

admission. GIANNONE says, (Civil History of Naples, v. 1. l. 1.) "By the Law of Nations, the vanquished were always subjected to the laws of the victorious." The conclusion is, that the treacherous betrayal of 1774, in handing back the whole Province of Quebec, including both the Canadas, to the tender mercies of barbarian French laws, and still persisting in their maintenance, is not only indefensible, but is one of the foulest legislative frauds that history has recorded.

But what now, in 1791, was Mr. PITT to do? What had been so recently abandoned, could he reclaim? What had been so recently established, could he throw down? He had a choice of evils; and though it may be easy for us, who have seen and felt the evil consequences resulting from the choice, to say that *it* was evil, it might be very honestly questioned, by others, whether the case, *at that time*, admitted of any thing better. I say, "at that time:" for consider. There had been war and revolution in the west; and France was heaving and writhing under democratic convulsion, portending a far more fearful revolution. All men could see the gathering storm, could hear the distant thunder.

Black rising clouds the thickened ether choke,
And spiry flames shoot through the rising smoke!
With keen vibrations cut the sullen night,
And streak the dreary sky with dreadful light!

That was a time, if ever there was a time, for England to concentrate all her powers. Was Canada to be abandoned? I have not read a word of the history of the transaction beyond the debates in the House of Commons, but this is my conjecture. However, right or wrong in this respect, I know enough of the character of Mr. PITT to be confident of this, that had he possessed the opportunities which have been presented to the Government since the conclusion of the war, the barbarity of Canadian law would not have been tolerated as it has been. A re-union is at length to be effected, and the all-important question is: Are we, or are we not, to have a re-establishment of British Laws? Another and a still more important question is: Are we, or are we not, to have a Constitution of Government, in any tolerable degree approaching to that of England? I fear the low-souled policy that now prevails.

"THE LAWS OF ENGLAND ARE THE BIRTHRIGHT OF THE PEOPLE THEREOF: and all the Kings and Queens who shall