

meditated a constitution for the people of the conquered country, founded on principles of English liberty, a more intimate knowledge of the political tenets of the inhabitants, soon made it apparent that those recent subjects of France had no rational idea of true liberty, or of the inalienable rights of man: the imaginary greatness and glory of their *grand monarque*, engrossed their whole attention, and formed the prominent feature of their political creed." What would he attempt to make us believe that the infatuated, and despotic ministers, that lost the fairest gem in Britain's diadem, by their temerity, tyranny and imbecility, contemplated giving a free constitution to one colony, while they were trampling freedom under foot in all the others? And as to the fanciful and exaggerated picture here drawn of the attachment of the old French Canadians to the monarchical power and principles of Old France; it must only be considered as some of the honourable gentleman's flowers of rhetoric; for all know there never was the shadow of ground for an imputation upon the Canadians, after they became dependants of England, of disaffection to that country, or predilection for their old metropolitan government, beyond that same kind of historic veneration, and love, which all nations bear to the parent-stock whence they are, or conceive themselves to be, derived.

The argument which Mr. Sherwood used, by stating it as his opinion, that "the wisdom of man could never devise a system by which two separate parliaments," (meaning the parliaments of Upper and Lower Canada,) "legislating at the distance of 600 miles from each other, on the same principles, for the same purposes, and to the same end, could ever succeed so well, or promote the general interest so effectually, as if they were brought together and joined in council;" might be applied to prove that neither, *a fortiori*, could the Imperial parliament of Great Britain, and the colonial parliaments, legislating, as regards the mutual interests of the colonies and the parent-state, on the same principles, and for the same purposes, at the distance of 5000 miles from each other, succeed so well, as if they were brought together; and that therefore we ought either to have no parliament at all, or should send our representatives to London.

The trade-bill, he contended, was not an effectual remedy for the difficulties and disputes that had arisen between the two provinces, and he certainly pointed out, in a very able manner, many of its discrepancies, and inconveniences. But, because a measure of that kind has not been, all at once, made one that is perfect; or because it may be found, as I am sure it will be, to trench upon the constitutional rights of both provinces, are we to adopt a measure still more pregnant with imperfection, one that, instead of merely infringing in some minor points upon the constitution of the country, must destroy it altogether,