

was then on an embassy in Europe. Alarmed by what he considered the impending danger of such a project, in a series of letters to a friend, (entitled a "Defence of the American Constitutions"—that is, of the *State Constitutions*, all of which establish *two Chambers*)—he shewed the numerous instances, both in ancient and modern times, of a Government by one Assembly always degenerating into a tyranny, either of one or many.

This work, my Lord, is a mine of historical information and sound political remark upon this very important subject, and deserves to be consulted before such a project shall be acted upon.

The advocates for such a reform in the Lords House allege, as a farther reason for it, that at present they are *irresponsible*. The proper answer to this objection has been given by Sir Robert Peel; the Lords are responsible for the upright exercise of their high functions to God. This is the only effectual responsibility in every rational and moral agent, compared with which the responsibility to the people (the immediate constituents) is as dust in the balance. To whom is the King responsible, but to God? To whom are the members of the Commons House ultimately responsible, but to the same Almighty Being? Should their responsibility to their constituents come in collision with this superior responsibility, with this paramount obligation to their Maker?—that is to say, should their constituents require of them to act in a given case in a manner which they conceived inconsistent with their religious duty, would they hesitate one moment to resign their seats? Thus their