

portion of the price paid for peace; that in concluding this peace, so necessary to restore vigour to her exhausted frame, Great Britain consented to seal the final sentence of exile and ruin to the loyalists, her best allies, who had clung to her with a filial devotion, whom honour, gratitude, nay even the commonest sense of obligation called upon her to protect. Or, can it be said that any thing in the conduct of the loyalists since the peace, or in their mode of pursuing their claims, has in any degree forfeited rights at that time admitted? Can they be charged with negligence or remissness, in now coming before Parliament for the first time, after a lapse of thirty-six years? A slight glance at the facts and dates before stated, will sufficiently disprove such a charge, and shew a continuous series of active exertions and applications, of frustrated efforts and painful disappointments, from their first resort to the commissioners under the Act of 1783, down to the present time.

But, then, it is objected that the claims of the loyalists have been so long united with those of the British creditors, that it is not possible now to separate them. From what is stated above, the origin and nature of this connexion, a connexion of mere accident and circumstance, with a total distinctness of character and merits, may be sufficiently seen; but admitting for a moment (what is far from true), that this groundless identification were attributable to their own fault, nothing more could fairly be inferred from it, than that the loyalists, conscious of being creditors of America as well as loyalists, had considered themselves authorized, and even called upon, to use every effort for recovering their debts from their real debtors; and in doing so, had acted in concurrence with individuals, who though not loyalists, resembled them in being creditors; reserving to themselves the ultimate right of putting forth their separate claims as loyalists, when redress failed them in their collateral character of creditors. Instead of being weakened by these exertions, are not their claims, in truth, rendered more irresistibly powerful from the certainty thus established, that they are utterly excluded from compensation in America, and that the British nation is now their only appeal.

But in point of fact, to whom is the connexion of the loyalists with the general creditors to be attributed? Clearly not to themselves, but solely to the commissioners under the Act of 1783. They first coupled the two cases, by referring the loyalists to America, under the 4th article, which applied only to the creditors; all the subsequent blending of the two classes; the applications of the loyalists to the Board at Philadelphia in common with the creditors; the receipt of a dividend of the £. 600,000 in common with them, and their signature of the general petition to Parliament, along with all the partakers in this sum, grew out as necessary consequences, from the first erroneous treatment they received from the commissioners. A prescribed road was marked out to them, which they were peremptorily ordered to pursue; and is their perseverance in pursuing it to be now turned against them, when their efforts have proved abortive? Are they to be told, that, in seeking indemnity from America, as British creditors, (for this was, in fact, the tendency of their various efforts from 1783 to 1811,) they have forfeited their claims on Great Britain, when it was Great Britain herself who sent them there, in order to exonerate herself, if possible, of their undeniable claims? Is it not manifest, that, if at an earlier period, they had refused to seek payment as creditors of America, and had come before Parliament with their claims as loyalists, they would have been told they were premature; that a door was open to them in America, and that it was only in case "by particular circumstances" they failed there, that they were entitled to come to Great Britain, under the act of 1783, and to claim fulfilment of her pledges of compensation, which were merely conditional, on a failure of redress in America? Would not this have been the language opposed to their earlier applications? And yet, are they now, after having removed the possibility of any such objection, after having rendered their title to compensation doubly complete and indisputable, by leaving no effort untried, by religiously fulfilling all the conditions precedent on which their ultimate claims on the nation might depend, are they now to experience the injustice of being told, that this very course of exertion, far from constituting an additional claim, or fortifying their previous ones, lays them open to be charged with a dereliction of their claims on Great Britain, and with having voluntarily sunk their powerful pretensions as loyalists, into the inferior character of common creditors of America? The loyalists cannot anticipate treatment of such signal injustice from the British nation.

Nor do the loyalists expect to be accused by any one who shall give a moment's attention to their case, of being influenced by a spirit of cupidity or exaction, in not