

0284

211-11



A
L E T T E R
TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
L O R D C A M D E N ,

ON THE
BILL FOR RESTRAINING THE
TRADE AND FISHERY OF THE
FOUR PROVINCES OF NEW
ENGLAND.

L O N D O N :
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE
STRAND. MDCCLXXV.

A
L E T T E R, &c.

MY LORD,

A Sense of your distinguished abilities, admiration at your uncommon eloquence, and respect for the high rank which you once held in the most liberal of professions, served only to increase the surprize of your audience, when your Lordship spoke to the commitment of the New England Fishery Bill. We cannot but be apprehensive, my Lord, that to say the Americans now have a right of resisting, are justified in

B

resistance,

(2)

resistance, and that they must resist or be enslaved, appears to give a sanction to rebellion; and to add weight to their counsels, who have endeavoured to lead our American subjects from tumult and disobedience, to open and avowed resistance. Assertions, which proceeding from men neither known nor esteemed are rejected as enthusiastic and seditious, when clothed with your high authority, acquire a duplicated power of mischief: and we have cause to fear, for the influence which your Lordship's speech will have upon the minds of the Americans, already sufficiently inflamed by the artifice and sedition of men of dark and dangerous designs.

It was a very wise law of Solon, which condemned him to infamy, who remained neuter and indifferent in the troubles of his country: for he could have little claim to the esteem of his fellow-citizens, who, secure in his own private interests, could
be

(3)

be insensible to the calamities of the public. My regard for the duty which every citizen owes to his country, and my ruling wish that every event may be fortunate and happy to Great Britain, are the only motives capable of supporting me in the avowal of opinions contradictory to your Lordship; when I cannot but feel how very unequal my powers are to such a contest.—But truth requires no ornament, and falsehood is incapable of any disguise that will escape detection.

As the doctrine of a right of resistance to government, which you quoted from Mr. Locke, and applied to the present case of the Americans, is of a general nature; and, if it refers to the present question, must equally refer to every measure which we may adopt, to preserve entire the British empire, wheresoever extended; permit me to premise a few words on that subject, before I enter into those parts of

(4)

the speech which confine themselves to the matter in question,

A power of tyranny, without any right of resistance in the oppressed objects of that tyranny, was never supported by any competent argument. The right of resistance in cases wherein the subject will probably be benefited by the event, as well as justified by the cause, is natural and common to all mankind, under whatever form of government they may be placed. When, therefore, political writers talk of a supreme power, they do not mean a power which absolutely precludes resistance, but a power which cannot be resisted without a subversion of government, a renunciation of civil rights, and a recurrence to the natural rights of mankind.

The word "supreme" has been said to be relative, not absolute: yet as the subjects have transferred into the hands of the state

(5)

state all the rights which they could transfer, the rights of nature being unalienable, the supreme power of the British, is *de jure* of the same authority, as that of the Persian empire;—that is, competent to every object of legislation and government, and controlable only by the natural rights of mankind. There is no right of tyranny in Persia, any more than in Britain; and if we have been able to resist its exertion, it is because we have had the means and spirit of resistance.

It behoves those, who contemplate the subversion of the government under which they live, to consider, not only the justice of their cause, but the probability of its execution: for, however the successful opposition of a nation to a bigotted tyrant, becomes a happy revolution; yet a partial and unsuccessful resistance to government is at best an unfortunate rebellion.

The

(6)

The very able commentator on the laws of England observes, that Mr. Locke, like most other theorists, carries his reasoning too far; and makes too light of, what deserve the maturest consideration, the causes of resistance to government. Many of the errors, which have crept into this subject, have been occasioned by a confusion of natural rights with civil rights, and of independence with liberty: for, if a citizen can once do what the laws forbid, he will no longer possess liberty; because all his fellow-subjects will have the same power.

I should pay little respect, to the authority of any man, or of any precedent, against liberty, or in favor of anarchy. But, if the names of political writers must have their weight, suffer me to refer your Lordship to the opinion of Algernon Sidney; a man, whose enthusiasm never led him to countenance even the semblance of tyranny; and who, as much as any one, prepared

(7)

prepared the way to the Revolution. In his "Discourses concerning Government," which were wrote in the same cause, and against the same opponent with Locke, he repeatedly and expressly recognises the supremacy of this power.

"The difference," says he, "between good and ill governments, is not that those of one sort have an arbitrary power, which the others have not, but that those which are well constituted, place it so as it may be most beneficial to the people." The art of polity, my Lord, has been chiefly, and almost singly, directed to the vestment of this power in proper and safe hands; and intrusting it to those, whose knowledge, situation, and interest might induce them, to exercise it for honest ends, and by wise means: "for," says Sidney, "the difference, between the best government and the worst, does wholly depend upon

(8)

“ upon a right or wrong exercise of this
“ power.”

It has been the wisdom of the British constitution, to temper this power, by committing the blended exercise of it, to the three chief bodies, which compose the state. In them therefore rests the united authority of the British empire; and whoever, as a subject, continues to claim the benefit and protection of that empire, must continue to merit such benefit and protection, by obedience to the constitutional authority thereof.

Your Lordship knows all this much better than me; wherefore I am the more unhappy, in not being able to concur in your justification of America's resistance: but had I contented myself with merely contradicting your assertion, and had I omitted to offer those reasons, which compel me to differ from so respectable
8 authority,

(9)

authority, it might have appeared foolish and assuming.—How far the foregoing principles authorise the conduct of America, will appear in the subsequent parts of this letter.

When indeed the benefits of civil polity are converted into evils, and government becomes tyranny, nature has pointed out to mankind their remedy, and made resistance to oppression a natural defence. It is a right given by the laws of nature, and not by the ordinances of any state, or age; for whoever attacks the government of his country, precludes himself from its benefit and protection. And, whatever may be the case with America, I am persuaded that you cannot mean to point out this as a proper time for us, the home-born subjects, to appeal, from the most perfect constitution that ever existed, and from the mildest government upon earth, to independence
and

(10)

and anarchy, to the sword and the natural rights of mankind.

Your Lordship stated the Bill for restraining the New England Fishery to be cruel, impracticable, and unnecessary. It is cruel, because it will have too great an effect;—it is impracticable, because it will have no effect at all;—it is unnecessary, because the Earl of Chatham proposed another Bill, which has not been adopted.

If I was to follow your Lordship over your own ground, I should plead its humanity, because it will have a good effect; its practicability, because it is to be effectuated by the navy; and its necessity, or rather propriety, because it is the best measure that has occurred, to check the seditious practices of a faction in New England.

But let us first examine the charge of cruelty.—The provinces of New England have

(11)

have attempted to withdraw their obedience from that state, which, having settled and protected them, has exercised authority over them, with a mildness and benevolence unequalled in the annals of history. And what has Britain done? She denies unto those, who continue to avow resistance, the benefits of that fishery, which her fleets have acquired, defended, and secured; the advantages whereof she had held out to them, in preference to her own home-born subjects: a measure, which as it is calculated to draw them back to their duty, so at their return to obedience its operation ceases. But, in the mean time, common prudence forbids to suffer them to grow strong from her resources, who already seem willing to bid defiance to her authority.

An effect however of this act, according to your Lordship, will be the starving a considerable part of the four provinces of

C 2

New

New England. Thus it is, that you hold out to us their power of resistance, because their internal resources supply them with every necessary and conveniency; and yet we are forbid the mildest exertion of our authority, lest they perish for lack of food. If, my Lord, their daily existence doth thus depend on the continuance of our bounty, their obligations to us are doubly increased; and they never could have dared to set up claims of independence, unless they had been counselled from hence how far they might go.

Did the act indeed carry with it the miseries of want, among those who continue to resist and rebel against lawful authority, it might be justified by precedents from every page of history. The great Henry of France, the only instance I can recollect, supplied with food an obstinate and rebellious faction, which seemed determined to perish within the walls of Paris, rather than submit

submit to his government. And if mankind have concurred in paying homage to the benevolence which dictated the action, political writers have blamed a measure, which continued the calamities of a civil war, and gave strength to the miseries of his country; when he might have ended them, by the death of a few obdurate rebels.

But we are not obliged, like that good king, to balance between benevolence and policy. It is true, that the colonies of New England have acquired strength and riches thro' the extension of this fishery to them; but it is no less true that their subsistence has not depended upon it. By a custom and policy of their country, adopted for the encouragement of the fishery, the Newfoundland salt fish has supplied the chief part of their Saturday's dinner; and in very few families has gone further: in those settled fifty or sixty miles back, it has not

gone so far. Their fresh fish they have always caught upon their own coast; they raise their own Indian corn, feed their own pork, and find among themselves the means of supplying the mere necessaries of life. But to those necessaries of life they will now be restrained; nor, until from a sense of their loss, when we withdraw our support, they are reclaimed to their duty, will they be able to make returns for those luxuries, which they import from Spain, Portugal, Italy, and the West-Indies, by means of that fishery, which we have resumed for the benefit of our subjects at home, and for the immediate advantage of our own commerce.

It has been the endeavour of those who wish to make us despair of our own virtue, bravery, and strength, to represent us in the hopeless and exhausted state of the lower empire; like those unworthy descendants of ancient Rome, debilitated by vices,
 enervated

enervated by luxury, and depressed by that most insupportable of burdens, our own degeneracy; while they ascribe to the Americans all the force and vigour of maturity, with all the untainted virtue and purity of infancy.

But, my Lord, when the last war carried our wealth to America, it carried our luxuries with it; and America reached that period in a few years, and by one event, which we are arrived at in the course of nature. Besides, at their first settlement, they were not a rude, but a civilised people; and their continued communication with Europe, has made them partakers in the evils as well as benefits of civil refinement. Luxury, which begins as a conveniency, soon grows into a second necessity; and though the fine arts have not accompanied it in its transatlantic progress, it has not had less effect in precluding their return to rude and uncivilised simplicity.

When,

(16)

When therefore they find the enjoyment of this fishery, and of the luxuries derived from it, confined to those who recognise our authority, they will then have to determine their choice in favor of mere necessities, independence, and anarchy, or of the conveniences of life, and the blessings of good order.

Your Lordship stated the Bill to be cruel, not only on account of the wretched alternative to which it will reduce our subjects, of submitting to our authority, or suffering by their obstinacy; but also because it is unjust and unproportioned to their crime. By a very short narrative of plain facts, it will appear how far the charge of injustice is applicable to this measure; and how far your Lordship is authorized in calling Great Britain the aggressor.

When the Non-importation agreement, entered into about five years ago, dissolved,
like

(17)

like a chain of sand, in its own weakness, the Colonies, their measures being no longer united, each acted as their peculiar motives and situations directed them. The Custom-house duties, which had for many years been paid on all East India teas exported to America, as well as on those consumed in England, amounted to twenty-five per cent.; or, on a general average, to about one shilling on the pound: but as the Americans received great part of their teas from Holland, the tax was never complained of. To remove, therefore, this inducement to smuggling, and to restore this trade to the East India Company, the parliament reduced the duty to three-pence a pound; and directed it to be paid in America upon the consumption. So that this act in reality operated as a bounty, and as a very considerable one; but there were traders at Boston to whom it was both oppressive and injurious. In order therefore to restore to the smuggler of Dutch teas the advantage

vantage which he had over the fair trader, and effectually to deter our merchants from daring to supply them, they adopted the decisive measure of destroying, by a kind of mob authority, a cargo belonging to British merchants, consigned under the sanction and faith of commerce.

Permit me now to appeal to your Lordship, as to a man read in polity, in law, and in historic experience. Can you find in the annals of those states which have successfully flourished from the earliest period unto the present time, through the whole extent of your reading, a single instance wherein such an open violation of the laws of commerce, such a signal insult from a province to the mother-country, has been suffered to pass with impunity; and that province kept at the same time in any degree of subjection to the imperial state? In vain, my Lord, we recur to the Utopian archives, and search the visionary systems of the

the most refined speculators for such a solicitude in politics. Was Great Britain, respected throughout the western world as the strenuous supporter of the liberties, and the indefatigable extender of the interests of commerce, to inflict no punishment on an offence in its consequences as fatal to the interests of both countries, as it is subversive of every principle of commerce, and repugnant to every sentiment of justice? If France, Spain, or Portugal, had committed such an outrage, should we not have demanded immediate satisfaction? And on delay or refusal, should we not have declared immediate war?

Were we then to turn our cheek for another injury? Or, in the forcible language of a noble Lord, when we had received a blow from one hand, were we to shake hands with the other? Must not such a mistaken and extraordinary policy, though adopted only in America, have operated
D 2 upon

upon every part of the British empire, through the wide extent of the universe; to evince the insensibility of Great Britain to her interests, or her timidity in asserting them?—to encourage the infringement of her laws at home, and create a contempt of her power abroad.

As this offence in part proceeded from the peculiarly democratic form of their constitution, and the consequent weakness of their powers of government; the first object of parliament was to reform their constitution, after the model of the imperial state. It was also deemed proper, to inflict some temporary punishment on the town of Boston; until at least they should be so sensible of their offence, as to be willing to make satisfaction for it. And, thirdly, it appeared necessary to prevent the officers of government being sacrificed, for their obedience to acts of parliament, to the madness and injustice of those who denied the

the competency of parliamentary authority. With these views, three acts of parliament were passed; which your Lordship has described, as setting all justice and humanity at defiance, and thereby transferring their offence to us, and rendering us the aggressors.—I therefore take leave to submit a short state of them, accompanied by a few obvious remarks.

The first of them gives to the province of Massachusetts Bay the same system of civil polity, as that received by all the other provinces, whose governors are appointed under the great seal. Though a very inferior copy of the dignity of the imperial state, it receives by it the same constitution. Its legislative body, its executive officers, and its judicial magistrates, are by it directed to be appointed in the same manner as they are appointed here. If there is any difference, it is that their judges are removable by the crown, without making the

(22)

the interposition of parliament necessary. And whoever considers the inferiority of the judicial bodies of a new settled and dependent province, compared to those of the mistress of a mighty empire, and the little inducement that the crown can ever have to exercise this power, except for the benefit of the people, will see the expediency of this regulation. The same attention to the happiness of his subjects, which made the independency of our judgment-feat the first act of his reign, will influence our sovereign, to recommend the extension of the same benefit, to all the other parts of the empire, whenever their peculiar circumstances shall render it beneficial to them.

The second act, my Lord, suspends the trade of a port, in which the commerce of our subjects cannot be safely carried on, until it shall appear that the goods of British merchants may be safe there; and until satisfaction shall be made to the East-
India

(23)

India company, for the loss which it sustained.—The third act, in cases of indictments or prosecutions against officers of the crown, for things done in discharge of their duty, and in obedience to acts of parliament, where it shall be made to appear that an indifferent trial cannot be had, permits the governor, with the advice of the council, to remove the trial of it to another colony, or to an English county; the extraordinary expence whereof is to be defrayed by the crown. For it were a manifest injustice, and utterly abhorrent to the spirit of our criminal law, that people should be parties and juries in the same cause: and whatever reason your Lordship may have to distrust an English jury, we have seen several foreign causes lately tried at Guildhall, which afford evident proofs of their impartiality.

For my own part, my Lord, I can see neither injustice nor tyranny in these measures. To punish tumult and sedition, by
8 correcting

(24)

correcting the sources from whence they flow, and to convert their offences and evils into their own good, what is it but to endeavour, in the truest spirit of polity and benevolence, to melt down their unwilling hearts with benefits? Have they offended! She vindicates her injured authority by a punishment, which an hour's real repentance will do away; and shews by her willingness to forgive injuries, that the injury did not originate with her; adopting the benevolent sentiment of the Roman poet,—“*Pro peccato magno paulum supplicii satis est patri.*”

I need not trouble your Lordship with what has happened since; the facts are so recent that we all remember them. The rest of the province, and the other colonies of New England, have made themselves parties to the contest; and have taken some steps little short of actual rebellion. It is true, that the spirit of infatuation and error has

(25)

has not misled the whole province; there has been a party formed in support of government and order; and, as we have reason to believe, acquiring daily strength. This association was formed by brigadier Ruggles, a man who, having commanded in the last war the three regiments of Massachusetts's Bay, when on the peace his country no longer wanted his services, retired like Cincinnatus to the cultivation of his own farm; receiving no pension for that support of government, which he thought it the duty of every subject to afford. He is a man, my Lord, who reminds us of the virtues of ancient patriotism, as much as your Lordship renews the powers of ancient eloquence. And surely you do not censure them merely because they have united in support of government: whether they are governor Hutchinson's justices or no, is indifferent to the question, since they stand forth the friends of their country. But your assertion in this instance admits of a

E very

very singular contradiction; for, so far from having appointed six justices, governor Hutchinson never made even one at Marshfield, the town where you mention the association to have been formed.

Having premised thus much, let us now, my Lord, consider what is the mighty vengeance that the British eagle demands.

“ She does not bid the thunder-bearer shoot,
“ Nor tell tales of them to high judging Jove.”

She carries not an offensive war into their country, nor even exerts the common right of reprisals; but only withholds in part the continuance of her bounty, until her wishes are accomplished, in their return to obedience and pardon.—

I beg leave next to turn your Lordship's attention to the practicability of this measure; and on this, I need give you very little trouble. The same naval establishment, which has hitherto protected them
in

in the enjoyment of this fishery, will effectually exclude them from it: and therefore, we are the more happy to hear your Lordship confirm, what the experience of two centuries has taught us, that by sea we are irresistible; for to our navy is committed the execution of this act. Troops may be necessary in turbulent times, to secure the seats of government; and so are they now applied. But to march them through the wilds of America, was an idea totally new, when your Lordship offered it to the house: and it may be true, that an attempt to storm the woods and lakes of America, in defiance of the many species of enemies which we may meet there, would be an inadequate measure; though, when the last war called upon us to defend our American subjects, the bravery of our troops shewed it to be practicable.

It is not enough for your Lordship to say, that the Americans can return to the natural
E 2 tural

(28)

tural produce of their own lands, that they can relinquish the luxuries and conveniences of life, and forego the benefits of trade and commerce. I am free to say, that I do not believe they can; but the question is, whether they will: and, if probability may be an earnest of the event, I will venture to affirm that they will not. What, my Lord, when there has been an endeavour to shew, that they will be deprived of the necessaries of life, if denied the participation of our fishery, can we be persuaded that they will be able, so immediately, to create among themselves the comforts and conveniences of it? Or that they will obstinately preclude themselves from every thing, for which it is worth while to live, in order to diminish one of our sources of wealth?—The bitter spirit of Moloch was the only one, to whom the poet could ascribe a counsel of this nature, “which, if not victory, were
“yet revenge.”

Whatever

(29)

Whatever want of gratitude or of prudence some of them may have shewn, I cannot believe them capable of this excess of madness and folly. For if, in consequence of their own inveteracy, they should abandon the real profits, which in the course of trade they have derived from their fish, lumber, potash, corn, tobacco, rice, sugar, and indigo, to depend on their own internal resources, it would operate not only to the prejudice, but to the ruin of America: it would reduce her from that degree of wealth and strength, which under our protection and favour she has acquired, to a situation incapable of exciting jealousy in us, or envy in the rest of mankind. But however sanguine their hopes or expectations may be, they must have many serious reflections, whether a precarious and dubious independency be equivalent to the price at which they must purchase it; and whether it were not better to return to the good
old

old path, in which they have trod so long, and found it the way of pleasantness.

The novelty of their settlements which, to use the words of the Pennsylvanian farmer, are "thinly scattered over an immense region," and their inability to defend themselves by sea, will make them, for a century at least, incapable of existing, except under the protection of some powerful naval state. For this necessary defence and security, obedience and contributions will probably be required: while they can persuade any state to protect and defend them, without receiving contributions in return, they will act very wisely on their part; but if, unable to obtain this gratuitous protection, they purchase it at the price of submission and reimbursements, they will also act wisely.

If perverseness and disobedience should ever lead us to return injuries for injuries,

ries, the severest measure which we could adopt, would be to declare them independent of, and unconnected with us, and to abandon them a prey to internal factions and external invasions. On our part, perhaps it might be said, that we should suffer little real loss by such a measure; as we ought to regard our acquisitions there in the same light in which our merchants view their American debts,—nominally great, but really not worth the trouble of collecting. Yet, perhaps, how ever full the measure of their injuries might be, some traces of our old affection would remain, to prevent us from leaving them, perhaps under some future Alva, to experience the difference between subjection to a modulated and to an absolute government; when in the bitterness of their affliction they might hear, "the English chastised you with whips, but we will chastise you with scorpions."

Whenever their present state of demeritation shall allow them a few hours of calm reflection,

reflection, they must foresee this; and fear will operate where gratitude has failed in keeping them united to us: it will rest with us to determine, whether this union shall be continued on our terms or on theirs. And, my Lord, we must be cruel, only to be kind: neither justice nor mercy forbid the exercise of this power, while it is directed to our mutual good. We have received empire of our fathers; let us not be so supine, as like faithless guardians to yield it up, sooner than take the pains of transmitting it to posterity.—

Athens and Rome are now no more; and such is the condition of humanity, that whatever is human must perish. The fairest feats of science, the noblest monuments of art, have mouldered under the hand of time, and left nothing but a melancholy ruin to mark their situation. When the fatal revolution is completed, a period must be put to the grandeur of Britain; and that

that empire, which is unconfined by space, must be circumscribed by time. But, till then, my Lord, he merits best of his country, who, adopting the expiring wish of father Paul, does most to procrastinate the period of declension, and attempts to extend to ages the prosperity of the empire.

It was a maxim of the Romans, never to despair of the commonwealth;—a maxim that supported them in the greatest exigencies, and rendered the event fortunate: and I trust affairs are not yet so desperate, but, while we remain true to ourselves, an union of Englishmen will prevail against American intrigues on either side of the Atlantic. If we have suffered by our own dissensions, concord will soon do away the mischief, and leave us to adopt the Roman arts of empire;—“to fix the terms of their relation to us, to protect the dutiful, to subdue the rebellious.”

F We

(34)

We wish not that their imposts should lie like that heavy weight, which among us boweth down the neck of the poor. We are content that those victories, which have secured to them their property, should yield to us an heavy debt and duplicated taxes. But, my Lord, while we are kind to America, we should also be just to ourselves; and not draw all the supplies of their defence and government, from the sweat and labour of our home-born subjects. It were an hard reflection for the inhabitants of this island, that they are alone to support all the burdens of that empire, which either their valour has conquered or their wisdom extended. To be a Roman citizen, included an exemption from every tax, and the privilege of tyrannising in every province of the known world; and at a great price obtained they this freedom. Friends as we have ever been to civil liberty, we ask not that; we only

(35)

only demand, that every part of the empire may be subject to the same condition.

For it is against every principle of our constitution to enlarge the sphere of the executive power beyond that of the legislative. We cannot but see infinite danger to our liberties, in the extension of the authority of the crown to any part of the empire, where the parliament does not accompany it. My Lord, this is no visionary apprehension: Dr. Franklin, in his examination before the house of commons in 1766, gave it as his opinion, that the colonies can grant the King money against the advice and will of parliament.

The natural rights, which we receive from our Creator, we hold by a title common to all mankind. But those civil rights, the peculiar blessings whereof make us the envy and admiration of Europe, and that liberty, in defence whereof our fa-

thers have so often bled, are derived from the parliament alone; and by that body only can be preserved. To those therefore, who love their country, it must be a matter of the deepest concern, to see men affecting to despise the constitution handed down to us by our fathers, and attempting to weaken, diminish, and confine the jurisdiction of that body, on the preservation of whose privileges our civil liberties depend. For if this balancing power is once rendered light and ineffectual, it will be indifferent to us, whether the royal or democratic scale preponderates: the consequence will be tyranny, either immediate or through the medium of anarchy. We know not what the desire of novelty and the necessity of retrieving desperate affairs may incite some men to: but this we know, that if the authority of parliament is once broken, it is not tumult, and riot, and uproar,—it is not uncontrolled licence that will avail to secure our liberties.—Had

the Cardinal de Retz succeeded in his unwearied efforts to produce such a mediating power between the authority of the crown and the licence of the people, the French had at this hour been free.—My Lord, he failed,—and they are slaves.

This example will apply very strongly to the matter in question, when we consider the causes of his failure. The body which he attempted to erect into this medium, was the parliament of Paris; which parliament had the power of verifying or giving authority to edicts and taxes. It had most of the properties of a British parliament, but it moved in a smaller sphere: and while the executive power extended over the whole French empire, it was confined to the narrow district of Paris. There were other parliaments for other districts; and whatever security they might have afforded to the liberties of France, had they been united in one body, yet single and divided they

they had a most unequal contest with the crown.

The events of empires have happened for examples; they are written for our admonition, and happy shall we be, if we grow wise by the misfortunes of others. We should not forget, my Lord, that when Cæsar affected the tyranny of Rome, "his first step was, by means of the people, to break the power and authority of the senate; being aware," continues Lord Bacon, "that so long as that remained entire, there was no climbing to immoderate and unlawful sovereignty." The evidence of history tells us, that he succeeded in his attempt; that he destroyed the senatorial power, and thereby not only made them slaves, but confirmed them irretrievably so. Even at his death, Rome proved incapable of liberty; for the respect and authority of the senate was no more.—

Having

Having stated the moderation and practicability of this measure, and endeavoured to shew the equity of our settlements contributing to their own defence and protection, and the danger to the liberties of the empire in their emancipation from the jurisdiction of parliament, I find occasion to add very little on the necessity, or rather propriety, of the Bill in contemplation. But, my Lord, I cannot omit observing, that the third division of your subject fully explains to us why this measure, which bears on the face of it the characters of humanity and propriety, is cruel and tyrannical, declaratory of war against our American subjects, and a justification of America's resistance; and how their virtue, supported by the patrons of liberty here, will frustrate its execution.—The Bill is unnecessary and to be rejected; for a Bill, which the Earl of Chatham lately offered to the house, was rejected as inexpedient and unnecessary.

I will

(40)

I will not trouble your Lordship with any observations on the merits or demerits of the Bill which you referred to.—Peace be to its manes!—The policy of the last war, which expended fifty millions in the conquest of America in Germany, has been renewed in the late attempt to conquer the minister in America. But the eyes of Englishmen are now opened; they see, my Lord, that it is now high time, that the rights of Great Britain should be vindicated; and we hope and trust, that they shall yet be completely vindicated.

Your Lordship is therefore right, in premising the unpopularity of the cause, which opposes this Bill; for the annals of our nation do not afford an instance, wherein opposition has been so unpopular. From the nature of our constitution, the prejudices of the people incline to the side of the minority: they naturally consider them as their friends, and as friends who have sacrificed,

(41)

sacrificed, to the interests of their country, emoluments, honours, and power. But, my Lord, the people of England perceive, that there are men in the present opposition, who would sacrifice the dearest interests of their country, to a restless and disappointed ambition; and that, not content with opposing every measure here, they endeavour to add strength to the resistance of America, and make themselves a party in rebellion.

They, who look up with reverence to your Lordship as the ornament of your country, lament that so great a name, and so great abilities, should be profaned by even the appearance of support to such a cause: a cause which it is impossible you can wholly approve; and which, if we may judge by the conduct of an opposition which appears to be desperate, and whose measures seem hopeless, affords as little to expect from
G ambition

(42)

ambition as from fame. There was a time when the minority rested their pretensions to power and place, on the debate and decision of some popular question; and abided by the event. If they failed, they considered their own interest in the support of peace, order, and government; and did not attempt to raise tumult and sedition at home, and spread rebellion abroad:—they did not endeavour to undermine the foundations of the state, and mark that career with blood and carnage, which was to lead them to rule by the miseries of their country.

And, my Lord, speaking with the plain and single heart of an Englishman, when I see those who have taught the Americans to resist, make it the means of ministerial opposition; and triumph in the futile expectations of their renouncing our authority; I feel it through every vein. I cannot with such versatility transfer my affec-
tions

(43)

tions from my native country, to the rising western empire. If it is a weakness; it is a weakness in which I glory, and of which I hope no Englishman need be ashamed.

I do not wish to blame the Americans.—They know that they cannot so offend, but their return to their duty will ensure them forgiveness, and seal their pardon. There may be men of American property resident here, who are justified in supporting American opposition, against the government in which, and under whose protection they reside. But, my Lord, were this reasoning carried to its furthest extent, it would not authorize an Englishman, whose connections, rights, and obligations are all centered here, to annoy his country, and oppose its authority, as the means of embarrassing the minister. The hope of acquiring those honors in the troubles, which they despair of in the peace of their country,

(44)

try, were a poor excuse for endeavouring, like the strong man, to subvert the pillars of the constitution, in order that their enemies may be buried in the ruin.

F I N I S