

identified themselves with the empire at large, and had spilt their blood in its service. They were ready to do so again. They revered the laws, and gratefully venerated the constitution that had been given them. He would not dwell upon any abuses of the law, or infringement of their rights, although such might be complained of. Those might form objects of separate remonstrance. But it was the sweeping away of the constitution altogether, and the substitution of another, that was to be now opposed. The union of Scotland had been quoted as a case in point, but it was by no means analogous, no more than that of Ireland. Colonies were widely different from integral parts of an empire, and conquered provinces were again essentially different from colonies. The Romans never interfered with the internal policy either of their colonies or of their conquests, nor did the Carthaginians, nor the Phœnicians. It is impossible to do full justice to his speech. His decided opinion, and that of a great majority of his friends, was against the union of the two provinces, and he and they were resolved to oppose it with all their power. He was much cheered, and in conclusion he moved that a committee should be appointed to draw up a petition to the imperial parliament against the union, which was carried without the slightest opposition.

After the meeting a party of the gentlemen present at it, amounting to about 130, partook of a dinner, provided for the purpose, at the Mansion-house-hotel.

On this occasion, the raw and imbecile tyro who, at the recommendation of the well-known Bum-Bailiff, Mr. Non-mi-recordo, and by the behest of His Majesty the King of Montreal, has been installed as editor of that degraded *turn-coat-paper*, the Montreal Gazette, he, the venal vamer up of forgery and falsehood,\* has thought fit to display his mother-wit,

“A witty mother, witless else her son,”

his elegance of composition, and accuracy of Scotch grammar, in a long editorial paragraph, in ridicule of the meeting, of its objects and of its members. He begins with an attempt at a sarcasm upon the designation of NOTABLES made use of in the advertisement by which the meeting was convened. In a preceding Gazette a tolerably good historical account of the Notables of France was given, with the view of stigmatising the name, as a false and improper one, as applied in the present instance. According to that account, the Notables consisted of “princes of the blood, peers, nobles heads of the church, law and army, ministers of the crown, deputies and magistrates.”—

\* Alluding to the infamous pamphlet, of which Mr. Cl—m is reputed to be the writer, under the most unappropriate name “the Man of Ross.”