Bond (H. L.) Dunn M.D.

AN ADDRESS

with the respects of
The Author.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

NEW ENGLAND SOCIETY

OF PHILADELPHIA;

AT ITS

SEMIANNUAL MEETING,

IN MAY, 1824.

BY HENRY BOND, M. D.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST AND BY THE DIRECTION OF THE SOCIETY.

1824.

ADDRESS.

Being called to address an assemblage of those, who are natives of the same region, educated in similar principles and institutions, and here associated under a name, that reminds us of whatever was dear and joyous in our childhood and youth, I feel that nothing would be appropriate to the present occasion, which should be foreign to New England, the place of our nativity, and where rest the ashes of our fathers for many generations.

Why do we feel a stronger throb or a warmer glow in our bosoms at the enunciation of the name of New England? Can we assign no better reason than that filial reverence and attachment, which often blinds one to a parent's imperfections; or that instinctive feeling, which binds men to whatever may have been the place of their nativity, or the scenes of their childhood? Is it because the Creator has adorned it with so many scenes of beauty and sublimity, to which the ingenuity of man has added so many of the conveniencies and so much of the elegance of civilized life? These circumstances alone would give her no preeminence over much of the civilized world. She might even possess

such advantages, but yet connected with circumstances of a character, that would make us ashamed to own we were her sons. But there *are* reasons why we may both love her and boast of her, were her climate as inclement as Labrador, and her scenery as dreary as the plains of Africa. It is of those men, who have been styled the fathers of New England, and whom we claim as our ancestors, that we may boast; and that man, who can read their history, and not feel an emotion of pride and delight, that he is their descendant, must be base and degenerate. He, who would blush to own as his ancestors those apostles of liberty without licentiousness, and religion without priestcraft, would be ashamed to claim Cato or Aristides for a father, or the Apostles for brethren. The veneration, the respect and pride, which those men ought to inspire in us, are not founded on wealth or heraldick titles, but upon their principles, their habits, and the institutions, which they established and transmitted to their posterity.

The grand object of the first settlers of New England was the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and no founders of a colony ever understood better the means necessary for securing that object to themselves and their posterity. They knew that ignorance and licentiousness had ever been the bane of free institutions, and they sought by all the means in their power to exclude them from their community. They not only saw that intelligence is the life of liberty, but that morality is necessary to its health; that without the one liberty would not exist, and without the other its existence would be sickly and transient. How far they

were successful in conceiving and adopting their measures, let the world learn in the moral, intellectual, and political condition of their descendants.

New England has often been charged with bigotry and intolerance, on account of the strictness of her religious discipline. But, even if we overlook the great difference in the ideas of toleration of the present day, and those which prevailed two centuries ago, the policy which they pursued may be excused, if not justified. The first settlers were republicans in religion and politics; and the enjoyment of their sentiments was the chief inducement for them to make the sacrifices, and to encounter the hardships, privations and dangers, necessarily presented in establishing such a colony. They assumed and acted on the incontrovertible principle, that *the majority of the people have a right to rule;* and it was their wish that their colony might be the home and refuge of people of congenial sentiments. And as they neither compelled nor desired any to join them, who would not concur in the government, which they had freely chosen and adopted, and who would not consent to have the majority rule, no door of complaint was left open. To those who should complain of their policy, they might say, 'A wide continent lies before you. There are other colonies more monarchical in their politics and less puritanical in their morals and religion—go to them; or do as we have done, open the forest for yourselves. Our government and religion are those of our choice, not imposed upon us by royal despots or lordly prelates. We have planted ourselves—we govern ourselves—we have hitherto protected ourselves, and we impose no burdens on

others, which we have not voluntarily assumed ? Had not the puritans adopted the policy, which they did pursue, and which has often been branded with odious epithets, they would have been thronged with emigrants of the same idle, dissolute habits which populated some of the southern colonies,—cargoes of convicts from the London prisons might have been thrown upon them; the church of England established by law to the exclusion of others, as was done in Virginia; and in a short time they would have found themselves subjected to all the grievances for which, they had abandoned their native land, and for which they had encountered such incredible dangers and hardships. Their colony would no longer have been the refuge of the devout inflexible republicans of England. It would have ceased to be "the land of steady habits." Their colleges and schools, those lights which had already been kindled, and which now shine thick as stars in the milky-way, would have dwindled into non-existence, or become as devoid of general illuminative influence, as were most of those of the other colonies.

The literary institutions of New England are her pride. Well may she boast of the great and continually increasing facilities, which she presents for the acquisition of a liberal education. Her colleges are monuments of the liberal spirit and enlightened policy, which characterised the pilgrims; and the affection and liberality with which they have to this hour been fostered, show that the descendants have not, in this respect, acted unworthily of such progenitors.

But what chiefly distinguishes the land of the pilgrims is her elementary schools, scattered through

every valley and upon every mountain. Who has ever known a child there so poor, or in a situation so secluded, that instruction might not be obtained within a distance, that would hardly fatigue a child from the cradle? Go to the tops of the Green Mountains, or into the valleys among the White Hills; go into the remotest settlements in the forests of Maine, or among the poor fishermen, who have perched their habitations on the barren rocks and islands on her sea-coast, and where will you find the child, that can not point to what he will call *our* district school-house? The system, which gives education such a *universal* diffusion, greatly distinguishes New England from the rest of the world. For except where her sons have gone and propagated the principles, upon which it is founded, it is almost unknown even in the United States. In these schools the wealthy and indigent are placed upon equality; and the only things in them which will give distinction, are moral excellence and intellectual power and cultivation. To these may be traced that spirit of enterprise, which has so long characterized the sons of the pilgrims.* Those institutions and that

* The number of *district schools*, (with nearly an equal number of school houses) in New England, supported at the public expense, is not less than *eight thousand*, and probably amounts at this time to nearly *ten thousand*. It is calculated that there are also every winter not less than *ten or twelve hundred* schools for vocal sacred music. There are likewise *several hundred* public and private *grammar schools and academies*, many of which havebeen liberally endowed by legislative grants or by private munificence. Besides two or three collegiate institutions in an incipient state, with pretty liberal endowments, there are *eight colleges and universities*, in which there are about *twelve hundred under-graduates*. Medical schools are attached to several of these institutions, at which about *three hundrad* medical students, besides some academical under-graduates, attend lectures annually. Besides the theological departments in several of the colleges, and two or more theolo-

intelligence and enterprise have not sprung up suddenly under the magic influence of some Alfred or Augustus, who could command the whole resources of the nation. They originated in the genius or good sense of those men who founded New England, and from whom is derived that spirit, which has nurtured those plants of freedom and intelligence into their present luxuriant growth.

To every son of New England who loves his native land, it would be delightful to examine and exhibit the influence she has exercised in advancing a few feeble colonies to a mighty empire—to observe what she has contributed, whether in literature, arts, or arms, to adorn America with that crown which now encircles her brow. But neither my time nor the occasion allow me even to glance over a field so extensive. Let me, therefore, call your attention to the question, *Where did the American revolution originate?*

gical schools recently organized, there is the Theological Seminary at Andover, which surpasses every other monument of private liberality in the United States. One gentleman has expended upon it about *two hundred thousand dollars;* another has bestowed not less than *seventy-five thousand dollars;* and another *thirty-five thousand dollars;* from one family it has received not less than *forty thousand dollars*, besides some princely donations from other individuals.

In Boston, a thousand dollars or more for every thousand inhabitants, are annually expended in public schools. There are few country towns or villages, where there is not a *Social Library*. These are not peculiar to New England, but they are no where else so common. The number is not known, but it undoubtedly amounts to several hundred. Besides these, the libraries in the colleges and academies contain above *seventy-five thousand volumes.* In the foregoing are not included the Athenæums in some of the large towns, the Historical and Antiquarian Societies, and the American and Connecticut Academies, whose libraries contain above *thirty thousand volumes.* New England, with a population of about seventeen hundred thousand, may challenge the world to produce a parallel.

I attempt its solution, not with the view either to excite or indulge sectional prejudices, not to strike a feeble note of discord in our happy Union, but to do justice to our ancestors; and if we shrink from the task as invidious, if we sit in timid silence, while we see their glory despoiled of its chief effulgence, we are unworthy of our Bunker-hill fathers, we never inhaled a breath of the bold spirit of Faneuil-Hall, and their glory has become our shame.

An attempt has recently been made by an eloquent and fascinating writer to convince the world, that American independence originated in the "ancient dominion,"—that Patrick Henry "gave the first impulse to the ball of the revolution,"—that a fire was kindled by him in Virginia, which spread until it extended over the whole colonies. Perhaps it will appear in the sequel, that these high pretensions are both unsubstantial and unjust.

It must have been evident to every man of political foresight, who watched the rapid advances of the British North American colonies in every thing which fitted them to become an independent nation, and who especially observed the hardihood, the enterprise and bold republicanism of New England, that they were not destined to be forever the colonies of Great Britain. It was impossible to effect such a revolution, unless the people had been prepared for it; for the colonies were not to dissolve their allegiance to the mother country as easily as the ripe fruit drops from its branch. It was to be accomplished by an effort of every noble power with which God has endowed human nature. It is not difficult for a leader, possessing eloquence and

popularity, to induce his followers to embark in a revolution; but unless they be sufficiently intelligent to comprehend, and sufficiently interested to feel, the importance of the cause in which they engage; if it be one upon which they have never ruminated, nor even cast their eyes, until it was presented to them by their leader for immediate espousal, their enterprise will prove to be only a gust of popular phrensy, and probably terminate in their shame and degradation.

New England had been, from its first settlement, preparing for the revolution, and the character of the settlers and all their policy and institutions pointed to such an event.

It has been erroneously stated by judge Marshall, that the congregation, which went to Leyden with the Rev. Mr. Robinson, and which afterwards founded the Plymouth colony, were of that rigid class of separatists called Brownists. But this is so far from being correct, that the Brownists, whose chief seat was Amsterdam, would hardly hold communion with them; and Baylie, who was no friend to either party of the puritans, asserts that Mr. Robinson was the principal overthrower of the Brownists, and the author of Independency. The Independents who settled New England, and who were sometimes called Semiseparatists, to distinguish them from the Brownists, dissented from the church of England, not on account of a difference of opinion as to faith and the sacraments; for they believed the doctrinal articles of that church, and of the other reformed churches, to be agreeable to the holy scriptures. Their dissension from the church of England was therefore grounded on matters purely eccle-

siastical. They desired the church to be purified from all those *inventions*, which had been brought into it since the days of the apostles, and restored entirely to *scripture purity*. The whole object and tendency of the inventions, of which they complained, obviously were to aggrandize the clergy, and to deprive the laity, as they were contemptuously called, of those rights, which God had given them as men and as christians.

With the Independents in their ecclesiastical inquiries, the first question was, what do the *scriptures teach* on this point? for their grand first principle was, that *the inspired scriptures* ONLY contain the true religion. The next question was, what does *reason* teach? for they maintained it as the right of human nature, as the basis of the reformation, and indeed of all sincere religion, that every man has a right of judging for himself, of trying doctrines by the scriptures, and of worshipping according to his apprehension of the meaning of them. They also maintained the right to choose their own ecclesiastical officers, and that, when ordained, they have no lordly, arbitrary, nor imposing power; but can only rule and minister, with the consent of the brethren, who ought not in contempt to be called the laity, but to be treated as men and brethren in Christ, and not as slaves and minors. That no churches nor officers whatever have any power over any other church or officers, to control or impose upon them; but that all are equal in their rights and privileges, and ought to be independent in the exercise and enjoyment of them.*

No people ever loved or revered their clergy more than the pilgrims; but it was as the pastors of their flocks. For that love and that reverence subsisted no

* See Prince's New England Chronology, Part II. Sect. 1.

longer than they sustained a character consistent with the holy office. A hierarchy was their utter aversion, not only as anti-republican, but as unscriptural, and contrary to the spirit of the gospel. Those who know any thing of their history must know, that these liberal principles did not spring from an impatience of moral restraints. They were derived from a careful and conscientious examination of their duties, rights and privileges, both civil and religious; and they manifested a noble freedom of thinking in religious matters, which was astonishing in an age of such low and universal bigotry as then prevailed in the English nation.

It was impossible for men who, in ecclesiastical affairs, were capable of soaring so far above the mass of bigotry with which they were surrounded, to feel or reason like slaves about their civil rights. New England being thus peopled by men who understood and appreciated their rights, and being left a long time to self-government, had acquired a love of freedom and independence, which England was never after able to extinguish. Whenever the exercise of arbitrary power became intolerable to the puritans and republicans; when, in the language of the author of Waverley, England was driving from her bosom her dearest friends, as the drunkard flings treasures from his lap, they fled to New England, the refuge of the oppressed and the abode of freemen. Thus her population came to be composed of the resolute supporters of civil liberty and popular rights—of those men, to whom the English, as Hume says, owe the whole freedom of *their* constitution. Her clergy were Oxford and Cambridge scholars, who, from a regard for religious liberty and pure

consciences, would rather retire into a wilderness, preaching and labouring with their hands to obtain a coarse and scanty subsistence, than retain easy livings in the church of England by conforming to what they believed to be inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel.

In all the contests between the king and parliament about prerogatives and privileges, New England invariably favoured the latter. She was always consistent in her republicanism. She did not shout one day, *vive le roi*, and the next, *vive la republique*, and the third, *vive l'empereur*. Being puritanical in her religion and republican in her politics, all her affections were engaged in favour of the popular party in England in the time of the commonwealth. When Charles II. was restored, it was announced in New England with none of the demonstrations of a joyful event; and in their address to the king professing their loyalty to the crown, they sacrificed no opinion concerning their rights, and justified their whole conduct. When James II. demanded the surrender of the charters of New England, and a writ was about to be issued to take them away or to cancel them, the people refused to give them up. The decision throughout Massachusetts was, 'It is better to die by the hand of another than our own; we will not, by surrendering our charter, acknowledge the right to demand it.'

No colonies were ever more prompt than the New Englanders, in cooperating with the mother country, either by expending their treasures, or by encountering dangers and hardships in the most perilous warfare, so long as their rights were respected. This is abundantly manifested by the alacrity with which she

cooperated with England in her wars with France. Of their rights and liberties they were ever more jealous, than of their treasures or blood. When the former were threatened or invaded, either in principle or practice, such a spirit was immediately evinced as we might expect in a people, in whose veins flowed the warmest, truest republican blood of the most republican days of Old England.

About 1720 a contest arose between the house of representatives of Massachusetts and the governor respecting his salary. He had instructions from the crown to require a salary to be *permanently fixed* for the governor of the colony. The house took the ground, that a compliance with the requisition would render that officer independent of the legislature. The people maintained the contest on this question for ten years, in opposition to three governors in succession. Notwithstanding every means was taken to subdue the people—sometimes by changing the seat of the legislature, at others by stopping the pay of the members; sometimes by dissolving that body hastily, in order to make way for a new election, at others by refusing to dissolve or prorogue it, when there was no business to occupy it—they persevered and triumphed. They did not contend a moment about the *amount* of the salary, but concerning the *principle*, whether they should, by complying with this requisition, render a royal governor independent. Judge Marshall says, this contest "shows in genuine colours the character of the people engaged in it. It is," says he, "an early and honourable display of the same persevering temper in the defence of principles believed to be right, of the same un-

conquerable spirit of liberty, which at a later day, on a more important occasion, tore the then British colonies on this continent from a country, to which until then they had been strongly attached."

These circumstances show that New England, from her very inception, contained the elements of freedom and independence, and was prepared to assert them, as soon as she should acquire strength to maintain them. England very early, even ages before the days of Patrick Henry, manifested a jealousy of her independent spirit, and was ever suspicious of the least indication of a wavering allegiance.

Virginia, for whom Mr. Wirt claims the honour of having originated the revolution, was, until that period, in almost every respect the reverse of New England. She was planted and supported by the Virginia Company, and in her infancy was governed in a very arbitrary manner. The whole legislative and executive powers were vested in a governor and council appointed by the crown, who were empowered, without the intervention of the representatives of the people, to make laws and execute them—to levy taxes and enforce the payment of them—to transport colonists to England, to be tried and punished there for crimes committed in Virginia. Added to all this, the crown exacted the monopoly of their staple article, tobacco. This system the Virginians endured without resistance for many years, until governor Harvey was sent over, who conducted in so tyrannical a manner, that oppression at length aroused them. But even then it does not appear that they found fault with the principles or arbitrary form of their government, but with its bad administration.

The voice of New England was, 'Let us govern ourselves, while we remain faithful in our allegiance to the crown, and contravene neither the laws nor constitution of England. We ask no protection—state the sum you demand, and you shall have it, but we will raise it in our own way. We will not be taxed contrary to the constitution of England.

The assembly of Virginia not only disavowed a petition sent in their name, praying for the restoration of their ancient patents, and corporate government, but sent an address to the king, expressing their high sense of his bounty and favour towards them, and *earnestly desiring to continue under his immediate protection;* that is, to be governed by crown officers.

I have already indicated the spirit, which pervaded the ecclesiastical affairs of New England. The people were as much opposed to having their consciences lorded over by a hierarchy, as to holding their persons and property at the will of a despot. In Virginia the church of England was established by law, and provision made for the clergy by the crown, and *no others were allowed to preach publicly or privately.* Why is the strict discipline of New England so frequently made a theme of reproach, and almost never a word said of the intolerance of Virginia, where no religion was tolerated except the church of England, where the clergy must be ordained by a bishop in England, inducted into office by a royal governor, and remain independent of the people?

The New England pilgrims were characterized by their scrupulous regard to the religion, which they believed to be revealed in the sacred scriptures; by their

careful attention to the education of the rising generation, both as to their learning and morals; by their sober industrious habits; by their persevering temper and enterprising spirit, and by a sagacity which her enemies, whether savage or civilized, seldom or never found asleep. On the other hand, observe what a character the historian of Virginia gives of the emigrants who flocked thither after the first permanent settlement in 1609. "A great part of the new company," says Stith, "consisted of unruly sparks, packed off by their friends to avoid worse destinies at home. And the rest were chiefly made up of poor gentlemen, broken tradesmen, rakes and libertines, footmen and such others as were much fitter to spoil and ruin a commonwealth, than to help to raise or maintain one. This lewd company, therefore, were led by their seditious captains into many mischiefs and extravagancies. They assumed to themselves the power of disposing of the government, and conferred it on one, sometimes on another. To-day the old commission must rule, to-morrow the new, and next day neither; so that all," says this historian, "was anarchy and confusion." Not many years after this, the crown directed the Virginia company to transport to their colony cargoes of convicts—those idle and profligate persons, with which the English prisons were in those days crowded. It was about the same time, and probably in consequence of the dissolute character and idle habits of the people, that *negro slavery*—the bane and disgrace of our republic—was first introduced into that colony and into English America.

As New England was the asylum of republicans and

puritans, and of all who became obnoxious to the crown by advocating popular rights and civil liberty; so Virginia was the favourite colony of the arbitrary and licentious Charleses and Jameses; and during the commonwealth became the asylum of the cavaliers and all the advocates of prelacy and despotic power. Emigrants of such different characters and principles, being distributed and embodied into separate communities according to those differences, would necessarily exhibit, in a striking manner, the peculiarities of the party to which they belonged in the mother country. Accordingly, until the revolution, Virginia was always the *royal colony*, supporting the king in opposition to parliament; maintaining regal prerogatives in opposition to parliamentary privileges; and advocating "the divine right of kings" against the natural and unalienable rights of human nature. But the New Englanders were complained of as inflexible turbulent republicans, always contending for their liberties and privileges, and watching with a lynx-eyed jealousy for any encroachment on their rights. In supporting or opposing a principle affecting their rights, they disputed every inch of ground, and never waited to feel oppression or injustice, before they sounded the alarm; and they were so persevering in their temper and so sagacious in their policy, that they were almost always victorious in their contests with arbitrary power. After acquiring sufficient physical strength, what would such a people require, besides an invasion of their rights, to induce them to throw off their allegiance?

But Mr. Wirt says, as I have before noticed, that the resolutions, which Mr. Henry introduced into the

house of burgesses of Virginia immediately after the passage of the Stamp Act, and the speech which he made on that occasion, kindled a spirit of resistance, which spread throughout the colonies—that with his match he communicated the first spark to the train of American courage. Mr. Henry may have communicated, then for the first time, such a spirit to Virginia; and it may have required "the greatest orator that ever lived" to enkindle such a flame *there;* but it was a fire, which had been burning uninterruptedly in New England for more than a century. So far back as 1660, the General Court of Massachusetts passed resolutions, in which they asserted the right to exercise all power both legislative and executive, provided they did not contravene the laws and constitution of England. Again in 1692, Massachusetts explicitly denied the right of parliament to tax the colonies without their consent.

By recurring to Mr. Wirt's book, where he attributes such a wonderful efficiency to those resolutions and that speech, it will be seen, that Virginia was at that time governed by a body of aristocrats, many of them descended from the cavaliers of Charles I. and II., devoted to the interest of the crown, and inheriting the arbitrary principles of their ancestors. The resolutions, which did pass the house of burgesses, were thought by Mr. Henry to be too timid and suppliant. The additional resolutions, introduced by him, were a part of them rejected; and those, which were adopted, passed by a majority of only one, notwithstanding they were supported by such superhuman eloquence as that gentleman is represented to have possessed; and the very next day the house ordered the resolutions to be

expunged from their records, and they would have forever remained in "the tomb of the Capulets," had not their author taken better care of them, than he or his cotemporaries have done of his eloquent speeches. The best evidences of his eloquence on this occasion are unhappily wanting, as he failed to carry his audience into his measures; and as his speeches were not thought by his cotemporaries to be worthy of preservation. And yet, marvellous to tell! his panegyrical biographer, so intent upon glorifying every thing pertaining to the "Ancient dominion," assures us seriously, that this affair, which contains more for shame than for boasting of the independent revolutionary spirit of Virginia, gave the first impulse to the ball of the American revolution! All this credit of having originated the revolution, appears to be claimed upon the fortuitous circumstance, that the assembly of Virginia being in session at the time the intelligence of the passage of the Stamp Act was received, gave her a little priority in the time of publishing her resolutions. But what was there in these resolutions for which the New Englanders had not been contending for a century?

As soon as it was known that such an act was in contemplation, Massachusetts employed an agent in London, who was directed to use his utmost endeavours to prevent the passage of the stamp act, or any other, levying taxes or impositions on the American provinces. A historian of that period says, that in 1764, the year before the passage of the Virginia resolutions, and before the passage of the stamp act, "the New Englanders, who retained the inflexibility of republicans and the opposition of sectaries, determined at once to strike

at the root and deny the principle without any compromise." At the same time that Massachusetts took that decisive course for herself, she opened a correspondence with the other colonies, requesting a concurrence in her opposition. If the revolution originated in Virginia, why did not she, instead of that state, summon the first continental congress? Why did not the British ministry send general Gage with his fleet and army to Virginia, and strike at the root of revolutionary principles? Why did not the ministry and parliamentary orators sometimes condescend to notice Virginia, if *she* were the leader of the rebels? Why were they directing the thunders of their eloquence and of their cannon almost exclusively against New England? If the fire of the revolution were first lighted by Patrick Henry, why was not he excepted in the pardon offered to the rebels, instead of Adams and Hancock? A single sentence from an English historian is a decisive answer to all these queries. "The New Englanders," says he, "were the first to take hostile steps, as they had been in all other measures of opposition, against Great Britain."

In the days of the most absolute monarchs of England, Hume says, "the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved by the puritans *alone;* and it was to this sect," which planted New England, "that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution." This precious spark our pilgrim ancestors brought with them, and guarded it with a vestal's care. It was a fire, that burned brighter by every attempt to quench it; and in the last attempt, which Great Britain made for its extinction, it burst forth

with a broad flame, it spread throughout the continent, and became as inextinguisable, by any means in her power, as a volcano. The result of her attempt to crush the republicanism of New England, or, in the language of British orators of that period, "to dragoon the Bostonians into a sense of duty," shows that the sons of the pilgrims were not less prompt and resolute in maintaining their rights by force, than they had been bold and tenacious in asserting them in argument.

The revolution had neither its origin, nor its "first impulse," in any set of resolutions, nor in the eloquence of any individual, much less in a single speech. The germ of the fair tree of liberty, of whose precious fruits we now all partake, was brought to America by the New England pilgrims, who thought no sacrifices too dear to secure the enjoyment of it. There were many puritans among the settlers of other colonies, but they were chiefly Presbyterians, who, in their ecclesiastical and civil policy, were less liberal and less inclined to democratic republicanism, than the *Independents.* All emigrants of this class went to New England; and as they were neither enticed nor compelled to go thither by a proprietary lord, nor company of speculators, but went to enjoy the delights of liberty, they could not view the violations of so dear an object with indifference; and hence arose those frequent disputes, that constant action and reaction, between the people and the mother country. These controversies naturally tended to evolve those principles and habits, which after several generations terminated in the declaration, that "they were and of right ought to be free and independent states." *To these controver-*

sies, therefore, *I would attribute*, not exclusively, but more than to any thing else, *the origin of the American Revolution*. And as New England has led the way in our progress to freedom and independence, so we trust she will be the last place on the western continent, where will be heard or seen the lash of despotism or the chains of slavery.