

state of the case is considered, and the grounds for Mr. Ingersol's boast disposed of.

If we refer to the position occupied by the Americans during one period of the year 1813, we find that nearly the whole of the western peninsula was in their possession, with the single exception of the position at Burlington heights, and if we trace the events of the war from that date we find that by the energy and strategic skill of Generals Drummond and Murray, the whole of the country thus occupied had been wrested from the invaders, that their strongest fort (Fort Niagara) had been stormed, that their whole frontier had been devastated, and that, with the solitary exception of holding Fort Erie, Mr. Ingersol had not the smallest excuse for giving to the world the statement we have quoted above.

Mr. Ingersol, however, not satisfied with the above extraordinary assertions, goes still a step further, and ascribes the success of the American troops in repelling subsequent attacks, to the prestige of General Brown's valour. "Not less," writes the voracious American, "than six thousand five hundred excellent British regular troops, without counting their hordes of Indians and Canadian militia, had been routed, mostly killed wounded, captured, all demoralized and discouraged. In defiance of the mighty efforts of the undivided strength of Britain, three or four thousand American troops held possession of that part of Canada." This mere holding of that part of Canada (Fort Erie) was, also, found by Ingersol "inestimable in its beneficial natural consequences," as it defended the Atlantic seaboard "more effectually and infinitely cheaper than a hundred thousand militia could have done. The invasion of Canada kept a very large hostile force occupied there. If Brown, instead of two or three, had been eight or ten thousand strong, they would probably have detained the British who captured Washington from venturing there."

We could cite many more instances of Mr. Ingersol's misrepresentations. It will, however, suffice to make instead a short one from General Armstrong's "Notices of the War," who, after condemning Gen. Brown for fighting the battle "by detachments,"

and pointing out how the affair should have been conducted, asks whether, "if such views had governed in the affair at Bridgewater, the trophies won on that occasion would have been lost, or would the question be yet unsettled, to which of the two armies the victory belonged?"

This admission from General Armstrong is sufficient to settle the question as to whom belonged the victory at Lundy's Lane; any admission by an American of doubt as to whether "they had whipped," being, when we consider the national character, tantamount to an acknowledgement of defeat.

Mr. Ingersol traces in these battles the origin and cause of peace. "Battles in Canada did more to make peace than all the solicitations at St. Petersburg and London, negotiations and arrangements at Ghent. The treaty of Ghent without these battles would have been the shame of the United States, and the beginning of another war."

We fully concur with Ingersol that these battles had very much to do with producing peace, but we contend that it was the issue of these battles, in conjunction with the other humiliating defeats which they had experienced, that brought a vainglorious and boasting people to a sense of their real power, and that, the remembrance of their signal discomfiture in Western Canada was sufficient to outweigh the subsequent successes at New Orleans, Plattsburg and elsewhere.

The "reflections on war" of Mr. Ingersol are not less curious than his assertions as to the consequences of the battles of Lundy's Lane and Chippewa. "To the student of history," he writes, when moralizing on the effects of what he claims as victories, "the view reaches further in the doctrine of warfare, its martial, political, and territorial effects. The battles which made Cromwell the master of Great Britain and arbiter of Europe, which immortalized Turenne, and which signalized the prowess of Spain, when mistress of the world, were fought by small armies of a few thousand men."

Ingersol has here thrown new light upon some most interesting periods of history, and we learn for the first time that the battles of Naseby and Worcester in England were fought by armies of similar strength to that