

you in detail the repeated declarations contained in these despatches, that the honor of the Crown is concerned in maintaining inviolably the rights of the officers thereby secured. This was fully done last year by the hon. and learned Attorney General, and it was distinctly declared that it would be a breach of the public faith, to interfere with the rights thereby vested.

But consider it well the force and import of the expression "the honor of the Crown of England, in what does it consist? Is it her vast wealth and power, the progress of her arts and arms? No, not all the triumphs of her army and navy, all the laurels of Waterloo and Trafalgar have shed so imperishable a glory on England as her lofty moral position among the nations of the world, and her pure unspotted faith, which has made the word of England current through the world. The Crown of England; aye, and the Crown of New Brunswick too, and the honour of that Crown, ought to be dear to every inhabitant of this Province. The Hon. and learned Atty. General himself, last year told you that he could not on his oath advise the Lieutenant Governor to give his assent to a bill touching the present incumbents.

But it is not the declaration of the Colonial Secretaries merely, that forms the bar to interfering. They truly say that it cannot be done. But with the salaries so secured—if Lord Glenelg, Lord Stanley, Lord John Russell, or Lord Grey had never written a line on the subject, the difficulty would have been equally insurmountable. The objection arises out of the nature of the case and not from the opinion of the Colonial minister, and every constitutional lawyer would have returned the same answer.

With regard to my own case it was thought desirable by the Legislature to establish and provide for a judge in the Court of Chancery. By the Act of 1st Victoria—the appointment of a master of the Rolls in the Court of Chancery was authorised who should hold his office during good behaviour. It was necessary that the person to be selected to fill so responsible an office should be taken from the first ranks of the profession, and it was provided that he should be a barrister of ten years standing. By the second section he is to have the same powers as the Master of the Rolls in England; and by the fourth section, there is granted a fixed sum annually as a salary for the said office. When then the Commission under the great seal issued to me, thereby granting me to hold that office during good behaviour together with the salary thereto attached—it conveyed to be an indefeasible title to that office and to that salary during my incumbency. But it may be said, 'it may be taken away by Legislative enactment; undoubtedly it may. We are all aware of what has been called the omnipotence of Parliament; but so an act may be passed to take away my house, or the land on which it stands and transfer it to my neighbour. I have no better title to it than to the emoluments of the office I hold. My title to each is by the law of the land.—If that will not protect me in the one, it is no security in the other.

Here then was a special act expressly passed to establish this office, and to fix the salary. It was a permanent act, and by it the Lieutenant Governor was enabled to make a selection for the office. I was so selected. And can it be for a moment imagined that it is now competent to break the faith thus pledged, to destroy the title thus given and granted; it is utterly impossible. I am quite satisfied when this matter is understood that the present measure can proceed no further, that the learned Attorney General will see himself that it must be withdrawn.

Why, what would be the effect of passing such an act? what would become of the independence of the judiciary. It would lay it prostrate at the feet of the House of Assembly, and the maintenance of the judges would be a subject of an annual vote.

This proposal I understand, goes to reduce the Judges to £600. Suppose it done, how long would it remain so? Already a lower note has been sounded, and another hon. gentleman proposes £500. There it might remain for a year or two, but another hon. member has declared his opinion that £300 per annum is quite enough for any public officer; and he says, the country are fast coming to his opinion; and one hon. gentleman has expressed his sentiment that the duties of the office I have the honor to hold may very well be performed for two hundred a year—perhaps they may. You are then fairly warned—the notion of finality in what you now do is altogether avowedly repudiated. The reduction of salaries is always a popular cry, and thus hereafter, the judges instead of being secure, will be subjected to the conditional agitation which any man may at any time and for any motive set on foot in this House. Those who are called on to discharge their high functions between high and low, rich and poor, men possessing political power, and men possessing none, are members of this House and those who are not to be brought down to be absolutely dependent on the votes of this house. Is it possible the people of New Brunswick desire such a state of things? I do not believe it.

And for what is all this? what is the advantage proposed in return for the dishonour to the Crown, the breach of public faith, and the overthrow of Judicial independence? Why, the saving contemplated by this bill as far as the Judicial salaries goes, is about £1200. The inhabitants of this Province are about 240,000. This will make about one penny in the year to each inhabitant of the Province. By the year 1870, when probably—if not sooner—the whole, or nearly the whole of the present incumbents will be gone, the saving will amount to one shilling and nine pence to each individual!!! This is literally the whole benefit, and is it for this miserable mess of pottage that the country is to break faith, and barter away its character and render suspected the administration of justice? But it is said there is another advantage! It is the great moral effect that will be produced by the reduction of salaries; that the country is "ground down" by these high salaries. This may be an excellent reason for the measure of last year, providing for a prospective reduction.—Economy in all departments is no doubt desirable, but it is no ground for a breach of faith. A moral effect to be produced by means which are not moral is not much to be

commended. It would almost be supposed from the language used that the salaries of official men were employed in erecting small fortresses around the country or procuring instruments of torture for the oppression of the people; but after all the salaries raised by indirect taxation for the most part flow back in small streams over the land and may occasionally be felt not to be injurious to the poorer classes.

A similar question to the present, has been raised in Nova Scotia; and I hold in my hand a paper in which certain resolutions appear, whether they were or were not carried I cannot state. They were however introduced into the Nova Scotia Legislature, by the Provincial Secretary, and may therefore be taken to establish the opinion of the Government. There the subject was the reduction of the Lieut. Governor, and one of the resolutions affirms that a Salary was fixed in the Civil List Bill, and formed part of the compromise by which the casual and territorial Revenues of the Crown were transferred to the Province, that any breach of that compact would be dishonourable to the people and Legislature of Nova Scotia.

But I have said this measure, if carried, will place this Province in a false position with England: we have been told by Secretary after Secretary, that in England this proceeding is held to be dishonest, a breach of public faith. Is there a different standard to be established here?—we may doubt the wisdom of her commercial or her financial policy, but who doubts the wisdom of her good faith? Is this House about to proclaim that England's honour is toopure for New Brunswick, that we must lower the standard; that we must have a sort of Provincial honesty and faith. That, what minister after minister tells you is dishonourable in England—what your fellow-subjects in Nova Scotia tell you is dishonourable there, will do well enough for New Brunswick! Last year you were warned in reference to this measure, "let there be no repudiation,"—Why then is that which was disgraceful in 1849—recommended in 1850? Is it possible that like the disease that affects our wheat or our potatoes, this baleful principle has crept upon us by degrees until it has infected the very lips of him who last year warned you against it? If this is indeed the case, then have we made greater strides towards separation than I was aware of but whatever may be the future destinies of New Brunswick, if the standard of England must come down, I trust it will not be to be replaced by a banner of *drab*.

Is it that since last year the powers of this Legislature have been enlarged, and is it the first use to be made of your enlarged powers to commit an act of public dishonor, and a breach of public faith? I am satisfied that this measure has been introduced without sufficient consideration, and that it can never pass into a law.

### CANADA.

(From the Toronto Colonist.)  
COL. JOHN PRINCE, M. P. P.

The following correspondence, we received from Colonel John Prince, with a request to publish. The introductory remarks, and the two first letters came to us printed: the second letter to the Secretary, and the note from Colonel Prince to ourselves, in manuscript. The printed form bore the newspaper title, 'The Canadian Free Citizen,' with the motto, *Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech, and the Freedom of the Press*. We copy them entire.

#### A MENACE.—COL. PRINCE AND THE GOVERNMENT.

The following correspondence has just taken place between the Government and Col. John Prince; and we hasten to lay the same before the public. The letter of Mr. Leslie awakes the following train of thought.—There is a decided pre-disposition in the present Government to tyrannize over the FREEDOM OF SPEECH and of the PRESS. We cannot discover in Col. Prince's letter the first syllable of disloyal sentiment, much less of treasonable doctrine, or inflammatory appeal; the whole concern is the candid opinion of a free citizen of a free country, freely given for the consideration of an enlightened and magnanimous people. No overt acts, no resistance, no rebellion is recommended, but the most mild and peaceable means, to secure to our beloved Province the entire management of their own affairs, uncontrolled by a power 4000 miles off—so far off that it is morally impossible that it can know or appreciate our resources, wants, or grievances, or apply a suitable and sufficiently timely remedy to such political maladies as may exist. Our candid opinion is, that the Government, in meddling in this affair, will promote the very cause they seem so anxious to repress.

(Copy.)

Secretary's Office,  
Toronto, 26th March, 1850.

SIR,—A letter has been published in several of the newspapers of the Province, dated 19th February, signed with your name, and addressed to Arthur Rankin, Esq., recommending 'Independence from the Mother Country,' as a remedy for certain evils under which the Province is therein alleged to labour.

I am commanded by the Governor General to inquire from you if you are the author of that letter.

I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your most obed't servant,  
J. LESLIE, Secy.

John Prince, Esq., Sandwich.

(Copy, Answer.)

The Park Farm,  
Good Friday, 1850, 1 p. m.

SIR,—Your letter of the 25th has been this moment received.

You may inform the Governor General that I am the author of every word in my letter to A. Rankin, Esquire, of the 19th ultimo: and you may be sure that I believe what I therein wrote is true—that I hope it will in due time be carried out—and that my best exertions shall be ever used towards that great end.

From your humble servant,  
JOHN PRINCE.

To the hon. J. Leslie, Provincial Secretary, Toronto,

The Park Farm

Saturday, 30th March, 1850.

SIR,—I presume that my letter of yesterday (Good Friday) duly reached your office. I now presume also to send to you, for the Governor General's perusal and your own (as an earnest of my intentions to carry out the meaning of that letter,) a Petition to Parliament, praying for 'Independence.' It may probably relieve his Excellency from cogitating much about my 'Silk Gown,' &c., &c.; and I trust I shall be able to carry it through the house next Session.

I remain, Sir,  
Your humble servant,  
JOHN PRINCE, Q. C.

To the hon. J. Leslie,  
Provincial Secretary, Toronto.

The Park Farm, 1st April, 1850.

Mr. Prince will be much obliged to 'The Colonist' to condescend to publish the above together with the inclosed printed correspondence; in his next issue. He merely puts it as the request of an independent Member of the Provincial Parliament—a very rare animal now a days.

Note by Editor Colonist. We would desire to draw the necessary distinction between an independent member and an infatuated member. Independence is one thing,—infatuation another. We are sorry for Colonel Prince. We have still hope's of his getting on the 'right track' again.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

[FOR THE CARLETON SENTINEL.]

MR. EDITOR.—In resuming my promised task, viz.,—the analyzation of Mr. Wilmot's Speech—the more I view this piece of composition, the more I am astonished at it. The misrepresentations, the plain falsehoods, and the uncharitable remarks made by that man, are so enormous, that no man of common sense could for a moment believe them. I was quite surprised at the declaration of Mr. Wilmot when he said "that Orangemen glory in taunting Roman Catholics." Let Mr. W. if he can, bring forth one living proof of this statement. If he does not I shall regard it like many other parts of his speech, unfounded! He also makes reference to the County of Carleton in 1847, and brands the Orangemen with all the disorder and confusion which then took place. Well might Mr. Connell (member for Carleton) boast of the peace that is now enjoyed in this County. If Mr. Wilmot received information which he stated, relative to domestic feuds, that information was wrong; peace and tranquility is the legitimate fruit of Orangemen, and not party feuds. Let Mr. W., if he can, or the gentleman who gave him the information, point out any family as a living witness of their statement, if they do not then must we believe that we have a public demonstration that what they declared is false. Mr. W. does refer to one or two circumstances which are well calculated, certainly, to injure the Orange Association; one is the fact of an Editor of a public periodical presenting to view the character of Mr. W. in such a manner as made him ashamed. A litigation having taken place between himself and that writer, he therefore uses that as an argument against Orangemen. Do you think, Mr. Editor, the thousands of Orangemen in this Province will ever get the better of such a mighty shock? Oh! Mr. Wilmot, why did you strike us with such a mighty weapon as that? you might have had a little compulsion upon us! But this is not all—this great Goliath of Popery, as he was stretching his fertile imagination, he met on his way Mr. Marshall Roberson's *Grist Mill*, and by one twist of his *Magna Lingua*, uprooted the whole mill and threw it right at the Orangemen; but as good fortune would have it, they were some eight or nine miles off at another mill, where they were better served, and where they received better treatment, and therefore they escaped being ground up into powder.—And oh! Mr. Editor, did you not pity those poor little children who were called Miceys, at that School down there in the County of Queen's? oh dear, how the poor little things must have suffered! Is it possible Mr. Wilmot that really was so? Can it be possible that it could take place? You were actually among the little ones as this persecution arose! why Mr. Wilmot, after that the Orangemen may never again show their heads in this world. Why Sir, was not that act worse in your estimation, than all the cruelties inflicted by the Roman Catholics during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries?—Those poor martyrs who endured the rack, the cross, the scalding lead, the boiling oil, the fagot and the flame, were not nearly so much persecuted as those poor boys that were called Miceys. Oh! Mr. Wilmot, I am astonished at you repining at such a childish occurrence. It might have done very well for you to have referred to when you were about ten years age, but now you are a man, do, oh do, put away childish things from about you. I am very much afraid Mr. Editor, that the people of the adjacent Provinces will think that we are a parcel of children in this Province, and that an idiot has been appointed one of our leaders. The hon. Attorney General says, what if he had been bred a Roman Catholic, and the faith which a man has he says, is merely the result of circumstances. Why, is not Mr. Wilmot a Roman Catholic now? if he is not, what is he? Why, says one, he is like the Mickey who put the Methodist coat on, he is a Mickey still. It is hard to tell in what Mr. Wilmot's faith will terminate, for it is the mere result of circumstances, as circumstances occur and vary, so will his faith be.

Pardon me, Mr. Editor, for this very brief epistle, while

I remain, your's, &c.,  
VERUM.

Woodstock, May 2nd, 1850.