

POINTS IN AMERICAN HISTORY.

THE BOSTON TEA PARTY.

No chapter of the world's history do we read of any nation escaping unscathed from an attempt to enrich or reimburse itself by the arbitrary taxation of a dependency. And indeed, in the last century, England herself was taught a very severe lesson, and paid the penalty with the loss of the American colonies. She claimed the right as mother-country, to levy both internal and external taxes upon the young and struggling colonies.

The result is well known. After a few years of fruitless remonstrance and patient endurance the American settlers broke the ties of filial love : and in the words of Daniel Webster "poured out their blood and their treasures like water in a contest in opposition to an assertion, which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words."

The term "arbitrary taxation" has been used in the opening lines, and it is this very term from which sprang the little sapling that afterwards grew into the vigorous oak of the Revolution. The colonists saw in it a "seminal principle of mischief, the germ of an unjust power," because by it the English Parliament asserted an absolute and undeniable right to tax the colonies in all things, without allowing them to have American representatives in the English halls of state. This was manifestly unjust, illogical, and illegal. What right had England to levy imposts upon the colonies, without allowing them to have a voice in those matters? What right had England to quarter troops upon the colonists in time of peace? What right had England to restrict the foreign trade of the colonies to herself? No right at all.

Some may maintain that a mother has absolute control over her offspring ; therefore England as mother had full control over the American colonies, her children. But any mother who would so ill-treat her offspring as England did America, should lose that sweetest, most venerable of all titles--mother. Or again this argument may be brought forward viz : During the recent war with France, the armies of England had saved the colonies from the power of the French. But history tells us that it was due mainly to the valiant and untiring efforts of the raw American troops that the flag of England was saved from being trailed through the dust in defeat and dishonor. Besides the colonies paid towards the war-debt the sum of \$16,000,000, of which but \$5,000,000 was ever repaid them by England. To meet this demand upon their resources the colonies issued much paper money, which depreciated greatly in value, and at the conclusion of the treaty of peace the colonies were depressed and exhausted.

The idea of English statesmen that the union of America to Great Britain would be strengthened by a cement of arbitrary taxation, seems to be very strange, "a strange infatuation," and stranger still does it appear since it came from men who boasted that an attempt to deprive them of the liberties granted by King John had cost one ruler his head, and another his throne. Indeed a nobleman arose in the House of Lords and asserted that England had tenderly nourished America. To this startling statement Pitt made a brief but caustic reply when he said "if a child asks bread of its mother, does she give it a stone?" This reply is an exact word picture of the relations between England and America. The Englishman in America asked