r of any been to In fact, etely an affecting the Mi-Against valgar nst the e of the thrown ot the ament. reserve its just e war, of the

thereons of
he rench of
ndent
gainst
roga-

lent of

n the d to able t fall in our state was evidenced, and a new and a false basis laid for future acts and judgment. Now new dangers were to be guarded against, increased vigilance was requisite—new laches for negligence, new snares for presumption—while to meet them there was less wisdom, patriotism and vigilance. All things were thrown out of joint by the first error, and subsequently there was adjustment without rectification. When the colonists were loyal, we treated them not as citizens—it therefore followed that when they were rebellious, we treated them only as foes.\* When they had achieved an independent existence, we treated them not as strangers, and we offered in our falsely reawakened sympathies the hand of fellow-citizenship when they had become alien. We took

\* "Indeed, the whole period of the American war is fruitful in instances of dispensation with laws; - practised at least and connived at, but not openly acknowledged. Every prisoner of war, made by our troops, before American independency was established by the treaty of 1782, was, in the eye of the law, a felon; whom, not to bring to justice was a heinous offence, second only in character to his own. Yet not one American rebel, as such, was brought to justice, nor, save in the field, was the life of one forfeited. Cartels were regularly exchanged; flags mutually respected; passports reciprocally given; the rights of lawful belligerents, on both sides, acknowledged and enforced; and all this, without one Act of Parliament. How came it then, that Ministers were not impeached for so criminal a neglect of duty? for criminal and neglectful must their conduct have appeared, to those who were sincere in the assertion of the supremacy of Parliament, over the constitution, and over the Law. Yet no man impeached them. During the Nine Years' War, no man questioned, in their case, the lawfulness of transactions, which, were the actors private men, would have confessedly deserved, and drawn down, animadversion and heavy chastisement."-Portfolio, Vol. II. p. 292-3.