

*liberty, property, Englishmen, &c.*" are in his opinion of no use but to "make strong impressions on the more numerous part of mankind who have ears but no understanding." The times have been when the favorite terms *places, pensions, French louis d'ors* and *English guineas*, have made very undue impressions on those who have had votes and voices, but neither honor nor conscience---who have deserved of their country an ax, a gibbet or a halter, much better than a star or garter. The grand aphorism of the British constitution, that "*no Englishman is or can be taxed but by his own consent in person or by his deputy*" is absurdly denied. In a *vain* and most *insolent* attempt to disprove this fundamental principle he exhibits a curious specimen of his talent at chicanery and quibbling. He says that "no man that he knows of is taxed by his own consent." It is a maxim at this day, that the crown by royal prerogative alone can levy no taxes on the subject. One who had any "understanding as well as ears" would from thence be led to conclude that some men must consent to their taxes before they can be imposed.