

should " have a treacherous and delusive peace, we" should " soon find we had done nothing *," and the like must occasion doubts, not only of the candour, but probity of the author.

When I heard another set of men, under the present circumstances of the nation, and the war, urge a restitution with so much warmth, and without the least precedent or authority to enforce such an innovated doctrine, could I impute it to an over zeal, to an ardour for the honour of our King and country? Moderation, Sir, is truly commendable; but it may serve as a cloak to base and iniquitous purposes; it may be professed and practised too, not only to check " the madness of the " people," but to " make a virtuous and able ministry " act against themselves," their judgment, and the most important interests of their country. If the author of the Letter to two Great Men was reprehensible for a repetition of French perfidy, and a desire to see the stipulations of a former treaty executed previous to a future peace, and was therefore to be censured as tending to increase and inflame an improper disposition among the people; how much more so must his accuser, who pretends to be so cautious of fomenting popular clamours, and yet affords much greater cause for them, by unjust obliquy and reproach, could telling the people, their " arrogance" would " destroy" the good intentions of " a virtuous and able ministry," and the " effects" of " their victories and successes;" could telling them, they " had no share in acquiring" those " successes," be the means of preventing or abating this insolent mood he complains of? Such language seemed so far from being the

* Letter to two great men, p. 31.