

superlatively ridiculous to waste more words upon it. As to their right of *altering* the constitution of either province; if it be meant that they had a right to *give* the provinces a constitution, I allow it; but after a constitution is *once given*, it can never be *taken away* or *altered*, without the consent, and perhaps, strictly speaking, without a spontaneous application from those to whom such a charter (for constitution and charter, are with respect to the British possessions, synonyms,) has been granted.

Although an advocate for the union, Mr. Jones was one of those who declared he wished for no union but one, in its detail, in strict conformity with our present constitution. "The clauses of the projected bill, were not such as it would be reasonable to suppose that British subjects, who understood and appreciated their rights, could be patient under. They were not such as could have emanated from any mind admiring the constitution of the mother-country, and having a due regard for the rights of his Majesty's loyal subjects in this portion of his dominions. They were worthy of the grovelling advocates of despotism." He urged the house to make themselves heard on the present momentous occasion; "if they neglected to do so, they abused the trust reposed in them, by an abandonment of the dearest interests of their constituents. Their silence would be taken for consent, and they would be burthened with a most unacceptable union. Let not this fair fabric of a constitution, founded upon principles of rational freedom, be inconsiderately razed to the ground! better by far that the heart that could conceive so foul a deed, and the hand that could willingly lend itself to guide the pen to record the foul conception, should have withered at the instant!"

Mr. Baldwin having risen a second time, said "he had before denied the *right* of the Imperial parliament to alter our constitution, without our consent; he was still of the same opinion—not but that they had the *power* to do so, but he insisted it would be derogatory to the justice and beneficence of the British parliament to do it." He illustrated his position by a quotation from Vattel, a part of which, most particularly in point, as to the distinction between *power* and *right*, is as follows.

"By the fundamental laws of England, the two houses of parliament, in concert with the king, exercise the legislative *power*. but if the two houses should resolve to suppress themselves, and to invest the king, with the full and absolute government, certainly the nation would not suffer it. *And who can presume to say that they would not have A RIGHT TO OPPOSE IT.*"

In the course of his speech he gave the following lucid representation of the consequences that would be let in by not opposing the principle that parliament had such a right as was