

terests of these Provinces than any other, and it has been argued here and there, that we ought to have such a Union as exists in Great Britain."

Is it possible that the speaker was unaware of the fact, that though Scotland is represented in the General Parliament, Scotch law is as unlike that of England as the law of Otaheite is dissimilar to that of Nova Scotia, (take, for instance, the marriage, divorce, and trial by jury laws). A Legislative Union, however exists between these countries inasmuch as a common Legislature rules the destinies of Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. McCULLY continues his argument thus:—After shewing that Nova Scotia is amply represented in the proposed General Parliament; (represented in the Upper House doubly in regard to population,) he contrasts her position with that of Ireland, or Scotland entering into a permanent Union with England. The analogy we consider totally inapplicable, but since it has been adopted by Mr. McCULLY, we must accept the comparison and argue it upon its own merits. The leader of the Opposition spoke thus:—"Now, let me ask your attention to the nature of the Union in that country. We have been told that the proportion of representation assigned to Nova Scotia in the House of Commons of the Confederation (19 members) is too insignificant—that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, P. E. Island, and Newfoundland will be largely overborne by the preponderating influence that Canada would have. I have taken a little pains to consider what the condition of Scotland was at the time of Union with England.—"At this time, 1706, England, with a population of six millions, had 514 members in the Commons, whilst Scotland, with one million of people had only 45;—that is to say, whilst Scotland was, in point of population, one-sixth, yet, in reference to representation she received one-twelfth. Again, in the House of Peers, whilst England had 185 peers, Scotland had 16."

Incorporated, or Legislative Union matters little. The representatives of the three countries met at Westminster and local Parliaments were abolished as cumbersome and unnecessary. The argument which rests upon the paucity of representative power of Scotland and Ireland in the Union of Great Britain and Ireland recoils upon Mr. McCULLY. That Gentleman is "hoist with his own petard" when he attempts thus to urge the value of Federation against a Legislative Union. Ireland and Scotland were content to sacrifice much: to come into an Union partially represented, rather than question the advantage of an Union with England altogether. Nova Scotia, on the contrary, by Mr. McCULLY'S own shewing can only be expected to enter the Confederation Scheme on the promise of an undue representation power in the great Parliament at Ottawa.

We now come to the latter portion of Mr. McCULLY'S speech. After arguing fluently, if not successfully against a Legislative Union, and exposing his private views on the cause of the Civil War in the United States, the leader of the Opposition remarked as follows—

"I am quite ready to admit that when this subject first presented itself to my mind, I was inclined to favor a Legislative Union, but when we came to consider the difficulties step by step," &c., &c.

Mr. McCULLY indulges in an eulogium on the pride and national feeling of the Lower Canadians, who, as he just before suggested, forced him to the conclusion that a Legislative Union, though desirable, was at present impossible.

We ask our readers, is this a fair way of treating so great a question? Mr. McCULLY argued generally (with little success) in favor of Federation versus a Legislative Union. He then admits that he personally desires a Legislative

Union, but finds it impracticable, and concludes with fulsome praise of that obstructive Lower Canadian population which renders the present scheme, as Mr. McCULLY suggests perfect *Credat Juleus*.

#### MR. ARCHIBALD'S SPEECH.

One of the greatest errors into which the Nova Scotian public appears liable to fall is this. They seem inclined to imagine that the Delegates are justified in assuming before this province the position of special pleaders for the scheme which they advocate. Nothing can be more injurious to the interests of Nova Scotia than such an assumption. This position once granted to the delegates it becomes their duty—as is the custom with special pleaders—to urge its acceptance on the public by fair means or foul—to show its advantages and conceal its disadvantages—to use their intimate acquaintance with the scheme as a cloak against honest but partially informed criticism: to check inquiry, and if inquiry becomes importunate, to crush it by assertions of difficulties overcome at Quebec and a general appeal to their former political honesty. If our delegates were to be treated merely as counsels for the defence of the Union Scheme such a mode of procedure would be fair enough. Their position however in Quebec was far higher than that of special pleaders. They there represented Nova Scotia and we will hope did their best to further her interests. Why then on their return to Halifax should they lower themselves into rabid advocates of a scheme which they agreed to indeed in Quebec but which it was generally agreed should be rejected or accepted by the populations of the various provinces there represented? The delegates after all were merely sent to Quebec to consider whether any union was practicable—and if such was the case to report fairly and honestly to their constituents the results of their deliberations. It is plainly their duty to Nova Scotia to point out, whether by speech or by writing, the disadvantages of the scheme when they elaborate its advantages: to conceal nothing and being as yet only statesmen in Nova Scotia to treat the subject from a Nova Scotian point of view. Dreams of a United British North America may be very cheering, and we hope some day to see the great Union effected, but such dreams can afford no excuse to our politicians for concealing the disadvantages and arguing the benefits of the scheme which has been suggested at Quebec. Their business is with the present and a sensible population is not prone to dreaming. Honesty in the end must prove the best policy, and we must confess that it was somewhat scarce in the rostrum of the Temperance Hall on Friday the 9th inst.

Of all the speeches made at the recent meeting of the Delegates that of Mr. Archibald was at once the most temperate and the most plausible. Graceful language, a ready flow of figures, and an absence of offensive claptrap distinguish it forcibly from the illogical rhodomontades of Messrs. Tupper and McCully. The financial portion of the Confederation scheme is its most important feature. Since no real Union is in contemplation, but rather a careful bargain between Canada and the Lower Provinces—free trade and an Intercolonial line offered by the former, and a Union which will loose Canada's political deadlock by the latter—the fiscal portion of the agreement assumes a gigantic importance. Mr. Archibald was peculiarly fitted for his task. He made figures as interesting to his audience as figures can be. He made figures interesting to the opponents of Federation by a couple of false calculations or perhaps a dexterous concealment of figures which might lower the Federation Scheme in the eyes of the Nova Scotian public. Here for example is a little torturing of figures which we consider totally unfair