

THERE WILL BE NO UNION. This prophetic assertion is both dismaying and annoying to the Scotch faction; and they harp upon it as grating to their feelings, and make many feeble attempts to hide their chagrin and conviction of defeat, under very palpable distortions of language and sentiments attributed to the British ministry when that subject has been agitated before them. But we ought to do like Hotspur, get a sturking, and teach it to cry, *no union, no union*, and let it haunt their conclaves, and their desks, their morning rides, and midnight pillows, and that from a more charitable motive than induced "the Percy" to wish to present his chattering bird to Bolingbroke; for the more they are used to that funereal cry to their hopes, *there will be no union*, the better will they be able to bear the shock, when the dreaded catastrophe arrives, and all their dreams of despotic oppression, and foul controul over the free natives of these provinces, fade into thin air. Drowning men catch at straws, and, in defiance of Lord Londonderry's positive declaration in parliament that "the union was a measure in which the government had no concern," (which one of their organs actually had the ideotism to alledge was spoken in a fit of insanity,) the papers in their interest, attempt to argue, from an extract of a letter to Mr. Commissioner Robinson, to Major Hillier, dated London, 27th August 1822, both that the hateful union-bill originated with ministers, and that they are "resolved to pursue it with avidity in the ensuing session." Before pointing out the fallacy of the conclusions they draw, from premises that ought to be considered as having a bearing almost the direct contrary way, I will just point out what I conceive to be the real meaning, both of that unfounded assertion (to call it by no worse a name) that the governor was advised to make in his opening speech, namely "that His Majesty's ministers had proposed the union-bill to parliament," and of that expression of Lord Londonderry's that is in direct contradiction to that assertion. The bill was never thought of by ministry, but (the eggs having been sent over from the junto here) was hatched in a private conclave of those London merchants, Inglis Ellice & Co. and M'Favish Fraser & Co. who are also the parents of the late shameful act that has been passed for the regulation of the fur-trade, and who, (and I speak from experience, for I know them all personally,) invariably aim at the prosecution of their own private views in whatever they recommend to government. I will not at present stop to enquire into, or detail, the means by which those two houses acquired the ear of government, and have been, excepting the official reports transmitted by the Governors of Canada, for a series of years, almost the only channels through which representations have been made, or information sought, respecting Canada, whilst it may readily be conceived that those representations