

his position in the House, he was most imperfectly heard in the gallery.

Sir C. WETHERELL said that the attention of the House was now called to a subject as important as any which had come under its discussion. The opinion of Mr. Burke had been quoted to show that he was unfavourable to the colonists having direct representatives in that house. A more able man, one with more information, and a greater desire to benefit his country, could not be found. Now what did Mr. Burke in effect state? Why, according to the abstract principle upon which the House of Commons was then constituted, the colonies ought to have representatives, but practically he felt it a great difficulty to overcome. But Mr. Burke was speaking of the existing Constitution of the Country—[Hear, hear.] And if the Constitution was to be torn up in the way the Bill contemplated, the difficulty in having representatives for the colonies under the new Constitution was not insuperable—[Hear, hear.] Mr. Burke's objection was, because it was contrary to existing things, *rebus extantibus*. But there was no longer any thing in such an objection, because the Bill had removed the cause of it. What was done with the colonies, he begged to enquire? Were they not taxed? Certainly not in the same way that the House of Commons had attempted to tax America. Nevertheless he would contend that the colonies were subject to a taxation. The trade was regulated, the import and export duties were imposed by the Legislature. It might not be pleasant to awaken a reminiscence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, otherwise he would ask the Noble Lord what was the regulation of duty on American timber and Cape wine, but a species of taxation on the colonies?—[Hear, and a laugh.] This country, it could not be denied, internal and external, directly and indirectly, did levy monies on the colonies. When there was about to be a reduction of thirty-three members of that House—for which, by-the-bye, the noble Lord had given no satisfactory rea-