

takes, as an equivalent for the current expences that are made in carrying on the war."

We are inclined to think the authorities cited will convince our people of the right they have to seize and confiscate British property in their power.

The policy of the measure depends on opinion. We think it impolitic to load our constituents with taxes, and convinced that they cannot pay what is really necessary to carry on the war, without selling part of their property to raise the money, we thought sound policy dictated the propriety of first selling the property of our enemies.

We must now beg leave so far to intrude on your honours time and patience, as to make a few strictures on your arguments, or rather objections to the bill. Permit us to discuss them with that temper and disposition their importance and weight may require.

It is made an argument by your honours against the confiscation of British property, "that it may be made a preliminary article of the peace, that it be secured to the present (or, as we would rather say, original) owners." It has been an argument with other states, and it is also an argument with us, why it should be confiscated, that it may not be in the power of the enemy to make it a preliminary article; for while it remains in its present state, it is possible that it may be given up, but when confiscated and applied, it would be evident that it is impossible. Other states have made it impossible with regard to them; and shall this state leave it possible with regard to her alone? If the giving up this property would purchase peace, shall we alone be at the expence to purchase it? Nay, by her hesitation to confiscate this property, will she alone be the means of continuing the war? For your honours must be sensible, that a
want

Message in — *the*