

have received the resolutions of the assembly on this subject. When I addressed your lordship in my despatch No. 74, of the 26th January, 1832, I could not but suppose that there was some erroneous statement in the case of Mr. Christie as represented by himself. I could not until the assembly had considered his representations, and had supplied such information on them as it might deem meet to convey to his Majesty, assume that the house had pursued a course which certainly did, to my apprehension, appear opposed to principles solemnly recognized by the parliament in this country. Now, however, I learn that the assembly distinctly asserts its right to expel one of its members, on no other ground than that on which he was expelled by a former assembly. A former house having expelled Mr. Christie, the present house had in three successive sessions renewed the expulsion without the assignment of any new cause: and finally, has declared that this proceeding is the exercise of an unquestionable privilege belonging to the assembly. According to this doctrine Mr. Christie can never be admitted to the house, the ground of exclusion being always the same, there will be no reason why he should be admitted on the occasion of his next election more than on any previous occasion; and the assembly, if it act consistently, must continue to expel Mr. Christie as long as his constituents shall continue to return him. If to pursue such a course be one of the privileges of the house of assembly, the house is possessed of a privilege not merely to expel a member for any one session, but virtually to declare him disqualified for life, and to disfranchise, until one party or the other shall abandon the contest, the body of electors by which the same member is continually selected.

The resolutions state, that in expelling Mr. Christie, the house exercised a privilege frequently exercised by the house of commons. I am not aware how this opinion is reconciled with the principle established by the resolution on Mr. Wilkes' case, passed by the house of commons on the 3d May, 1782.

“The decision there recorded appears to be sufficiently explanatory of the doctrine adopted by the house of commons for its own guidance on the great constitutional ques-