ing Farringdon street—another striking contrast to the day of the pirates' execution, when it was necessary to remain housed until after the cutting down. But after the Old Baily had been left, in court and in alley, in street and in ginshop door, were seen the watchers of the night. They might be easily recognised by their pale sodden faces, blear eyes, and wild talk, and as they came in contact with the stream of busy life on its way to homely duty and honest work, it was as if the contents of a fœtid sewer had been suddenly let loose. There were, of course, besides thieves and prostitutes, working men of different grades, and philanthropic and professional observers at this execution. But after carefully estimating the behaviour of the crowd, we declare it to have been earthly, sensual and devilish. We cannot recal a single redeeming incident, or quote either a word or a look of pity for the soul gone to judgment; and in recurring to our experience of the night, we do so with a sense of shame and unutterable loathing and humiliation, such as would be evoked by no other spectacle on earth. — *London Daily News.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

[FOR THE EXAMINER.]

A DREAM ABOUT THE UNION.

A few evenings ago, after having puzzled myself over the financial articles of the *Islander* and *Protestant*, I fell into a doze; and as I dozed, I dreamed. I fancied myself in a strange room of a strange house. A cheerful wood-fire was blazing and sparkling in the wide chimney. The sticks of which the fire was made were supported by dog-irons, but they were very different from the rough rusty concerns I had seen in my boyhood. The upright part of them was of brass, handsomely ornamented, and highly polished. The furniture was much more massive than that now in use, and not at all showy, but the way in which it reflected the flickering light of the fire showed that it must have been excellently kept. On the walls, which were destitute of paper, but dazzlingly white, hung quite a number of guns of various sizes, and a brace of pistols and a sword were suspended above the fire-place. The door, I noticed, was of oak and plentifully studded with nails, and the windows, which were few, were very narrow and barred with iron. Nor were the occupants of the room less strange in appearance than its furniture and surroundings. Two men sat near a table, on which were a decanter and glasses, and an elderly woman occupied a chair beside the fire knitting. Near the cleanly swept hearth, and apparently enjoying the warmth of the fire, lay two fine dogs of a breed I had never before seen. A glance showed me that one of the men at least was of the pure Anglo-Saxon race. There was the burly form, the massive head, the ruddy complexion that distinguish the genuine John Bull all the world over. The nationality of the other was not so apparent; he was lean and sallow, and the melancholy cast of countenance contrasted strongly with the jolly, good-humored expression that beamed on the face of his companion. The dress of both the men and the woman was very different from ours. I could have laughed at the short-waisted dress, the scanty skirts, the high-heeled shoes, and singular head-dress of the lady, had not her gentle motherly look, her quiet thoughtful smile, and her matronly dignity of manner won my respect, and made me instantly forget the peculiarities of her dress. The men wore stockings and knee breeches, (and these became my stout friend wonderfully well,) their shoes were ornamented with large silver buckles, their coats were straight cut and single-breasted, and the back hair was gathered into a que which was tied with a bit of narrow ribbon. The whole scene was quiet and home-like, and the men had all the appearance of being old friends. Indeed, such was the keenness of my mental vision in this my "superior state," that I knew instantaneously that they had long esteemed one another, and that each had the most unbounded confidence in the integrity and disinterestedness of the other.

Shortly after I entered, the sallow man said—as if resuming a conversation that had been begun before I came in—"I have well considered this matter, and I think I can demonstrate that this scheme will prove the ruin of these flourishing colonies." [illegible] "Go on, go on, let us hear what [illegible] you have to say," said the stout man. [illegible] the other, "are a we[illegible] "We," resumed [illegible] over a large exte[illegible]ak people scattered [illegible] enjoy the pr[illegible] of country. We now [illegible] powerful [illegible]otection of one of the most [illegible] nations in the world—her armies are our armies, and her fleets our fleets. Our taxes are, comparatively speaking, exceedingly light; still they are as heavy as we can afford to pay. What grumbling we hear every day about the difficulty of making a living in these Colonies. How many are constantly complaining of hard times and heavy taxes. Now, if we rise in rebellion, in the first place, many of our best men will be taken from productive occupations and become a charge on the country. Wars are ruinously expensive things. See how they have burdened and impoverished almost every country of the Old World. How must our taxes be increased, and what a strain must be put on our resources in order that we may be able to maintain this contemplated struggle with anything like a chance of success. We will have to increase our public burdens tenfold, but even this will not be sufficient. We will be forced to borrow money, if we can find any one foolish enough to lend it to us. And then supposing—what is in every way unlikely—that we do achieve our independence—that, contrary to every probability, we, an unwarlike, undisciplined people, almost destitute of military resources, will be able not only to withstand but to overcome the disciplined hosts of a warlike nation, which has at command inexhaustible resources both of men and material—suppose, I say, that, in spite of all these manifest disadvantages, we do succeed in establishing our independence, how can that independence be maintained? How can three millions of people, impoverished and weakened by a long war, deeply in debt, support the most simple and inexpensive form of government but by a taxation so ruinously heavy that it will paralyse our energies and exhaust our resources? How can such a people, so situated, maintain a place in the family of nations? There will be armies to arm, pay and feed; there will be fleets to build and to keep in a state of efficiency; fortifications to raise and equip in every part of the extensive territory of the republic; president, governors, and public officers of all kinds to pay, and relations with foreign powers to keep up. I ask you how are all these things and many more to be done by a weak nation of simple farmers, surrounded by powerful and jealous neighbours? The prospect, my friend, appals me, and makes me believe that those who encourage the people to resist, either have not counted the cost of what they are about to undertake; or ambitious of distinctions and covetous of power, they care not for the happiness and welfare of the people." "They are honest men, noble men," interrupted his friend. "Do not impeach their motives. You do not understand them; perhaps you cannot understand them, but they are patriots, sir, patriots. I grant you that the prospect does appear gloomy when seen from your point of view, but were it ten times gloomier, I, for one, would not the less cheerfully engage in this contest. Tyranny must not be endured. We would be unworthy our race if we tamely submitted to the exactions of Britain. But let me hint, my friend, that even you may be mistaken in your calculations. You have made no allowance for the increased energy that freedom and independence will infuse into [illegible] rank of society and into every branch [illegible]. You have not sufficiently con[illegible] greater efficiency that Union will [illegible] our exertions, both public and [illegible] all restrictions will have [illegible] our trade, when native [illegible] most extensive sphere of [illegible] ambition may aspire [illegible] ill be a very dif[illegible] hetic, unambi[illegible] [illegible] lighted by [illegible] es their [illegible] hope

Give our young men higher aims and our industry a wider field, and, mark me, we will accomplish wonders. Besides, will not the lovers of freedom and the industrious needy of all nations hasten to our republic to people our towns, to clear our forests, to cultivate our prairies, to man our ships, and in a thousand ways to develope the vast resources of this magnificent country. Yes, your children and mine will live to see towns and cities spring up in the midst of the yet untrodden forests of the West—they will see borne upon the bosom of the now solitary waters of this great continent, unvisited except by the screaming water-fowl and the solitary Indian, myriads of vessels freighted with every commodity that ministers either to the comfort or to the pleasure of civilized man. We are destined to be a great people: no power on earth can arrest our progress."

"Dreams, dreams, all dreams, my honest friend. It is one of the most melancholy signs of the times that those men, who were once the most sober-minded and calculating, have become the most visionary and unreasoning. This Utopia of yours will, at the very outset, be engulphed in the quicksands of National Bankruptcy. The intolerable load of debt with which it will be burdened will sink it deeper and deeper each day. It may drag on a feeble, short, and miserable existence, but its final and irretrievable ruin cannot be long delayed. The good things which this favoured land most undoubtedly possesses will be enjoyed by a more reasonable and a less high-minded people—a people who will establish its prosperity on a more secure foundation—one who will not abandon a real and tangible good for unreal, shadowy, and uncertain advantges. I, for one, will have neither lot nor part in this matter. I will not assist, however, indirectly, in what I verily believe will result in the ruin of my country. I will sell what worldly goods I possess, and seek a home where I may enjoy the gifts of Providence in peace. I have a friend in the little Island of St. John, in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, who tells me that I may there with industry make a living for myself and my little ones, afar from the din of strife, and undisturbed by the contention of the ambitious. There, perhaps, you too, my friend, when your visions have been dispelled, may find a peaceful home, unmolested by the frequent but unwelcome visits of the tax-gatherer."

"Not I; my country is mine for weal or for woe. If it prosper, I and my children shall enjoy the good; if adverse fate befall it, I am content to endure what thousands of better men will have to bear. But I have few fears. Take care that your children may not in future years have cause to reproach you for burying them in a remote and insignificant place, where they can find little occupation for their talents and a narrow field for their industry—a country in which they will have to endure all that we have endured, and at the last to struggle for what is now within our grasp." "Nay."

Just then a cry from the baby awoke me, and I found I had been dreaming.

CONFEDERATION OF THE PROVINCES

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir:

It is not my intention in this letter to dwell on the moral necessity of a union of the Colonies, as I have touched on this point to a considerable length in a previous communication. I may, however, observe *en passant* that there are copious and cogent arguments, which should naturally and, one would suppose, irresistibly determine the British Provinces to come together and to form one grand and illustrious whole out of their several distinct and independent parts, viz: their common history, their common language, their common allegiance, their common ambition, their mutual affection, their mutual sympathy, their mutual interests, and, in general, the lofty desire inherent in man of occupying a nobler and worthier position. These are, however, but *internal* arguments—arguments of the mind and of the heart; but, besides these, there are *external* forces, which will force us to a union of some description; and, if not presently, the period, Mr. Editor, is not far distant when absolute necessity will drive us, *nolens volens*, to this identical stage of policy, which many at present discuss in public and private, consider indifferently, and finally throw aside as a mere political sham. Yes, Mr. Editor, if [illegible] active measures do not soon be taken on the [illegible] subject, we will all bear testimony but too so[illegible] rious and unenviable attit[illegible]on to the precarious [illegible] in by our Yank[illegible]de we will be placed [illegible] neighbors at the close of the present war. [illegible] No doubt exists that whatever may be the final destiny of this monster offspring of Mars, who has deen devastating for the last three or four years the rich and luxuriant fields of the once United States with fire and sword, the Yankees will ever be a constant source of apprehension and awe to us. In the first place, should the South gain her independence, as no doubt she will, the North will be always obliged to maintain a large standing army in order to be at any moment prepared to repel any Southern incursion or disturbance, for we cannot suppose the Southerners will easily forget the sad and lamentable scenes of bloodshed and desolation, poverty and misery, now everywhere present to their view in their once fertile and prosperous territories; and no doubt the time and occasion for revenge will ever be present to their minds. On the other hand, should the North be so successful, or rather so fortunate, as to overcome the South, to bring them back to the Union, to place them in bondage, or in some humble situation, opposed and repugnant to the spirit and nobleness of the brave defenders of Southern liberty, of Southern rights and Southern institutions—then, *a fortiori*, must the North support a standing army not inferior to that of the first European powers, in order to crush all lurking spirit of sedition and rebellion. Have we not then, my readers, every reason imaginable to fear those powerful and revengeful neighbors, who entertain but little natural predilection towards us? It is manifest the Colonies must be defended, or else pass under the galling yoke of the Yankees, and be their auxiliaries in defraying their enormous expenses; but England alone is incapable of affording us the requisite protection and security. She cannot spare us a sufficient quantity of troops for the internal defence of the country. Some effort, therefore, must be made by the Colonies. Separate, however, they can effect nothing, for of what avail would it have been for one of the States that compose the present Southern Confederation alone to have resisted the numerous and powerful legions of the North, had all the other States kept aloof and attended solely to their own defence? But what prodigies of prowess and valor have they not performed clubbed together? How often have they not repelled with shame and confusion their more numerous and overbearing antagonists? This, my readers, is an exact image of our military situation after the consummation of the Union. Each Province will then have at heart the interests of the others, and will fly on the swift wings of charity and fraternal affection to bear succor to them. Thus *Confederacy*, aided by the gigantic naval powers of Great Britain, will defend the Colonies from any attack whatever of the Yankees. The blockade of any hostile American port could be rigidly enforced, and English ships of war and gunboats would cover the lakes intervening between Canada and the United States; and all this we can easily accomplish through the *Confederation*, for we will then have a population of 4,000,000 as brave, hardy and robust people as are to be found on the face of the globe. Many of them are already trained to military exercises, and already understand how to wield their swords in defence of their rights, in defence of their liberties, and in defence of their country. Yes, Mr. Editor, I know that the sons of P. E. Island at least will not shrink from any danger; and no doubt it will be a happiness for many to learn that should their services be ever required, they will have an able, experienced and world-renowned leader to lead them and lead them to the charge in the person of Sir John Michael, K. C. B.

Having now expatiated to greater extent than I at first designed, and than was perhaps necessary to show the necessity of a union in a military point of view, I am now obliged to pass over very cursorily many other objections that are daily hurled against the union machine. The first, though, in fact, the least important, objection of the anti-Unionists is the increased taxation—a natural consequence, say they, of the union—to which the Colonies, P. E. Island in particular, will be subjected. But those who adopt and cherish so ardently this principle, do not dive sufficiently deep into the true philosophy of the question. Apparently they do not appear to understand how a person with an income of £1000 can more easily liquidate a bill of £20 than he could £10 with only a revenue of £100. This will, however, be precisely our situation after the consummation of the Confederation. Although our taxes may be *somewhat* augmented, yet we shall also possess resources to meet them. The encouragement given to commerce and emigration, the factories established among us, the railways constructed along our highways—all this, my readers, cannot fail to cause to arise an overflowing source of riches and prosperity. Some there are who will here object that the railways will most probably never be extended to P. E. Island, and are the inhabitants of this place to contribute their share towards a concern which is never to benefit them? This is a fallacious argument often employed by the leading anti-Unionists in order to delude and distract the people. It may indeed happen that the railways be never extended to our Island; but are we to infer hence that we are to gain nothing by the great intercolonial railway? In order to answer this question, I would ask my opponents to what does the now thriving and prosperous little town of Summerside owe its rapid growth? Is it not manifestly to the great increase of trade caused by the construction of the railway between Shediac and St. John. If, then, this railway of only about 100 miles should have had the effect of augmenting the trade of Summerside so much, what must we not expect from the great inter-colonial railroad?

When we study the results of union in other parts of the globe, and when it is manifest that union has almost everywhere produced beneficial results, we can then, I presume, *a pari*, draw the safe inference that the Union of the British Provinces will not only be beneficial, but, according to the order of things, it cannot prove prejudicial. Every intelligent reader is acquainted with the poor, miserable, and uncivilized state of Scotland before its union with England, and again, the subsequent rapid strides it has made in the path of civilization, wealth and prosperity. The Irishman will now, no doubt, stare me in the face, and ask me what "poor ould Erin" gained by the *union?* Candidly I aver it gained nothing, nor did it in a certain sense lose anything; but the bulk of its misfortunes were due to a number of other sources alien from the union, of which it is not my intention here to write an essay. Another person will probably ask me, what gained Cape Breton by its union with Nova Scotia? Well, if we are to give credit to Mr. Munro's history of that Island, we must admit that it is progressing rapidly since its re-union, previous to which, Mr. Munro says, it was making but "*slow advances in civilization.*" After these, however, and sundry other objections make the round, the wily anti-Unionist will again bring into action his old weapon—*Taxation*—and he will inform us that the present system of taxation in Upper Canada is extortionary and insupportable, and that, after the union, our condition would be perfectly assimilated to theirs. But to persons proposing such absurd, subtle and fallacious arguments, I would reply that they are either totally unacquainted with Canadian politics and Canadian resources, or that they wish merely to have something to say on this all engrossing topic. In fact, the reason of their arguments resembles a good deal two grains of wheat lost in two bushels of chaff: when they are found, they are not worth searching for. Sir, we all know that if the Upper Canadians are somewhat heavily assessed, this is not due to the Government but to the *municipal bodies*, who, keeping time with the spirit of progress of their enterprising neighbors, tax themselves accordingly. This, then, can no longer be upheld as an argument militating against the Union.

Before bringing to a close this communication, which has, I fear, already trangressed the bounds generally allotted to a lucubration of this nature, I will pass some remarks on the opinion entertained throughout the Island with respect to the Union. It is commonly rumored in Charlottetown that the country people are in general adverse to the Union of the Colonies. Now, the reason of this is simple, namely: that the bulk of the Protestant population receive the *Protestant*, while a great number of Catholics read the *Herald*, and as the editors of these two journals earnestly labour to impress on their minds the injustice of forcing them into a union, and the heavy taxes they must necessarily bear, it is but natural to suppose that all such readers (and many there are) should be opposed to union in every shape and form. I opine, therefore, that the editor of the *Herald* is wrong in supposing that the country people are generally opposed to *Confederation*. I would rather say that they are in a state of vincible ignorance of this all important question, which requires the fire and eloquence of Mr. Whelan, or some other warm advocate of union, to arouse them, and instil in their minds the true tenor of the question. Moreover, I do not hesitate to add, that should Mr. Whelan pass through those districts, where Mr. Reilly drew every one after him by his great eloquence and logic, and deliver a lecture, Mr. Reilly, I apprehend, would find, on a second visit to the same localities, as many traitors as he had adherents the first time. This, indeed, is only natural. The leading statesmen of England and the provinces prescribe union as the only means of effecting permanent peace and security, and will P. E. Island, already so small, so insignificant, and so contemptible in the eyes of our neighbours, render itself still more so by its determination to remain isolated? No, such, I presume, shall never happen, and the day is not far distant when we will hail the *Confederation of the Provinces* as the dawn of a new era of social, physical and moral culture.

With the intention [illegible] of returning to the subject next week, [illegible]

I remain, &c.,

WILLOCKS.

Charlottetown, Dec. 16, 1864.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, December 19, 1864.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE SECOND DISTRICT OF KING'S COUNTY.

Gentlemen—

I am aware that an attempt is being made (and, indeed, the intention of making it has been avowed), to create an impression on your minds prejudicial to me as one of your Representatives, on account of recent political transactions. I have been stigmatized by a paper which is said to have some circulation amongst you, as a "traitor" to the country and a "conspirator" against its interests, because I, in common with other political friends, thought proper to connect myself with the Quebec Convention, and to form and entertain an independent opinion of the objects of that Convention.

It is not my purpose to reply here to the persons who thus stigmatize me, but I merely ask you to suspend your judgment on the question of Confederation, and my connection with it, until, in the course of next month, I shall do myself the honour to address you at public meetings, at Morrel, at St. Peter's Bay, and at Grand River, when I shall explain to you, without reserve, every matter connected with the Conference at Quebec; and I will endeavour to unfold, for your information, the principles agreed upon as the basis of a Constitution for the proposed Confederated Colonies.

It has been my constant intention to do this ever since my return from Canada, and nothing has prevented me from carrying it out but the bad state of the travelling, and, I may add, my own imperfect health. But I feel assured that the explanation which I shall give, when given, will not be unacceptable, or show that the aspersions of my opponents are justifiable. After a political connection with you of more than eighteen years duration, in the course of which I have had many proofs of your confidence, and during which it cannot be said that I, for one moment, abandoned any one political principle favourably announced by me at the commencement of my career—I think I am not asking too much in requesting you to wait to listen to me before giving any attention to the falsehoods of my revilers.

I will give printed notices of the public meetings, as to the time and place at which they may be held, which I think will be about the second or third week in January; and I desire to say that should any interference be attempted at the meetings *by persons who are not electors*, it will be discountenanced, as my explanations will be addressed only to my constituents, who will believe that I am, as ever, their

Obedt. humble servant,

EDWARD WHELAN.

Charlottetown, December 19, 1864.

MR. PALMER AND THE "SUBSIDY" AGAIN.

Mr. Attorney General Palmer has made a further attempt, by means of another letter in the *Herald*, to shew that he was the tenants' friend in seconding, at the Quebec Conference, Mr. Coles's resolution regarding the subsidy for the purchase of township lands. Mr. Coles's action in the matter is completely lost sight of. Mr. Palmer is, evidently in his own estimation, the only patriot in whose honour the tenantry should toss their hats into the air. The subject is quite unworthy of the space that has been already devoted to it; but we have no intention of allowing Mr. Palmer to practise, without check, such special pleading in the matter as might leave our veracity open to doubt, and therefore we return to the subject.

We stated that Mr. Palmer was not heard seconding the resolution moved by Mr. Coles. Mr. Palmer insists that he did second it. We adduced the names of four delegates, and the direct testimony of three, all of whom sat close to Mr. Palmer, who aver that the Attorney General was not heard doing what he says he did. Mr. Palmer has not brought forth a tittle of evidence to support his bare assertion,—he has not given even the name of any one who heard him, who would be likely to corroborate his statement. Then, has he a better right to be believed than four other persons, who were quite as attentive as he to the business before the Conference? Alluding to Mr. McDonald's testimony, to the effect, that he (Mr. McDonald) believed himself to be the seconder of the resolution, Mr. Palmer triumphantly asks: "Now, if it be true that Mr. McDonald *did* second the motion, how comes it he was not heard to do so?" Mr. Palmer surely knows that this is the most flimsy of all special pleading; it is travelling very far beyond the record, as lawyers say. We are not trying the issue yet—Was Mr. McDonald heard seconding the resolution? But—Was Mr. Palmer heard doing it? We say NO; and although it is not our business to prove a negative, we have done it in this case most abundantly.

The learned Attorney General makes a sad attempt to put such a construction on Mr. Coles's letter, published by us in connection with this subject, as will suit his own purpose. He says:—

"Mr. Coles's letter, which Mr. Whelan has also published, establishes what I before informed you took place *between that gentleman and I*," &c.

Lennie and Murray both lay down this rule, which English writers of any character understand—that "prepositions govern the objective case." We will let pass, however, the flagrant violation of grammar in the above quoted sentence. Mr. Coles's letter is important to us in this particular—which Mr. Palmer has taken precious good care not to notice—that it "establishes" the fact of Mr. Palmer not having been seen or heard by Mr. Coles making any effort whatever in support of the resolution.

Mr. Palmer, evidently staggered by Mr. McDonald's straight-forward and honest testimony, seems willing to divide with him the honour of seconding the resolution. He says:—

"Supposing it to be a fact that Mr. McDonald, at the time, did say 'I second it,' does this render it any more likely that I did not, at the same time, use the same expression? How often does it happen on a motion made in the House of Assembly, that two members simultaneously say 'I second it.'"

Now, here is a confession forced from the Attorney General at last—that he did no more than any other member of the Island Delegation might have done, and possibly did, without rising from his chair! And this is the gentleman, forsooth, who desires to have it proclaimed that he was, *par excellence*, the tenant's friend on the occasion referred to!

Mr. Palmer has drawn into this controversy—(but what connection it has with it we are at a loss to discover)—an allusion to Lord Grey's despatch relating to the claims of the proprietors, which Sir Alexander Bannerman brought to this Colony in 1851, when he came here to assume the Government. We will allow Mr. Palmer to express, in his own lucid way, the insinuations he would fain prefer against Mr. Whelan in connection with the despatch referred to:—

"Mr. Whelan was one of those, who, as has been clearly shown by some of his new-found friends, in the year 1851, entered into the compact with Governor Bannerman, by which Responsible Government, with its brazen and crowded departmental system, was given to the Colony, on condition that the rights of the Proprietors were to be preserved inviolate at the point of the bayonet. Mr. Whelan was one, who, for his generous feeling towards the tenantry, and the trifling inducement of getting the office of Queen's Printer, consented to this arrangement, and having obtained his office, faithfully carried it out by voting for the raising and maintainance of the celebrated Ragged Regiment."

We deny most emphatically, as Mr. Coles and Mr. Whelan denied it last winter, and in previous winters, on the floor of the House, that the despatch referred to was the basis of a "compact" for securing Responsible Government. When the leaders of the Liberal Party took office in 1851, they had no knowledge of Lord Grey's despatch. It was not produced until asked for in the Legislature. But if it had been produced, it would have had no effect upon their minds so far as changing their policy or principles. Mr. Palmer once declared in the House that he had not much respect for the despatch of a Colonial Minister, for, said he, the Minister in office to-day may be succeeded by another one to-morrow, and new principles may be set forth in a new despatch. We agree thoroughly with the Attorney General on this point. Despatches cannot be regarded as possessing legal and binding power. They are, generally, nothing more than mere words of advice and opinion, expressed for the guidance of the Lieutenant Governor.

Now, as regards Lord Grey's despatch, what is the real character of it? It is merely an injunction to the Lieut. Governor to use his authority in upholding the claims of the proprietors, and advising him (a matter upon which he required no advice), that resistance to the law should, if necessary, be met by military force. Surely, no sensible person will say that the laws of the country should not be respected at all hazards. Lord Grey was merely expressing, in his despatch, a sentiment that has an abiding place in every well constituted mind. As regards the suggestion of the despatch, that the claims of the proprietors should be protected, Mr. Palmer should not, we think, regard that as a legitimate ground of complaint against the distinguished person who made the suggestion, or against those who respectfully listened to it. The despatch referred to had the same force and effect in 1854 and 1859—and has the same force and effect yet—as it had in 1851; and Mr. Palmer did not scruple to take office in 1854, and again in 1859, and is glad to hold office yet, while Lord Grey's despatch is still fresh in the archives of the Council Office, and possesses all its original virtue, whatever that may be worth.

It is unfortunate for Mr. Palmer that he is so weak as to let his anger get the better of his judgment, as he has done in alluding to Mr. Whelan being swayed by the "trifling inducement of getting the office of Queen's Printer." Quoting Mr. Palmer's words, as we do, we are not responsible for their grammatical construction; but we beg to ask the learned Attorney General was there anything improper in Mr. Whelan's taking and holding the office of Queen's Printer when his party had a majority in the Legislature? He held the office with the clearly expressed sanction of his constituents—held it in the face of day, and discharged its duties faithfully. He was not like a certain President of the Executive Council—not *now* (or yet) President—who pocketed on the sly a portion of the salary which appertains to the office of Attorney General—who pocketed, besides, heavy fees as Queen's Counsel, when criminal cases in Court—properly the care of the Attorney General—were transferred to *his* hands, for *his* pecuniary advantage; and who—not satisfied with all these gains—still craved the Executive Council to give him a salary of Three Hundred and Fifty Pounds a year as President of the Executive Council, without having to appeal to a constituency for an approval of the salary. Does the Honourable Edward Palmer know the person to whom we allude? We know him, and can say to his beard—"Thou art the man."

SOME OF THE "ARGUMENTS" AGAINST CONFEDERATION.

The opponents of Confederation frequently boast that they are the only people who use argument in the discussion of the great question, and that not one solitary argument has been advanced in favor of it. We will let the latter assertion pass for the present. The people will discover by-and-bye—when certain writers have grown weary of their passionate appeals to popular prejudice, and when the public mind shall be calm and clear—which side has had the soundest sense and the most solid information to support it, without taking, in any case, as an auxiliary, a common lying street report. Our present purpose is to give specimens of the arguments used against Confederation. We make the selection almost at random from the last issues of the *Herald* and *Protestant*. Our first extract shall be from the *Herald*, Dec. 14, and is as follows:—

"History furnishes many instances where politicians have stabbed the liberties of their country, or sold it, Judas like, for so many pieces of silver, but we are happy to know that their memories have been branded with infamy, nor should we, with these examples before us, hesitate to brand as conspirators and traitors men who have usurped the rights and privileges of parliament and the people, who have far exceeded their authority and powers, and who have, intentionally or unintentionally, sacrificed the interests of their country."

By way of answering this "hi-faluting" writing, let us ask was Mr. Palmer one of the "conspirators and traitors?" In the estimation of the *Herald* now—for reasons best known to itself—Mr. Palmer is the embodiment of all that is good and patriotic. Was he one who "usurped the rights and privileges of parliament and people," exceeding his "authority and powers," by going to the Quebec Conference? It may be replied that he went to guard the interests of the Island. The same reply will be as forcible in the mouth of every other Delegate. But the mere going to Quebec, and taking part in the Conference, constituted the sin against "parliament and people!" That is the logic of the person who wishes to be considered as keeping "Whateley's Logic" for hourly reference, and who will reward skilful disputants who foil him in argument by presenting them with copies of it! Truly, we have in this intance a powerful argument against Confederation!

Now, we turn to our friend the *Protestant*. In last Saturday's issue, the editor—the pink of exactness and "evangelical" truth—says:—

"At Quebec the two delegates from Newfoundland would not sit as members of the Conference, because the Legislature of that Colony had given no authority for their appointment."

Your statement is not true, Mr. Laird. The Newfoundland Delegates were, in every respect, on the same footing as the other Delegates—they sat at the same table, met at the same time, joined as others did in the discussions, and voted as others, when votes were taken. We will convince you of this, if you wish, by handing you our printed authorised copy of the Minutes of the Conference; and indeed, Mr. Palmer could have told you the same thing, if you took the trouble to ask him, before committing yourself to the rash statement above. The Newfoundland Delegates are not fools enough, any more than ourselves, to believe, that Parliament *must authorise*, by vote, a delegation on any public question, *before* the Delegation can set about its business. The Canadian Government, consisting of twelve members, every one of whom sat at the Conference Table, had no authority from *their* Parliament to hold the Conference; and we think—without intending to disparage the Canadian Ministers by the comparison—that they are quite as well learned in constitutional law as the Editor of the *Protestant* is. Surely Mr. Laird has not read so negligently his De Lolme, or any other work on the British Constitution, as not to know that the Ministry of a country where that constitution prevails—and the Colonies have *fac similes* of it—may send their ambassadors or Delegates wherever they please, on any emergency, when they think the public service requires it; and they trust to Parliament to sanction their proceeding. If Parliament disapproves of it, they know the consequences. They took the responsibility, confiding in the support of Parliament. The Cabinets of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, were all alike as regards the powers they had for holding the Quebec Conference. Their several Parliaments did not authorise it by vote; but we are sure they were violating no principle of the Constitution in sending Delegates to that Conference; and we are confident the several Legislatures will take this view of the matter.

So much for another "argument" against Confederation.

Another "argument" of the *Protestant* had a colouring from a religious (so-called) point of view. To arouse Protestant zeal against the measure in localities where the schoolmaster's visits have been few and far between, it was only necessary to hint that Confederation was likely to be approved of by the Catholic Bishop and Priests, and it was proclaimed in tones calculated to excite great alarm, that one of the Delegates, shortly after his return from Canada, actually visited the Bishop at the Episcopal Residence! This was dreadful! But who the Delegate was, and what was said during the visit, are things about which the *Protestant* is mysteriously silent. The editor thinks it was a "deep plot," concocted in Canada by Pope and Whelan, to secure success to the question of Confederation in this Island. The editor of the *Protestant* says:—

"This running to the Bishop before the question was fully and fairly discussed, looked as if the object was to bargain with him for the votes of his flock, while certain Protestant champions would try and get the additional support required to carry it among the Protestants. We have reason to believe the whole thing was but the developement of a deep plot concocted in Canada, by which Messrs. Secretary Pope, Whelan, and one or two other ambitious gentlemen could advance their own, and not the people's interests."

This is one of the silliest objections to the question of Confederation, that a gentleman in public life cannot visit the Episcopal Residence, either in the way of courtesy or business, but that he must be suspected of having his mind charged with a deep-laid "plot" against his country, and that he goes there to bargain for the votes of the Catholics! To argue against such an absurdity would, indeed, be puerile in the extreme. If "Messrs. Secretary Pope, Whelan, *and one or two other ambitious gentlemen*," plotted in Canada or anywhere else to get the Catholic Hierarchy and Clergy on their side, it must be frankly acknowledged that they have been eminently successful. In truth, the Hierarchy and Priesthood of Canada, and we believe of the other Provinces, are warm advocates of Union, and would be so if "Secretary Pope, Whelan, and one or two other ambitious gentlemen" (not named) were sunk to the bottom of the sea. If this fact be alarming to a few timid, and not well informed Protestants, we cannot help it; but fact it is.

Another objection urged by the *Protestant* against Confederation is, that Mr. Secretary Pope helps to write the editorials for the *Examiner*. This is great news to us. Alluding to an article published in this paper of the 5th inst., headed "Mr. Palmer's Plea for Deception," the *Protestant* says:—

"If Mr. Secretary Pope will affirm that he had neither part nor lot in writing, supplying, or suggesting any of the remarks in that article, he is more innocent than we take him."

Mr. Pope had about as much to do with the "writing, supplying, or suggesting," and so on, as Mr. Laird; but suppose the case was different, we cannot see what that has to do with the Confederation question.

Another weighty argument against Confederation is, that Messrs. Pope and Whelan are "fast friends." An announcement of this stupendous "fact" is made with tremendous emphasis and solemnity in the editorial columns of our contemporary on Saturday last. Listen to the dire intelligence:—

"That he (Mr. Pope) is Mr. Whelan's *fast friend* in some respect, may be judged from the fact that he has been seen walking arm in arm with that gentleman in the streets of Charlottetown."

Mr. Whelan assures us that the "arm-in-arm" feat never occurred at any time, and he gives the assurance solely for the purpose of removing another powerful argument against the Confederation cause.

We might instance other absurdities from the *Protestant*, written in its "venomous and ungrammatical" style against Confederation, but we think we have produced enough to shew the "puerility" of its "productions." Mr. Laird takes pleasure in sneering at the person he styles the "historian of the Convention." Mr. Laird is aware that Mr. Whelan is engaged in compiling a little book which purports to give the substance of the public utterances of the Delegates in the Lower Provinces and in Canada. Should Mr. Whelan be sneered at for doing such a thing? If he should, Mr. Laird deserves to be sneered at for printing the book.

THE CONFEDERATION CAUSE IN HALIFAX.

The cause of confederation appears to be progressing most favorably in Halifax. A public meeting was held at the Temperance Hall there on Friday evening, 9th inst., the Mayor presiding, called for the purpose of enabling the Nova Scotia Delegates to explain the principles of the proposed Constitution. The leading men of the Province were present, including the Chief Justice, the Archbishop of Halifax, besides other clergymen of different denominations. The Hall was crowded to excess, and the Delegates were most enthusiastically received. The speakers were the Hon. Mr. McCully, Hon. Mr. Archibald (both members of the opposition), and the Hon. Dr. Tupper, Provincial Secretary. We are indebted to the Halifax *Morning Chronicle* for the following synopsis of the speeches.

The Provincial Secretary informed the audience that it had been arranged that the Hon. Attorney General was to be the first speaker, but owing to indisposition that gentleman was not able to attend. He observed that Hon. Mr. McCully, one of the delegates, had consented to address the meeting first.

Hon. Mr. McCully then rose to speak, and was received with loud cheers. He spoke at considerable length, and his eloquent and forcible address was listened to with marked attention. He explained fully and very clearly the nature of the scheme adopted by the delegates, and showed the advantages likely to flow from a Union of the Colonies. He ably combatted the augument put forth in certain quarters that the proposed number of Nova Scotia representatives to the General Parliament is too small, and showed that by the terms of the scheme, the Lower Provinces would enjoy, comparatively, a larger representation than either Ireland or Scotland had in the Imperial Parliament. In referring to the elements of the general scheme of Federation, he argued that Nova Scotia would reap valuable advantages from her connection with Canada. He showed that in the details of the scheme local rights and privileges were duly protected and kept under the control of those most interested in them. In framing the Constitution of the Confederation, he said the Delegates had carefully and, he thought, successfully avoided the rock upon which the American Union had split. He was aware that there was a diversity of opinion in this city upon the propriety of the arrangement, and he was glad of it, because such leads to grave consideration, and he was satisfied, that after a minute enquiry and a full understanding of the subject, the people would approve of the plan agreed to by the Delegates. He maintained that the fact of Colonial securities having advanced more than 10 per cent in Great Britain immediately upon the arrival of the news that a federation of the Provinces was contemplated, was a potent argument in support of the propriety of the Union. He distinguished between the advantages of a Federal and a Legislative Union, and showed that the former was preferable. Mr. McCully spoke for about an hour and a half, and sat down amid much applause. During his address the sentiments he expressed were met by a display of much enthusiasm on the part of the audience.

Hon. A.G. Archibald took the platform, and explained fully and clearly the financial aspect and character of the Federation scheme agreed upon at the Quebec Conference. He adduced arguments to prove that we could have Federation without involving any considerable cost, and contended that the avantages that would naturally accrue from Union will be fully commensurate to the expense, and besides place Nova Scotia in a far better position commercially than she now occupies. After presenting the financial features of the project, Mr. Archibald proceeded to show that it was probable, when Federation was effected, that immigration would flow largely into the Province from the American States, and become contributors to the general revenue. He argued that Nova Scotia possesses all the elements that are required to constitute a great manufacturing country, and showed that Union would tend to create markets for the productions of this Province. Mr. Archibald's very able speech was well received, and upon closing he took his seat amid cheers.

The Hon. Provincial Secretary followed, and spoke at length in his usual forcible style. He pictured the prospective benefits of Federation, and in the course of his remarks argued that unless the Provinces assumed the attitude of consolidation for the purpose of mutual defence it was not improbable that they would ultimately be absorbed by the neighbouring republic. He recounted the circumstances that led to the Conference at Quebec, and to some extent explained the nature of the various questions there discussed, and announced that the construction of the International Railway was a positive condition in the Colonial Compact. He believed that the Scheme, when understood, would fully satisfy the public mind of this country. He observed that it was the desire to participate in the advantages presented by the sea ports of the Maritime Provinces that induced the leading public men of Canada to seek union with them, and for this privilege Canada had offered a full equivalent. In his closing remarks he disposed of some of the objections that had been urged against a Colonial Union.

The Provincial Secretary having finished his speech the audience dispersed. All present appeared to take a deep interest in the proceedings. The meeting may be termed a decided success. There was much enthusiasm manifested.

[The following sensible and well timed article appears in the *Halifax Reporter* of the 10th instant. The able reasoning of it will apply quite as well to Prince Edward Island as to Nova Scotia.]

WHO ARE FOR AND WHO AGAINST FEDERATION?

It may seem almost premature to point out the various classes that range themselves on the one side and on the other in debate upon this most important subject. Still indications are not wanting by which we may trace the line of demarkation that separates the pros. and the cons. Perhaps, also the attempt at classifying may serve to show the futility of factious opposition by showing the power possessed by those in favor of the constitution recommended by our thirty foremost colonial statesmen. Not that we mean to decry opposition By no means. Better to have it in superabundance than not at all. But let us at the same time carefully discriminate between that opposition which springs from genuine honest belief in the unfitness of the constitution proposed, and that which is the result of fear, or self interest. Nor do we mean to insinuate that the advocates of consideration are possessed of any means which they propose to use irrespective of fairness and patriotism. The only power they possess above their opponents is that which always belongs to the right side. To have a bad case, as everybody knows, is a most effectual check to success, no matter how much ability or even genius is brought to bear to ensure the success desired. While, on the contrary, to have a good case is to possess a moral power that goes further to ensure conviction than the weightiest argumentation; and this the supporters of the scheme undoubtedly have. For when it is considered that it is the easiest thing possible to raise an objection in a single sentence that would require pages to contain a full answer thereto, the only wonder is that the objections raised have not been more numerous and more telling. We honestly declare we have not seen any objection raised that has not received an answer full and complete.

Let us, however, look at the opponents of the plan. Who are against it? Our capitalists are as a body in the front rank of opposition. These are so because an union will disturb their present arrangements, and modify considerably their future plans. Another reason for their opposition is, because they see that the influx of further capital will influence the state of the money market, and will increase their difficulty in investing. All moneyed men are, as a rule, every where vehemently opposed to change. They are doing first-rate—can hardly do better. Naturally then they are opposed to that change which cannot improve their prospects, and may cause them to do not as well as before.

Many of our merchants are strenuous opponents of union because union in their estimation means more business men, greater competition, less profits, more trouble, and they are naturally averse to all these unwelcome things. Our dry goods men are opposed to an union because they fear that for them union means fifteen or twenty per cent. *advalorem* duty, and an increase in their duties implies the necessity for a larger capital to carry on business. Why, however, the larger wholesale houses should be opposed, we do not see. In Montreal increased duty has led to consolidation of the dry goods trade, in the hands of some half dozen persons, supplying other dealers who before imported direct. Increase in duty has therefore benefitted these, and will, to some extent, do the same here, though our custom of importing fortnightly by steamer may lessen the likelihood of this. There are, in proportion, more direct importers in Halifax than in any of the large cities of the continent. New York, for instance, is supplied by comparatively a very few houses. We cannot therefore understand the opposition manifested by leading men in the dry goods line though there is some show of reason in the opposition of the retail houses. Even with these, however, it might be well to enquire whether the plan in vogue is the most profitable that might be devised, taking into consideration large stock—bad debts made through anxiety to sell out the large stock—interest—without mentioning other items

This enumeration will, we think, include almost all the opposition. On the other side we may safely count upon our young men, who are evidently as a body in favor of an union. One reason for the favor it meets from these may indeed be because youth loves change of any kind, and is not on the whole averse to a change just for the sake of change. But deeper than all this is the feeling of our young men that they want room. Their instincts tell them as truly that this change will be a boon to them as the sensitive apprehensions of moneyed men tell them this change may not be for the good of their pockets. Hundreds of our mechanics would try their fortunes in New Brunswick and Canada rather than in the States, if Confederation would not give them more than they could do within our own borders. Our young men know that Halifax must increase in population, and have confidence enough in themselves to believe that they will find opportunities for advancing their own interests much more surely in the new order of things than at present. Our mechanics then, and our young men in general, are in favor. Moreover, the very greatness of the conception chimes in well with the aspirations of youth and of manhood in its prime. And, after all, it is by the proper cultivation of these noble aspirations that nations become great and flourishing.

Our manufacturers as a class are in favor of the proposed union. Through it they see the means of obtaining what they have longed for—a larger market than Nova Scotia offers. Some may deem their hopes fallacious, and may base their judgment upon the statement that Canada is already well supplied with manufacturers, that in fact the Canadas have a greater number than they can now support. This statement we doubt. But even if it were true, there is still the fact of rapid increase of population creating a rapidly increasing demand. However, whether fallacious or no, it is yet believed by those who ought to know best—those whose interests are most affected—that union will develope our manufacturing interests.

Our Lawyers are in favor of an union. It may be that the prizes which glitter before their fond eyes have something to do in impressing them favourably towards the scheme. We are not, however, willing to concede that this is the only reason for the position taken by the best legal minds of the country. Our lawyers are undoubtedly the men who have given, and are giving, the closest attention to the science of government, because many are actually engaged in governing, and many more expect their turn to come soon, and as such should have considerable influence on the minds of the country. The same may be said of the Ministers and Physicians. These are not under the same influences that mould our commercial men. Whether trade flourishes or decays, their work remains. Not subject to the same fluctuations as other men, they have less to fear in a change like that contemplated on the one hand, and less to hope on the other. There is therefore less likelihood of their judgments being warped by interest. Their judgment is, therefore, at the present time of peculiar value.

Those who are against union are, then, those whose fears are excited lest pecuniary loss should be sustained. But take all those whom we have pointed out as opponents, and what are they, or what their opposition when compared with the great bulk of the people, whose interests will, we are assured, be advanced by union.

The London *News of the World*, of the 27th November, brought by Tuesday's Mail, contains the following short article in reference to the Quebec Convention, approving of the scheme there adopted.

THE NEW AMERICAN CONFEDERATION

It is one of the contradictions of the day to find the scattered colonies of the British Empire in America taking steps to consolidate themselves into a Confederation. On the very same Continent we see the people of the once United States engaged a fearful Civil War, the object of which on one side is to sever, and on the other to preserve, a union of States; and yet on the very borders of the Northern States we find the colony which the American war still left under our sway, Canada, leading the way to a political and administrative Union, closer, and likely to be more lasting than the Union founded by Washington, Hamilton, and Jefferson, little more than seventy years ago. We have before us the Resolutions adopted by representatives of the British American Colonies, who seem to have adopted the notion of Union less from any absolute necesity than from the expediency and convenience of a common centre of British political action on a continent where Republican institutions threaten to prove a failure. These resolutions begin by affirming the common loyalty of all the colonists to the British Crown, and it is taken for granted to be the desire of every colonist to remain a British subject. Starting from this point, the representatives of the several colonies declare that their interests will be best consulted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain, "provided such a Union can be effected on principles just to the several Provinces." That the principles already laid down are just, may be inferred from the fact that the French Canadians, as cordially as the British population, unite in the effort for such a Federation.

It is a new experiment in political history to find a Governor-General administering the affairs of monarchical Confederation. The idea seems almost to be as anomalous at first sight as a Republican Monarchy, and yet the fact is not impossible if the solution is set about in good faith. In England we have a Monarchy, and a form of Constitutional Government which gives us all the advantages of freedom sought for in Republics, whilst Scotland and Ireland, differing from England in many respects, in law and in religion for instance, are contended parts of the Monarchy. There is, therefore, no reason to fear that the representative of the Sovereign may not rule a contented people, once divided, any more than we need fear a convulsion in England. The British Americans have laid down a basis of government with great liberality. They attach due importance to Parliamentary functions; but they have instituted a check upon the possible excesses of their representatives by providing Legislative Councils to be appointed by the Crown, and yet the power of the Crown is limited, because the members of such councils are only to be appointed on the nomination of the local Governments; but even the local Governments are restricted in their choice, for "due regard is to be had to the claims of the members of the Legislative Council of each Province, and of the Opposition of each Province, so that all political parties may, as nearly as possible, be fairly