nt

ly

th

he

he

on

the

the ind

et-

of

not

of

tter

of

the

er:

ars

on-

hat

ng-

een

ish

of

nd.

England. This it was which determined them to apply to Lord Albemarle, and feek their Liberty that Way. And as to the Indemnification for the Loss of that Merchandize, it is plain the M—y have ceased from demanding it, nay that they never demanded it at all, unless barely naming the Word demand, and then relinquishing all Right to it, can be denominated a Demand.

Now where is the Absurdity or Fashood, in saying these Men were deceived, and that the true Spirit of an English Minister no longer dwelt amongst us. If it had, would he not have infifted on receiving Reparation for the Infult on this Nation; Indemnification for the Merchandize unjustly taken; and Satisfaction to those who had been illegally imprisoned? And all these being never obtained, how much short is it of a Demonstration that the Men were discharged on a Request, and not on a Demand? or wherefore did the M-rs relinquish Claim to the other three Demands, if the Subjects of England were released in Consequence of a Demand? since the French in giving them Liberty on such a Remonstrance, must have acknowledged the English Right to the other three Articles. Wherefore then did the M-r neglect the latter, if