

less of British origin; and why do they hold so different a language from the others who have presumptuously, and insolently, because arrogantly, laid claim to the exclusive designation of *British-born subjects*, subjects of *British origin and descent*? It is because, as is well observed by the *Quebec Canadian*, "they are really British subjects, real Englishmen, as we are, Englishmen in heart and in spirit, and not like those who usurp the name of British, AN HONOURABLE NAME WHICH THEY DISHONOUR!"

Of a like stamp with those *usurpers of an honourable name which they dishonour*, appears to be one Col. Robert Nichol, of the House of Assembly in Upper Canada, who breathes sentiments worthy of the most slavish and abject reptile that ever licked the foot of tyranny. It is, such men that the government at home ought to mistrust. It is not His Majesty King George the IV, nor the Imperial Parliament of Britain, nor the English constitution, these men love and venerate; but it is only "the powers that be" Equal to them a king, a president, an emperor, or a proconsul; equal to them, a parliament, a congress, or a secret tribunal; equal Britain, or France, or America: provided they have place and power, provided they can domineer, and monopolize, provided they, the men of property, no matter how acquired, may be allowed the right of governing, "the worthless mob of vagrants," who happen not to be possessed of £500 sterling. On the debate in the provincial Assembly of Upper Canada, Mr. Nichol displayed, along with a despotic disposition to carry a question *per fas aut nefas*, and a total disregard of common decency, the utmost ignorance of common sense, parliamentary usage, and constitutional principles. A committee on the subject of increasing the representation, being appointed, it was moved to make an addition to the number, because those who had been named were known to be favourable to the union; which Mr. N. opposed because, *if an equal number of gentlemen of opposite feelings, were on the committee, no report could be expressed.* To be sure, what can he be expected to know of the usage of the House of Commons in England? but I will tell him, that not only that invariable usage, but also common sense, dictates that committees upon questions that are expected to breed divided opinions must have men of opposite feelings and sentiment in them, or else their report is not the report of a committee, but the report of a party.

(To be continued.)