

"that Florida and Texas and Delaware and little Rhode Island in the neighbouring States would be stronger if detached from each other. You must prove that the petty and miserable Republics of Central America, with all their Responsible Government, and entire exemption from foreign control, are in any way benefited by their smallness and isolation, and their reluctance to coalesce and form one strong Government as the only possible guarantee for the lives and liberties and happiness of all. *On the principle that the part is greater than the whole, you must prove that the smaller the state, the greater, and stronger and happier the people.* And that on your own principle the Republic of the Union at the present moment would be a signal benefit to Cape Breton, and Yarmouth, and Shelburne, where they have far stronger local reasons for being dissatisfied with the central government in Halifax, than Nova Scotia can ever be for being united, with Ottawa as its capital and the boundless British territory beyond our borders. Prove all this if you can, and without referring to the financial and commercial views at all, which are completely beyond and beside the question, you will correct me and thousands like me in Nova Scotia."

Now, we believe that it is a rule of Whateley's logic that no premises shall be subject to deductions, which are not so undeniably true that they are perfectly indisputable. Such premises form a fair axiom from which we may draw deductions, and no other.

It will be observed that the Archbishop treats the old maxim "Union is strength" as such an axiom—on which he proceeds to draw deductions in favor of the Confederation Scheme. And he is so positive of the universal truth of this axiom that he commences his argument by throwing upon us the "onus probandi." It must be observed that he maintains that "we must first prove that union is not strength," before we deny what he is pleased to call "the obvious advantages of Confederation." It is not logical to assert positively that a certain maxim is an axiom and then call upon you to show that it is not. On the other hand we might with greater force dispute the premises upon which he builds his argument. We have a logical right to call upon him to prove the universal truth of his premises—that "Union is strength" and we may compel him to prove this without allowing him to take instances from the histories of past days and of past peoples. We may in fact in this question compel him to confine himself to the effects of Union on the Anglo-Saxon race of the present day. We may call upon him to answer satisfactorily various questions, such as the following, before we accept his assertion that "Union is strength"—as an axiom:—

(1.) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland? Will you show that if Great Britain is in danger of weakness anywhere it would not arise from her union with Ireland? or will you show satisfactorily that Ireland would not be in a more prosperous condition if separated from Great Britain?

(2.) On this Continent? Will you show that the effect of Union has been strength to the United States, peopled as they chiefly are by Anglo-Saxons who have come to this great Continent and had boundless wealth and prosperity forced by Nature upon them; who have been blessed as no other people in the world's history have been blessed with all the means which should have made them happy themselves and contented with others? and who have an almost illimitable territory to spread out upon—so that one marvels how it is possible that, amid their unbounded, active prosperity and in a country where there is more than ample room for all, they could have found time to disagree with one another—will you show that the effect of their Union is that it has made them a greater, stronger and happier people—or

that they are not at this moment and have not for the last four years been tearing each other to pieces like savages, throwing aside for their fratricidal holocaust, all their wealth and all their morality, and carrying civilization back to the era of barbarism? and have not they rather become the most contemptible, degenerate and unhappy people upon the earth?

(2.) Will you show that the Union of Upper and Lower Canada has made the Canadians a greater, stronger and happier people (granted that they do not speak the same language—granted that they do not worship their God after the same fashion, still it is much to the point in the argument concerning Confederation, that these people are to be the chief elements of it) or will you show us to be misinformed in our information that these two provinces have been struggling for years to weaken each other, that they have been in fact ready at any moment for years past to engage in a war for separation, and that this fight has only been prevented by the knowledge that a policeman was standing by. (Lord Palmerston is on the beat just now.)

But now the Roman Catholic Archbishop here has done all but admit that The Fenian Brotherhood is a Roman Catholic Secret Society—and the following extract from his letter will appear very enigmatical to those who weigh every word of his important communication:

"If one half of what you say about Fenians and armed and hostile organization in a neighbouring country be true—which I do not contradict, some or many of our Catholic Churches, with or without our consent, may be turned into drill rooms,—but if I know anything of the Catholic body in this country, I vouch for it they will never be used."

We say this passage reads enigmatically—and that the occasion, (the unadvised allusion to the acts of the Fenians) was an unfortunately selected one for the expression of the views of the Roman Catholic Archbishop on the Confederation Scheme. We should have thought it a strange thing if the Bishop of the Church of England had seen in the passage—quoted reason to defend the Sanctuary of his Church from the desecration. The *Chronicle* never charged it with Orangemen turning it into a Drill room—and yet the Orangemen are notoriously a Protestant organization, and are spoken of in the same way in the article which the Roman Catholic Archbishop feels it his duty to correct. But if we have pointed out a passage that is enigmatical, His Grace has furnished us with a solution to the Enigmas, and we cannot quote the noble religious truth he teaches without paying a tribute to one of the purest and most brilliant gems of English literature, with which he has enriched our language, when speaking of the purpose of the Fenians, he says,

"If good, it is wicked to conceal it—the name of Him who is Light himself, should not be invoked to hide it from the eyes of mankind; and if bad, it is doubly wicked, as it is sacrilegious to attempt to have it hallowed by the religious obligations of an oath."

The pen which wrote that glorious sentiment, cannot have been dipped in the Fenian pitch with which it has accidentally been contaminated—and it were idle to seek a further solution of what would else seem enigmatical from one who places the actions of men under so faultless a religion. Nay, we might go further and require the Archbishop to show that Nova Scotia is not prospering "ceteris paribus" in fair proportion to other Anglo-Saxon people.

Again, it must be observed that the Archbishop says that "on the principle that the part is greater than the whole," it devolves upon us to prove that "the smaller the state the greater, the stronger and the happier the people"—and His Grace tries to drive us to a "reductio ad absurdum" by a reference to "Cape Breton and Yarmouth and Shelburne"—Butlo-

gically, it
less than
or disadv.
that, be
happine
that a lar
the Gre
mense Ru
the Robi
most una
must sho
less than
ness dep
Archbish
terests w
we may r
versus fr
may sug
some day
that a qu
tic State
ters of tl
of the la
cause "
ters as tl
the grea
must thi
selves a
question
found it
we are r
a dilen
the thoo
oppositi
In th
bisho
his offi
thinkin
Ther
tion for
and in
purpose
earth—
garden
article
their s
Archbi
these r
"Ever
ing of
Upper
comin
packa
armed
cross
The
man
gion,
been
izatio
rald r
suspi
Rom
that