

the Bill was  
it.

s brought  
the black  
ne of the  
seeing it  
unrobe it  
succeeded,  
more dis-  
ved senti-

In this  
rds: bad  
r. Burke's  
difference  
I thought  
ive upon  
I should  
uld seem  
ed in our  
he holds  
worfe, I  
onsiders a  
a greater  
conceive  
premises  
ing, and  
whenever  
law and  
justice,

" justice, the whole people should be universally  
" subjected to the same suspension of their  
" franchises." Be it so: but then the whole  
people should fall under the reason and occa-  
sion of the Act. If England was under the  
same predicament with America, that is to say,  
if Englishmen were looked upon to be Rebels,  
as the Americans are, in such a case, a *partial*  
suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* would be invi-  
dious, and consequently more unjust than a *ge-  
neral* suspension of it; for why should one Rebel  
be distinguished from another? but English-  
men are not accounted Rebels, and the Ameri-  
cans are; and therefore in the same degree that  
a *partial* suspension, on the one hand, *might* be  
just, an *universal* suspension, on the other,  
*would* be unjust. Where the offence is local,  
the punishment too must be local. It would  
have been unjust if the lands in *America* had  
been forfeited to the Crown in the year 1745,  
because *Scotland was then in Rebellion*. I do  
not use these arguments in favour of the Bill.  
The principle was *bad* with respect to America:  
it was *worfe* with regard to this country. And  
herein consisted the very malignity of the Bill:  
for whilst the *Habeas Corpus* was taken away  
from the *imputed guilty* Americans, the *inno-  
cent* English were at the same time deprived of  
its benefit; suspicion, without oath, being