

sides—the other only by the delegates—which appear to have produced a greater effect than they deserved, upon the audiences in the Temperance Hall.

Let us take the argument made use of by the delegates alone first; it is this. "The stupidity of those who can declare that an Inter-colonial Railway is of no advantage to this Province, is inconceivable. The stupidity of those who do not see that Union is strength is culpable—and it is born of selfishness. The stupidity of those who do not know that a great country is greater than a small one is well—no words can describe it. Therefore, the Federation Scheme now offered you must be accepted. Its opponents, prove themselves not only the opponents of our scheme, but of Railways, free trade and self-defence. We can quote you words of every Statesman of this Province, showing the unanimity of feeling which existed in their minds in favor of a Union of British North America. Argument of this kind is most unfair, since by branding those who oppose the Federation Scheme with a stupid aversion to all improvement whatever, it endeavours to conceal the consideration that this Union does not stand merely upon 600 miles of railway and a common tariff. It lays its entire strength upon advantages which may, or may not be obtainable without Union, and at the same time condemns the opponents of the Quebec Scheme as undesirous of improvements which the latter fancy can be had without entering upon a dangerous Union at all. This we assert is an unfair way of laying a great question before the public. It is as if a shop-keeper should say to a customer "boots are essential to your comfort. A hat is necessary for out-door exercise, and a life spent in the house is conducive to ill health. Therefore you must buy my boots and my hat." The purchaser may urge that the hat and boots are somewhat dear. The shop-keeper replies: "No, all the great doctors of the day say that hats and boots are essential for health." Is the purchaser convinced by such arguments? We think not.

The other false reasoning indulged in largely by both delegates and Anti-federalists is this. Both sides seemed to take delight in quoting from the former speeches of their opponents in order to show that the latter by their adoption or rejection of the Union Scheme contradict their own opinions formerly expressed. Mr. UNIAKKE twitted Dr. TUPPER with the remarks made by the latter last year to the effect that a general Union of the Colonies was impossible. Dr. TUPPER humorously, but somewhat unfairly, crushed Mr. MILLER by referring to a speech of that gentleman which advocated an *equitable* Union of all the Provinces, in preference to one of the Maritime Provinces alone. We should have thought that the time for such bickerings was past. Then again Mr. HOWE, our great living Statesman was brought forward (and the mention of his name produced a cheer) as a kind of *Deus ex Machina* in support of arguments for, and against the Delegate doctrine. Now all this kind of argument is excessively weak, especially in a country like ours, which being young, is liable to undergo many sudden changes of public feeling and national necessities. The greatest of men have changed their opinions, and as long as honesty dictates such changes, nothing can be said against them. Public men being but the representatives of public feeling should be fairly credited with honest intentions until dishonesty of conduct can be proved against them. As Lord Macaulay observes—"A man ought no more to be called an apostate because his opinions alter with the opinions of the great body of his contemporaries than he ought to be called an oriental traveller, because he is always going round from west to east with the globe, and everything that is upon it." In the same manner, neither Dr. TUPPER

or Mr. MILLER should be exposed to the public as turncoats, until an open breach of faith on their parts has made their dishonesty a subject for general reprobation. We have alluded to these two false aspects of the Confederation argument for the simple reason that they are liable to mislead the public. We have indeed but three objects in view. We wish to see the Provincians united if ample provision be made for their self-defence. We wish to see the terms of Union fairly set before the people, and we desire that the people's voice may be heard upon the proposed annihilation and reconstruction of their constitution.

AMERICAN JOURNALISM.

The manner in which the *Chronicle* seeks to counteract the arguments temperately put forward by this journal upon the Federation Scheme, is not a little instructive, as illustrating the peculiarities of the American people. It would seem that disinterestedness is a quality which is not comprehended upon this side of the Atlantic. When Mr. LANCASTER's yacht gave shelter to the survivors of the Alabama, the American press boldly declared that the owner of the *Deerhound* was in the pay of Captain SEMMES. The New York papers would fain make their readers believe that the *Times* is in the pay of JEFF DAVIS. The *Chronicle* asserts that "Mr. UNIAKKE and his confederates have organized and secured the *Citizen* and *Bullfrog*" to write down something, or somebody. As regards the *Bullfrog*, this statement on the part of the *Chronicle* is simply untrue. Mr. UNIAKKE, and his friends have no more connection with, or influence over this journal, than they have over the *Chronicle*. The *Bullfrog* declared against the terms of the proposed scheme long before Mr. UNIAKKE or his friends came forward in the matter at all. The *Chronicle* writers make use of one or two names in connection with this journal, and in so doing blunder, as men usually blunder, when treating of business other than their own. This is, however, one of those striking peculiarities of American journalism which so materially weaken the influence of the fourth estate on this side of the Atlantic. The next indictment preferred against us, is somewhat serious. It is urged (by the *Chronicle*) that we impute base motives to the Imperial Government, and would have our readers believe that Her Majesty's Ministers are trying to deceive England's Colonial subjects. Yet what is the true state of the case? We reproduce the sentence upon which hinged the whole of our argument. "There can be little doubt that the praise accorded the Federation Scheme has been called forth on the supposition that the details of the scheme could be accepted in good faith as meaning exactly what they profess to mean, and under such circumstances the English Ministry and the English press must necessarily rejoice." Now, "naval defence" was one of the details referred to, and English Statesmen are not in the habit of regarding such items as meaning nothing whatever. If the words "naval defence" are not calculated to deceive the English people we are greatly at fault. Nova Scotia is a fine Province, and should be fairly dealt with; but England is also a fine Country, and English tax payers should not be deluded by words "full of sound and fury, signifying—nothing." We shall in future let contemporary remarks about this paper pass unnoticed. To reply to all the nonsense printed about the *Bullfrog*, would only bore our readers.

THE OLD STORY.

If we recollect aright, that worthy body of men to whom have been confided the interests of this city, not long since congratulated one another, and the public in general, that Rockhead had, as a suburban retreat, lost many of its former charms, and was, in point of fact, but thinly populated during this inclement season. This is highly satisfactory, especially when we come to consider the dangers and difficulties to be overcome in a winter journey from the Mayor's court to our model jail. But, it would seem that while Rockhead prison is comparatively empty, that other model establishment—the Pauper Asylum, is, if possible, more overcrowded than usual.