

give up your privilege of the fur-trade, if all parties join you in demanding the union, as you proposed it, with all its infamous appendages? Do you think they would, Mr. Editor? I doubt it their avidity for money is above patriotism. Let the mercantile unionists weigh these facts in their minds, and the injury they, as well as the country, have sustained by the furtrade law, and see whether they are not taking a wrong part, as in this case I consider the sanction of the one, to be also that of the other; being moved and brought by the same persons. This act will shew the people on the other side of the Atlantic, the pusillanimity of our unionists who are always ready to swallow every thing that is proposed from a certain quarter.

I hope while our legislators are taking the Canadian trade bill into consideration, that they will use their influence to have that disgraceful law repealed. The fur-trade before the conquest of the country was free and should be so still, and ought to belong to its inhabitants, where the profits would be employed in making improvements, instead of being spent abroad. It is to that free trade that we are indebted to (for) the numerous scientific discoveries that have been made in this country.

You's till another moment

ANTI-COMMERCIAL.

Though the above writer is not clear in all he says, and is mistaken in one or two instances, particularly where he considers the balance arising from the fur-trade in favour of this country as being all expended in it, (in which, indeed, he contradicts himself, when he speaks of the profits arising from it being spent abroad;) yet his general views of the injurious tendency of the fur-trade law, with respect both to this country, and the traders who resort hither, as well as of the perfectly selfish and interested motives upon which the proposers of the Union-bill, and the proposers of the fur-trade-bill, whom he properly identifies as one and the same set, have always acted; are consonant with these I entertain, and mean to enlarge on, when opportunity permits.

L. L. M.

REMARKS ON THE POST-OFFICE ABUSES, AND REVENUE

(Continued.)

The third mode, namely, to petition the Imperial parliament to make the necessary alterations in the statutes relative to the post-office, would, undoubtedly, not only be the most respectful, but also the most advisable, (for it would not destroy the abstract right of effecting those alterations, which, if need be, I contend, exists in the provincial government, no more than petitioning the Imperial parliament to preserve our constitution inviolate, would affect the right we have to deny the power of