

sion and primogeniture. He says, "The English law in these respects, is repugnant to the feelings, the wishes, and the manners of that part of the country. Few of them understand it, and almost all desire to have nothing to do with it, more than with any species of aristocracy, which a few persons have been found to advocate, and to which the law of primogeniture inevitably tended. They look upon the law of succession as not consistent with natural justice: all wish that the brothers and sisters of each family shall be equal in their rights of succession, and it is the desire of parents to provide equally for their children. In this country, we have no commissions in the army or navy, no government patronage to provide for younger sons." Such is the language which Mr. Peck is reported to have used in the House of Assembly. He is a representative from the Eastern Township, and cannot be supposed to be at all under the influence of those national feelings, which, it may be said, attach the inhabitants of French origin to their own laws. I quoted last year the opinions of other Lower Canada lawyers of established character, in favor of the law of that Province on this subject. These opinions were given before a committee of the British House of Commons, and are entitled to respect. Why is it that we cannot have the law here? They enjoy it in other colonies, whose loyalty we will not dispute, and they are upon trial attached to it. The people very generally desire it here. And if it were a law in existence, no man living would be so foolish and so presumptuous, as to propose its repeal. It is not unconstitutional; it is not inconsistent with the principles of the British Constitution. If it were, the British Parliament would not have left us at liberty to adopt it, but would have fixed the law of primogeniture as one of the principles of our Constitution. But they did nothing of the kind; when they passed the act of constitut-