

on the part of the mother country, I had the honour, warmly to recommend, and I believe, forcibly by argument to support, in a treatise which, in 1809, at the request of the committee of correspondence of the East India Company in London, I drew up on the subject of the best method of administering the government, and regulating the political relations of the British possessions in the East-Indies. For this treatise, the Court of directors voted me the sum of fifty guineas, in token of their approbation, which were presented to me, with the thanks of the company, by William Astell, Esquire, the then chairman.— That project, however, died away, and lies buried in the archives of Leadenhall-Street. That, however, at some future period, not only the Canadas, but also, the British possessions in Hindostan, Southern Africa, and (tho' at a period that can be very dimly seen thro' the mist of successive ages) New-Holland, will become sovereign and independent states, does not require a very deep insight into futurity, judging from the past, to predict. Whether that sovereignty and independence be gained by force, or granted by *concessions*, will depend on the councils by which the empire may be governed; but of this I am sure, that if independence be granted to each dependency, as it rises to maturity, upon the footing of being inalienably allied to, and indissolubly connected with, the original empire, no colossus of ancient, of modern, or of future history, can, or will, ever bear any comparison with the gigantic, the noble, and the happy structure, at the head of which Britannia would then be seated as the arbitress, protectress, and benefactress of the world; the preponderating and dominant state, either in her own person, or in that of her immediate progeny, in all the five grand divisions of the globe. L. L. M.

Quebec, 16th Nov.

Mr. MACCULLOH,

I have, with many apologies to you and the public, to rectify part of the information which I lately gave you, with regard to Mr. James Stuart, which I am bound to do, both in justice to the Free Press, and to that gentleman. It is certain he was at the opening of the assembly in its last session, and after having procured the 19th of March to be fixed for the discussion of the question relative to the judges, he returned to Montreal, but did not fail to be in his place in the house, on the 19th of March. Unhappily for Canada, he did not succeed in his object, not receiving that support, which he both expected, and ought to have had, and which without doubt, those members of the assembly who, from delicacy or weakness, declined going all lengths against the judges, now heartily regret. This error, with regard to Mr. Stuart, I was before led into, by