

grantees,) nothing can be more contrary to justice and honour, or more subversive of the mutual confidence that ought to exist between the mother country and its colonies, more debasing to the honour and dignity of the one, more destructive of the affection and loyalty of the other. It is a libel upon the British nation to suppose it. No, the power that gives any constitution, charter, or privilege, by that very act, divests itself of all further controul and dominion, in those points and particulars, that it does so grant or give; and can not retract, relake, or annul a grant or gift, farther than reservation may have been made for such retraction or resumption, under particular circumstances. It is wholly beyond the competency of the Imperial Parliament to repeal the constitutional act of Canada. I question very much, whether the Imperial Parliament has any right, even to modify it. I know that it can not constitutionally interfere in any points, excepting such as are specified in the 42d section of the act of the 31st Geo. III, and I could lay my finger on several of the clauses in the proposed union bill; which, had they passed into a law, I should not hesitate in saying, had been unconstitutionally, illegally, and oppressively enacted by the Imperial Parliament, whose right, I utterly deny, to take away, or even to alter, the constitution of these provinces, without the consent of their legislative assemblies. I do not say with Mr. Hagerman, 'let us not deceive ourselves,' but I say, let us not be deceived by those who dare maintain so baseless and so base a proposition, as that it is, or can be, in the power or competency of parliament, to take away that constitution, that has once been granted, without our own consent. I should not have wondered, had this false and scandalous libel upon the good faith and unstained character of the British nation, been uttered by one of that crouching and reptile race, the vagrant Scotch adventurers, to whom we may ascribe all this commotion; but that Mr. H. who is neither a North Briton, nor a transitory sojourner in the country, and whose professional legal abilities are, I believe, far above mediocrity, should have been so blinded by party feeling, is really surprising. There are many other points in his speech, I could advert to, as conveying such unconstitutional and servile sentiments, as I should not have expected from him, but I will confine myself to the gross and absurd fallacy I have here pointed out, and conclude with the remark, that the only argumentative part of his speech, is that relative to the disputes between the two provinces, about the duties; the rest is nothing but froth and declamation.

L. L. M.

MR. MACCULLOH,

In part reply to the 29th query of Socraticus, I can aver, from my own knowledge, that the Hon. John Richardson is not