

bear a greater proportion of the sacrifice demanded by the prevailing ideal of a self-sufficient commercial Empire." G. L. Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*).

This distinction between the Empire as a whole and the separate parts of which it was composed is the justification of Chatham's otherwise untenable distinction between internal and external taxation. Logically, there can be no doubt that George Grenville and Lord Mansfield were right, and that the taxing power is simply part of the legislative power; that if the latter be admitted, the former follows. But there is a difference between local taxation for local objects, and Imperial regulation of Imperial trade. The question obviously arises, must not the body which legislates for the whole represent the whole? Is it fair that Imperial trade should be regulated by a body in which the colonies are unrepresented? From this also Pitt did not shrink. The idea of a great Pan-Britannic federation had evidently made a deep impression on his mind. Writing to his friend Lord Shelburne on Oct. 24, 1773, he says: "I hope government will have wisdom and humanity enough to choose the happy alternative, and to give to America a constitutional representative, rather than hazard an unjust and impracticable war." In the Chatham Papers are two schemes for the representation of the colonies in an Imperial parliament; the more important of these has been printed, with notes, by Mr. Basil Williams in the *English Historical Review* for October, 1907. The various colonies were to have about fifty members, elected not by direct vote, but by their local assemblies. The other scheme proposes fifty M.P.'s and ten peers for the Continental and West Indian colonies.

But Chatham further saw that such a representation was practicable only if England put her own house in order; he reversed the argument of his opponents; to say, as did Soame Jenyns, that because seven-eighths of the people of England were unrepresented in the House of Commons, therefore the colonies were as well represented as the great majority of the English people, was, as Chatham said, "frivolous"; to argue that if seven-eighths of the people of England were unrepresented, therefore the time was ripe for a change in the representation, was a perfectly sound argument; one which he emphasized for the balance of his life, and one which, given a