

amount of dollars can produce it, unless we change the laws concerning division of property, and regulate its possession with reference to primogeniture. In fact, to be a great people under the English form of Government, we must become more English than we are at present. We may, or may not grow rich by Federation, but it will never transform us into a great nation. The bubble of "greatness" so laboriously blown by the PROVINCIAL SECRETARY has we think been fairly burst, and it only remains for us to note such portions of that gentleman's speech as relate to defence. DR. TUPPER says, "It is stated broadly in the British Press that the policy of the British Government is to take every man out of Canada," and then, very sensibly remarks that we ought to do our best towards defending ourselves. This Province has already done a good deal in the way of organizing militia, volunteers, &c, whereas Canada has done comparatively little in this respect. There can be no doubt that Canada, as was formerly remarked by SIR R. PEEL, is England's weak point. For many years the Canadians evinced an apathy regarding their own defence but ill calculated to awaken much sympathy at home. But, prior to the commencement of the war between North and South, the defence of Canada was a matter about which Englishmen seldom troubled their heads, nor was it until the Trent affair was noised throughout the country that any serious apprehensions were entertained. Then came the departure of the Guards from London, and the Canadian government proposed that Canadians should arm, for which offence the latter ousted their Ministry, and refused to do anything of the kind. From that moment English feeling was aroused. How did matters progress? Canada did something towards self defence, but not so much as was fairly expected of her; then came the Union question, and ultimately the scheme before us. We cannot think that DR. TUPPER has given the defence question (as a monetary consideration) the attention to which it is fairly entitled. Canada is prepared to grant one million of dollars yearly for purposes of defence, and DR. TUPPER and his co-delegates admit that under the proposed Federation Scheme, British Soldiers are supposed to be withdrawn. Now, the English money annually sunk in B. N. America on behalf of British defence, is at least six million dollars, which sum we lose when we undertake our own defence. The annual loss sustained therefore upon the item of defence is not merely the extra money voted by the several Provinces, but likewise the six million dollars per annum. This fact seems to have been overlooked by those absorbed in the contemplation of some chimerical future. But, if, instead of voting one million of dollars, Canada were prepared to vote, annually, treble that sum, England would be satisfied, and leave B. N. America such Imperial defence as she now possesses. In this case England would rejoice in the possession of Canada, and would aid her more cheerfully than she does at present. We, as British Americans, would have to contribute towards raising two extra millions, but by so doing we should secure a yearly influx of six millions otherwise lost to us for ever.

THE FEDERATION SCHEME.—MR. McCULLY.

The policy was perhaps a wise one, which dictated to the two leading Journals a total abstinence from all arguments on the merits or demerits of the Federation Scheme. Their managers reasoned wisely, that a great effect might be produced upon the country by a sensational burst of eloquence—argument heaped upon argument—in the Temperance

Hall. MESSRS. McCULLY, ARCHIBALD, and TUPPER speaking unanimously *ex Cathedra* from a common platform are naturally more competent to produce a desired effect than rambling articles in different papers which may contain, severally, minor sneers against their heretofore political opponents. The Delegates have spoken, and we must confess that their exposition of the proposed scheme tends materially to lower it in our estimation, and still further to force upon us the conviction that it is totally unsuited to the present requirements of Nova Scotia. Let us consider Mr. McCULLY's speech. The sudden indisposition of Mr. HENRY forced upon MR. McCULLY's shoulders the double duty of opening the subject—a feat easily performed after dinner several months ago—and further, of combating the arguments urged against the scheme. His exordium, though somewhat heavy, was excellent in its way and only invites comment by a striking contradiction in which the speaker indulged—MR. McCULLY said—

"In consequence of circumstances over which *Nova Scotia* at least had no control it (the Confederate Scheme) has been forced upon the attention of the country at the present time."

After a fulsome tribute to the capabilities of British North America, and the usual clap-trap about Union, is strength—Union a necessity &c., &c. "We are therefore in this position, *compelled by no external pressure* but looking at the prospect of the future (? as every child does) the public men of this Province have undertaken to deal with this question calmly and dispassionately," &c., &c.

Now, even in the opening of the subject, which unfortunately fell to MR. McCULLY's lot, how fearfully that gentleman breaks down! "Circumstances over which *Nova Scotia* has no control" force her into an Union, and at the same time *Nova Scotia* is gravely assured that no "external pressure" is employed in forcing upon her the Scheme adopted by the Delegates. The head of the Liberal party may possibly mean that the word *external* should be used in implied contradiction to the suggestive word *internal* pressure—viz, that "if our *Nova Scotian* Politicians," &c. If this be the case we must apologize for a lack of perspicuity and a blindness to the low standard of *Nova Scotian* politics. The contradiction between the two sentences must however be apparent to all. To find a difference between "*circumstances over which Nova Scotia has no control*"—and "*external pressure*," were difficult indeed. The difference between external and internal pressure, upon the provincial position of a Delegate is easily imagined. Exordiums, however, are often vague, and we will lay no stress upon this small point but proceed to consider the other portions of MR. McCULLY's speech.

The Orator next proceeded to the assertion that Union is necessary. No one will deny that Union of some kind is desirable. This as MR. McCULLY says, he "largely assumes." The advantages of a Federal over Legislative Union are next considered.

We must confess an astonishment great in proportion to the greatness of MR. McCULLY's Provincial reputation, when we read his definition of a Legislative Union. The absence of knowledge, not only of history, but of the existing constitution of Great Britain, displayed by the leader of the Opposition should make *Nova Scotians* extremely careful in their acceptance of his assertions as undeniable. MR. McCULLY thus defines a Legislative Union:

"It means, if I understand the term aright, that there shall be an uniform system of Laws and constitutions, that the same laws which exist in Newfoundland shall be in force at the Red River. * * * Now I have heard it remarked that a Legislative union would be more conducive to the in-

terests of
gued, here
as exists i

Is it po
that thou
ment, Sco
Otaheite i
stance, th
Legislativ
inasmuch
Great Brit

Mr. Me
ing that N
General P
in regard
of Ireland
with Engla
but since it
cept the
The leader
your atten
We have b
signed to
Confederat
Scotia, Ne
will be larg
that Canad
sider what
with Engla
lation of si
whilst Scot
that is to
one-sixth, 1
one-twelfth
had 185 pe

Incorpor
representat
and local P
necessary.
representat
of Great B
That Gent
attempts th
legislative U
office much
rather than
altogether.
own shew
Scheme on
the great I

We now
speech. A
a Legislati
cause of th
the Opposi

"I am q
sented itse
tive Union
step by ste

Mr. Mel
national fe
fore sugge
tive Union

We ask
a question!
cess) in fi
He then