

distinguished writers conceived, that the right of Parliament to tax the *unrepresented* part of England, stands exactly on the same footing with their right to tax America. I conceive, on the contrary, that I have sufficiently explained the important distinction there is between the two cases; a distinction to which a proper attention has not been given, and which constitutes, in my apprehension, the true and essential merits of this great question.

“and prejudicial to their quietude and peace; this country would, I am persuaded, have no objection to their being represented in our Parliament.”

“But the Colonies, though that circumstance is only intimated in the declaration, have uniformly asserted, that granting the representation of persons, is not extend over the whole empire, yet that they themselves have a right to an exemption from taxes, either by the concessions of the Legislature, or by charter from the King. It is not incompatible with reason, say they, that the Colonies should have for a limitation of their own, possessing the authority of taxation, and that notwithstanding the British Parliament should retain its power of taxing capitals. The first of these assertions is not founded in truth, and the charges are not given, nor can they be sustained from taxation.”

It is unnecessary to say that the objection of the great questionable point is in itself of no weight. They are only here made to show, that the