

seems to jostle himself into the throne with the king, and talks of our subjects in the Colonies. The Parliament cannot well and wisely make laws suited to the Colonies, without being properly and truly informed of their circumstances, abilities, and temper, &c. This cannot be without representatives from thence; and yet it is fond of this power, and averse to the only means of acquiring the necessary knowledge for exercising it; which is desiring to be *omnipotent* without being *omniscient*."

In writing to his son William, on 6th October, 1773, he says, "From a long and thorough consideration of the subject, I am indeed of opinion that the Parliament has no right to make any law whatever binding on the Colonies; that the King, and not the King, Lords, and Commons collectively, is their Sovereign; and that the King, with their respective Parliaments is their only legislator."

Adam Smith remarks that the assembly which deliberates and decides concerning the affairs of every part of the Empire ought certainly to have representatives from every part of it. Then he goes on to say, that this union could be easily effectuated, or that difficulties might not occur in the execution of it, he did not pretend; he had, however, as yet heard of none which appeared insurmountable. The principal perhaps would arise not from the nature of things, but from the prejudices and opinions of the people both on this and on the other side of the Atlantic.

Dean Tucker has recommended Colonial Representation as a means of lessening the great scramble of faction and ambition.

Judge Hallyburton, who has just been returned for Launceston, another able advocate for Colonial Representation, having spent many years in Canada, he is entitled to speak on this subject with peculiar weight.

Extending imperial representation to the Colonies is entirely in accordance with the ancient precedents and the traditional policy of this great empire. It has ever been the aim of British statesmen to impart to territory unre-