

MR. McCULLY ON CANADA.

A POWERFUL ARGUMENT.

The following article, also from the P. E. Island *Protestant and Evangelical Witness*, should open the eyes of our readers to the "white-washing" or "greasing" process that must have been practised in Canada at the Convention—so strongly to have changed men's views. There is no denying or resisting the truth and force of Mr. McCully's reasoning in his views at Charlottetown. Very little reliance, indeed, can be placed in the interested opinion of mere professional politicians when they have some under-handed scheme to accomplish, but, the opinion of Mr. McCully, as given below, was evidently expressed at a time when he was thoroughly disinterested, and, is, therefore, entitled to greater weight:—

HON. MR. McCULLY'S OPINIONS BEFORE APPOINTED A DELEGATE.

In a late No. of our paper we referred to an article in the *Halifax Chronicle*, bitterly attacking the Hon. Edward Palmer for his alleged inconsistency; and we stated that as we believed it was written by the Hon. Jonathan McCully, one of the Nova Scotia Delegates, who is an ardent advocate of the basis of Union agreed upon at Quebec, we considered his remarks of no more account than the ravings of Mr. Secretary Pope. To show that a great change has come over the spirit of his dream, and that he appears to have found his price in some manner, we give the following extract from an article in a recent number of *Halifax Chronicle*, reflecting the sentiments of the Hon. Mr. McCully when he had reason to believe that Hon. Mr. Archibald and Mr. Locke were to be the Liberal Delegates for Nova Scotia. Mr. McCully, however, was afterwards appointed a delegate, and we suppose very soon after saw matters differently. His opinion in August last, as to how he thought the Canadians should be addressed when they came to the Conference at Charlottetown was expressed somewhat in the following strain:—

"Gentlemen, your past history has been one of political eccentricity and internal disquiet. Passing over your rebellions, and Parliamentary conflagrations and annexation movements, all of which have occurred within five and twenty years, you now present a spectacle to the world, in which, by your own shewing, Parliamentary Government is impossible. The Upper Province forced a union upon the Lower, and though the much less populous, claimed and secured an equal representation. Now that the Upper Province has increased her numbers, regardless of the principle she enforced upon the French, and of which for years she enjoyed the advantage, she demands representation by population, has made Parliamentary Government impossible in order that she may obtain it, and seeks to destroy the union by enforcing a principle the very opposite to that upon which, at her own instance, it was framed. Such conduct may well excite suspicion, and ought to warn us not to surrender the management of our affairs to a people who can so readily combine for selfish objects, whenever it suits their interest. Besides, if your population, who live in the same Province, cannot work in one Parliament, being divided by adverse nationalities or incompatibility of temper so striking, that Government is impossible, what security have we that, when we have broken down our constitutions, and adopted the one you offer, we shall not always be in hot water? We wish you well, but we are very happy and very well off, and we cannot consent to peril in a rather hopeless attempt to reconcile elements so conflicting and incongruous. There is another thing, Messieurs, that we cannot easily forget. You sold us all in 1852, and deceived us as grossly in 1862. You have taught us self-reliance, and distrust of Canadian good faith. We are still open to negotiation upon all questions of importance, but as to surrendering to you the control of our revenues, the appointment of our officers, and the management of our affairs, pardon our sincerity, but there is nothing in your past history, or your dealing with intercolonial questions to justify such confidence."

This language is as true now as it was then. But Mr. McCully is now an advocate for union with the Canadians. Has he been bought?

The *Examiner* of Monday last copied a part of an

article from the *Toronto Leader*, reviewing Mr. Palmer's letter against union, but he omitted one of the best points. We shall give it here because it is a pertinent commentary on the conduct of Messrs. Whelan and McCully. Referring to the material of which the Quebec Conference was composed, the *Leader* says:—

"Men can often be got to assent to a thing when they have a hand in it, WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN RELENTLESS IN THEIR OPPOSITION IF THEIR AID HAD NOT BEEN ASKED. It is not difficult to conceive that the self-love of several members of the Conference was flattered by the position in which they found themselves. There can be no doubt, we think, that the fact of being members of the Conference made all the difference in their support or opposition with some of them."

To Correspondents and Patrons.

A great number of valuable articles, prepared for this issue, have been crowded out. Still, we say to our friends, SEND FORWARD YOUR COMMUNICATIONS AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE MOMENT, and we will give them our best attention. Work for the noble cause of patriotism! Men, and there is no reason to doubt the result! With such energies as you are now putting forth, you may rely upon it that YOUR OPPONENTS WILL NOT POLL A ONE-THIRD VOTE. We will devote an editorial to the *Morning Telegraph* in our next issue.

Contributed Matter.

(To the Editors of the "Patriot.")

GENTLEMEN,—

We are informed, or rather we heard it reported "on change," that Mr. George Stymest, of this City, Secretary to the Society of Underwriters, &c., &c., lately visited the country district known as the Golden Grove, and made a speech there on the great question of the day. Mr. S. has had some little practice as an after-dinner speaker at Agricultural Society festivals; and, what is more, feels not a little proud of his performances on such important occasions. But on this particular occasion he appears to have fairly eclipsed all his former efforts; and, in the vigor of his imagination, rose to so sublime a height that he represented himself as the owner of, or at least interested in, no less than 23 ships; and that there had been so great a rise in the value of shipping in consequence of the probable Confederation of the Provinces, that he was compelled to leave his business here, and was about to proceed to England to look after his marine interests! This, of course, gave great weight in the country to his arguments and his illustrations. But the only effect the report of this little appeal had in the City, was to create a hearty laugh.

Mr. Stymest spoke at the Ratification meeting of the supporters of the scheme, held in Ritchie's building on Friday evening; and, in that speech, he alluded to the Golden Grove story, which had become a joke about town; and said that if he now was interested in 23 ships, he would be sure, under Confederation, to have an interest in at least 46. And this brought down the house! But Mr. S. did not deny that he had made the original statement at Golden Grove.

We will only add that we hope Mr. Stymest may have another "very pleasant trip" to England, whether he goes on the business of "The Society of Underwriters," or on his own. And we hope that he may, if he should, while there, accidentally find his way into a court of law, meet upon the Bench as pleasant and witty a Judge as Mr. Baron Martin.

SHIP-OWNER.

(We are in receipt of a large number of communications on the subject of Confederation, by some of the ablest writers in this City. There may be points upon which we may differ with some of our con-

tributors, but of the general correctness of their arguments we have no doubt whatever. We shall be happy to receive additional articles from gentlemen opposed to the present Canadian scheme of Confederation.—EDITORS PATRIOT.)

A few Questions on Confederation.

(To the Editors of the "Patriot.")

GENTLEMEN,—

Is it correct, that all who are not ready to accept the Quebec Confederation Scheme, are opposed to British connection, and in favor of connection with the United States?

Would not the imputation be much more apposite or correct, if it were just reversed?

WHAT DOES CONFEDERATION CONTEMPLATE?

Does it not propose to raise up a *Second Union* in North America, separated from the existing one by an imaginary line across the continent where it is broadest?

Has not the Union already existing nearly ten times the population; more than ten times the wealth, and much more than ten times the military and naval power of the one contemplated?

May we not continue to exist as a fringe on the outside of that Great Republic, if we remain as British Provinces, each directly connected with, and dependant on, the British Crown?

But if we have the responsibility and expense of our own "DEFENCES," thrown upon us as a virtually independent Confederation, with a Federal head on this side of the Atlantic, will not the inducement to Union with the States be incalculably increased?

With Confederation, would not the maintenance of a line of defences across the Continent be such a disadvantage, that all our capability of taxation would not meet the expense?

A strong cause, like Slavery, might keep two adjoining Unions of States separate, or a strong principle of loyalty to the British Crown, coupled with dependence on its power, may be sufficient to keep the Provinces from unity with the States; but is not the whole aspect of the case greatly changed the very moment our allegiance is, in the slightest degree, transferred from the British Crown to a few politicians met in Quebec as a Federal Government? Do we not then have to face, at once, THE GREAT QUESTION OF OUR OWN DEFENCE?

Must not every thinking man admit, even if he goes not the length of believing, that Confederation means inevitable union with the United States, at no distant day, or at least see the experiment is a most perilous one for a British connexion?

Under Confederation, would not our loyalty be a mere rope of sand, for this reason, viz.:—A merely local head could not command the same respect or feeling inspired by the British Crown?

Is not popular feeling in all cases, nearly, in favor of the Sovereignty of the local bodies; and if any of them were thwarted by the Federal Government, would there not, to say the least, be the wish of its "looking to Washington?"

Is not the whole object of the Confederation Scheme to raise up a Federal power among us, which must sooner or later take the place of the British Government? Can there be two Federal heads? Can a man serve two masters?

Is not Legislative Union far more practicable, leaving far less chance of future divisions than the contemplated Federal Union?

CAUTION.

We always supposed that the story of the two boys, who, when shut up in a room together, made ten dollars a-piece swapping jack-knives, was mythical; but we are told the Confederation scheme is to have the same effect. We are to send manufactures to Canada, and Canada is to send the same kind of manufactures to New Brunswick, whereby we are both to make money out of each other!

RICH!