

my once favourite idol. I therefore, as an amusement, take in several different newspapers, pamphlets, and other political materials. But the majority of opinions seem, to decide in favour of the measures pursued by the minority. Great and immeasurable encomiums have with profusion been bestowed on some of our late Commanders in Chief, witness the cautious, inactive and mercenary General in America. Long-Island and New York, I grant you, were conquered; great was the conquest! because the enemy made little or no resistance. King's Bridge being then the enemy's post, *the distance was so great, and Report said,* that the post was impregnable; and considering the great fatigues the few thousands had sustained by the stubborn conquests just mentioned, the cautious General, out of pure tenderness and affection to his Majesty's troops, did not choose to pursue conquest, and expose the ardour of his men to a cruel and unmerciful enemy, who consequently were left to themselves, and nourished with just ideas, that the British troops were afraid to face them!

A very natural conjecture!

But