

plea that "he believed himself to be an exchanged prisoner," but as no shadow of proof has been brought forward, the defence can not be entertained.—The following was the form of parole signed by lieutenant-colonel Scott and others when taken prisoners, "we promise, on honor, not to bear arms, directly or indirectly, against his Britannic Majesty, or his allies, during the present war, until we are regularly exchanged. We likewise engage that the undermentioned non-commissioned officers and privates, soldiers in the service of the United States, who are permitted to accompany us, shall conform to the same conditions." This is no accusation trumped up at this late period to impugn Gen. Scott's character as a man of honor—on the contrary, it was made at the time, and while lieutenant-colonel Scott was yet unknown to fame, and of no more importance in public estimation than any other American officer. It is therefore of consequence, that his friends should, if they can, at least make the attempt to wipe away the imputation.

An extract from James will throw some additional light on the subject, and prove that there were other officers besides colonel Scott, who did not scruple to break their parole, when a convenient opportunity presented itself. "To the doughty quarrel between Mr. President Madison, and general James Wilkinson, * of the American army, we are indebted for some important disclosures relative to the paroled prisoners. The general very candidly tells us, that lieutenant George Read, a witness examined on the part of the prosecution, at the general court martial, held at Troy, in the State of New York, in February, 1814, deposed on oath, "that on the 24th December, 1813, while a prisoner on parole, he received from colonel Larned, an order to repair to Greenbush, in the following words:—

'I am directed by the secretary of war, to call in all the American prisoners of war, at or near this vicinity, to their post, and that the officers join them for drilling, &c.—You will therefore repair to the cantonments at Greenbush, without loss of time.' 'Lieutenant Read further deposes, that he repaired to Greenbush, in pursuance of the order, and

made no objections to doing duty: that on general Wilkinson's arrival at Waterford, in the ensuing January, lieutenant Read called upon him, and exhibited the order received from lieutenant-colonel Larned; that general Wilkinson thought the order very improper, and afterwards issued the following order, dated, Waterford, January, 18th 1814.

'A military officer is bound to obey promptly, and without hesitation, every order he may receive, which does not affect his honor; but this precious inheritance must never be voluntarily forfeited; nor should any earthly power wrest it from him. It follows that, where an officer is made prisoner, and released on his parole of honor, not to bear arms against the enemy, no professional duties can be imposed on him, while he continues in that condition; and under such circumstances, every military man will justify him for disobedience."

"Such," adds James, "are the principles upon which Mr. Madison conducted the late war. Lieutenant-colonel Scott, although perhaps not one of those American officers, who, like lieutenant Read, 'made no objection to doing duty' in compliance with the shameful order of his Government, certainly gave his parole at Queenston, and yet subsequently appeared in arms, both at Fort George, and at York."

We take pleasure in mentioning, that lieutenant Carr, of the United States army, also a prisoner at Queenston, declined obeying the order to perform duty, on the ground, that it was always contrary to the parole. This meritorious case being an exception, as it would appear, enhances its value; and it ought to operate as a lesson to that government, which could thus stab the reputation of its officers, to facilitate the means of conquest.

It is perfectly clear that Lieutenant-Colonel Scott broke his parole in every sense, as he not only joined what might be called the non-combatants in their usual garrison routine of drills, &c.; but he took, according to Sir George, an active part in the more stirring scenes of the campaign, thus rendering his dereliction from the path of honor doubly flagrant. We have found that American writers have been always ready to lay hold of the slightest charge (witness the case of Capt. Manners at Stony Creek) against British

* Wilkinson's Memoirs, vol. 3, page 197.