

expression of opinions formed by previous concert. If two or three men make up their minds upon a subject and wish their views made public, they arrange a public meeting for that purpose, and notify the same to outsiders. They are not supposed to be debaters, they are merely lecturers, or speech-makers, for a particular occasion; they study their parts as actors might, and appear before the public "for one night only." A member of the House of Assembly, on the other hand, who would enter the House merely to express the wishes of his constituents, would not be doing his duty towards the Province, inasmuch as, were members elected solely upon this understanding, the House of Assembly would forfeit all claim to be regarded as a deliberative assembly. It is, therefore, perfectly clear that Messrs. LYNCH and WIER were altogether in the wrong, and that Messrs. UNIAKKE, ANNAND, and McDONALD were altogether right. Mr. UNIAKKE, then said:—"The people of Nova Scotia will put their own construction on the course pursued by the friends of Federation; they will perceive that the delegates and their friends do not desire fair play, that they are not willing that this subject should be subjected to that careful analysis, that cautious sifting it surely deserves and requires."

"Our eyes cannot be closed to the fact, that a disposition exists on the part of some persons in this hall, to shut out fair and full discussion; witness the unseemly conduct of a portion of this audience—an insignificant portion I believe, but yet sufficient to mar the harmony of the meeting. * * I think, therefore, judging by what has occurred, that fair play is to be denied us, and concur with Mr. McDONALD that the only course left open to us under such circumstances, is to leave the hall, and call another meeting at a subsequent date." These remarks, coming from a gentleman so well known and respected as is Mr. UNIAKKE, will go a long way towards annihilating the Federation bubble. We do not altogether coincide with this gentleman's views regarding the unwillingness of the delegates to hear their arguments controverted; but, be it remembered, Mr. UNIAKKE spoke on the spur of the moment, amid a tumult of voices. We should be sorry to think that men of Anglo-Saxon descent would deny fair play to a gentleman living in their midst; but, on the other hand, we can fully comprehend the trying position wherein Mr. UNIAKKE was placed. He came to the Temperance Hall expecting a hearing, and that hearing was denied him, owing to the indecent interruption of the PROVINCIAL SECRETARY. But—mark how Dr. TUPPER tries to allay the storm he had so gratuitously provoked.—"He would remind him (Mr. UNIAKKE) that he (Dr. TUPPER) was not at the present meeting in the character of an advocate, or special pleader;—but anxiously endeavouring to discharge an important duty impartially. Now what position do we occupy here?" Dr. TUPPER had, already (forgetting that, "on their own merits modest men are dumb"), enlarged upon the fact that he had done his duty, which he was paid for doing—and had, moreover, informed the meeting that he was present only as "a listener and spectator." Yet in his marvellous condescension he consented "to waive any objection he might have to the course proposed by the opponents of Federation, and allow them to complete their arguments before any reply was attempted." It is difficult to read this passage without a smile. He, Dr. TUPPER, would allow Mr. UNIAKKE to address the citizens of Halifax!!! But, for virtue's sake, we wish not to press "a falling man to far." The meeting of Monday last has been generally pronounced a disgrace to the citizens of Halifax, and, to our thinking, the PROVINCIAL SECRETARY alone to blame. His officious, and utterly uncalled for interference, led to something very near a riot. He may grow wiser in time, but his Administration is doomed.

The query arises,—who will succeed him? Perhaps some men of the UNIAKKE stamp will come forward to save their country in its approaching hour of need.

X

JOURNALISM BY THE WAYSIDE.

Not the least pleasant feature of a coach journey in Nova Scotia is the perpetual patter of *Chronicles* and *Colonists* as, guided by the dexterous hand of the coachman, they fall into the road-opposite the different houses by which his way lies. Knowledge entering the house of the distant settler is a charming spectacle. It is as pleasing to the philosopher as it is to proprietors of the newspapers in question. Of course if you have the bad luck to be in company with a politician, or a candidate for a vacant seat the sight loses its charm. The eye, balls of such an one start from his head when a little bundle leaves the driver's hand. If he be a liberal a suppressed oath follows each delivery of the *Colonist* and the same mental crime is performed by a conservative when a *Chronicle* plashes into the mud. "Hang Jones," he mutters, "I thought he was safe, but there he is, still reading that wretched paper. He must be looked after." Now all this sort of thing is very unpleasant to a fellow passenger who, not being politically inclined, is in constant fear of seeing his neighbor in a fit. If you happen to be in an inquiring state of mind the question suggests itself "Why does my friend give way to all this excitement? These country people read the papers I should imagine for news. Both *Colonist* and *Chronicle* speak the truth, why then this annoyance on my friend's part, when the latter falls in front of a cottage? You clothe your doubt in words and put it to your fellow traveller. He smiles grimly, and mentally writes you down an ass. "My dear Sir," he says, "that *Chronicle* does a great deal of harm. If you read the *Colonist* only, as many do, you would be convinced that I speak the truth." You suggest feebly that perhaps it might be better to read both. "Oh no Sir! Both sides of all questions are freely ventilated in the little road side meetings—in the alehouses, stores, and other places of resort. The readers of both *Chronicle* and *Colonist* meet there on equal terms." This puts an end to your inquiries for a few moments. Then, feeling that you have hitherto made rather a poor figure in the discussion, a bright idea seizes you. "How would it be if both *Chronicle* and *Colonist* agree? eh?" The politician again sneers and says "That can never be. So long as Messrs. McCully and Archibald live, they will endeavour to out Dr. Tupper and his great conservative party." This is undeniable until you remember the Federation Scheme—when you venture to assert boldly, "They have coalesced on the greatest question ever brought under their consideration. How then, if there be an opposition to this Scheme, is it to be heard of in your country districts?" The politician may either answer that there is no opposition or that if any such exist it cannot concern the dwellers in remote parts of the Province. Both these answers of course are fallacious, but the coach rolls on. You fall asleep, and the politician still glares upon the falling papers, reading in the name on their outside his approaching success or discomfiture.

This little picture has been suggested to us by the consideration of how poor a chance many of our country farmers and settlers have, of seeing both sides of the Confederation question. They may read their local journals, many of which are ably conducted, but whose space in many cases restricts a full discussion of this important matter. They can extract one or two articles from a Halifax paper but that is all. They can show up the fallacies of the Pro-federation Journals as far as their space once a week allows. They do their best and we are glad to observe that, removed as they are from the