

“ being made entirely subject to the crown ;” that this subjection should be absolute, and confined to the crown, he had better have suppressed his wishes. This never will nor can be done, without making the colonists vassals of the crown. Subjects they are ; their lands they hold of the crown, by common soccage, the freest feudal tenure, by which any hold their lands in England, or any where else. Would these gentlemen carry us back to the state of the Goths and Vandals, and revive all the military tenures and bondage which our fore fathers could not bear ? It may be worth noting here, that few if any instances can be given, where colonies have been disposed to forsake or disobey a tender mother : But history is full of examples, that armies stationed as guards over provinces, have seized the prey for their general, and given him a crown at the expence of his master. Are all ambitious generals dead ? Will no more rise up hereafter ? The danger of a standing army in remote provinces is much greater to the metropolis, than at home. Rome found the truth of this assertion, in her Sylla’s, her Pompey’s and Cæsars ; but she found it too late : Eighteen hundred years have roll’d away since her ruin. A continuation of the same liberties that have been enjoyed by the colonists since the revolution, and the same moderation of government exercised towards them, will bind them in perpetual lawful and willing subjection, obedience and love to Great-Britain : She and her colonies will both prosper and flourish : The monarchy will remain in sound health and full vigor at that blessed period, when the proud arbitrary tyrants of the continent shall either unite in the deliverance of the human race, or resign their crowns. Rescued, human nature must and will be, from the general slavery that has so long triumphed over the species. Great-Britain has done much towards it : What a Glory will it be for her to complete the work throughout the world.

The author of the administration (page 54) “ describes” the defects of the “ provincial courts,” by a “ very description,” the first trait of which is, “ The ignorance of the judges.” Whether the description, or the description of the description, are *verily* true, either as applied by Lord Hale, or the Administrator, is left to the reader. I only ask, who makes the judges in the provinces ? I know of but two colonies, viz. Connecticut

and Rhode-Island, where they are chosen by the people. In all other colonies, they are either immediately appointed by the crown, or by his Majesty’s governor, with the advice of what the administrator calls, the “ governor’s council of state.” And if they are in general such ignorant creatures, as the Administrator describes them, ’tis the misfortune, not the fault, of the people, in the colonies. However, I believe, justice in general is as well administered in the colonies, as it will be when every thing is devolved upon a court of admiralty, general or provincial. The following is very remarkable. “ In those popular governments, and where every executive officer is under a dependence for a temporary, wretched, and I had almost said arbitrary support, on the deputies of the people,”

Why is the temporary support found fault with ? Would it be wise to give a governor a salary for a longer time than his political life ? As this is quite as uncertain as his natural life, it has been granted annually. So every governor has the chance of one year’s salary after he is dead. All the King’s officers are not even in the charter provinces “ dependent on the people” for support. The judges of the admiralty, those mirrors of justice, to be trusted, when none of the common law courts are, have all their commissions from home. These, besides other fees, have so much per cent. on all they condemn, be it right or wrong, and *this by act of parliament*. Yet so great is their integrity, that it never was suspected that 50 per cent. if allowed, would have any influence on their decrees.

Custom-house officers universally, and Naval-officers, in all but two or three of the colonies, are, I believe, appointed directly from home, or by instruction to the Governor ; and take just what they please, for any restraint they are under by the provincial Acts. But on whom should a Governor depend for his honourable support, but the people ? Is not the King fed from the field, and from the labour of his people ? Does not his Majesty himself receive his aids from the free grant of his parliament ? Do not all these originate in the house of commons ? Did the house of Lords ever originate a grant ? Do not our law books inform us that the Lords only assent or dissent, but never so much as propose an amendment, on a money bill ? The King can take no more than the parliament will give him,