

Angers and his colleagues, in the nineteenth century and under the Union Jack, heroic legislation of this kind is not appreciated. British subjects, such at least of them as have any idea of their rights and privileges under the constitution, have an awkward way of enquiring whether such laws can really be passed, and whether, supposing them to be rushed through a venal House of Assembly and an incapable Legislative Council and the Royal sanction extorted from some subservient tool, such as has ere this been seen in the Lieutenant Governor's chair, whether and to what extent armed resistance would be justifiable.

It must not be forgotten that six hundred years ago, with arms in their hands, the forefathers of the British portion of the population in this Province secured from King John, among other inestimable rights and privileges which now constitute the heirloom of every British subject, the *guarantee* that no man's property should be seized except upon the judgment of a properly constituted tribunal. The liberty which it was deemed worth risking life to secure six hundred years ago, is surely worth a struggle to retain to-day. Mr. Angers of course knows nothing about Magna Charta, except by name; Mr. Church seems too indolent to care whether himself and all his countrymen are enslaved or not; and Mr. Baker has even less knowledge of Constitutional law than his "august leader," the Attorney-General. The House had previously been bought by a bribe promised, the railway rings; that fact is now established beyond question by Mr. DeBoucherville's own assurance to the Lieutenant-Governor, that the Government could be carried on in no other way. The resolutions, unconstitutional though they be, therefore, passed in a house, composed for the most part of lawyers, by a two-third vote. And yet many of these gentlemen must have known that the infringement upon the secured rights of the people contained in that Statute was far more outrageous than the exercise of lawless power which brought Charles Stuart's head to the block. In his case he had only levied monies from his people without their consent; in this case agents were to be named to bind the people by bonds signed not only without their consent, but against their will, and the courts of justice were unlawfully to be shut in the face of those who might attempt to seek redress. With a wonderful skill which no one else has ever matched, Mr. Angers by one law, managed to infringe the two most essential provisions of the Magna Charta. The resolutions, as may be readily imagined,