

means? Your Lordship has, unintentionally, perhaps, but very satisfactorily, answered this question in the succeeding page, wherein you justly observe that "the Reformers (that is the prospective traitors) well knew that if once they obtained possession of the *Executive Council & the higher offices of the province*, the *Legislative Council* would soon be unable to offer any effectual resistance to their meditated reforms!" (such as "assimilating the institutions of the province rather to those of the United States than to those of the Mother Country;" separation from Great Britain. and the overthrow of our glorious constitution.) How could you, my Lord, advocate a measure thus 'confessedly' calculated to 'nullify' that "chock on the popular branch of the Legislature" which you subsequently declare "*you consider necessary*?" But more of this anon.

I now approach a subject, your remarks upon which evince not only profound ignorance, unpardonable injustice and utter disregard of truth, but, *when it is recollected that your Lordship is a son-in-law of Earl Grey*, that which may be most justly termed *shameless effrontery*! I allude to your observations on the, so-called, "Family Compact." Who could have supposed that a relation of Lord Grey's would ever have the audacity to impugn the *influence of family connections*! Why, my Lord, to such influence do you owe your present exalted rank; and so extensive and all-grasping was it, "*till lately*," in England, that scarcely (*facts* may be venially illustrated by hyperbole) a *grey* goose or a *grey* tom cat could escape from patronage and place. To shield yourself and your connections from such obvious animadversions was, probably, your motive for representing the appellation as a *misnomer*; but it matters not whether such representation were the result of shame or ignorance. You state that Upper Canada "*has long been governed by a party commonly designated through the Province*