

outside the ranks of corruption, or the circle of those who expect to gain by it, an intelligent man in the province, who would consent to its adoption. The game of the advocates of the system has been to confound *Confederation* and *Union*, when they are, in fact, as distinct as possible from each other. A federal union and a legislative union, have a faint generic resemblance, but there is a decided specific difference between them, and they are no more identical than the beautiful, sagacious and tractable horse, and the stubborn, stupid and ill-favored ass. They are no more the same than the gentle, tame and useful domestic cat, and the fierce ferocious and terrible tiger. There is something very attractive in the idea of union, and therefore many persons even of intelligence, are inclined to approve of confederation, because they are influenced by the impression, that confederation means union, when it in reality means nothing but discord. Their error arises from a misapplication of the English language, of which the advocates of confederation artfully avail themselves. When one of them undertook to conduct a paper, in the interest of confederation, he deceitfully called it the "*UNIONIST*," and Lazarus, in the same manner, endeavours to puff *CONFEDERATION*, under the pseudonym of *UNION*.

Archbishop Connolly addressed an excellent letter, to the public in favor of *confederation*, which he evidently mistook for *union*, and no one can read that able and benevolent communication, without perceiving, that the archbishop, from its beginning to its conclusion, was in reality desirous of advocating a union of the colonies, and inadvertently employed the word *confederation*, to express the sentiment of *union*. Let the archbishop apply his vigorous understanding, to a consideration of the comparative merits, of federal and legislative union, and judging from the spirit of his letter, there can be little doubt, as to the kind of union, he desired to see accomplished.

I may here remark, that I never meet an advocate of confederation, who does not admit, that a legislative union, would be much preferable to a federal union. If then there be two kinds of union, whereof one is universally admitted to be far better than the other, why should we adopt the worst of the two? The only answer I get, is, that the best kind of union is found to be unattainable? "Why" I ask? "Because there is a French element in Canada that makes that kind of union impracticable." "Then," I reply, "There is an element of discord, which will make confederation, not only more dangerous, but absolutely impossible; for whatever renders a legislative union impossible, must make a federal union fatal to the peace of the confederating colonies." In plain words, "if the Canadian French will not have a legislative union with us, we cannot have a federal union with them; for if, at the outset, we cannot cordially agree, we shall be sure in the end bitterly to quarrel."

It is my desire to impress strongly on the mind of the people the most important distinction between a *CONFEDERATION* and a *UNION*. They no more resemble one another than the heartless,