

obedience and loyalty, which the Colonists owe to the *Kings* of Great-Britain. If it should be alledged, that this cannot be the meaning of the expression, because it is applied to the *kingdom*, and not to the *King*, I give the same answer that my Lord Bacon gave to those, who said that allegiance related to the *kingdom* and not to the *King*; because in the statutes there are these words: "born within the allegiance of *England*," and again, "born without the allegiance of *England*." "There is no trope of speech more familiar, says he, than to use the *place* of addition for the *person*. So we say commonly, the line of York, or the line of Lancaster, for the lines of the Duke of York, or the Duke of Lancaster. So we say the possessions of Somerset or Warwick, intending the possessions of the Dukes of Somerset, or Earls of Warwick. And in the very same manner, the statute speaks, allegiance of England, for allegiance of the King of England." *

DEPENDENCE of the Mother Country seems to have been understood in this sense, both by the first planters of the Colonies, and also by the most eminent Lawyers, at that time, in England.

THOSE who launched into the unknown deep, in quest of new countries and habitations, still considered themselves as subjects of the English Monarchs, and behaved suitably to that character; but it no where appears, that they still considered themselves as represented in an English Parliament, or that they thought the authority of the English Parliament extended over them. They took possession of the country in the *King's* name: They treated, or made war with the Indians by *his* authority: They held the lands under *his* grants, and paid *him* the rents reserved upon them: They established governments under the sanction of *his* prerogative, or by virtue of his charters. No application for those purposes was made to the Parliament: No ratification of

E the

* Bacon's argument in the case of the postnati of Scotland.