Dc- of the British Parliament; but that the Parliament should never before the Sub- ate Stamp-Act, in one Instance, have imposed an internal Tax upon the Colonies for the single Purpose of Revenue, and that, even when Acts of Assimed sembly passed in Consequence of Ministerial inforced by Royal Requisitions ty of shave been laid before Them, They should be so far from objecting to their t this Validity, as actually to recognize the Authority of the Provincial Legislatures, and upon that Foundation superstruct their own Resolves and Acs.

But the' it hath been admitted, that the Stamp-Act is the first Statute that hath imposed an internal Tax upon the Colonies for the single Purpose of Revenue, yet the Advocates for that Law contend, that there are many Instances of the Parliament's exercising a supreme legislative Authority over the Colonies, and actually imposing internal Taxes upon their Properties—that the Duties upon any Exports or Imports are internal Taxes-That an Impost on a foreign Commodity is as much an internal Tax, as a Duty upon any Production of the Plantations-That no Distinction can be supported between one Kind of Tax and another, an Authority to impose the one extending to the other.

If these Things are really as represented by the Advocates for the Stamp Act, why did \* the Chancellor of the Exchequer make it a Question for the Consideration of the House of Commons, whether the Parliament could impose an internal Tax in the Colonies or not, for the single Purpose of Revenue?

I have presumed to mention this Fact upon the Authority of private Intelligence, as well as of the News Papers, and other Publications, and tho' the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not named, yet the Fact seems in general to be referred to in the Postscript to the excellent Letter concerning Libels, Warrants, Seizure of Papers, and Security of the Peace, &c. in the following Words: " Otherwise (i. e. if it " were not right for the Parliament to resolve general Warrants to be illegal) let " me ask how that momentous Resolution touching an English Parliament's Right of " taxing the Colonies could be justify'd? It was an independent substantive Reso-" lution, followed by Nothing, (i. e. that Seffion) and yet was a Resolution not " only of extreme Magnitude, but of the most general and bigbest legal Nature, in-" volving in it a Decision of the first and most fundamental Principles of Liberty, " Property, and Government, and well worthy also, as to the temporary Policy of it, "the most ferious of all Consideration. This was resolved too if I am informed " right, at the Close of the Night, and the Rising of the House; so that every " Body must have taken it as a clear Thing, that They could at any Time come to " a Resolution upon any general Point of Law, whenever They should see it expe-" dient so to do, sed Verbum sapienti sat est."

listent nonly ent to n fuffingle

ority of

dupt the

e Co- j

t, nor

ı De-

which

volu-

ers of

y now

neant

hould

were Sen-

r fuc-

Ideas

embers

fame

atives

Help

Bill of

free;

ed to

is to

Ne-

Com-

s the

Co-