

Minister three months before. These conciliatory propositions were studiously withheld, while the Ministry were using their utmost endeavours to raise 15,000 men from Scotland, Manchester, &c. and to plunge the nation into the general adoption of the war, by entangling private individuals in subscriptions of money, to be put directly into the hands of the Crown, unconnectedly with Parliament, for the purpose of supporting the authority of Great Britain *over the rebellious Colonies*. Such were the terms and objects held out for these subscriptions. But when the bills themselves made their appearance in parliament, which was not till after this *eventual* treaty was signed, their contents were found to be an absolute surrender of all the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain over the Colonies. What then is the charge against this *eventual* treaty? It is this that America, with an evil mind, engaged in, and consented to, a treaty of alliance with France, having the fullest reason to be confident, that every possible concession necessary towards establishing a safe and permanent peace, would be made? Upon what grounds were they to conclude this? Did the Minister declare that he was preparing a bill for surrendering every claim of parliamentary supremacy over the colonies, viz. parliamentary taxation, parliamentary controul, and the act of navigation? No!—Were they to conclude that the Ministry in the cabinet were meditating this universal surrender of all the authority of Great Britain, from their public and well-known conduct, in employing all their partizans abroad, with the utmost fury, to engage in private subscriptions *the friends to their King and Country, in order to support the authority of Great Britain over her rebellious Colonies?* Surely such conduct on the part of the Ministry could not justify the construction of any supposed amicable and pacific dispositions towards America. The only authentic manifestation of the ministerial intentions, was conveyed through the King's speech, at the opening of the preceding session of Parliament, on November 20th, 1777, which declared the necessity of preparing *for such farther operations of war, as the obstinacy of the rebels might render expedient*. The addresses of the two houses of Parliament expressed their full satisfaction and concurrence with such measures. Could it then be expected that the Americans should construe all these concurring testimonies of the continuance of hostile measures, as so many pledges that ministers intended to relinquish hostility, and to proceed by the road of conciliation and unlimited concession? It is an insult upon the understandings of mankind, to pretend, that an explicit declaration of war from the throne, is to be considered as a fiction, preparatory to the surrender of every parliamentary claim of legislation and supremacy, and of every beneficial interest of this country. No one can expect that the Americans should have resigned themselves with implicit confidence, in the sincerity and good faith of a Ministry, who in every public act of their own and their partizans, discovered the certain and unequivocal marks of duplicity. However, under all these justifiable causes of suspicion, they still did not run headlong into an *actual* treaty of alliance with France; as long as the terms of the conciliatory propositions were undivulged, and as long as the mode of the negotiation, carried any pretence of being conducted unconnectedly with force of arms, they refused to bind their