

be advisable, in their constituted form of government. Mr. Macaulay goes on to say, that "it is not quite decorous to bring against that august assembly, charges of having abused that power." Had the parliament passed the union-bill; I for one, declare they would have grossly abused that power; but parliament, though very near being taken by surprise, although they would have abused that power, would have only done so in consequence of having been blinded by a set of intriguers,—of having been urged precipitately into a measure that compromised their own consistency and dignity, as well as the dearest privileges of an entire nation, (for I am prepared to defend the title of the Canadians to be called a nation,) by a few interested, undermining, individuals; and would have soon perceived their error, and have retraced their steps. But decorous or not, whether the parliament abuse their power, or the slave-driver his whip, to let a fantastical idea of *decorum*, prevent us from calling things by their right names, is only the more criminal, the greater, the more important, and the more extended, such abuse of power is. This is no time for deceiving either ourselves or the parliament, and it is a libel upon the good sense, and political sagacity of the British senate, to suppose that they will consider the strong language of remonstrance that it may be necessary to use, in order to ward off the blows, that are aimed at the vitals of the Canadian constitution, either as disrespectful, or menacing; it is a libel to suppose that they are not enlightened statesmen, and experienced legislators, sufficient to perceive what it was that lost the American colonies, as well as the towering prosperity, and elevated grandeur, Great Britain would have attained, had she retained that station, as arbitress, fostering protectress, and chief guide, over the rest of the continent of America, which I trust, the temperance, justice, and experience of her councils, will long, long, maintain her in, over the northern part of this continent.

I will not follow Mr. Macaulay at present, into any other part of his harangue; but as his, and Mr. Hagerman's, speeches have been so ostentatiously printed, reprinted, extolled, and bepraised, whilst that of Mr. Dalton, at the same meeting, has received no notice, I will here give an abstract of the latter, and leave those who have read the three, to form their judgment of the whole.

Mr. D. moved a resolution which, while it expressed a desire of a union of the two Canadas with uniform laws, (except in as far as would infringe upon the civil code now enjoyed by the French Canadians,) united interests and combined resources, protested against such a union, and such a change of the constitution, as was contained in the celebrated union-bill.—This he prefaced with a speech, in which, in conformity with the resolution, he, after expatiating on what he considered as