

upon me to controvert this Proposition, that there is not such a Charm in Words as to make two Things, distinct in their Nature, one and the same; but I think the Consequence is by no Means to be supported, that because there is a Distinction between two Bodies, the same Rights cannot be common to both, where they may be exercised without clashing or interfering with one another. If the Lower House have no Right to the *Lex Parliamenti* of the House of Commons, because they are a distinct Body, I apprehend it will just as well follow, that the Courts in this Province ought not to judge according to the Laws of *England*, because they are distinct Bodies from the Courts at home. — *And thus, if the Reasoning of those profound Logicians were to take Place, we should be deprived of the Benefit of all the Laws of our Mother Country; and our Liberties, secured by those Laws, would be entirely at the Mercy of the Proprietor.*

It would have been much more to the Honour of the Upper House, to have rested the Matter simply upon a fair Quotation of the Attorney General's Opinion (which I shall hereafter have Occasion to mention) than to intermix their own Comments and Explanations, to make it speak more in their Favour; and thereby to puzzle and perplex what, as it stands in his Opinion, is very clear and intelligible. He thinks that Assemblies in the Colonies are not entitled to *all* (a Word very significant, though it seems to have escaped their Honours Notice) the Privileges of the House of Commons, *not because they are distinct Bodies,*