

may likewise give me an occasion, when leisure will permit, to enquire into the causes and motives, why that part of the 31 Geo. III. which gives the power to the crown of creating an hereditary nobility in Canada, that shall be hereditary councillors, has never been availed of; why the ancient French landed proprietors, who ought to have been the natural and legitimate counterparts, in this province, of the house of lords in England, have not had that mark of confidence and distinction, extended to them, which, when that act was made, it was undoubtedly in contemplation to have bestowed upon them. If that had been the case, we should never have seen that eternal struggle between the council and the assembly that we have witnessed; but then too, the executive government would not have had a sufficiently subservient council, as they now have, when the members are only appointed for life; for sentiments, opinions, and court-devotion, can not be transmitted, like honours and privileges, by hereditary descent. We should then have had a real and perfect model of the English constitution, with its three noble and inseparable branches, king, lords, and commons, whereas in truth, we have only two branches and a stump, or rather two branches grown into one, and overtopping and smothering the other. The reflections that arise upon this subject, must however, be deferred, to a more suitable opportunity.

In my last, I strongly reprobated that part of Mr. Hagerman's speech at the meeting at Kingston in which he asserted, that "the power that gave us a constitution had the power of taking it away." In the speech of his coadjutor Mr. Macaulay, the same opinion, though stated less positively, appears, where he says, "surely the Imperial Parliament possesses the power of repealing its own acts." It can not be too often repeated, or too strongly inculcated on men's minds, on this occasion, that the parliament can not morally, legally, or constitutionally, repeal, revoke, or annul, any *grant* that they have made. they can not take away a charter that has been given, nor any corporation, nor any exclusive privilege bestowed upon individuals in England; can they take away the charter of the East India Company, before its expiration? can they cancel the rights of the corporation of London? Yet the proprietors of East India stock are all virtually, and the city of London absolutely, represented in parliament, and so might be said to have a voice in their own undoing, should such a supposed repeal of their privileges, be agitated. If the parliament can not do these things, and a thousand others that might be named, which affect the rights of persons, actually represented there, *a fortiori*, they can not do so, with regard to those who are not only not represented amongst them, but who have a separate representation of their own, the only legal and proper organ, and mode, by which to express their sentiments, and make alterations, if any