

THE FREE PRESS.

VOL. I.] MONTREAL, THURSDAY, 21st NOV. 1822. [No. 7.]

Huic legi nec obrogari fas est; nec derogari ex hac aliquid licet; neque tota abrogari potest. Nec vero aut per senatum, aut per populum, solvi hac lege possumus; neque est querendus explanator, aut interpres ejus alius. CICERO.

No part of this law can be annulled; nor is it allowable to curtail any of its provisions; still less can it be wholly abrogated. It is not competent either for the senate, or the people, to make it void; neither does it require an interpreter or commentator.

The proceedings of the meeting, which took place at Kingston, in Upper Canada, on the 30th ultimo, for the purpose of passing some resolutions in favour of the union, having been much cried up by the partizans of that measure, I have been induced to pay a little more attention to them, than upon the first perusal of them; I considered their inanity and windy wordiness required, for Pope justly observes,

“Words are like leaves, and where they most abound,
Much fruit of sense beneath is rarely found.”

I had, however, even at that first glance, marked some passages in them for reprobation, and now call the attention of my readers to one of them, for the purpose of exposing the political ignorance, fallacious assertions, and presumptuous imbecility, that are puffed up (by those indeed who know no better) as a display of talent and cogent argumentation.

In the speech of C. A. Hagerman, Esq. he presumptuously, and almost treasonably, imputes to the Imperial Parliament a disposition to repeal the constitutional act of Canada, entirely, in case they should find the provincial legislature of Lower Canada, obstinate or refractory in submitting to the views of the executive government; adding “let us not deceive ourselves, the power that gave us a constitution has the power of taking it away.” This I hesitate not to say, is utterly false. Nothing can be more grossly repugnant to every principle of public law, to every feeling of common honesty between contracting parties, (which Grotius, and Puffendorf, and every writer on the fundamental principles of social law and morality, will tell Mr. H. is the invariable relation between granters and