

inequality of representation, in our constitution of this day. Henry VIII. issued a writ to Camis, to send one burgess to parliament; and one of the counties palatine was taxed fifty years to subsidies, before it sent members to parliament.

‘The clergy at no time were unrepresented in parliament. When they taxed themselves in their assemblies, it was done with the concurrence and consent of parliament.

‘The reasoning about the colonies of Great Britain, drawn from the colonies of antiquity, is a mere useless display of learning; for it is well known the colonies of the Tyrians in Africa, and of the Greeks in Asia, were totally different from our system. No nation, before England, formed any regular system of colonization, but the Romans; and their colonial system was altogether military, by garrisons placed in the principal towns of the conquered provinces; and the jurisdiction of the principal country was absolute and unlimited.

‘The provinces of Holland were not colonies; but they were states subordinate to the House of Austria, in a feudal dependence. And, finally, nothing could be more different from the laws and customs of the English colonies, than that inundation of northern barbarians, who, at the fall of the Roman empire, invaded and occupied all Europe. Those emigrants renounced all laws, all protection, all connection with their mother countries; they chose their leaders, and marched under their banners, to seek their fortunes, and establish new kingdoms upon the ruins of the Roman empire.

‘On the contrary, the founders of the English colonies emigrated under the sanction of the king and parliament; their constitutions were modeled gradually into their present forms, respectively by charters, grants and statutes; but they were never separated from the mother country, or so emancipated as to become independent. and *sui juris*.

‘The commonwealth parliament were very early jealous of the colonies separating themselves from them; and passed a resolution or act, and it is a question whether it is not now in force, to declare and establish the authority of England over her colonies. But if there was no express law, or reason founded upon any necessary inference from an express law, yet the usage alone would be sufficient to support that authority; for, have not the colonies submitted, ever since their first establishment, to the jurisdiction of the mother country? Have they not even invoked it in many instances? In all questions of property, have not the appeals of the colonies been made to the privy council here? And have not these causes been determined, not by the law of the colonies, but by the law