

THE "BRITISH COLONIST," "PATRIOT"
AND "AGRICULTURIST."

Notwithstanding the non-political character of the *Agriculturist*, and the expressed intention of its proprietors, to abstain from the discussion of all party questions in its columns, it would seem that a newspaper of this city is determined to drag us into politics, whether we will or not, for no other purpose apparently than to gratify a selfish, revengeful feeling against another newspaper, and some personal pique against one or both of the proprietors of this journal.

In consequence of the enlargement of our paper, and the desire to have it well printed, we entered into a contract with the only publishers in this city, who had a press of sufficient size, Messrs. Rowell & Thompson, to print it for the present year. Sometime after we had made our arrangement, these gentlemen became also the publishers of the *Patriot*, and, among other things, to advance the interests of their paper, agreed to purchase from us as many copies of the *Agriculturist*, as would be needed to give one to each of their subscribers who should pay in advance. The *Patriot*, as most persons are aware, is a *conservative* paper; but, as the *Agriculturist* professed to have the promotion of agriculture, and the advancement of science, for its objects, and disclaimed any intention to engage in political discussion, the publishers of the *Patriot* felt no reluctance in sending our journal to their subscribers. The *British Colonist*, however, a paper at present *professing* to hold conservative opinions, in the course of a dispute with the *Patriot*, in which we had no concern, made the discovery, that the *Agriculturist* was a paper of the most "radical complexion," and had "always displayed the rabid qualities of its temper, particularly at the last general election"!! We feel sure our readers will not be less surprised at this discovery than ourselves. The charge is as devoid of truth, as the editor of the *Colonist* has since shewn himself devoid of honourable feeling, and therefore of fitness to conduct a public journal. As soon as we read the wanton and malicious attack of the *Colonist*, the writer of these remarks, believing that he was the individual aimed at (Mr. Buckland having had no concern in any publication in this country till within a few weeks) felt bound to answer it, through the channel in which it had been conveyed to the public, and accordingly addressed the following letter to the *Colonist*. Any other newspaper in the province would have inserted the letter, in conformity with a just and universally recognized rule, to allow those who have been attacked in their columns to be heard, through the same channel, in explanation or defence. But the *Colonist* is a singular exception, and, with his usual fairness, the editor not only refused to insert our reply, that his readers might judge in the premises, but reiterates the attack with more virulence than before, and quotes a *portion* of a sentence from our letter to prove that we "admit" the charge, while that very sentence taken as a whole, is an express denial of it. Again, he quotes a *portion* of the sentence which speaks of the "difficulty of sustaining an agricultural publication," and twists it into an intimation by us, that we intend to take up politics in our paper, in order to lessen that difficulty! Against such unfounded attacks, such shameful disregard of the courtesies of the press, and such despicable tricks of argument, it is impossible to contend. We should have taken no further notice of the matter, had the *Colonist* permitted his readers to see our defence; but as some of our political cotemporaries at a distance may be deceived as to the character and objects of the *Agriculturist*, by these misrepresentations, we have occupied our outside sheet with such observations as seemed necessary. As to our readers, they can safely dispense with the *Colonist's* sagacity in smelling out the "radicalism" or "high toryism" of the *Agriculturist*.

Whenever they find either of these *isms* in the paper, they will probably let us know of their disapprobation "in the usual way." Up to the present time, among nearly six thousand subscribers, of all shades of politics, scattered over British America, from Sandwich to Prince Edward's Island, we have not heard a single complaint on this score. And we believe, had not the *Colonist* got into a squabble with the *Patriot*, and, under the influence of jealousy and spiteful feelings against the latter journal, become reckless of truth and decency in the ejection of his spleen, we should not have heard the charge now.

To the Editor of the "British Colonist."

SIR:—In your paper of the 13th inst. you have thought proper to publish an unprovoked, and most unjustifiable libel against the *Agriculturist*, a cotemporary journal whose character and avowed objects ought to have shielded it from newspaper attack, especially if prompted by no higher incentive than the satisfaction of making a fling at a third party.

You assert, speaking of your rival the *Patriot*, "He professes to advocate the most ultra tory principles, while he embraces and incorporates the sentiments of the *Agriculturist*, a publication of the most Radical complexion, and which has *always* displayed the radical qualities of its temper, but more particularly at the last general election, when it *shone conspicuously* as a *Radical Organ*."

I beg to assure you, Sir, that you have been misinformed as to the character of the *Agriculturist*, and that your remarks, so far as they relate to that journal, are unwarranted and untrue. The *Agriculturist* was *not in existence* at the last general election, and could not therefore have "shone" in any character. The *Agriculturist* has not identified itself with any political party, nor advocated opinions that belonged to one party more than another. The *Agriculturist and Canadian Journal*, the first number of which was issued in the latter part of January, 1848, no longer exists; with that paper the writer was connected, and during the year it contained occasional observations on two or three questions of great public importance, viz., the Banks, the Usury Laws, the Navigation Laws, &c., which may in one sense be called *political* questions; but they belong to no party as such, and were not discussed in either a "Radical" or "Tory" spirit. But, sir, while I deny that there is a single line to be found in that paper, that would warrant the remarks you have made, I must inform you that the *Agriculturist*, whose "sentiments" you taunt the *Patriot* with "embracing," to the great peril of its reputation as a tory journal, is *exclusively* devoted to Agriculture and Science; is a *new* publication in form, character, and proprietary, the first number being all that has yet appeared; has no connection direct or indirect with any other paper, and neither has had, nor will have, ought to say on matters purely political, or which serve to distinguish one political party from another.

The principal editor, Mr. George Buckland, is comparatively a stranger in Canada, and has not so far as I am aware, formed or expressed any opinion upon the politics of the country. The *Patriot* of the 18th inst., I perceive, states the belief, that his opinions are "Conservative," but, though I have known him very intimately for nearly two years, I could not have expressed that belief with confidence, so little interest has he taken in our politics, and so seldom have I heard him speak on such topics. I trust, therefore, you will see and acknowledge the mistake you have made in charging the *Agriculturist* with disseminating "Radical," or any other political opinions, and the injustice you have done to Mr. Buckland, a stranger among us, whose past life has been spent in the quiet pursuits of agriculture, and who has come here with the intention of spending the remainder of it in the effort to improve and elevate that most important art in Canada.