

tion, which he knows nothing of.—The dismissal of a Privy-Counsellor is the undeniable prerogative of the Crown; but then there is no necessity such Member of the Privy-Council should also be a Member of the Upper House of Parliament of England, and granted, that such Member of the Privy-Council be also a Member of the Upper House here, his Majesty's dismissing him from the Council does no way affect his seat in the Upper House of Parliament.

Contemporary Printed Pamphlet Md.Hist.Soc.

The comparison between the two dismissions you see, Sir, can no way hold, is needless, and far from the point the writer argues for. Why does he not keep to the Rights and Prerogative exercised by his Majesty, relative to the Counsellors and Members of the Upper Houses in the colonies, immediately under the authority of his Majesty, and those exercised by the Proprietor delegated to him by the King's Royal Charter; because there he will find no difference, The dismissal is undeniably of the same force and validity under the delegated, as the immediate power of the King's supreme authority.

p. 124

As to the similarity between the two authorities, I refer the Pamphleteer back to my Answer to the Querist, No. 2. which with what I have said above, will clearly obviate the following, and all other his absurd remarks on this head.

He says, "It is a vulgar notion, that the Proprietor has a right to displace a Counsellor, but that he cannot remove him from his seat in the Upper House, or annihilate his legislative capacity.—The above case is a solemn determination to the contrary, nor do I know it has ever been contravened by any subsequent proceeding, so that the precedent remains in full force to this day." Yes, and will remain a prescriptive right granted by regal authority to the Lord-Proprietor, and will for ever be a bar against the unjust attempts of the Pamphleteer and all his adherents, to subvert or molest, the power or property of the Proprietor in possession; 'tis too strongly fix'd for him to pretend to meddle with it.—Respecting the establishment of the Upper House of Assembly, I conceive no doubt of the rectitude of their actions, conjunctively in the legislature with the Lower House.

p. 125

The writers says, (page 55,) [p. 400] "The Upper and Lower Houses, say their Honours, are coeval." This, says he, "is nothing but a play upon the words Upper and Lower, which being relative terms, and mutually implying each other, can neither of them exist independently of the other. For let it be supposed that the legislature, according to the plan of the Charter, had consisted only of two branches, to wit, the Proprietor or his deputy, and the delegates of the people, from the first settlement of the Province till yesterday, when his Lordship's Council were admitted a branch of the legislature, and the necessary distinction of the Upper and Lower Houses was introduced; the proposition to-day that the Upper and Lower Houses