

advantage which they originally expected to receive, and which was contracted for in their stipulation with the Crown, and they can have no just reason to complain on this account. Yet notwithstanding all this, they have been lately told by their agents, who had it from the best authority, that if they chose to send over persons to represent them in Parliament, they should be admitted to seats in the House. In my opinion, they have done wisely in not accepting of the offer; but after refusing it, they have surely no reason to complain, that they have no representatives in the Parliament that must govern them.

It has been frequently asserted, in justification of your claim, that, “ as the charters granted by the
“ Crown, have allowed a legislative authority to the
“ several Colonies, the inhabitants are to be bound
“ by no laws, but what are made by their respective
“ provincial legislatures, to which they consent by
“ representation.” With regard to this doctrine, I beg leave only to ask a few questions. Can you be made to believe, that it was ever the intention of the Crown, to establish by charter a power of legislation, in any of the Colonies, that is sovereign, independent, and incontrollable by the supreme authority of the nation? Can you imagine, that in any instance, more than a *subordinate* right of jurisdiction was meant, for the internal regulation of the district mentioned in the charter; or conceive that such a grant can place you beyond the reach of parliamentary authority? Would not the arguments that perhaps have deceived you, prove as strongly, that the charter of the city of *Albany*, granting a power to make laws for its internal regulation, *provided they are not contrary to the laws of the Province*, places the inhabitants of that city beyond the reach of laws made by the assembly of *New-York*?
You,