

Westminster-hall, and the house of lords) as my voucher for many of these reflections *.

For what plausible reason are these principalities suffered to exist? When a government is rendered complex (which in itself is no desirable thing) it ought to be for some political end, which cannot be answered otherwise. Subdivisions in government, are only admissible in favour of the dignity of inferior princes, and high nobility; or for the support of an aristocratic confederacy under some head; or for the conservation of the franchises of the people in some privileged province. Such, for the two former of these ends, are the subdivisions in favour of the electoral, and other princes in the empire; for the latter of these purposes, are the jurisdictions of the imperial cities, and the Hanse towns. For the latter of these ends, are also the countries of the States [*Pais d'Etats*] and certain cities, and orders in France. These are all regulations with an object, and some of them with a very good object. But how are the principles of any of these subdivisions applicable in the case before us?

Do they answer any purpose to the king? The principality of Wales was given by patent to Edward the Black Prince, on the ground on which it has stood ever since.—Lord Coke sagaciously observes upon it, “That in the charter of creating the Black Prince Edward prince of Wales, there is a *great mystery*—for *less* than an estate of inheritance, so *great* a prince could not have, and an *absolute estate of inheritance* in so *great* a principality as Wales (this principality being *so dear* to him) he *should* not have; and

* Case of Richard Lee, Esq; Appellant, against George Venables Lord Vernon, Respondent, in the year 1776.

“ therefore