

A  
050  
B78

# THE BROAD-AXE.

Eros Tyrusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

Vol. I.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Tuesday, March 14, 1871.

No. 4.



TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 14, 1871.

## THE LOCAL PRESS.

No. 3.

In our previous notices of the local Press, we took occasion to give due prominence to the oldest and ablest of the editors who have, at different periods, controlled the *Examiner* and *Islander*. This week we will make the *Patriot*, and its staff, the subject of a few comments. That journal, as our readers are well aware, was born of the *Protestant*, of unenviable notoriety. The latter sheet was established by a few ultra Presbyterians, who thought that the best way to further their narrow views, was, by establishing a paper which would take high grounds on the religious tenets which they professed to advocate. "No surrender" was its motto, and certainly the ungentlemanly way in which it treated those who were opposed to the peculiar ideas of its editors, as well as its advocacy of religion itself, was not calculated to advance the meek and humble doctrines of the Saviour of mankind. Certain Catholics, however, wished to show what could be said on the other side of the question, and, as a matter of course, the *Indicator* was established. Then came a war between the two journals, in which neither party gained much honor. Personal abuse and recrimination were the order of the day, until really sincere people began to cry out against the evil. Sensible men, on both sides, became disgusted with the gross personalities which tainted our literary atmosphere, and the two papers were suddenly snuffed out of existence. Both of them terminated an inglorious career, which no person would wish to see revived—the one by changing its patronymic into the *Herald*—the other into the *Patriot*.

Of the latter journal and its managers, we mean to speak pretty freely. We are bound by

no particular ties to Mr. Laird. We do not agree with him either in religion or politics. Indeed, we are opposed to him on both questions; consequently no person will accuse us of flattering him; at the same time we wish to do him impartial justice. As a politician, he has many faults, and on some questions his views, in our opinion, are entirely too contracted. He possesses none of the elasticity of conscience for which the Popes are so notorious, and to this reason we attribute his want of success as a political chief. If he could only divest himself of a certain rigidity of principle on religious points, he would be far better calculated to succeed as a popular tribune. That he possesses many of the qualifications necessary for a political leader, very few who have listened to him on the public platform will deny. He is gifted with ready powers of speech, a loud and sonorous voice, and—in cases where he is hard pushed for argument—with a laugh which disarms hostile criticism; yet, he has never succeeded as a politician, and to us the reason appears plain. It is, we have already stated, to be found in the fact that he is too rigid and unbending in his religious principles. Governments do not legislate for a single sect; neither should individuals imagine that their denomination alone is entitled to all the honors and emoluments in the gift of the State. The man who aspires to political honors must adapt himself to the circumstances of the country in which he strives to lead public opinion, otherwise he need never expect to succeed. We readily admit that men of high moral principle could never, for the sake of power or office, degrade themselves by making promises which they did not intend to fulfil,—that they would scorn to be instruments of deception or to mislead a people; but it unfortunately happens that such men, rarely, if ever, rise to the surface among politicians. Men of "easy virtue" and lax principles,—men with brazen faces and lying tongues, but with a certain plausibility of disposition and suavity of manners,—these are generally the individuals who succeed, while the really honest politician is left to chew in silence the bitter cud of disappointment. We are no admirer of the political chieftains of British North