

the benefit which was intended for him by the creation of the Baronets ;" that He (King Charles) would be " very careful to maintain all his good subjects who should plant themselves in New Scotland, and would let none of the Baronets ANY WAY BE PREJUDICED in the honour and privileges contained in their Patents ;" that they (the Baronets) might have " full assurance from Him, *in verbo principis*, that he would be ready by his gracious favour to protect them, and such as should thereafter at any time concur with them for the advancement of the Plantation ;" and that they should " be encouraged to prosecute the said work by all lawful helps thereunto, as well by completing the intended number of Baronets as otherwise."—*Letters from Charles I. to the Privy Council of Scotland, 17th November, 1629, 12 July, 1631, 14 June, 1632, and 24 April, 1633.*

The Crown has no interest in opposing the revival of the rights and objects of the SCOTTISH BARONETAGE. On the contrary, it has a direct and paramount interest in aiding and advancing their revival. The overlordship and proprietorship of the whole Province of Nova Scotia belongs to the STIRLING FAMILY, now represented by Charles Sherreff, Esq., Robert Hepburn Swinton, Esq., the Duchess de Coigny, (formerly Miss Hamilton of Bargany,) and the Marquess of Downshire ; but on the resignation of that family, each Baronet holds his grant of 16,000 acres of the Crown and Kingdom of Scotland. Every Baronet therefore is a vassal of the Scottish monarchy, and the restoration of their territorial rights, will unite the colony and the mother country, by one hundred and sixty new ties, in the persons of an Hereditary Order comprising the most numerous, wealthy, powerful, and influential portion of the old NOBILITY of Scotland.

OPINIONS.

In the year 1731, upon a representation to King George II., in Council, some Protestants from Ireland and the Palatinate were allowed to settle on a tract of land adjoining to Nova Scotia, whereupon the inhabitants of Massachusetts Bay, who till this time had always neglected the said tract, claimed not only the proprietorship of it, but also the government. This led to a case being submitted for the legal opinion of those eminent lawyers, the Attorney and Solicitor General, Yorke and Talbot, which embraced the two following queries, viz., 1st, Whether the said claimants had not by their neglect forfeited what rights they had under their Charters, and 2ndly, Whether by the said tract being conquered by the French, and afterwards re-conquered by General Nicholson in the late Queen's time, and yielded up by France to Great Britain by the treaty of Utrecht, that part of the Charter relating thereto became vacated ; and whether the government of that tract and the lands thereof are not absolutely re-vested in the Crown ; and whether the Crown has not thereby a sufficient