

dal tenures, where every man was a soldier, and yielded personal service. But in our situation money is undoubtedly the nerves of war, and it would be difficult, if not wholly impossible, to carry it on, for any long time, without it.

Your honours are of opinion, "that the sale of the back lands will be a resource to prosecute the war, even if internal loans should not supply the deficiency of taxes." We are of the same opinion. And from this very circumstance is overthrown your honours reasoning with regard to the property in question, for if it will prove any thing it will prove too much, and the back lands cannot be confiscated. If they belong to the native Indians, your honours will say, that though they have made war against us, yet their property cannot be confiscated, for Vattel, a late and celebrated writer on the law of nations, has shewn, "that the rigour of that law is much softened in this very point, by present usage and practice." If they belong to the crown of Great-Britain, as trustee for the nation, as we conceive, and will be called British property, the congress, should they adopt the same way of thinking with your honours, will not be willing to confiscate it, as it may be made a preliminary article of the peace, "that it be secured, or at least the full value of it, to the original owners." Nay, if they should not adopt the sentiments of your honours, but be willing to confiscate it, yet will there not be danger, in the opinion of your honours, that as in the mean time the "title must be doubtful, and the purchase invidious," engrossers and speculators will buy it up, and depreciate the currency still more? For, as your honours would suppose, the more readily money will buy land, the more evidently it is depreciated. But it lies upon your honours, who have