

**REVIEW.**

sent to *punish* the Rebels?—Clearly not.—He was sent to protect dutiful and loyal subjects, who remained in the peace of the King, against the outrages of Rebels, who had broken the peace of the King.—Does any man speak of those who fell at the battle of Culloden, as of men that were *punished*? Would that man have been thought in his senses, who should have urged, that the armies of the King should not have been sent against the Rebels in Scotland, till those very Rebels had been judicially heard, and judicially convicted? Does not every man feel that the fact, the *only* fact, necessary to be known, in order to justify these acts of self-defence, is simply this:—Are men in arms against the authority of the King?—Who does not feel, that to authenticate this fact, demands no judicial inquiry? If when his Royal Highness had led the army under his command into Scotland, there had been no body of men in arms; if, terrified at his approach, they had either laid down their arms and submitted, or had dispersed and retired quietly, each to his own home, what would have been the consequence? The civil magistrate would have searched for and seized upon those who *had* been in arms; would have brought them to a court of justice: That court would have proceeded to examine, and to condemn or to acquit, as evidence was, or was not, given of the guilt of the respective culprits. The Rebels did not submit, they did not lay down their arms, they did not disperse; they resisted the Duke: a battle ensued: some of the Rebels fled, others were slain, others taken. It is upon those only of the *lost* class, who were brought before and condemned by Courts of Justice, that *punishment* was inflicted. By what kind of logic then are these acts ranked in the class of grievances?

THESE