and instruments, in relation to that very controversy. It was natural therefore, that the person slandered and condemned in *his absence*, and without a hearing, should avail himself of the first opportunity which presented itself, to unravel and expose the misrepresentations, under cover of which resolutions, prepared in Acadia College, were passed at the Nictaux gathering. That such a refutation was "anticipated," you and others know right well—that my statements were regarded as *conclusive* and *satisfactory*, may be inferred from the unanimity of the audience, and from the cordial assurances of many worthy people, who had been, for a time, misled.

Mr. Johnston says that "the tribunal appealed to, (the public) had already decided the question." They had:—and I believe that ninety nine out of every hundred, not belonging to his own communion, had decided, that in retaining my money, a part of it for *six months*, and the bulk of it for *twelve*, after yourself and two other Baptists had *investigated the Accounts*, and *fired the amount due*, and *the day when it should be paid*, a grievous wrong was done me: which, coupled with the abuse poured from the Christian Messenger, while the money was withheld, and *many months before any reference was made by Mr. Nugent to the debt*, led to the controversy into which I was afterwards so indecently driven.

Though the public had thus decided, the Baptists of Wilmot had *decided the other way*. That they should have done so, is not surprising. Many of them read only the Christian Messenger; and its Editors, fearing the weight of my case, had carefully excluded it from their pages. Assembled by the friends of Ferguson and Nutting, harangued by the Professors of Acadia College—told that *I had commenced the controversy*, and had insulted their Church; and misled by a perversion or suppression of material facts, it was natural that Resolutions, covering forty pages of MS. which nobody but myself could answer on the spur of the moment, should have been adopted by the people of Wilmot without a division. When, however, the whole case was laid before them, it was just as natural that an audience, full as large as that at Nictaux, composed of all denominations, and bound to me by no personal or religious ties, should *reverse the judgment*.

The Attorney General thinks it was unfair to broach the subject "behind" Ferguson & Nutting's "backs." You know where I was, and how I was employed, when the Nictaux Meeting was assembled—you, *who investigated the whole case as an Arbitrator*, know how often I have been misrepresented behind my back; and the public know that at Yarmouth, Onslow, and Bridgetown, Mr. Johnston was not very sparing of his assaults upon people behind their backs. But he tells us, that he has reviewed the evidence, and "is surprised at its strength and conclusiveness, in support of the positions assumed" by his friends. Who doubts that the man who could see no evil in the Pietou Observer, and no good in the Nova Scotian—who imprisoned Nugent, and allowed Martin Wilkins to escape—who throws his own brother in Law into the political scale, to weigh down all the Liberals of Nova Scotia—who busies himself in raking up charges against the Liberals, and writing threatening letters

to bolster up the character of a tool, stained by every vice—who doubts that a person, with such an obliquity of vision, would decide that his friends were right, and his enemy wrong, no matter what the controversy, or what the nature of the evidence?

Mr. Johnston seeks to prove that the Editors of the *Christian Messenger* were not liable for the *balance*, because they had paid as much *on account*, as would cover the work done before they disclaimed personal liability; but he knows that *the whole debt was incurred under one Contract*—was delivered to these Editors—that all the payments were made through them—that *for a part of the work, equal to the whole balance claimed*, they were undoubtedly liable—that, for the whole of it, as men of honor, acting for third parties, whose guarantees they held, they were morally, if not legally liable; when those parties neglected or refused to pay the creditor, with whom they had contracted, *under pledges and assurances never redeemed*, until after the controversy arising out of this strange transaction had commenced.

If these Editors were not liable, how did it happen that Mr. Nutting declared to a thousand Baptists at Yarmouth, that the persons who conducted the *Messenger* were not only not remunerated for the large portion of their time necessary to perform that duty, but “*were accountable for the expenses incurred in its publication?*” If they were accountable then, who was accountable afterwards, no new contract having been entered into, the whole debt having been incurred by those Editors—and no legal liability attaching to any body else?

But, admitting, for the sake of argument, that those persons were not *legally* liable—that there were looseness in the arrangement, and overcharges in the accounts; I hold, that all these matters having been referred to Arbitrators—a sum fixed, and a day named, the day should have been kept, and the sum paid; and if this had been done, *in January*, the controversy could not have broken out in *August*.

The story of the draft on the Secretary of the Missionary Board, which Mr. Johnston attempts to mystify, is soon told, and so simple, that any business man can understand it; and see that, whatever may be thought of the previous stages of the transaction, on this branch of it the conduct of Mr. Johnston's friends was anything but creditable.

At the close of 1841 I sold the Novascotian, and retired from business. Contemplating such a step, and wishing to close my transactions with the Bank of Nova Scotia, I withdrew my paper, giving a Bond, with good security, for the payment of the whole amount by the end of 1842. Two parties owed me the sum due the Bank—the *Messenger* people, and another individual. The Arbitration had been held in August, 1841—the debt assumed by the Missionary Board—the disputed items adjusted, and principles fixed which were to govern a final settlement, and the 31st of December following named as the time of payment. Suppose these steps taken between any two merchants in Halifax, all disputes adjusted, and the whole debt found to be due in 70 days; and suppose that the creditor wrote a polite note to the debtor, informing him that he had drawn an order for the amount, *not on the day it was due*, but at any date *which might suit his own convenience*—and suppose the debtor never answered his note—accepted his draft—or paid a farthing, for six months after the day fixed for payment of the whole, what would be thought of the transaction? Suppose he paid but a fourth of the amount for twelve months after; and, in the meantime, ripped up all the details in the newspapers, settled the year before by arbitration, and sought to destroy the character of the man thus dealing with him? Such a transaction would stamp any party with disgrace in a mercantile community; yet *thus was I treated by Mr. Johnston's friends*, who resolved at Nictaux that they were all right, and that I, *thus giving them their own time to pay a debt determined by arbitration*, had been guilty of a grave offence. Here is the naked truth—the Attorney General cannot deny a word of it; and the public, with the facts before them, may judge of the transaction.

My principal reason for discussing this affair in Wilmot, was, as you well know, because it had been stated by a learned Professor, that a partial payment, made after the controversy commenced, *not having been endorsed upon the*

draft, the Association might have been called on to pay the same sum twice. You will remember that I explained that my draft never having been accepted, lay at the Bank like any other note that had not been endorsed, or discounted, a piece of mere waste paper; the Bank looking to my Bond, and having no claim against any body, till the estate of my Bondsman, and my own, were exhausted. Had the draft been accepted, the partial payment would have been endorsed on it; but having been *dishonored* by the parties on whom it had been drawn, no further notice was taken of it—the Bank looked to my Bond, and I to my own resources.

At the close of 1842, when public opinion forced the parties to pay the debt, a year after it had been declared due by the Arbitrators, Mr. Pryor lodged the balance at the Bank, and demanded to have the draft. I forbade the Cashier to give it to him, stating as my reason, that it having never been accepted, and treated with wily caution for fourteen months, he should not have it then. He at first refused to pay over the amount due, and I then tendered the whole sum, necessary to discharge the bond. Finding that he had no remedy, and the officers of the Bank deciding that the draft was mine, he consented to pay the money, taking receipts; the draft, which the Attorney General says "he obtained," being given to me.

These plain facts settled the question in the minds of plain men in Wilmot, and they will weigh down, in the judgment of plain men everywhere, all the sophistry of the learned Attorney General.

Passing from this topic to that of the Civil List, Mr. Johnston wonders how that could have been introduced, as the present Executive Councillors were ever as forward as Mr. Howe to diminish the pecuniary burdens of the Country.—This is certainly a good joke. From 1828 to 1836, Mr. Howe turned attention, in the Nova Scotian, to the growing extravagance of our public expenditure—during all which time he was denounced as a mischievous demagogue, and an agrarian leveller, by some of the present Executive Councillors, and by the whole party which sustains them—yet "they were ever as forward." In 1837 Mr. Howe came into the House, and voted for almost every retrenchment, by which about £5000 a year was struck from the annual appropriations. Which of the present Council put himself "forward" on that occasion—who of the party did not resist the growth of the public sentiment, by which these retrenchments were obtained?

The Civil List was then attacked, but the Casual and Territorial Revenues were in the possession of the Government, then in the hands of George, Robie, Dodd, and afterwards of Stewart and Johnston. From 1837 to 1840, these Revenues were demanded, in a succession of Bills and Addresses, and an adequate Civil List respectfully tendered by the People's Representatives. At every step of our progress we had to encounter the dogged and vituperative opposition of the party now in power. The Bills were rejected by the Legislative Council, controlled by Johnston, Stewart, and Robie—counter addresses were forwarded to England—Stewart, and Wilkins sent as a counter delegation; while Mr. Johnston denounced, at Mason's Hall, the salaries extorted from the House in 1840, as too low, and "a breach of the public honor." Yet he tells us now that he and his friends, who thus resisted every movement of the Liberal Party, "to diminish the pecuniary burdens of the Country," were as forward as Mr. Howe, who, down to this period, acted with the Liberals.

The salaries tendered in the Bill of 1840, included—

To Sir Rupert D. George £1100, independent of his fees from the Registry.

To the Chief Justice, £1100, besides his Travelling Fees of a guinea a day.

Because the House did not give more, Mr. Johnston rejected the Bill, and denounced the Liberals, in his speech at Mason's Hall, as violators of "the public honor."

Had this Bill been allowed to pass, the whole question would have been settled four years ago.

But, at this time, the Casual Revenue afforded a surplus—Responsible Government had not been conceded, and Crown Officers and members of Government could set the people at defiance.

The rejection of this measure, and the remonstrances sent home in consequence, led to the withdrawal of the question for the subsequent three years, Mr. Howe doing his best to remove the difficulties, down to the moment when he left the Council.

But, Mr. Johnston says, "that the Civil List was brought before the House, last session, in a manner more favourable to the Province than had been arranged or contemplated when I left the Council"—yet he boasted, on the floor of the House last session, that it had been "brought forward" in the precise manner *recommended* by me "before I left the Council!"

When it was introduced Mr. Johnston did his best to carry the highest salaries in the printed scale—Mr. Howe to obtain a reduced scale, by which upwards of £2000 might be, and was, after repeated divisions, saved to the Province.

Mr. Johnston and his party, then, refused all compromise, and kept the salaries up to the highest point down to 1840.

Mr. Johnston and his friends embroiled the settlement of the whole question for years, by Addresses, and Speeches, and Delegations.

Mr. Johnston and the "present Executive Councillors" proposed and urged a scale of salaries, last Session, £2000 higher than the Liberals gave them.

Yet they were *ever* as "forward!"

Now the simple truth is this, that the falling off in the Casual Revenue had thrown Mr. Johnston and his party, (so rampant and exacting in 1840) at the mercy of the House; and the appointment of his Brother in Law to the Councils, had so weakened the Government, that the consistent, the pious, and the high minded Attorney, who rejected

£1100 for Sir Rupert George, and

£1100 for the Chief Justice,

and denounced such paltry sums, as violations of the "public honor," was glad to accept

£700 for Sir Rupert George, and

£1000 for the Chief Justice;

and after he had, to hold his place, yielded to these "violations of public honor," a thousand times more flagrant than those of 1840, had the meanness, in order to acquire popularity, to boast in the Bridgetown barn of retrenchments, which were made in spite of his teeth.

But we are told that he has "handled the public money" more sparingly than Mr. Howe. Let us try this boast out;

Mr. Howe served two years as a Member of Council, and discharged the duties of Indian Commissioner, receiving no salary at all.

Mr. Johnston was a paid officer of the Government from the moment they entered it together.

Oh! but he declined an increase of £100 to his salary as Solicitor General; so he did, *after* Mr. Howe had declined an increase of £100 a year, to the annual vote as Speaker. But he consented to a reduction of his salary as Attorney General—yes, when the revenues were gone, the Government in a dilemma—and the Liberals, whose opinions were well known, stood ready to reduce it. He threw his contribution, as the Russian woman did her child, because the wolves were round the sledge. Had he declined the £750 when appointed to the office, some credit might have been taken; but he took it as long as it could be got, and gave up just what he had not strength to carry.

The manner in which the Attorney General discusses his friend Mr. Nutting's emoluments, affords a fair specimen of his tact at ingenious mystification. One would suppose that this officer, who "possesses no salary," who is paid by suitors, whose services "are left unprovided," was a very ill used individual—a perfect martyr to the public service. What are the facts?

In 1842 we find, from a very incomplete return, that Mr. Nutting received in that year in fees—

From Halifax,	£450
Six other Counties,	152
	<hr/>
	602
As Clerk of the Crown,	125
In the same year he received,	
As Master in Chancery,	135 15 3
	<hr/>
	£862 15 3

So that the ill used individual, who was, in this very year, denouncing Mr. Howe in the Christian Messenger, as a renegade to his principles, gone over to the Government for a lucrative office, quietly pocketed all this money, and himself and his friends best know how much more, from the other Counties, whose returns are not here included. The public will now decide, between me and the Attorney General, whether I, in estimating at Wilmot, the "emoluments," not "salary," of this individual, at £900 a year, was far wrong; or whether he, in slurring the matter over, and endeavouring to create the impression that Mr. Nutting was poorly paid, has not been endeavouring to delude the yeomanry of Nova Scotia.

The question which arose last session, between the Government and Liberals, then, was simply this—whether Mr. Nutting should hereafter have £775 a year, or £900, and the smaller sum was given. Who, in the County of Annapolis—Baptist or Churchman—Tory or Liberal, but will frankly admit that it is an ample compensation?

Mr. Johnston labours to create the impression that the only question which divides the Opposition from the Government, is one "purely personal, and that involves no constitutional principle." No constitutional principle! When the Queen's Representative, having opened negotiations with several gentlemen, with a view to strengthen his administration; and having been advised, by some of them, to take another individual into the arrangement, violates the confidential nature of such communications, discloses the secrets of his own closet, and makes the independent advice given by those whom he had consulted, a pretext for *denouncing a Nova Scotian*, and declaring publicly, that a person *neither asking nor desiring any favour of him*, should be *deprived of his common rights*, and rendered ineligible to sit in Council, *whether the People of Nova Scotia desired his services or not*. If there is no principle involved here, and if a majority of the People's Representatives can be got to sustain such a violation of the Constitution, *and of all the rules of ministerial negotiation*, then the sooner Nova Scotians bow their heads in meek submission, and give up Responsible Government, the better.

The reason given for this singular outrage, would have weight with our countrymen, if they did not know that the person thus accused of "lamprooning" the Lieutenant Governor, was more "sinned against than sinning,"—that he was driven to a line of self-defence and retaliation, by a course of systematic insult to himself, his friends, and family—which need not be repeated here, but which extended over a period of many weeks—before he found himself compelled to teach all parties, that as a Governor has no authority to violate a Nova Scotian's rights of person or property, neither is he justified in misrepresenting his conduct, nor hiring sbirri to stab his reputation.

The Governors of Nova Scotia are not sent to rule the Province by their "personal feelings," but according to "the well understood wishes of the People." I sacrificed my personal feelings, when I sat, for years, beside a Member of Council to whom I did not speak. The Queen sacrificed her "personal feelings," when she dismissed Lord Melbourne, parted with the Ladies of her Bedchamber, and gave the Seals to Sir Robert Peel. George the Second did violence to his personal feelings, when he made William Pitt Secretary at War, but the nation reaped the advantage. William the Fourth forgot his personal feelings, when Lord Brougham rose to the Woolsack. The Constitution of England gives to the people a right to elevate to the Councils

of the Nation, those who possess their confidence—and patriotic Sovereigns respect the Constitution,—the Constitution of this Country makes the general good, and not the personal feelings of any individual, the rule by which Administrations are to be formed. A subservient Parliament may adopt a different rule, but an intelligent and spirited people will know how to call them to a rigid account.

I think that I have now fairly met, and answered, all the material points of the Attorney General's Bridgetown speech. There are one or two passages, and some ungentlemanly sneers, which demand a few words of explanation or rebuke, and then I shall bring these letters to a close.

Mr. Johnston wonders what I could have said in Wilmot, on the subject of the Roman Catholic claims, and takes credit for offering "two seats in the Executive Council to Catholics last summer, much more than was done or attempted, in this respect, all the time Mr. Howe was in office." Let me tell the Attorney General what I did say at the Pine Grove, and then the public will see at once how sandy and unstable is the foundation of the boast with which he has sought to tickle the ears, and win the support, of a body, who owe all the propositions made to them, not to the Attorney General's policy, but to the resistance of the Liberals, and to the despicable plicht to which he was reduced by the retirement of their leaders from the Council.

In December last, the Elections were over,—yielding to the desire of the Lieutenant Governor, the Liberals had consented to remain in Council. Mr. Johnston's influence, at that moment, was all-powerful—he was, or was to be the Leader—he had the Governor's ear. There were eight Members of Council, and one vacancy. Now, had this seat been offered to Mr. Doyle, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Tobin, or any other respectable Catholic, Mr. Johnston might have taken credit for regarding "the just claims of the Roman Catholics." What did the Attorney General do? He advised the Governor to fill up the only vacant seat, not with a Catholic, but with his Brother in Law. Suppose that Uniacke, McNab and Howe, had acquiesced—had not remonstrated—had not retired, is it not plain that the Roman Catholics would have got just nothing—neither the seat offered "in the winter," nor the "two in the summer?" When Mr. Johnston thought he was strong, he cared more for his Brother in Law than for all the Roman Catholics—when his own folly had got him into a dilemma, he sought to buy them with one seat in the winter, and two in the summer. This is what Mr. Howe said at the Pine Grove—can the Bridgetown orator deny a single word, there spoken, and here repeated?

But Mr. Howe said more: He said, that, while Mr. Johnston's allies had, at Liverpool and other places, denounced Mr. Young, and Mr. Howe, who had treated all Christians as one family, and fought for the rights of all, without looking to the peculiar interests of either—while the Christian Messenger had upbraided the latter with "cracking the whip of Catholic ascendancy" over the Baptists, when he sought to equalize the grants to their Colleges—that the Attorney General had illustrated the consistency of his principles, and those of his party, by the most barefaced attempt to traffic with the Roman Catholics for political support, that had ever been made in this, or any other Country. I said this—dare Mr. Johnston deny it?

We are told that the "leading practical difference" between Mr. Johnston's friends and the Liberals, is, whether or not the Country shall be "governed by a faction." There is a good deal of truth in this; but you will bear in mind, that the Liberals have ever contended that the Country should be governed by and with the aid and confidence of a working majority of the country's Representatives—that they have never attempted to carry on the Government by minorities—to appoint their brothers-in-law over the heads of the People's Representatives—to hold office with fragmentary Councils, and majorities of one. Mr. Johnston and his party have done all these things, and I therefore leave you to judge who it is that seeks, and has sought, to govern "by a faction."

What Mr. Johnston calls "a faction," in the city and county of Halifax, is a vast majority of the owners of real estate, of the industrious, upright, intelligent, and thriving members of the metropolitan community. If public questions were to be settled as in the olden time, this body could drive the Attorney General and "his faction" into the sea, in a single day. This body have returned all the members for the Town and County of Halifax, but one, in four elections—and have formed the base of, and cherished the spirit that has animated, all the more important movements of the Liberal party, which have induced the British Government "to throw the rein loose" to her Colonies, and to concede to the "people increased checks and influence," in spite of the blundering machinations of such obstructives as the Attorney General. He likes not the people of Halifax, and there is but little love lost—he professes great regard for the yeomanry of the interior, and shows it by exalting his own family at the cost of the peace of the Province, and the stability of the Administration.

But "power—office—salary"—these are the ends and objects of the Liberals. This is modest language, applied to men, who, for ten or twelve years, have toiled for the general good, regardless of "power—office, or salary;" who have had power, and withstood its highest fascination—who have held offices, and resigned them, in obedience to their principles—who have had salaries, and preferred their independence. This charge against the Liberals, in Town and Country, comes with a very bad grace from a man, whose relatives and friends hold nearly every "office" of emolument in the County in which he was speaking; and whose immediate friends and partizans certainly share among them so many offices, in Town and Country, that the bare enumeration of the list will be enough to teach him to hold his peace.

James W. Johnston—Leader, Attorney General, with "office" and "salary," though not much "power."

M. B. Almon—Member of Executive and Legislative Council—President of the Bank.

Professor Crawley—Office and Salary.

Professor Pryor— Do. Do.

J. W. Nutting—Offices and £900 a year.

Mr. Crawley's Brother—"Offices" and "Salary."

One of Mr. Johnston's Nephews Surgeon to the Poor House, and another Clerk to the Legislative Council, &c. &c. and thus I might go on, and tracing the Bridgetown declaimer's peculiar clique through their varied ramifications, find them rejoicing in the possession of more salaries, paid out of the earnings of the people of Nova Scotia, than are now or ever were held by *all* the "great Liberals" put together.

Mr. Johnston expressed his surprise that Mr. Young, "a Member of a liberal profession, possessed of abundant pecuniary means," should have attended the Pine Grove Meeting—but my "interests and prospects are at stake—and agitation is the staple." I comprehend the full malignity and meanness of the sneer; and should feel the power of it, if this man had ever established a claim to charge me with mercenary motives, or if my whole life did not give the lie to the contemptible insinuation.

Under Responsible Government public men, in North America, as in England, must occasionally appear in all the Counties, to explain their principles—to attack the policy of their opponents—to impart information; and he who desires to exclude all others from addressing the Constituency he represents, has a bad cause, and "loves darkness rather than light." Mr. Johnston went to Yarmouth, to Onslow, and to Bridgetown, because perhaps he felt that "agitation was the staple, and that his interests and prospects were at stake." Mr. Crawley, a man not much richer than myself, I believe, went lecturing and declaiming into almost every County of Nova Scotia—but then "agitation was the staple, and his interests and prospects were at stake." I but followed these illustrious and disinterested examples—treading softly in the footsteps of these great men, at a most respectful distance.

How little this man knows of my true interests and prospects! If mercenary, I might have done, as others have done, gone plodding, and saving, and extorting through life, bartering every feeling of my heart, and every generous aspiration, for the dust which they bow down and worship—if seeking my own interests, I could have had office under the old system, and held it without responsibility—I might have held it when I had it, and cared not who were my colleagues. My income, from my own humble business, was greater every year, for six or seven, before I entered the Government, than it was during any twelve months that I received a salary; and I could to-morrow take a Printing Press, and earn more, in half a dozen places in British America, than any office will yield that Lord Falkland has in his gift. But, suppose I could not—suppose me steeped to the lips in poverty, have I not the same right to speak in favor of my own political principles, in any County, that any poor Clergyman has to preach away from home—that any Professor of Acadia College has, to beg the socks off the feet, and the last shilling out of the pocket, of the poor Settler on the Wilmot Mountain?

There was a poor man once, born in a manger, that the Jewish scribes, with the Attorney General at their head, contemned and slew—but his precepts and his principles survived them. He has said “blessed are the poor in spirit, for their’s is the kingdom of Heaven,”—but James W. Johnston says, “blessed are the rich, for they only shall address the People of Annapolis, and sit, like my brother-in law, in the Councils of the country.” The People of Nova Scotia may say, Amen—but it will be when they have forgotten the difference between Young and Dodd, Huntington and Wilkins, and between James W. Johnston, and

Your old friend, and very humble servant,

JOSEPH HOWE.