

rational and delightful. Poor souls indeed must they be who cannot enjoy themselves over good Tea and Coffee, enlivened by harmless mirth, and lively song, and wit that leaves no sting. Many off-hand little speeches both from Soldiers and civilians contributed to the pleasure and profit of the company, and about Eleven, after loyally singing "God save the Queen," the party separated.

Correspondence.

MR. EDITOR,—

I find that the Subordinate Divisions are to be called on to express their opinion respecting the propriety of establishing a separate National Division for British North America. Permit me to place before them, through your columns, a brief statement of the reasons for and against that measure. In doing this, I shall adopt the language of others.

In the Journal of the Quarterly Session held at Wolfville in January last, there is a communication from the Grand Division of Canada West. They write thus:—

"Our views are contained in the following declarations, the truth and reasonableness of which we trust will be patent to all, without argument.

"1st. The vast extent of Territory covered by the National Division of North America, renders it almost impossible that the condition of all parts can be so similar as to be legislated for under any one simple code of laws.

"2nd. The distance to be travelled, and expense incurred in attending a majority of the Sessions of the N. D., render it exceedingly improbable that any sufficient number of Representatives will attend from the G. D's of B.N.A. to ensure a proper consideration of the wants and best interests of our Order, even if time allowed that attention to peculiar circumstances which is necessary. (Vide how many attended last Session of the N. D. at Charleston, and how many will attend the next at Lexington.)

"3rd. The position of all G. D's of B. N. A. is so similar, politically and socially that we can legislate for ourselves better than other parties can for us.

"4th. This question of Temperance is no longer one of "Moral Suasion" or mere philanthropy, but has become, and must be so more and more a political question—an important plank in our legislative platform—and our identification with, and subordination to the N. D. of the United States of North America does not add to our political strength.

"5th. The principle is ceded to us, by the admission of our excellent Most Worthy Scribe, "that the experience of the M. W. S. has left no doubt on his mind of the superiority of Home Government, in every practicable case, in the Order,"—by committees of N. D., in the declaration that "an investigation of the subject has satisfied us, that with proper limitations, it is eminently proper that such

a Charter should issue,"—and in the action of the N. D. of N. A. in granting a Charter to Great Britain and Ireland for a National Division.

"6th. We do not seek to dissolve the bonds of sympathy and fraternity which unite us to the great and good men who have originated and sustained so nobly the great and glorious Order, but request you to unite with us in asking for a Charter for a National Division for British North America, upon the terms and conditions of the one already granted to Great Britain and Ireland—as set forth in Journal of Proceedings of N. D. for 1854."

I cannot help thinking that these are powerful considerations.

But our New Brunswick brethren take the other side. The editor of the *Temperance Telegraph* expresses, I suppose, the sentiments pretty generally entertained in that Province. I will give an abstract of his reasonings, or rather an abridgement of an editorial of his, just published:—

"We admit that at first glance there is something seductive in the idea of a British North American National Division—Independent in its actions and distinctive in its organization, but when we examine minutely the necessary details of the scheme—the probable *modus operandi* of the head deliberative body of British North America—the extract, influence and wealth of that contemplated National Division's jurisdiction and constituency—and other matters of great moment which must press themselves upon the mind of the thoughtful man, we are led to view the scheme as one, if not impracticable, as exceedingly hazardous.

"Who would compose the contemplated independent National Division?

"There is, we believe, but one Grand Division in Canada—one in Nova Scotia—one in New Brunswick—one in Prince Edward's Island.

Say each of these send two representatives—thus the National Division of British North America, the great, irresponsible directory of the vast community of British American Sons of Temperance—would be—more than probably, composed of eight members!

"But allow them more—say five representatives each—will the great mass of members of Subordinate Divisions delegate the decision of contested constitutional questions, affecting the rights, privileges and actions of the great body, to twenty men?

"Now, this must be understood. We do not say no more would be constitutionally entitled to go to the National Division as representatives, but we do say that the above is based upon the calculation that two, or that even five might go—which we think is giving plenty of room. Indeed it would impoverish the Grand and Subordinate Divisions to send more than two every year when the deliberations were held in some distant City.

"Let us now consider the proposition by which this small representation is to be avoided.

"If any new economy of representation be adopted, it must be based upon population—we mean on the number of Sons or of Subordinate Division in each Province.

"Carry out this view, and New Brunswick must be—Prince Edward's Island certainly would be—and Nova Scotia would run this

imminent risk of being swamped in the halls of the National Division by the preponderating, not to say overwhelming vote of the two Canadas. In fact, Canada would rule.

"Now, not only would Canada possess an undue influence in the Councils of the National Division, independent, would almost exclusively confine its meetings to the Canadian Province. Even at best, under the most favourable state of things the National Division would meet once in four or five years in New Brunswick. We think this is overrating the number. Every City in the Provinces would claim the honor. New Brunswick might humbly put in her claim of the Cities of St. John and Fredericton, and perhaps for the municipality of Woodstock and the towns of Moncton and St. Andrew. Five claimants! Nova Scotia would have very few more who could claim the honor—and Prince Edward's Island would have even fewer to seek the distinction. But look at Canada, East and West! Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, Guelph, Perth, Hamilton, Stanley, &c., &c. Why if the doctrine of conceding the right to go by Cities were adopted the National Division would meet in New Brunswick about once in fifty or one hundred years! Probably not so frequently.

"Then it is said, it is too far to travel into the Southern States, and too expensive. Will the change of constitution obviate or obliterate this objection?

"And apart from trouble, travel and expense in that light—who will travel from St. John to Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, Hamilton &c. to meet TEN coadjutors—or perhaps to meet and sigh at the absence of a quorum?

"Then we lose the benefit of the wisdom and experience of such noble champions as White, O'Neal, Cary, Frickhardt, Buckley, and a host of others who have spent years of toil, hours of study and purses of dollars to complete and consolidate and vitalize the principles of Temperance and Prohibition.

"But then, say some, we can multiply the number of our Grand Divisions! Indeed! How? Will you give each City a Grand Division? A Grand Division for St. John—another for Fredericton—a third for St. Andrews and so on? And also one for Halifax, for Windsor—for Annapolis—for Liverpool and so on?

"Rather an extravagant and impracticable idea we opine. But suppose it once adopted. How many Grand Divisions would Canada have? Would not Grand Divisions be almost as plentiful as Subordinate Divisions?

"There are many more important reasons why, under the present circumstances, it appears to us mere madness to contemplate an independence.

"We like the idea in the abstract, but when you come to reduce it to practice and carry out its details it does appear like sending a child before he has attained his majority, to seek his own livelihood."

This is strong language. And the force of the argument is weakened by it, because it is too strong. I am sorry that the editor has manifested such jealousy of the Canadians. But there it is. They will not be pleased with it, I think.

The Subordinate Divisions will hear both sides, and endeavor, no doubt, to arrive at a just conclusion. It has been my wish to aid them by a fair statement