

free from those important objections which had been so successfully urged against Mr. Fox's Bill, as being dangerous to our constitution at home. That the new bill differed from Mr. Fox's in that respect, was indeed admitted at the time, even by those who argued most against its alledged weakness and inefficacy. A contrary assertion has lately been advanced, and an attempt has been made to support it by what was called *a Comparative Statement of the two Bills*. That pamphlet cannot however be considered as a serious argument in defence of a proposition so palpably absurd, but must in fairness rather be regarded as one of those paradoxical disputations, which are sometimes maintained for the purpose of displaying ingenuity, by men who are disposed to think very highly of their own talents, and very meanly of the understanding of the rest of mankind.

Mr. Fox's Bill was objected against as a violent and unjustifiable breach of the Charter of the East India Company, because it deprived them, without their consent, of the rights of which they were legally possessed, and this without even a pretence of necessity; as it took from them not only every species of interference in the political or territorial government of India, but also all share in the direc-  
tion