

corporeal glories of three present delegates, it is also required that they should work their brains by talking sense." Such appears to have been the mode of reasoning employed by our leading statesmen whilst addressing the crowded meeting at Truro; and such doubtless, has been the mode of procedure elsewhere, where minor audiences were to be addressed, by minor advocates of the Federation bargain. Let us consider this Truro meeting. Relieved from the shackles of a ready tongued opposition, the three leading delegates Messrs ARCHIBALD, McCULLY and TUPPER, each and all said things which they had not dared, for the sake of their own reputation, to say in Halifax. Mr. Archibald we are told—proceeded to pourtray the benefits of a Union of small States or Provinces, by reference to the unprecedented prosperity, the mighty impulse, Confederation and free trade had conferred upon America, that had increased from 3 to 33,000,000 in 89 years.

Is it possible that Mr. ARCHIBALD imagines the people of Truro ignorant of the war at present devastating the United States? To urge a confederation of the Provinces at the present moment, which should imitate in any manner that of the United States, is most futile. The last four years have shown us clearly that misery, civil war and an uprooting of the very foundations of society, may follow hard upon a confederation of States, however commercially prosperous, each of which has interests totally different from its neighbors. We fancy that Mr. ARCHIBALD would not have put forth such an argument as this in Halifax. Dr. TUPPER also said many things on this occasion which he must now feel had been better left unsaid. The *Colonist* reporting his speech, says—“Mr. ANNAND of all men to utter a word against a union of the Colonies. He (Dr. T.) took up the Journals of the House for 1861—2, read the resolutions moved by Mr. Howe, and the extract from Mr. ANNAND's own report, showing that Union of the Colonies could not be obtained without free trade, and free trade could not be obtained unless a uniformity of tariff was first secured, and that could not be until the *Intercolonial Railway* was accomplished.

Dr. TUPPER thus attempted to crush Mr. ANNAND before a country audience. Mr. ANNAND however, only holds the opinions which he held in 1862, that the railroad—free trade—and all the other items are necessary before a real Union can be accomplished, a very different matter from Dr. TUPPER's assertion, that they cannot be obtained without our acceptance of the present scheme offered by the delegates. Mr. ANNAND wishes for a Union when the provinces are fitted for such, by connecting links in the shape of a railway, free trade, and a common tariff. Dr. TUPPER on these grounds holds up his opponent to ridicule, because he will not join a scheme which promises all these—railroads—tariff, &c.—after Confederation. Dr. TUPPER like Mr. ARCHIBALD dare not have argued thus in Halifax. We cannot conclude this article without referring briefly to a portion of the speech delivered by Mr. JOHN TOBIN at Truro. The assertions of this gentleman were so preposterous, and the applause obtained so loud, that it seems highly questionable, whether gentlemen like Mr. TOBIN should be allowed to range at large about the Federation platforms of Nova Scotia. The delegates should place Mr. TOBIN in confinement. Their cause is much damaged by a rampant roaring lion prepared to assert anything as occasion may require. Pushed into a corner by a Mr. RETTIE, Mr. TOBIN, unable like his distinguished friends to escape by a flourish of rhetoric, made the following extraordinary assertion:—

“The financial returns of the two countries (Canada and Nova Scotia) proved beyond all doubt or controversy, that the Canadians pay but \$2.35 per head of their population, while we pay \$2.50 each, our taxes being higher by full

“fifteen per cent for every man, woman and child than theirs.”

This we are told brought down the house with tremendous effect. Our only hope is that Mr. Tobin may have been misinterpreted by the “*Colonist*,” from which journal the above extract is quoted. Should the reverse prove to be the case, we can only say that Mr. TOBIN, pushed by the exigencies of an excited audience, unwittingly strayed from the paths of truth, or believing his words, evinced a consummate ignorance of the primary statistics of British North America. In either case, the delegates should have their eye upon him. A man who can say that Canada is more lightly taxed than Nova Scotia is capable of saying anything. His speech, if correctly reported, must bring disgrace to his friends if they suffer it to remain uncontradicted. It must prove to the best lovers of the Confederation Scheme, that the supporters of the same, unmindful of fact, are prepared to throw honor, statesmanship, and personal respectability to the winds in furthering, “by hook or by crook,” their great BARGAIN with Canada.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

When somebody reported something about somebody else having said that the political friendship existing between Mr. Ben. Wier and somebody else, has been estranged, and that Mr. Ben. Wier had in a public speech given expression to self glorification for past services, it was easily to be understood why Mr. Benjamin Wier should sit down and write a letter to the *Chronicle*, on, we do not know how many sheets of foolscap, he had evidently been on the look out for some opportunity, and here was one, of putting into print his picturesque conception upon things in general—his confederation and conglomerate ideas upon things Historical, Geographical, Moral, Social, Commercial, Martial, Naval, Political, Statistical, &c.—an instance by the way of the nonsense of the proposition “Union is strength”—and when the Roman Catholic Archbishop takes eagerly the slight, and as we shall show unfortunately selected, opportunity afforded him by the remarks in the *Chronicle's* article “Botheration Scheme No. 1”—upon the doings of the Fenians—it would be pleasant if we could regard the letter of the Archbishop as a similar piece of innocent vanity—but he takes pains to tell us that he does not write in his personal capacity, nor as a politician, but because the time has come when the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church should officially declare his views on a subject affecting so greatly the interests of the people: and it is plain that every sensible person must regard such an expression with much respect, and that every remark made by such an authority will be carefully weighed and thought a great deal about.

His Grace, however, does not (as small fry do,) state his opinion categorically, he endeavours to place his readers in a logical dilemma, from the horns of which if we can escape he admits that he and a thousand like him, are ready to be converted; but the dilemma in which he places us is, we fancy, not a logical one, according to the school of logic in which an Archbishop of another Church—Dr. Whateley—taught, and we venture to point out wherein it seems to us to differ.

Let us here quote his Grace's argument, in extenso.

“To deny, therefore, the obvious advantages of Confederation you must first prove that Union is not strength—that England, under the Heptarchy, and France under her feudal Chiefs and Barons, were greater, stronger, and happier than they now are as the two greatest nations of the world. You must prove that Lucerne and Geneva and Berne, and the Grisons, would be equally strong and secure out of the Confederation of their sister cantons in Switzerland: and