

[1815, July 24]

Richmond. July 24. 1815.



Dear Sir.

Henry's resolutions, as given by Judge Marshall, were copied from Prier Documents. You conjecture that the 5th resolution was the 5th as offered by Mr. Henry, or at all events that which produced "the bloody debate" derives great strength from the resolutions of Rhode Island of which I enclose you a copy. * These were obviously copied with a few slight variations from the Resolutions of Virginia, and retain the 5th resolution which was expunged here. But how did this 5th resolution get to Rhode Island, having been expunged from ^{our} Journals ~~here~~? - probably by a letter from George Johnston, or some other patriot in our house. I think you are mistaken in supposing that George Johnston wrote the resolutions. Mr. Edmund Randolph has left a history of Virginia in which he says that William Fleming wrote them and Mr. Henry, on the back of the resolutions left by him, of which I sent you a copy, expressly says, that he wrote them himself on the blank leaf of an old law book, and showed them only to George Johnston and William Fleming before they were offered to the house. Judge Tyler says, in the printed statement of Mr. Henry, that they were written by him on the blank leaf of an old letter upon dell letter. Now does it seem to you that the style of the resolutions is at all above Mr. Henry, but, on the contrary, very much like him. They remain in the office of the clerk of the House of Delegates ~~where~~ several of his original letters fully equal to the Resolutions in point of composition. -

It would form a very interesting back ground to the portrait of Henry in exhibiting his resolutions, to give a sketch of the distinguished members who opposed them. I have been attempting some, of whom I write by information,

without the aid of any personal knowledge, save the little which I saw of Mr. Pendleton and Mr. Wythe after they were in ruins. Will you take the trouble to examine these sketches of character and to correct ^{or to enlarge} them where they require it. You have not the journal of '65. I send you a list of the members, and beg you to give me a sketch of any others who may strike you as deserving it. Landon Carter was a writer. I have seen his pamphlet in support of the Two Penny act, and thought it very well. I have been able to learn nothing more of him. Mr. Thomas L. Lee is highly shaken of by Mr. E. Randolph; but not as a public speaker. I would be obliged to you to mark off those of the members who were considered as composing the aristocracy of the day, and if you could add a statement of the differences between the class of society and the lines of demarcation which separated them, you would oblige me very much.

Will you give me leave to found myself on your statements in the following particulars - 1st in regard to the project of the loan office and its defeat - 2 In regard to Josiah Philips - and gently as to the address from Congress prepared by Henry Lee, and superseded by Thomas Jay & Dickinson? - You may rely upon it that I shall make no use of your name, except so far as you may permit it. -

I do not perceive that Robert C. Nicholas was a member of the House in '65 - Edmund Randolph says that he came in, in the death of Peyton Randolph, and, in his place, as the delegate for Williamsburg.

The interest which you take in every thing that relates to the history and character of your country, saves me the necessity of those frequent apologies which I should otherwise feel myself bound to make to you for the ~~prolonged~~ length I give you.

It has just occurred to me that as you saw Mr. Henry in 59-60 it will be in your power to give me a more distinct picture of his mind, disposition & manner at that period, than any other person who has described him to me - That was three years before his display in the Faneuil's cause - before he had studied the law and before his talent for public speaking is said to have been dreamed of - Will you be so good as to tell me how he struck you at that time.

your much obliged friend Stewart

Wm. H. W. R.

P.S. The manuscript Journal of '65 is not to be found. - Phillips was indicted, tried and ^{executed} ~~and executed~~ for Robbery. I have now the original indictment with the names of the witnesses before me and will send you a copy if you desire it.

West Lm. Richmond July 24. 15.
rec^d July 31.

Mr. Jefferson

July 24

July 21, 1861



On a more attention personal, I find that the Journal of '65 which you have, contains the names of the members who composed the house of burgesses in '65. So that it becomes unnecessary to send you the list of members promised in my letter. On the first day of May '68 being the first of the session, 4 new writs of election were moved for. 1st for Chesterfield to supply the place of Richard Epper who had died. 2nd for Amherst, to supply that of old Greenhill who had accepted the place of Sheriff. 3rd for Luxembourg, to supply that of old Clement Read, appointed coroner. and 4th for Louisa, in the room of William Johnston who appointed coroner. The tradition is that Colo. Johnston vacated his seat for the express purpose of letting Henry to appear the Stamp act. The first appearance of a new member on either of those writs is on the 18th May. the name of the member is not given. On Monday the 20th another member appeared and then it is added - "Ordered that old Ward be added to the committee of claims - and old Henry to the court of justice". Henry's first appearance therefore was on the 18th or 20th of May. Other writs of election had been moved for after the 1st of May, and in the course of the session the new members took their seats from time to time; but no notice is taken of names till the 30th of May when there is an order that old Read, old Livingston, old William Taylor and old Robert Allington should be added to a committee. This is all the information which the journal of '65 affords as to the new members.

By The Pennsylvania Gazette of August 29. 1765 - Printed by B. Macklin Postmaster, and D. Hall. It appears, that the tax of Rensselaer on the 13th of that month instructed their ~~Delegates~~ ^{exclusive} Deputies in General assembly to insist on their right of the colony to tax itself, and proposed a set of resolutions, which were afterwards adopted, in substance nearly in words, by the assembly, as follows - Resolutions of Rhode I. S. P. P. extracted from the P. Gazette of 26. Sept. '68

1. That the first adventurers, settlers of this his Majesty's Colony and Dominion

of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, brought with them and transmitted to their posterity, and all other his Majesty's Subjects, inhabiting in this his Majesty's Colony, all the Privileges and Immunities that have at any time been held, enjoyed and possessed by the People of Great Britain.

2. That by a charter, granted by King Charles the Second, in the 15th year of his Reign, the Colony aforesaid is declared entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of natural born Subjects, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been abiding and born within the Realm of England.

3. That his Majesty's liege people of this Colony have enjoyed the Right of being governed by their own Assembly in the Article of Taxes and internal Police; and that the same have never been forfeited or on any other Way yielded up, but have been constantly recognized by the King & People of Great Britain.

4. That therefore the General Assembly of this Colony have in their Representative ~~character~~ capacity, the only exclusive Right to lay Taxes and Imports upon the Inhabitants of this Colony; and that every Attempt to best such Power in any Person or Persons whatsoever other than the General Assembly aforesaid is unconstitutional, and hath a manifest Tendency to destroy the Liberties of the People of this Colony.

5. That his Majesty's loyal People the Inhabitants of this Colony are not bound to yield Obedience to any Law or Ordinance designed to impose any internal Taxation whatsoever upon them other than the Laws or Ordinances of the General Assembly, aforesaid.

6. That all the officers of this Colony appointed by the authority thereof be and they are hereby directed to proceed in the execution of their respective offices in the same manner as usual: and that this Assembly will indemnify and save harmless all the said officers on account of their conduct agreeable to this Resolution.

[This paper was enclosed in the letter of William West
July 21, 1815, in this Volume, no 99.]
H. Maunton.

Members of the house of Burgesses
of Virginia in 1765.

and

Resolution of R. H. in the
same year.