

the inhabitants of the Lower Province, secured by a British Statute. Montreal, under her local jurisdiction could not, for all the purposes of trade and collecting and dividing duties, be much more under her control than it is at present. So long as we are a British Colony, these must remain under the controul of the Imperial authority. The Upper Canada Legislature might indeed lay some internal duties within the annexed territory, which it cannot do at present; it might make some favorable local regulations, and improvements, but none which the interests of Lower Canada does not equally prompt her to make. Without the union of the Provinces, Quebec, and great part of the St. Lawrence would still remain between Upper Canada and the sea, and if the Local Legislation of Lower Canada is so mischievous and dangerous, it would still have free scope.

The demand for a sea port being urgent and nearly unanimous on the part of Upper Canada, its plausibility, and at the same time its utter impracticability, in respect to local position in the maintenance of the necessary power of the British Parliament for regulating trade, as well as in respect to the national faith and justice to all the King's subjects, it would lead to the union as the only substitute which could be proposed.

We have pointed out the incompatibility of uniting so vast an extent of territory under a Legislature constituted solely for local purposes.

But considerations of this kind can have but little weight with those who ardently pursue a great political object and expect to obtain it by the union. This object is the destruction of the political power of the French Canadians, which, it must be confessed, has been most indiscreetly exercised both as regards the prosperity of the Lower Province, the accommodation of the Upper Province, and the maintenance of the King's Government in Lower Canada.

The power of the French Canadians in every thing that concerns their peculiarities of laws, language, and institutions, would no doubt be diminished or destroyed by the union. But would they the less continue to exist if their power in these respects were destroyed? Would the two thirds or three fourths of the population of the Lower Province be then more British than at present? Would their feelings be more friendly to the British Government, which would have brought this about, by what they would consider as a violation of their actual possession and public faith?

It is not true that the leaders who have brought things to their present state in Lower Canada are much attached to either the laws, religion or institutions of the French Canadians. Although native Canadians, they are a half European, half French philosophic and revolutionary faction. Their most active partisans and supporters are not found among the steady and moral mass of the French Canadians. The mass, as was the case in France, has been rather passive than otherwise. But the leaders and their co-operators put forward what they know the majority of the people are attached to, because they feel that is the only way to have their general support. After having, as French Canadians attached to their laws and institutions and to every thing Canadian, being so strongly supported by their uninformed countrymen, will these leaders be less supported when it is found that all the apprehended dangers from the British Government and the British inhabitants of the Province are really come upon them or near at hand? Will they not rather believe that they ought to have given their leaders still stronger support, when they warned them of the approaching danger, and believe still more in their penetration and regard for their welfare? They will tell them that they will have no longer any hope but in an union with the United States—that they cannot be worse and may be better under exclusively "elective institutions."

It would be a strange legislation in the present times, in the British Parliament, which would be calculated to give preference to any particular caste of

British subjects, in apportioning the representation. It is utterly inconsistent with justice to disfranchise any portion of those having the common qualification. In the equal distribution of property which prevails in America, there is no established property qualification which will not extend nearly equally to all, in proportion to their population. Nothing in fact, excepting palpable injustice, can prevent a great numerical majority of the population, banded together by peculiar national feelings, having the majority in the representative branch of the Constitution; and this majority is still on the side of the French Canadians. Where, then, will be the annihilation of their destructive political power by the union?

We should rather say it would still exist and be rather increased for all mischievous purposes, although lost in regard to the preservation of their national peculiarities. The majority of the representation of a million of souls, would have more weight than little more than half that number. Is it forgot that an Anglo-American minority in Upper Canada, (which has been a majority some time since, and may be so again) would be united to a doubly discontented Gallo-American majority in Lower Canada; both with no friendly feeling to British connexion, both having made an open declaration against "a Government 4000 miles off," and in favour of "elective institutions" similar to those of the United States. With such a union of forces, that connexion could hardly be expected to hold out for a very few years.

The account in the elective branch of the united Legislature, as now constituted, would stand thus:

	Members
Disaffected—Lower Canada,	50
Do. Upper Canada,	13
	— 63
Loyal—Upper Canada,	44
Do. Lower Canada,	11
	— 55
Majority of disaffected,	43

No apportionment of the representation could be made to secure a well-affected majority, which would not be marked with injustice, and therefore add to the discontented, whose numbers are never without importance, when the bonds of social order and fidelity to the established Government are loosened by important constitutional changes.

The very inconveniences which would soon be felt by all parties after the union, would tend to unite all of them in seeking the nearest and speediest relief.

In all the troubles that would follow, the honest and industrious among the people of all national origins and political opinions, would be the sufferers, without any reasonable prospect of their obtaining any benefit which is not within their reach, under the present Constitution as established in 1791.

We trust that the people of both Canadas, who can have no objects of personal political ambition, will reflect seriously on the revolutionary vortex into which they are attempted, undesignedly we believe, to be plunged.

As things stand in Lower Canada, where political dissensions have the most rooted existence, the violent parties cannot much injure each other. They will eventually find it their interest and only resource to agree, and make the most of their present political institutions, which are indeed the only ones for which the country is yet ripe.

England has little to fear from the present dissensions in the North American Colonies. She may despise the loyal warnings of the factious, respecting the fate of her old colonies. They were contending for the preservation of their established Constitutions, while England was endeavouring to destroy them. Let her now maintain the Constitutions of her present Colonies, and she will find a cordial and sufficient support in the Colonists themselves. "Be just and fear not," is the safest rule of Empire.

From the Toronto Correspondent & Advocate, November 30.

We are happy to announce that Dr C. Duncombe, M. P. for Oxford, arrived in this city on Monday last, in good health, and will probably take his seat to day in the Provincial Assembly. The result of his mission to England, however unsatisfactory it may be considered in one point of view, cannot fail to be productive of much good. It will teach the reformers of Upper Canada that they have no justice to expect from the Colonial Office—that it is useless, any worse than useless, for them to appeal against Colonial misgovernment and oppression to that impotent tribunal, and, that if they would secure and perpetuate the blessings of good government, they must rely solely upon their own unanimity, activity and perseverance. After the marked indignity offered to Messrs Baldwin and Duncombe, and through them to all the Reformers of Upper Canada, by the head of that department, in having declined to grant either of them an audience, though repeatedly solicited to bestow this humble boon, it would be in the last degree, disgraceful for us ever again to put ourselves in communication with that office. United, active and determined amongst ourselves, much good may be expected from the justice of the British House of Commons, the advocacy of the British press and the sympathy of the British people, but there is no hope whatever from Downing Street Honor, or Downing Street justice.

Sir Francis Head may tell us that he is amenable to that tribunal for all his actions in the administration of our public affairs; but when our accredited agents go there to represent our grievances and to seek for redress, the common courtesy of an audience, never refused to the agents of Orangemen and Tories, is pre-emptorily denied them; and they are sent back again from Herod to Pilate after a tedious and expensive voyage of several thousand miles.

Was this the reception the reformers of this country had a right to expect for Messrs Baldwin and Duncombe at the hands of a reform minister? Was it becoming the consistency of the man, who a short time ago, declared that the complaint of the lowest of his Majesty's Canadian subjects should be received with due attention and consideration? There must be something radically bad in the system which tolerates such glaring injustice.

Some of the most influential members of Parliament whose support of the present milk-and-water Ministry is essential to their continuance in office, have not hesitated to pronounce the conduct of Lord Glenelg, in this affair unpardonable and unjust, and a gross indignity to the reformers of Upper Canada; and they strongly recommend that henceforward Downing Street shall be passed by unnoticed, and our complaints be preferred not to an ignorant, indolent, haughty tenant of office, but before that tribunal which can controul and punish the misdeeds of even the most powerful minister, the British House of Commons.

That Mr Duncombe has acquitted himself of the trust reposed in him in a manner highly creditable to his zeal and talents, is amply attested by the most satisfactory documents, which when placed before the public, will not fail to elicit their approbation and gratitude.

FOREIGN.

From the Providence Journal, Dec. 21.

FROM SMYRNA.—By an arrival at Boston from Smyrna, papers have been received of as late a date as the 15th of October. From extracts contained in the Boston papers, we condense the following:

Col. Campbell, English Consul in Egypt, has, after long negotiation, come to an understanding with Mehmet Ali, whereby the Rus-