

they have rights, what the parent cannot take away. Heaven grant that our mother country may regard us as her children, that if by the dispensation of Providence, the time shall come, when her power increases the memory of former kindnesses, may supply its decays, and her colonies like dutiful children, may serve and guard their aged parent, for ever revering the arms that held them in their infancy, and the breasts that supported their lives, while they were little ones.

It seems, as if the power of regulation might not inaptly be compared to the prerogative of making peace, war, treaties, or alliances, whereby "*the whole \* nation are bound, AGAINST THEIR CONSENT:*" and yet the prerogative by no means implies a *supreme legislature*. The language held in "the Commentaries" on this point is very remarkable. "With regard to FOREIGN CONCERNS the king is the *delegate* or *representative* of the people; and in him, as in a *center*, all the *rays* of his people are united ||; and the SOVEREIGN POWER *quoad hoc* is vested in his person §." Will any *Englishman* say these expressions are descriptive of the king's authority, WITHIN THE REALM. "Is the SOVEREIGN POWER *within that* vested in his person?" He is styled "*sovereign*" indeed; "his realm is declared by many acts of parliament an *Empire* and his crown *Imperial*." But do these splendid appellations, the highest known in *Europe* signify, that "*sovereign* POWER is vested in his person *within the realm?*" We have a full answer in the

\* 1 Blackst. 252, 257. || Fol. 252. § Fol. 257.