

colonists were their own masters? We do not wish to press the charge of hypocrisy too far; it is true that emancipation was difficult, but it is also true that there were difficulties in the path of the ministers of George the Third. The preposterous violence and the manifest insincerity of the suppressed clause are enough to create suspicion as to the spirit in which the whole document was framed. In fact, the Declaration of Independence is not more scrupulously truthful than are the general utterances of a statesman for whom his biographers do not venture to claim the credit of strict veracity. In its preamble it enumerates as normal examples of the King's government and justifications of insurrection acts which, however unadvised, were really measures of repression, taken after the insurrection had broken out. No government could allow its officers to be assaulted and their houses sacked, its loyal lieges to be tarred and feathered, or the property of merchants sailing under its flag to be thrown by lawless hands into the sea.

Republican institutions, if they exclude hereditary title, admit family distinction. The Massachusetts house of Adams might with some reason call itself the first political family in the world. It has given, in the direct line, two presidents to the republic; it has produced an ambassador whose task was hardly less important and certainly not less trying than that of any president, and its fertility appears not to be exhausted, though the times are not propitious to its prominence so far as active politics are concerned. John Adams, the founder of the line, was a specimen of the highest type of politician formed by the municipal life of New England, and of all engaged in the revolution, with the possible exception of Washington, the man whose character would say does most to justify or redeem the movement. As 'Novanglus' he is its great apologist, and weak enough from the constitutional point of view his apology is. It is surely idle to contend that under a parliamentary monarchy the connection of a dependency was with the king alone, and not with parliament. Where was the sovereign power? To whom did colonial commerce look for protection? Equally idle does it seem to contend that the King in dealing with the colonies acted in his personal capacity only, not in his political capacity and as the head of a constitutional government. Adams is much more rational when he says that the whole system of colonial government had been left in a very unsettled and equivocal state. Powers had, in fact, been legally retained by the Imperial Government which it was practically wrong and unsafe to exercise. Hence arose the quarrel; and this is precisely the relation which the framers of the Irish Government Bill purpose deliberately to create between the British Parliament and Ireland. At the same time John Adams was not free from the traits of the conspirator. He continued to express attachment to the connection with Great Britain and grief at the