

R E P L Y

TO

R E M A R K S

ON A LATE PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

A VINDICATION of Governor PARR  
and his COUNCIL, &c.

---

By J. VIATOR, Esq.

---

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE,  
OPPOSITE BURLINGTON-HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

M,DCC,LXXXIV.

[ PRICE ONE SHILLING. ]

A  
AS  
Nose,  
fary.

The  
WILL  
grievan  
*Loyalist*  
due re  
only b  
Scriptu  
with a  
a Divin  
want c

*Charit*

## ADVERTISEMENT.

AS a Book without a Preface is like a Face without a Nose, it seems some Introduction to this *Reply* is necessary.

The *Vindication* was inscribed to the Right Honourable WILLIAM PITT as the proper person to put a stop to the grievances therein complained of; but as the *Consistent Loyalist* appealed to the PUBLIC at large, *Viator* also, with all due respect, submits this *Reply* to the same tribunal. He only begs leave to offer his apology for introducing many Scripture phrases in this *Reply*; which he has done solely with a view to accommodate his antagonist, supposed to be a Divine, who misunderstood the *Vindication*, perhaps, for want of them.

Charing-Cross, September 12, 1784.

**T**  
Parr,  
seem  
fore t  
Gove

Th  
dicato  
" ab  
" on  
" fat  
I hav  
it as  
" Fi  
Parr  
when  
Fifty  
" th  
" at  
" al  
See I  
appe:  
putal

---

---

## R E P L Y, &c.

---

**T**HE public being in possession of the complaints of Fifty-five associated Loyalists against Governor Parr, and of his *Vindication*; original papers and letters seem no longer of use in this controversy: I shall therefore traverse the *Remarks* made on the *Vindication* of Governor Parr.

The Advertisement to the *Remarks* censures the *Vindicator* of Governor Parr as “an officious and detestable obtruder of the private disputes of individuals on the public, and of wantonly endeavouring to defame a number of innocent and reputable persons.” I have read those pamphlets with due attention, and give it as my opinion, first, that the dispute between “the Fifty-five most respectable characters” and Governor Parr was not of a private nature after April 7, 1784, when A. Steward and Thomas Knox, agents for the Fifty-five, wrote to Governor Parr, that “we shall take the earliest opportunity of transmitting to England an attested copy of the original warrant; with copies of all the papers which have passed on the subject.” See *Remarks*, p. 34.—Secondly, the *Vindicator* does not appear to have wantonly defamed any innocent and reputable person, having silently passed by all remarks  
on

on the characters of the Fifty-five, except one fifth of that number, who remained in the United States. As to what is said about Colonel Willard and Dr. Inglis, let the public judge, whether Colonel Willard, altho' once a Mandamus Counsellor of Massachusetts-Bay, has an invulnerable character; since in his letter, Vindication p. 27, he says, "And, on the whole, I can truly declare that the Association is composed of gentlemen loyal to a [an high] degree, and worthy of the protection of Government."—In p. 28 of Remarks, the Consistent Loyalist says, "he" [Governor Parr] "had indeed objected to two of the Associators; and struck out their names, though men of irreproachable characters."—For this cruel conduct of Mr. Parr, I find, in p. 37 of Remarks, a palliation. "Some who were near the Governor, who were actuated by mercenary, sinister motives, and cared not for his reputation, were chiefly to blame; and, from Mr. Parr's character in other respects, I think this highly probable."—No one but a Consistent Loyalist could have had such imprudence as appears in the above sentence; which asserts, in other words, Governor Parr to be so nearly an idiot that he cannot take care of his own reputation, nor act otherwise than as his mercenary, sinister Council directs.—I dare say, this Consistent Loyalist thinks himself "worthy of every attention from his sufferings in person and property on account of his attachment to his Majesty's Government," if not to his Majesty's Governor of Nova-Scotia; and, had he not told the world, in p. 8, that he had no relish for low and illiberal amusements, nor malice to gratify by holding up characters to public contempt, no one would have suspected him to be owner of such negative virtues. "Of Dr. Inglis," the Consistent Loyalist informs the world, p. 39 "It is needless to say much; as his character is beyond the reach of our Vindicator's malice."—I imagine Vindicator's malice would be thrown away on Dr. Inglis, seeing truth is the best weapon to make the proud

proud :  
of Dr.  
in his  
"reigt  
Besides.  
"know  
"Rebe  
"the i  
—I hoj  
he was  
sistent I  
known  
cuated  
from th  
to conti  
not suc  
to tran.  
If our C  
sermon  
had fix  
not be  
have ag  
heroes,  
than ar  
true.

The  
forms  
"that  
"and  
"expe  
"busi  
"itself  
and the  
the wor

\* Vic  
signed fo

proud and ignorant man know himself.—As to the loyalty of Dr. Inglis, he has confirmed it beyond contradiction in his farewell sermon:—"My fidelity to my Sovereign," he informs us, "cannot be questioned."—Besides, the Consistent Loyalist says, "he was *universally* known to *all* who were at New-York during the late "Rebellion"—"his loss of property, and attainder by the rebels, are clear indications of the part he acted."—I hope, after thus establishing Dr. Inglis's loyalty, while he was guarded by the British army and navy, our Consistent Loyalist will "remember," that it is "*universally* known to *all*," that Dr. Inglis, before New-York was evacuated by the royal army, endeavoured to obtain permission from the State of New-York, sovereign and independent, to continue in his church preferment;—but the Doctor, not succeeding according to his wishes\*, concluded not to *transfer* his allegiance from One sovereign to Thirteen. If our Consistent Loyalist, or if Dr. Inglis, in his farewell sermon, had told the public on what sovereign Dr. Inglis had fixed his fidelity, as his fidelity to his sovereign cannot be questioned, perhaps Vindicator and they might have agreed.—But more hereafter concerning those two heroes, whose characters are said to be more invulnerable than any others of the Fifty-five—but I hope this is not true.

The Consistent Loyalist, in p. 1. of his Remarks, informs "all Englishmen of sense, candour, and virtue, "that complaints went abroad against Governor Parr "and his Council, for not treating the emigrants as they "expected—but whether justly, or otherwise, is not my "business to enquire;" yet, p. 35, he says, "candour "itself cannot acquit Governor Parr of inconsistency," and then with "*candour*" wrote a dozen pages to shew the world his business was to enquire into the conduct of

\* Vide Loudon's New York Packet; and the reasons therein assigned for not permitting Dr. Charles Inglis to become a denizen.

Governor Parr, and to convict him. Had the author of the Remarks possessed what the liar always wants, a good memory, or had he used decency in respect to Mr. Parr and others, some people, who know not his character, might have been misled, and believed him "no enemy to Governor Parr or his Council."—This wonderful author has not forgot his old canting practice—P. 41, he says, "I shall not attempt to aggravate matters"—my inclination would rather lead me to soften "them, were it in my power." No one can doubt the author's christian benevolence, that reads half his pamphlet and omits the other half. After saying many bitter things against Governor Parr for not granting 5000 acres to each of the Fifty-five Associators, the Consistent Loyalist, p. 36, says, "He [the Governor] may be justifiable in supposing himself restrained, by the King's instructions, from granting more than one thousand acres to one person—no one at least should blame him for this." Here it may be asked, why then did the Consistent Loyalist publish his Remarks, seeing Governor Parr stood in no need of any vindication but against the complaints of the Fifty-five and their invisible Associates, who have graciously acquitted Mr. Parr of all blame for not granting the 5000 acres after the survey and returns were made? The Consistent Loyalist allows the Governor the privilege of being "guided by a sense of duty and honour of which others cannot so rightly judge." In this point the Consistent Loyalist might have gained some credit for his candour and generosity, had he not gone on to blame the Governor for "doing what no one at least should blame him for." Our Consistent Loyalist must be some soul-galled priest; otherwise he could not, after giving a verdict in favour of Mr. Parr, have found him guilty in the next sentence. He blames the Governor, p. 36, for not granting 5000 acres as specified in the warrant of survey, because the warrant was prior to the royal instructions; therefore the Governor could have been justified in disobeying the royal instructions.

This

This  
 " be  
 who t  
 Parr,  
 " his  
 gress a  
 and ha  
 of An  
 opinio  
 " be f  
 wel fer  
 is laid  
 which  
 preach  
 import  
 about  
 gress,—  
 " obey  
 " take  
 " fer  
 " you  
 " the f  
 " whic  
 ought  
 the pul  
 and co  
 the Do  
 the fan  
 ed that  
 him Re  
 pension  
 gymen,  
 property  
 not be i  
 ter, mo  
 God for  
 him? H  
 " affect

This opinion, we are told, will be adopted, "and may be supported with good reasons." The public knows who the men are that adopt such principles, and Governor Parr, "whose humanity and justice are as conspicuous as his name and candour," is well aware of them. Congress and their Associates trampled on royal instructions, and have ruined themselves, and the Thirteen United States of America, for, at least one century. How does this opinion of disobeying royal instructions, and which "may be supported with good reasons," agree with the farewell sermon of Dr. Inglis, whose invulnerable character is said to be above the reach of Vindicator's malice, and which so much affected the head and heart of the preacher and our Consistent Loyalist? The learned and important Doctor told his *loyal* congregation, who were about to transfer their allegiance from their king to Congress,—“It is the duty of christians to be subject to and obey the civil power, not only for wrath but conscience sake;” and adds, “Were I to remain here, and transfer my allegiance to the new government, I do assure you I would serve and support that government with the same fidelity, that I served the government under which I have hitherto lived.” The Doctor surely ought to be believed when he fulminates wisdom from the pulpit; and those who perfectly know his character and conduct since his arrival in America, agree with the Doctor, that he would serve any government with the same fidelity that he served the British; provided that Government, (under which he lived, continued him Rector of New York, at 800l. per ann. and 200l. pension, besides chaplainships, &c. &c. while other clergymen, with their families, driven from their parishes and property, were starving for want of a chaplaincy.—It may not be improper, on account of this invulnerable character, more dignified than esteemed, to ask, Did J b serve God for nought? and hast not thou made an hedge about him? However, we find our Consistent Loyalist was much “affected” by the farewell sermon of Dr. Inglis: but at

r of  
ood  
Parr  
ter,  
emy  
der-  
—  
ters  
ften  
the  
ph-  
itter  
ood  
tent  
juf-  
ng's  
land  
him  
the  
rnor  
inst  
lffo-  
all  
vey  
lows  
ense  
htly  
ight  
sity,  
oing  
Our  
her-  
Mr.  
He  
acres  
rant  
rnor  
ions.  
This

this I cannot wonder, since the reading of it made me cry—Alas!—Alas!—If the sermon had affected more than the eyes and ears of our Consistent Loyalist, his practice and writings would not have appeared so contrary to the principle on which Dr. Inglis says “government or society subsist”—The Doctor says, “it is the duty of christians to be subject to, and obey the civil power”—whether Nero, Cromwell, Congress, or George, whether ordained of God or of men, by law or usurpation, whether new rulers or old—“it is your duty to be subject to, and obey.” According to this opinion, power is right, and weakness is wrong; and Paul knew nothing about government when he told his hearers the powers that are *ordained of God* you must be subject to and obey. Dr. Inglis lugged in “all-wise Providence” as author of the American rebellion and independence; Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, in the last century, said no more: and when the Doctor shall condescend to prove his positions, and to confirm his ideas about christian government, I will allow his Bible to be a code of civil and political laws—but not divine.

In p. 36, our Consistent Loyalist exculpates Governor Parr for refusing 5000 acres to each Associator of the Fifty-five, allowing his sense of duty and honour, of which others (such as he and the Fifty-five) cannot so rightly judge, to be his sufficient justification—then asserts the Governor might have disobeyed the King’s instructions with impunity. In this situation, the Governor, no doubt, must have had the Fifty-five to be his judges, otherwise his condemnation would have been sure.

The Governor is accused of proposing “a grant of one thousand acres to each Associator. This proposal made in writing—this solemn promise was violated.” Let us see how this solemn promise was violated. P. 28, Mr. Bulkeley’s letter. “One thousand acres of land will be granted to such of the gentlemen for whom

“ who  
“ and  
to gra  
the 52  
in the  
vornor  
will be  
master  
promil  
cept t  
Consist  
Govern  
duty a  
spectin

Page  
“ of to  
“ espec  
“ as h  
“ anon  
“ lifthe  
“ plain  
“ grou  
has our  
lish thr  
“ of ex  
“ necte  
dignitie  
table wi  
“ chara  
Loyaliti  
upon th  
them ar  
and ofte  
conduct  
which I  
not be d  
were wr

“ whom you are agents, as are likely to become residents; and improve them.” The agents desired the Governor to grant 53,000 acres—The Governor replied, Where are the 53 men?—The answer was, part are in Europe, part in the United States, and part in Nova Scotia.—The Governor said, When they are in Nova Scotia, the grants will be made, and not till then;—for I am to obey my master’s instructions. *Thus* “ was violated the solemn promise”—a sin surely to be pardoned by all people, except the Fifty-five associated Loyalists: for even our Consistent Loyalist, in the same page, allows the poor Governor the liberty of guiding himself by a sense of duty and honor, which he owed to royal instructions respecting 5000 acres.

Page 2. “ The public can have but an imperfect idea of transactions at such a distance (as Nova Scotia), especially when no authentic information is produced, as has been the case in the present instance. A few anonymous letters and squibs indeed have been published in the news papers, setting forth these complaints;” these, however, we find, are not “ sufficient ground for forming a decided judgment.” Why then has our Consistent Loyalist been so fool-hardy as to publish three anonymous letters, written, as he says, “ by men of excellent characters,” and moreover “ are not connected with the Fifty-five?”—Men that speak evil of dignities, and the rulers of the land, like those respectable writers, deserve not to bear the epithet “ of excellent characters,” unless because they excel the Consistent Loyalist in calumny. Few people will believe those letters upon the authority of our Consistent Loyalist, after reading them and his Remarks, seeing he crosses his own track, and often contradicts himself. The Vindicator of the public conduct of Governor Parr has published letters and papers which bear the authors names; but perhaps they may not be deemed of sufficient credibility by the public, as they were written and signed by the Fifty-five associated Loyalists.

alists. In answer to this, "be it remembered," that the writings and confessions of thieves, robbers, and murderers, are deemed good proof against themselves, altho' they are no proof against an honest and good man. Notwithstanding the want of authentic information in the Vindication of Governor Parr, the Consistent Loyalist had not courage to meet the inferences in the Vindication fairly drawn from the papers therein published, which, in p. 7 of Remarks, are owned to be genuine, though "surreptitiously procured;" but he wisely, and no doubt with "candour, and a disposition to heal rather than aggravate matters," proceeds from complaining of Mr. Parr to infamous abuse of "Esquire Hake, and Esquire Hardy, and other carmen, ostlers, boys, &c. &c." p. 17.—This conduct of our Consistent Loyalist will bring shame on himself and his brethren. Had he been as prudent in this matter as the quack was in his advice to a German nobleman troubled with an head-ache, to cure which a clyster was ordered, I should not have thought him more ignorant than the nobleman, who said, "You blockhead, and quack, I sent for you to cure the pain in my head, and behold you mean to attack my breech!"—What has Mr. Hake, Mr. Hardy, and others, to do in the complaints of the Fifty five against Governor Parr and his Vindication? Or what business had our Consistent Loyalist to screen himself and his party under the Governor's proclamation (page 41, which shews "that discontents and uneasiness had arose in several of the new settlements, because they had not received grants for the lands which have been assigned for them." Does this proclamation prove that the Fifty-five were not the authors of those discontents? If it proves no such thing, it may be esteemed an artful doubling of our Consistent Loyalist. Before this proclamation is dismissed, it is necessary to give its date, viz. January 24th, 1784; whereas A. Stewart and Th. Knox's terrific letter to Governor Parr, "wrote with decent firmness," p. 32, was dated April 7th, 1784. The Governor set forth, in his

his pro  
lands  
proper  
and cla  
who ha  
also ha  
"ledge  
"legisl  
to such  
structio  
informa  
but we  
"spect  
discont  
1784;  
Fifty-fi  
compli  
Govern  
well fo  
denied  
"in th  
"have  
"is fa  
"fusir  
"Brit  
"and  
whose  
five A  
mory,  
lency  
"Affi  
"high  
"mer  
Bay, a  
could  
ton, t  
"our  
from

his proclamation, "That, as soon as proper surveys of the lands located shall have been returned, together with proper certificates that every person having a right to, and claiming, lands under his Majesty's instructions, and who has taken the usual oaths prescribed by law, and also has subscribed the declaration, viz. " I do acknowledge his Majesty in Parliament to be the supreme " legislature of Nova Scotia," grants shall be made out to such person in due form." These are the royal instructions to Mr. Parr, which were published for the information of Knox, Stewart, and all others concerned; but were not complied with by the Fifty-five " most respectable characters," nor by other fomenters of the discontents in the new settlements, on the 7th of April, 1784; nor have they been complied with since by the Fifty-five associated Loyalists: and they never will be complied with, if the 8th inference of the Vindication of Governor Parr is well founded; and it appears to be well founded, because our Consistent Loyalist has not denied it; viz. " One fifth of the Fifty-five are residents " in the United States, in whose service many of them " have been employed, and from whose past conduct it " is fair to conclude they will not be very useful in dis- " fusing and supporting a spirit of attachment to the " British constitution, and to his Majesty's royal person " and family."—Here is room to ask Colonel Willard, whose character shall be invulnerable, to please the Fifty-five Associators, Where was your modesty, your memory, your knowledge, when you wrote to his Excellency Governor W——, " I can truly declare, that the " Association is composed of gentlemen loyal to a (an " high) degree, and worthy of the protection of Govern- " ment?"—If a mandamus counsellor of Massachusetts-Bay, and the renowned Dr. Inglis, Rector of New York, could sign such a falsehood, and affirm to Sir Guy Carleton, that " we," the Fifty-five, " have ever been steady in " our duty as loyal subjects," what may we not expect from the fifty-three, whose characters are less " invulne-  
" rable

“ rable than the characters of Willard and Inglis ? ” — This reminds me of the stranger, who paid a visit to the lions in the tower. The lions growled at the stranger, who asked the keeper to let him out, for he did not like the noise. The keeper replied, “ No danger, Sir, the lions are only laughing.” “ Ah,” said the stranger, “ if this is laughter, I hope not to hear them cry.”

Supposing Governor Parr could have forgot all sense “ of duty and honour,” and had disobeyed the royal instructions so far as to grant the 53000 acres to fifty-three associated Loyalists a fifth of whom were residents in the United States, and some of whom had actually taken the oaths to their respective States, who but Congress and the Fifty-five could have justified Mr. Parr?—Knox and Stewart, with all their chicanery, impertinence, and querulous manœuvres, did not blind Mr. Parr and his Council, as the Fifty five “ most respectable characters” blinded Sir Guy Carleton by their letter, in p. 9 of the Vindication. Sir Guy Carleton is not the only general who has been deceived by the Junto of Fifty-five, and their invisible Associates, since the rebellion in America took place. This phalanx of most assuming characters have stuck to all the Commanders in Chief, like a set of Jews, in close confederacy one with another, to secure every place of gain among themselves; and the fact is, they succeeded in their views, and have been handsomely paid for their services—altho’ never one of them served the King in the field of battle during the war.—If more proof of the just and legal conduct of Governor Parr respecting his refusal to grant 53000 acres of land to the fifty three Associates, which refusal was founded on royal instructions, and the noncompliance of the Fifty-five associated Dictators, should be deemed necessary even in the opinion of our Consistent Loyalist, he shall have it.—A number of persons, calling themselves Loyalists, who adhered like leeches to the royal army from 1776 to

1783,  
Islands,  
four tin  
pension  
proper  
Nova S  
as they  
of thof  
pretenc  
“ cont  
“ situ  
arrived  
who lo  
and the  
to fell t  
return  
for one  
had gr  
be mac  
to the  
qualifie  
repair  
and we  
cited c  
“ sons  
“ with  
“ to t  
“ this  
“ pas  
“ wh  
“ hav  
after th  
Gazett  
associa  
Parr w  
bully  
deman

1783, and enjoyed their own estates on the Islands of New York, Staten, and Long Island, with four times the profit ever received before the rebellion, and pensions besides from the Treasury of England, thought proper to sell their estates at an advanced price, and to go to Nova Scotia with the sole view of fleecing the Loyalists, as they had done the Royal army and navy. Part of those gentry went to the town of Shelburne, under pretence of settling there, "and of being desirous of continuing to enjoy the benefits of the British constitution." When those "most respectable characters" arrived at Shelburne, they were among the first people who located their town lots. They drew for their lots, and those who drew the best situated ones were disposed to sell them to others, who the sellers knew could never return to the United States. Those base men sold their lots for one hundred guineas, and had no right to sell, till they had grants from the Governor, which they knew could not be made out, unless the grantees were qualified according to the royal instructions, and they designed not to be thus qualified. When they had sold their lots at Shelburne, they repaired to other new settlements to play off their old tricks, and were successful, till the Governor's proclamation above cited came out, in these words—"Whereas several persons to whom no grants have been made, have notwithstanding made pretended sale of the lands assigned to them, and have received consideration therefor—this is therefore to signify, that no grants of land shall pass to any other person or persons, than to those in whose names the original warrants were issued, and have settled on such lands."—Nearly three months after this proclamation was published in the Nova Scotia Gazette, Knox and Stewart, agents for the Fifty-five associated Loyalists, had the audacity to insult Governor Parr with their impertinent letters, and endeavoured to bully him and the Council into a compliance with their demands, which compliance they knew would be repugnant

pugnant to his own proclamation, the royal instructions, and the prayers and wishes of every real subject in Nova Scotia. Our candid Consistent Loyalist has written one truth, and I give him credit for it, p. 36, "No one, at least, should blame him [the Governor] for this; as a gentleman, in such cases, should be guided by a sense of duty and honour, of which others cannot so rightly judge." From the date of the Governor's proclamation, complaints have been spread against Governor Parr and his Council by the discontented in Nova Scotia and England. Who are those discontented plaintiffs? If credit is to be given to the words of our candid Consistent Loyalist, p. 37. we must believe and remember, that "the Fifty-five Associators neither made, nor published any complaints against Governor Parr; they had but little cause of complaint till last spring."—If this be true, the public may depend upon it, that Governor Parr is not blameable for obeying his Majesty's instructions prior to "last spring," whatever he may be by obeying future royal instructions since "last spring." In the same page we are told, that "complaints were made, and some of them published, though not by the Associators, is pretty clear." This is as prettily said as any thing I ever heard said by Dr. Inglis, while he was Rector of New York. However, "it is now time to enquire into the matter; but before I proceed to this," I advise my readers to skip with me from p. 37 to 43 of the Remarks, and "here we find the grounds of discontent pointed out, namely, because the new settlers had not received their lands." Who, pray, is to be blamed, because the new settlers had not received their lands, except the emigrants, who have paid no regard to the Governor's proclamation, nor taken the usual oaths, nor subscribed the declaration, nor produced certificates or returns of survey? The coxcomical writer of the Remarks now blames again Governor Parr, for not cramming the emigrants with qualifications, oaths, surveys,

survey  
things  
what  
other  
" Pro  
" cer  
" lan  
no suc  
to b a  
loyal  
from  
" dec  
" del  
his ca  
the G  
knows  
emigr  
instruc

P. 3  
" plo  
Half  
the e

P. 3  
" awa  
survey  
with t  
expen  
as we

" A  
" exce  
" tlers  
Loyali  
lofs to

" M  
to blai

surveys, returns, grants.—If the Governor did all these things, he would then be a tyrant and persecutor—and what reason compels the Governor to do the business of other men?—The Consistent Loyalist says, p. 43, “The Proclamation insinuates, that returns of Survey, and certificates of those persons who were entitled to lands, came in slowly”—The proclamation intimates no such thing—but suppose it did, was Governor Parr to blame for this? Our pious candid, and Consistent Loyalist, through force of modesty, as we may judge from the tenor of his pamphlet says, “I shall not decide how far this circumstance might justify the delay of granting lands to emigrants”—nevertheless his candour has not prevented him from condemning the Governor in many places for his delays, altho’ he knows the delays were entirely occasioned by the emigrants not qualifying themselves according to royal instructions.—

P. 34. “With great labour and expence they explored the wilderness and had the land surveyed.” Half is true, the other false—for Governor Parr paid the expence of the survey.

P. 35. “The lands thus explored are probably granted away to others” Why not? since the Governor surveyed them, and the Fifty-five have not complied with the proclamation. Others may have been at the expence and trouble of visiting St. Mary’s Bay, as well as Goldsberry, Livingston, and Chandler.

“As nearly as I can judge, all the Associators, except two or three, will become actual efficient settlers in Nova Scotia.” As nearly as I can judge, no Loyalist will ever thank them for it; and one fifth (no loss to England) remained in the revolted Colonies.

“Much time has been lost.” Was Governor Parr to blame for this? Did he send them to England?

Did he compel them to remain in the revolted Colonies? Did he prevent their compliance with his proclamation and royal instructions? Their precious time is as well lost as found; seeing "they cannot personally support themselves;" and, "as nearly as I can judge," their precious time has not been spent in "diffusing Loyalty" in Nova Scotia, the United States, or England.

"Candour cannot acquit Governor Parr of inconsistency." What inconsistency can be found in his not granting the lands which he had surveyed? He granted the survey by recommendation from Sir Guy Carleton, the Commander in Chief—he omitted to grant the lands by direction from the King, who was Sir Guy Carleton's master; and, p. 36, he may be "justifiable for this."

P. 36. The Governor, it seems might have escaped the lash of the Fifty-five Associators for a time, if he had granted 1000 acres to each Associator, on condition "that, if any Associator should not come to Nova Scotia, his share should revert to the Crown." I desire to know why all this expence, trouble, and hazard, seeing Knox and Steward well knew, that near a dozen of the most respectable Fifty-five never meant to reside in Nova Scotia, but to sell their grants, or to send tenants on the lands in order to become "efficient settlers," syndics, nabobs, and pateroons. Besides, Governor Parr will experience the difficulty of obtaining judgments in law to escheat lands of non-residents; unless the court should adopt the advice of Livingston and Chandler, p. 21 of Vindication, to fall upon lands liable to escheat belonging not to "persons of wealth and influence;" a crime which might pass for Gospel at New York, and Massachusetts Bay, but is despised at Nova Scotia, and at the courts of Great-Britain, where the  
poor

poor has  
Govern  
ators to  
arrive  
for thei  
their all  
"bene

From  
they are  
learn t  
"have  
lands to  
to othe  
because  
royal in  
tection.

In th  
ther ne  
—as G  
if can  
judge.

In p.  
made t  
"conf  
Vindica  
would a  
the blat  
asperse  
five are  
solutely  
British  
Council  
with ba  
I have  
that the

poor have their rights as well as the rich.—Add to this, Governor Parr thought it full as proper for the Associates to wait for his Majesty's grant till they should arrive in the province, as it was for his Majesty to wait for their determination, whether they would "transfer" their allegiance to Congress, or "continue to enjoy the benefit of the British Government."

From what has been said, as Clergymen say when they are about to finish an half-hour sermon, we may learn this truth, that Governor Parr and his Council "have been hardly used" for their refusing Grants of lands to subjects of the United States of America, and to other people not much better than open Rebels, because they will not qualify themselves according to royal instructions, to obtain royal bounties and protection.

In the remaining part of this Pamphlet, some further notes and strictures will be made on the Remarks—as Governor Parr's conduct stands clearly justified, if candour, or malice itself, should be appointed judge.

In p. 7 is assigned the reason why an answer was made to the Vindication, viz. "Silence might be construed into an acknowledgment of guilt." The Vindicator knew the Fifty-five too well to think they would acknowledge any guilt; he therefore wrote to fix the blame upon the persons who deserved it, and not to asperse any good man's character; and among the Fifty-five are some good characters, some indifferent, some absolutely bad and unworthy any farther protection from the British government. Of this Governor Parr and his Council were duly informed; and such as join themselves with bad men are punishable for keeping bad company. I have granted the above to be true, on condition only, that the Fifty-five do contradict the observation made by

our Consistent Loyalist in p. 34. viz. "they (the Fifty-five) wished to settle near each other, and for this purpose, applied jointly for a grant of land in Nova Scotia; nor was there any other design in view." This declaration is marvellous. Who but our Consistent Loyalist could have suspected the second Pentecost, a group of Parthians, Medes, Elamites, Jews, Profelytes, Cretes, and Arabians, had no other design in view, "but to form a neighbourhood in Nova Scotia, and by mutual society and support soften as much as possible their common calamities." If this position had any foundation, it follows, that 1000 acres would place them more contiguous to each other than five thousand. Why then not content? since "waste lands in America," we are told, p. 13, "are of little value, requiring more expence to cultivate and improve them, than to purchase an equal quantity and quality that is already improved." Why then did not those "most respectable characters" purchase land already improved, as they claim to be "efficient settlers?" The answer is, "Many who want land have not money to purchase what is improved, but they have hands with which they can labour." This is a plain contradiction to what the Fifty-five declared in their letter to Sir Guy Carleton: "From our former respective occupations, we shall be unable personally to obtain the means of a tolerable decent support." If the Fifty-five had no money, what merit or reason had they to ground their expectations of becoming efficient settlers in the wilds of Nova Scotia?—where the good creatures "designed to grant to others in fee simple a part of the lands assigned them," p. 19. By this we learn the Association of Fifty-five did not mean to make tenants—for what reason then could the Fifty-five desire the King to give them lands which they designed again to give away? The grants therefore might as well be made to the actual settlers by the Governor, as to the efficient settlers—unless we suppose Commissaries of lands to be as necessary in Nova Scotia as they were in New York,

York,  
The F  
p. 11,  
"peti  
"libel  
"the  
"Maj  
has wr  
5000  
Sir Gu  
"on t  
"arm  
Carlete  
Govern  
Majest  
5000  
and ab  
Guy C  
"ed t  
"land  
Sayer,  
five, i  
Hook  
ton's l  
passag  
55 Af  
Accord  
August  
ground  
claim  
"500  
posed t  
"mer  
for 50  
Fifty-f  
request  
"Off  
from l

York, to starve the multitude, and enrich themselves.—  
 The Fifty-five must likewise contradict what is said at  
 p. 11, viz. “It was agreed (among the Fifty-five) to  
 “ petition not for 5000 acres for each Associator, as that  
 “ libeller falsely asserts, (meaning Vindicator,) but for  
 “ the same quantity allowed to Field Officers in his  
 “ Majesty’s army.” How does it appear that Vindicator  
 has written a libel in saying the Fifty five petitioned for  
 5000 acres each, seeing the Fifty-five, in their letter to  
 Sir Guy Carleton, July 22, 1783, petitioned “to be put  
 “ on the same footing with Field Officers in his Majesty’s  
 “ army, with respect to the number of acres?” Sir Guy  
 Carleton granted, or rather recommended their petition to  
 Governor Parr. The allowance to Field Officers in his  
 Majesty’s army was publicly known at New York to be  
 5000 acres, as appears by the memorial of Mr. Hake,  
 and above 600 other signers, August 19, 1783, to Sir  
 Guy Carleton; wherein it is asserted, “they were inform-  
 “ ed that Fifty-five persons have solicited for tracts of  
 “ land in Nova Scotia amounting to 275,000 acres.”  
 Sayer, Stewart, Livingston, Chandler, agents to the Fifty-  
 five, it is presumed, understood figures: they left Sandy  
 Hook August 8, 1783, and, by help of Sir Guy Carle-  
 ton’s letter to Mr. Parr, discovered, on their tedious  
 passage of ten days, that, by dividing 275,000 acres by  
 55 Associators, the quotient would be 5000 acres to each.  
 Accordingly, those well-taught Agents at Halifax, on  
 August 28, 1783, delivered their memorial to Mr. Parr,  
 grounding on the patronage of Sir Guy Carleton their  
 claim of lands, “to be located in the proportion of  
 “ 5000 acres to each of the Fifty-five.” Can it be sup-  
 posed the Agents, of “decent firmness and spirit becoming  
 “ men of honour,” went beyond their power by asking  
 for 5000 acres to be surveyed and granted to each of the  
 Fifty-five? Our Consistent Loyalist says, the Fifty-five  
 requested only “to be put on a footing with Field  
 “ Officers.”—Why then have the Agents appealed  
 from Mr. Parr to the King and Council for 4000 acres  
 more

more than are allowed to Field Officers, inasmuch as Sir Guy Carleton's answer to the memorial of Mr. Hake and others informed the public, "that his Excellency within these few days has had reason to believe that no one person will obtain a larger grant of lands in Nova Scotia than 1000 acres:"—the meaning of which is, his Majesty has informed me, since I recommended the Fifty-five Associators to receive 5000 acres each, (the quantity formerly allowed to Field Officers,) that no one person shall have granted to him more than 1000 acres. — P. 18. "It (the counter memorial) produced no alteration in the sentiments of the Commander in Chief, or of Governor Parr." If this was true, I could not believe the character given of Sir Guy Carleton in pages 11 and 12; because Sir Guy Carleton's answer to Mr. Hake and others, p. 13 of the Vindication, says, "The power of issuing patents for lands there, resides solely in the Governor, to whom his Excellency (Sir Guy Carleton) will immediately forward the memorial, which he apprehends will arrive before patents can be made out for the tract of land mentioned in it." This answer alarmed the Associators at New York, who exhorted their Agents, by letters, "to make every dispatch in their power to complete the survey of the lands mentioned, &c. to make returns, and obtain letters patent, as soon as possible." This mighty haste, even with the aid of John Biddle, the Deputy Surveyor, and a creature of John Potts, and once a rebel Commissary, did not prevent the arrival of the counter memorial, sent by Sir Guy Carleton, at Halifax. It arrived, however, not soon enough to prevent the warrant of survey for 5000 acres to each Associator being signed by Governor Parr, August 30, 1783. By the 24th of September, 1783, Livingston and Chandler, two of the Agents, were apprised of the arrival of the counter memorial, and of Governor Parr's instructions "not to grant more than 1000 acres of land to any one person," and they re-

signed

signed  
 " wa  
 and t  
 of En  
 coura  
 Loyal  
 " Aff  
 " der  
 to eac  
 " can  
 " acre  
 goes  
 " and  
 " inst  
 " acre  
 page)  
 " aga  
 Hence  
 sistent  
 not dif  
 " mol  
 " spir  
 " to h  
 " rem  
 ceedin  
 doms  
 all the  
 and w  
 " henc  
 Jesus,  
 hence  
 " dece  
 sign of  
 " rem  
 and ho  
 from h  
 master  
 of duty

signed their agency. Thus "the counter memorial  
 " was treated just as it deserved." But Governor Parr,  
 and the whole body of Loyalists, as well as the people  
 of England, too well know the Fifty-five were not dis-  
 couraged in their evil pursuit; although our Consistent  
 Loyalist tells them, p. 21, "Soon after the plan of the  
 " Associators had been recommended by the Comman-  
 " der in Chief to Governor Parr," (plan of 5000 acres  
 to each of the Fifty-five Associators,) "instructions  
 " came from England to grant no more than 1000  
 " acres of land to any one settler in Nova Scotia." He  
 goes on, and says, "When the survey was returned,  
 " and a patent applied for, the Governor alledged those  
 " instructions as a bar to granting more than 1000  
 " acres to each Associator." "Hitherto" (in the same  
 page) "the Associators had no cause of complaint  
 " against Governor Parr, nor did they make any."  
 Hence we see, by the candid confession of our Con-  
 sistent Loyalist, that Governor Parr's crime consists in  
 not disobeying royal instructions, "to gratify Fifty-five  
 " most respectable characters, who were to support a  
 " spirit of attachment to the British constitution, and  
 " to his Majesty's royal person and family."—"Be it  
 " remembered," the Devil took Jesus up into an ex-  
 ceeding high mountain, and shewed him all the King-  
 doms of the World, and the Glory of them; and said  
 all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down  
 and worship me. Jesus said unto Satan, "Get thee  
 " hence!"—"Be it remembered," that the Devil left  
 Jesus, and angels ministered unto him.—From  
 hence it is visible, that Satan himself wanted "that  
 " decent firmness and spirit," boasted of so much as a  
 sign of honour by our Consistent Loyalist. — "Be it  
 " remembered," that those who are loyal, fear God,  
 and honour the King—nay, they will easily take an hint  
 from his Governor, when he tells them, I have a  
 master whose laws I am bound to observe, from a sense  
 of duty and honour.

P. 4 "The Vindicator does not, nor can he assert  
"it."—P. 6. "But in the conclusion he becomes posi-  
"tive, and asserts"—what in page 4 he does not assert.

P. 5. "I have known some whose principles were  
"loyal, take part with the rebels." "Be it remem-  
"bered," trees are known by their fruit.—"I have also  
"known republicans, flung among the Loyalists, by  
"caprice, &c. &c. to get rid of their debts, &c. &c. I  
"will not affirm Vindicator answers to this character."  
If I understand our Consistent Loyalist in his pamphlet,  
he means to say the two Esquires mentioned page 17  
were loyal, "to get rid of their debts." Mr. Hake  
owed in England, and not in America; Mr. Hardy was  
not in debt. If Mr. Hake had a design against his  
creditors, he should have joined the rebellion, and not  
have come to England.

P. 6. "No shadow of proof that the Fifty-five made  
"any complaints against Governor Parr" P. 37, "They  
"made none"—till April 7th, 1784, when Stewart and  
Knox threatened Governor Parr to send copies of all pa-  
pers to London; but it was June 21, 1784, "that  
"complaints were published in London," which caused  
the Vindication —Who made these complaints? The  
invisible Company "of deeper art and keener policy."—  
P. 3, "I honestly declare, I know nothing about them,  
"nor will I be answerable for their conduct." Why then  
publish the invisible company's letters, No. 12 and 13?  
which are totally contrary to "the custom of real Loya-  
lists," p. 9, "who speak not evil of dignities."—  
P. 8, The Fifty-five did "nothing blameable," in applying  
for lands in Nova Scotia—Vindicator censures them for de-  
parting from the plan held out by Sir Guy Carleton's  
letter to Sir A. S. Hammond; and for endeavouring to  
supplant their brethren in affliction, and for privately  
and cruelly deceiving the Commander in Chief, by their  
letter founded in error, vanity, and falsehood.—Our Con-  
sistent

sistent  
ing th  
they  
able f  
Loyal  
"300  
Mr. S.  
no me  
blame  
for the

Pag  
to the  
lists.  
1782  
"died  
went i  
How  
"fort  
"Par

P. 1  
55 die  
most—  
consci  
from t  
the wo

P. 1  
"fixe  
falscho  
at 5 or

P. 1  
"curr  
"the  
to ask,  
ton wh  
is not

consistent Loyalist makes batteries, to shew his skill in knocking them down. Who ever blamed the Fifty-five, because they applied for lands in Nova Scotia? They are blameable for asking 5000 acres for each Associator, while other Loyalists "expected 5 or 600 acres to each family, and "300 to a single man;" and Sept. 22, 1782, the Rev. Mr. Sayre, and the other invulnerable characters, expected no more, as appears by Sir Guy's letter. Also, some are blamed for breach of trust, having accepted an agency for the whole, and then acted clandestinely for a part.

Pages 9 and 10. The Fifty-five claim the arguments to themselves which belong to the whole body of Loyalists. Were the difficulties in 1783 greater than in 1782? Why could not the Fifty-five follow their "hundreds" of brethren to Nova Scotia in 1783, who went in 1782, "and who had obtained grants of lands?" How does this account agree with p. 47, "that only "forty-three grants have been made out by Governor "Parr?"

P. 10 and elsewhere, our Consistent Loyalist calls his 55 clients "respectable Loyalists," leaving out the word *most*—whether this omission was occasioned by a prick of conscience, or forgetfulness, let the public judge; but if from the former, we may hope he will in future omit also the word *respectable*.

P. 11. As to quantity of land, "there was no rule "fixed to go by, July 22, 1783." This is a direct falsehood: it was fixed by Sir Guy Carleton Sept. 22, 1782, at 5 or 600 acres to a family, and 300 to a single man.

P. 12. "No man would dare to ask Sir Guy's concurrence to any measure that was not consistent with "the strictest probity and rectitude." If no man dare to ask, yet Fifty-five creatures did ask of Sir Guy Carleton what was inconsistent with probity and rectitude. It is not material to know whether those creatures are men,

as they "honestly declare" they know not the invisible company of deeper art and keener policy.

P. 13. The Fifty-five "wished not to be understood as "soliciting a compensation for their losses." "This was "certainly right"—If it is right, as I grant, nearly one half of the Fifty-five had no reason to expect a compensation for their losses or services, and one fifth had no claim from their loyalty, it was certainly wrong and imprudent in the Fifty-five to request 5000 acres to each Associator, seeing, "waste lands in America are of little "value, and require more expence to cultivate them, "than to purchase when improved."—This wonderful fetch to justify an ill design, is a strong reason against the Fifty-five having any waste lands granted them; because the more they have granted, the more miserable they must be: nor can a grant of 5000 acres be so great an incentive to the Fifty-five, who were "to diffuse and support a spirit of attachment to the British "constitution," as one single acre.

P. 14. The grant of waste lands, &c. could not be considered as a "compentation" for losses, services, and loyalty; because the lands were worth nothing.—P. 11. "Considering the rank and characters of the Fifty-five, "let common sense judge whether there was any thing "unreasonable in their request" of 5000 acres.—Our Consistent Loyalist here proves, if he proves any thing, that the rank and characters of the Fifty-five were reasonably noticed by a grant of 5000 acres worth nothing—what can be the reason why the Fifty-five petition for 5000 acres?

P. 19. "Nova Scotia contains thirty millions of "acres; a twentieth part not cultivated; room enough "for all the Loyalists."—"30,000 Loyalists went in 1782 "and 1783." Let Mr. Parr grant 5000 acres to each, and he will grant 150,000,000 acres.—Half of Nova Scotia is composed of mountains, rocks, and waste lands; why were not the Fifty-five content to let the Loyalists  
first

first lo  
taken  
giving  
"othe  
until  
Loyal  
would  
as pro  
New  
at Sife  
"dista  
"adv  
"of t  
fistent  
"or r  
Sife be  
comm  
is the  
and m  
town,  
fistent  
away  
given  
church  
to "a  
suppor  
preten  
town  
from t  
and Co  
Did no

P. 1  
—I et  
only 1  
Dr. In  
things  
fall to

first locate their small shares, and then they might have taken their 5000 acres "in the back lands," without giving any offence: nay, "they might have granted to "others in fee-simple, and remained efficient settlers" until the third Pentecost happened! If our Consistent Loyalist had used his first thoughts before his second, he would have adopted this plan; for those back lands are as proper for the Jews, Profelytes, Cretes, and Arabians of New Jerusalem, as they are for the church and school at Sisebeau. Besides, "those back lands, at a convenient "distance, might be more proper for the Fifty-five, at an "advanced period of life, to form a neighbourhood out "of the reach of noise and interruption."—Our Consistent Loyalist, p. 20, accuses Vindicator of "stupidity "or malice;" let the public judge. The town-plot of Sisebeau is laid out half a mile square, around which is a common of 240 acres: back and adjoining the common is the glebe, the first settled minister's lot, the school lot and mill lot; they are half a mile S. 33° W. from the town, and a mile from the water's edge: yet our Consistent Loyalist justifies the Fifty-five Cretians in taking away these four public lots, which Governor Parr had given to the church, &c. &c. &c. and instead thereof, the church and school were to be driven into the wilderness, to "a convenient distance" *in the back lands*, there to be supported by Fifty-five "red dragons," under the false pretence that there was scarcely a convenient place for a town plot, and that those lots were not sufficiently remote from the bustle and hurry of business. Pray let our pious and Consistent Loyalist cry, Where is the harm of all this? Did not the woman flee into the wilderness?—

P. 40. "Yet the Vindicator insinuates from hence."—Let the public judge, whether Vindicator referred only to the passage cited, or to the whole sermon of Dr. Inglis. No one ought to despise the day of small things, yet I must "honestly declare," that from Adam's fall to this day, no sermon was ever filled with more

flummery, duplicity, doubtful charity, inscrutable nonsense, egotisms, free-agency, and necessity. In p. 29, he says, " My fidelity to my sovereign cannot be questioned."— P. 23, he says, " my departure is far from being wilful, or wished for ; but it is the result of necessity." &c. — P. 25, " I must in charity suppose," &c. &c.—the rebels meant not to do what they did, and what they are still doing — P. 27, " From my heart I forgive them." — P. 28, " You will soon be under new Rulers, and a new Government : when thus situated, let me admonish you to shew the same fidelity that you shewed to your former Government." In plain English this means, if it means any thing. Subjects have a right to transfer their allegiance from their King ; and as you are soon to exercise this right, I commend, or, at least, do not disapprove of your intention, but wish I might have done the like ; and I do assure you, I would follow the advice which I have given you. Quere, how acted Job in a similar case ? This is the spirit and the life of all republicans ; but totally inconsistent with the constitution of England, France, and Spain. viz. No subject can transfer his allegiance from one Sovereign to another ; for could he do it, treason might exist, but rebellion could have no place.—Dr. Inglis would have shewed his prudence, if not his loyalty, by his silence on this head ; for if his *loyal* flock are blameable for turning rebels, and transferring their allegiance from their King to Congress the sin lies at the Doctor's door. Had the Doctor spoken to them in the style of Scripture, he would have said, " Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord ; touch not the unclean thing ; and I will receive you ; and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."—Job trusted in his sovereign, and so will all sincere Loyalists in their .

P. 41. " I am not an enemy to Governor Parr."

The

The C  
saying  
" cou  
" gui

P. 4  
the C  
" of d  
" new  
gence  
Certifi  
neglig  
the C  
Howe  
guilty  
help i  
satisfie  
never

P. 4  
The v  
asserti  
langu  
Sovere  
his R

P. 4  
" and  
is les  
letter,  
accou  
Scotia  
Confir  
tion,  
of " c  
to be  
grieva

Vic

The Governor undoubtedly has cause to adopt an old saying, "If an enemy had" written the Remarks, "I could have borne" them; "but it was thou my guide, my familiar friend."

P. 43. Remarking on the Governor's proclamation, the Consistent Loyalist says, "Here we find the grounds of discontent are pointed out; namely, because the new settlers have not received their lands." The negligence of the emigrants was the cause, and not the Governor. Certificates and surveys came in slowly; but how far this negligence of the emigrants might justify the Governor, the Consistent Loyalist says he "shall not decide." However, Viator will decide, and say, the emigrants are guilty of suicide, and Mr. Parr and his Council cannot help it. If the emigrants will complain and not be satisfied with the Governor, for their own faults, I will never censure the Governor, but despise the plaintiffs.

P. 44. "A Letter from a respectable Merchant." The writer may possibly be so, but we have only the assertion of our Consistent Loyalist to confirm it. The language points him out to have no reverence for his Sovereign, nor respect for the person or character of his Representative."

P. 47. "A Letter from a Gentleman of distinction, and of the best information."—Here again the public is left to find out the authenticity of an anonymous letter, published in an anonymous pamphlet. By some accounts in the letter, people acquainted with Nova Scotia, and P. scataqua, may form a judgment who our Consistent Loyalist intends for its Author. His *distinction*, however, has not taught him to speak reverently of "dignities;" and were his charges well founded, it is to be presumed his Majesty had long ago removed the grievances complained of.

Viator has not any land in Nova Scotia, nor does  
he

he expect any; but was he to seek for lands of Governor Parr, he would rigidly comply with his proclamation, and then demand a grant. If the Governor refused, he would complain to his Majesty, and not in news-papers.

P. 14 “ He, ( the Vindicator ) insinuates, that it “ was criminal in the Associates to send agents for “ the purpose of exploring lands in Nova Scotia.” Our Consistent Loyalist is indebted to his own creative fancy for this ridiculous idea. Vindicator had not insinuated, but charged the Fifty-five with signing and presenting privately to Sir Guy Carleton the letter marked No. II. in the Vindication, which was incompatible with justice, honour, and integrity, and repugnant to the general plan adopted by the Loyalists in 1782—as appears in Sir Guy Carleton’s letter to Sir Andrew Snape Hammond, dated Sept. 22d, 1782, [No. I.] The Rev. John Sayre, one of the Committee for the whole body of Loyalists, betrayed his trust, and became an agent for the Fifty-five, and went from New York with a view to supplant Botsford and other agents of the whole, as well as the Committee of the whole, who never knew his designs till he had left New York. After his arrival at Nova Scotia “ he “ was treated just as he deserved,” with contempt and neglect.

Our Consistent Loyalist has taken great pains to prove self-evident propositions; such as men may appoint agents, or act for themselves, without leave from the Pope, Emperor, and King. This no one ever denied.

P. 15. Our Consistent, “ rather healing” Loyalist says, “ It is not material to enquire how Mr. Hake “ came to be dubbed with the title of an Esquire, tho’ “ it be mysterious and raises curiosity.” It seems, this sentence was written to prove the author’s wit, learning, and candour. But lest our author should believe this mysterious event to be an article of his christian system, merely because it is mysterious and unknown to him,  
and

and th  
by his  
matte  
acqu  
Esqui  
Leona  
on to  
“ It  
“ hov  
“ for  
“ age  
schoa  
mitte  
“ lear  
Loyal  
Hake  
of L  
Sayer,  
not to  
but by  
be onc  
Mr.  
him w  
refigne  
far no  
Comm  
York  
Loyal  
“ con  
“ ma  
our c  
an affa  
worfe  
these  
more  
attack  
E. Ha  
a legal  
sequen

and thereby endanger his soul, as he has done his body, by his mysterious loyalty, I will explain this mysterious matter. Mr. Hake is beholden to his friends and acquaintance for the title of Mr. or that of an Esquire, just as were S. Blowers, John Dole, George Leonard, E. Hardy, Esqrs. But our author goes on to shew his wit and mirth by way of ridicule. "It is," says he, "of more consequence to know how he came to be joined with, &c. &c. as acting for the Loyalists, since I cannot learn he had any agency in the business?"—Here our great wit and scholar takes for granted that Mr. Hake was no committee man for the Loyalists, because, "I cannot learn" he was—and, by the candour of this Consistent Loyalist, "I cannot learn" he was not. That Mr. Hake was one of the Committee for the whole body of Loyalists, is as certain as that Messrs. Seabury, Sayer, Blowers, Dole, and Leonard were. This is not to be proved by the papers of Brook Watson, Esq. but by Mr. Watson himself, who knew Mr. Hake to be one of the Committee, and treated him as such, till Mr. Hake insisted that Mr. Watson should procure him written orders; which not being done, Mr. Hake resigned before any vouchers were signed. I have thus far noticed the objection to Mr. Hake's being one of the Committee for the whole body of Loyalists at New York in 1782; because I find our Consistent candid Loyalist says, p. 16, "Some curious anecdotes indeed concerning him might be related, and, if necessary, may hereafter be laid before the public." Here our candid Consistent Loyalist has turned himself into an assassin, in wounding a character by innuendos much worse than by giving his "curious anecdotes." Let these curious anecdotes appear, seeing they must be more proper for the public eye than this singular attack made on Mr. Hake and his fellow-sufferer E. Hardy, Esq. This last gentleman, by the way, has a legal right to plead in Westminster-Hall, and consequently needs no dubbing, like Knox, Stewart, and  
Chandler,

Chandler, to obtain the title Esquire. Thus another mysterious truth is published to satisfy the curiosity of our Consistent Loyalist.—But why are Mr. Hake and Mr. Hardy so roughly handled in the Remarks of our Consistent and candid Loyalist.—In p. 17 is the answer, Colonel Willard in his letter to Governor W—, said, “some very turbulent people;” our Consistent Loyalist says, “the very turbulent people were Esquire Hake and Esquire E. Hardy,” who were “principal actors” with the Commander in Chief, against the Fifty-Five.—Poor men! they must pay for their sin, which is but little short of blasphemy. In the first place, these two English-bred gentlemen, Hake and Hardy, having not the fear of God before their eyes went to America some fifteen years ago, the first a merchant, and second a lawyer. Secondly, they drew the memorial counter to the views of the Fifty-five “most respectable characters,” and signed it, as did above 600 other Loyalists with their own hands. Thirdly, these two gentlemen, with others, presented the memorial to Sir Guy Carleton, and prevailed over the Fifty-five. All this would have been venial, had not Colonel Willard and the Rev. Dr. Inglis, and a few more very great and learned men, met with their superiors in justice, learning, and generosity.—Poor men! I know your characters and had you offended heaven, you might have hoped for pardon; but, alas! you have sinned against a Mandamus Counsellor of Massachusetts-Bay, and the late Rector of the church at New York, and must die by the hydra’s tooth, or an assassin’s javelin.—Hardy! behold your inscription, p. 17. “Esquire Hardy is now pursuing the same turbulent measures, and plaguing the poor Loyalists in Nova Scotia, as formerly in New York.”——O dear—O dear!—This inscription means, that Esquire Hardy is still the protector of the real Loyalists against the machinations of Colonel Willard and his “most respectable Fifty-five.”—Before I quit “this goodly brace of Esquires, to whom the counter memorial owes its  
“birth”

“bir  
one r  
Rema  
memo  
Carle  
hand.  
Consis  
candor  
strang  
too m  
pamph  
possess  
affirm  
“had  
“had  
“hav  
proph  
Job,  
“har  
event  
farther  
what  
“drav  
“Car  
“it.”  
not tr  
ference  
“who  
“wha  
“expl  
semble  
the son  
presum  
had a  
Hibern  
Consist  
fifty-tw  
not m

“birth,” as saith our Consistent Loyalist, I will record one remarkable falsehood charged against them in the Remarks, p. 17: “The one signed it” (the counter memorial) “in behalf of the whole.” Sir Guy Carleton has each signer’s name, written with his own hand. All this I do not suppose will cause our Consistent Loyalist to blush or own his guilt; for candour, justice, truth, live with conscience, a perfect stranger to the author of the Remarks, in which are too many contradictions to be noticed in this present pamphlet.—Our Consistent Loyalist, to show he is possessed with a prophetic spirit as well as an evil one, affirms, in p. 17, that, if Messrs. Hake and Hardy “had been invited to join the Associators, we never “had heard of this memorial, and the scheme would “have had their full approbation.” This invidious prophecy brings to mind what Satan said to God about Job, “Put forth thine hand, and touch all that he “hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.” The event proved Satan to be a false prophet.—Passing all farther remarks on this illiberal charge, let us see what is said about the memorial. P. 17, “It was “drawn up, complaining of imaginary grievances: “Carmen, Ostlers, Boys, &c, were solicited to sign “it.” Suppose this mighty charge all true, (which is not true,) what then? In p. 18 we have this inference; “and the few people of any note or credit “who were persuaded to sign it, were ashamed of “what they had done, when matters were properly “explained to them.” This mode of writing resembles the Rustic’s Logic—The father was a man, the son like the father, ergo the son was a goose.—I presume some dubbed Doctor in Divinity must have had a hand in this pamphlet of contrarities, or some Hibernian genius must have seized the pen of our Consistent Loyalist; otherwise he would not have written fifty-two pages to prove Carmen, Ostlers, Boys, &c. were not more useful subjects in Nova Scotia, than Fifty-

five "most respectable characters, who are unable personally to obtain the means of a tolerable decent support." The public would naturally have believed, the Fifty-five associated Loyalists, notwithstanding their high rank and respectability, were a public nuisance, as they say they cannot personally support themselves, had they not told Sir Guy Carleton, that they constantly had possessed "great influence in his Majesty's American Dominions," and might or would be "highly advantageous in diffusing and supporting a spirit of attachment to the British Constitution, as well as to his Majesty's Royal Person and Family." How far they have been useful in this momentous concern, let the public judge from the Remarks of our Consistent Loyalist, and the anonymous letters inserted in his ingenious pamphlet. Those faithful and loyal subjects have a curious mode of "supporting a spirit of attachment to the British Constitution," while they abuse the King's Governor and Council of Nova Scotia, for not trampling under foot Royal instructions.—I have read over the names of the signers to the counter memorial printed in Morton and Hornor's New York Post of August 22, 1783, and find them to be men of real merit, and most of them able farmers; and I think it my duty on this occasion to tell the public, that, after deducting ten from the Fifty-five, I will risk my reputation on this assertion, that, taking Forty-five of any part of the 600 signers, and their characters and estates in 1775, they were much superior to Forty five of the Fifty-five Associators. If this be a truth, the public can easily judge of the propriety of our Consistent Loyalist, who calls the 600 signers of the counter Memorial, "Carmen, Osters, Boys, &c."—I have known many gentlemen by birth, education, and fortune, who during the Rebellion fled to New York, proud of becoming Waggoners, Carmen, Osters, Servants, Soldiers, Waiters, in order to serve their

their  
themf  
Fifty-  
the R  
in wl  
exper

Ou  
" Aff  
He ar  
" con  
" titic  
" jud  
" unf  
the if  
" mo

Sir  
Ham  
p. 7  
" tior  
" trad  
" fett  
" and  
Sept.  
July :  
Guy  
" field  
" nur  
of th  
humb  
suranc  
" resp  
" infl  
one c  
what  
" a ft  
" to

their King, to suppress the rebellion, and to support themselves by their industry; although no one of the Fifty-five can boast of having done the least service to the Royal cause, but as commissaries, and other clerks, in which stations many made themselves rich, at the expence of honour, justice, and conscience.

Our Consistent Loyalist, p. 19, asks, "Did not the Affociators claim an undue proportion of land?" He answers, "By no means." In p. 11 he says, "And considering the rank and characters of these petitioners, let common sense and common candour judge, whether there was any thing unreasonable, unfair, or ungenerous, in such a request." Here then the issue is joined on the rank and characters of these "most respectable" petitioners.

Sir Guy Carleton, in his letter to Sir Andrew Snape Hammond, in behalf of the whole body of Loyalists, p. 7 of the Vindication, writes thus: "Their expectation is, that they shall be accommodated with such tracts of unappropriated lands as they shall chuse to settle in, and 5 or 600 acres be granted to a family, and 300 to a single man." This letter was dated Sept. 22, 1782, and was publicly known at New York. July 22, 1783, the Fifty-five Affociators petitioned Sir Guy Carleton to be "put on the same footing with field officers in his majesty's army, with respect to the number of acres:" that is to say, 5000 acres to each of the Fifty-five. Sir Guy Carleton yielded to their humble and modest request, because they had the assurance to tell him, "they were Loyalists of the most respectable characters, who have constantly had great influence in his majesty's American dominions." No one ought to censure Sir Guy Carleton for believing what was told him under their signatures? for "he was a stranger and they took him in;" and "he had a heart to sympathize with the Loyalists in their distress"—

and deserves the gratitude of all.—On August 9, 1783, was delivered to Sir Guy Carleton a counter memorial, signed by above 600 persons, shewing Sir Guy the presumption of the Fifty-five, in daring to mislead his Excellency in the manner they had done. Sir Guy was convinced of the error committed, and put a stop to the grant, by immediately sending forward the counter memorial to Governor Parr.

To make the proper comparison between the Fifty-five "most respectable characters," and the whole body of Loyalists, I will begin with the province of New-Hampshire, travelling southward, and mention man against man in each state.

*"Most respectable Characters." The contrast.*

New Hampshire.

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Col. E. G. Lutwiche | Col. S. Holland   |
| Mr. Hugh Henderson  | T. McDonogh, Esq. |

Massachusetts-bay.

|                      |                      |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Mr. J. Anderson      | S. Gardner, Esq.     |
| Mr. C. Barrell       | Sir W. Pepperrell    |
| Mr. W. Campbell      | Col. P. Frye         |
| Mr. R. Chandler      | Hon. Col. J. Vaffall |
| Mr. N. Chandler      | Hon. Col. Murray     |
| Mr. N. Coffin        | Hon. Gen. Ruggles    |
| Mr. W. Chipman       | Hon. Col. Brown      |
| Mr. B. Davis         | Hon. D. Leonard      |
| Mr. S. Goldsberry    | Hon. H. Grey         |
| Mr. J. Taylor        | B. Hollowell, Esq.   |
| Mr. W. Taylor        | C. Paxton, Esq.      |
| Hon. Col. A. Willard | Judge Auchmuty       |
| Mr. Abel Willard     | Hon. Judge Oliver.   |

Rhode Island.

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| Mr. T. Bannister | Capt. Dawson |
|------------------|--------------|

Walter

Wal  
Mr.  
Hon  
Mr.  
Wm

Capt  
Rev.

Col.  
Rev.  
B. C  
Col.

Mr.  
Rev.  
Mr.  
Mr.

Jame  
Mr.  
Mr.  
Capt.

Col.  
Mr.  
Rev.  
Mr.  
P. J.  
J. W

Mr. A  
Mr. C  
J. Lo  
Rev.  
Hon.  
Mr. J  
Col. C  
Mr. V

|                       |                   |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Walter Chaloner, Esq. | Col. Whiteman     |
| Mr. J. Clarke         | G. Rome, Esq.     |
| Hon. J. Maudsley      | Rev. G. Bisset    |
| Mr. J. Watson         | Capt. R. Ferguson |
| Wm. Wanton, Esq.      | Capt. Duffy.      |

Connecticut.

|                 |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Captain A. Camp | Col. J. Chandler  |
| Rev. J. Sayre   | A. Botsford, Esq. |

New York.

|                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Col. Billop            | Hon. Col. Philips      |
| Rev. J. Bowden         | Hon. Gen. Delancey     |
| B. Crannell, Esq.      | Col. B. Robinson       |
| Col. A. Cortelyou      | Hon. Judge Ludlow      |
| Mr. T. Horsefield      | J. Jauncey, Esq.       |
| Rev. C. Inglis, D. D.  | Sir J. Johnson         |
| Mr. T. Knox            | Rev. H. Munro          |
| Mr. J. Moore           | Hon. Col. Axtill       |
| James Peters, Esq.     | Col. Cruger            |
| Mr. H. Peters          | Col. Wm. Bayard        |
| Mr. J. L. C. Roome     | Rev. J. Beardsley      |
| Capt. D. Seabury       | Col. Delancey          |
| Col. B. Seaman         | Hon. Col. E. Fanning   |
| Mr. R. Seaman          | Col. Claus             |
| Rev. J. Sayre          | Rev. S. Seabury, D. D. |
| Mr. J. Taylor          | J. T. Kempe, Esq.      |
| P. J. Livingston, Esq. | Col. Guy Johnson       |
| J. Wilkins, Esq.       | H. Cuyler, Esq.        |

New Jersey.

|                    |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Mr. A. Bell        | Hon. Judge Ogden  |
| Mr. C. Campbell    | Hon. Gen. Skinner |
| J. Longworth, Esq. | Col. Buskirk      |
| Rev. G. Panton     | Rev. G. Lydekker  |
| Hon. S. Skinner    | Hon. D. Cox,      |
| Mr. J. Smith       | (Lieut. J. Moody  |
| Col. G. Taylor     | B. Legrange, Esq. |
| Mr. W. Taylor      | H. Johnson, Esq.  |

Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania.

J. Potts, Esq.

S. Shoemaker, Esq.

Maryland.

Rev. H. Addison  
Mr. A. Stewart

Rev. J. Boucher  
Col. Chalmers.

Virginia.

Mr. T. Blane  
Mr. J. Fenley  
Mr. S. Donaldson

Rev. J. Agnew  
Major Grimes  
J. Goodrich, Esq.

*55 of the Signers to Mr. Hake's Memorial.*

E. Hardy, Esq.  
J. Robinson, Esq.  
J. Rankin, Esq.  
J. Bunnell, Esq.  
Th. Barker, Esq.  
A. Hardenbrook, Major  
J. Dickenson, Major  
J. Huggerford, M. D.  
C. Carter, M. D.  
H. Law, Captain  
J. Gidney  
A. Graves  
J. Minshull  
C. Benson  
J. Bell  
W. Cunningham  
L. Buskirk  
J. Pell  
D. H. Mellows  
J. Fowler  
T. St. Croix  
T. Dickenson, Mr.

S. Jarvis, Mr.  
M. Jarvis  
W. King  
— Thompson  
— Ried  
D. J. Katcham  
A. Law  
J. Fox  
J. Blair  
N. Loafborough  
D. Duncomb  
T. Blaufelt  
J. Bicker  
S. Baxter  
T. Cain  
Amos Fowler  
Aaron Fowler  
Andrew Fowler  
Widon Fowler  
James Fowler  
Josiah Fowler  
Jonathan Fowler

L. Fegan,

|              |     |                      |
|--------------|-----|----------------------|
| L. Fegan,    | Mr. | Jeremiah Fowler, Mr. |
| T. Hanford   |     | W. Peters            |
| J. Thorne    |     | J. Burket            |
| S. Dickinson |     | T. Austin            |
| J. Evans     |     | G. Ryne.             |
| L. Owen      |     |                      |

Here the public have the *Rank* of the Fifty-five "most respectable characters," contrasted by fifty-five other loyal Americans of the same States; and by fifty-five of Mr. Hake's Carmen, Ostlers, Boys, whose Loyalty, Service, Property, will atone for the want of Rank. The next question respects the *characters* of the Fifty five "most respectable petitioners, who have ever "been steady in their duty as loyal subjects," p, 8 of the Vindication.

Samuel Donaldson was a rebel committee-man, then a spy at New York, and since the war has returned to his estate, and taken the oaths to Virginia state.—The Honourable J. Maudsley joined the rebellion, till the royal army took possession of Rhode Island: he then pretended loyalty, and at the end of the war satisfied the state of Rhode Island, that he had during the rebellion been a faithful rebel. They restored him to his property, and he has taken the oaths to that state.—These are the two names (most probably) which Governor Parr struck out of the list of the Fifty-five petitioners, for which the poor Governor is censured by our Consistent Loyalist, p. 28, because they are, "men "of irreproachable characters."—Perhaps our Consistent Loyalist may chuse to say, these are not the two names struck out of the list by Governor Parr, but the names of Col. C. Billop and Col. B. Seaman. If this should be the case, the Governor acted equally just and proper; for these two gentlemen had sold their estates to great advantage before New York was evacuated, and although good subjects, did not merit such

such distinction as the Fifty-five claimed, for diffusing  
 "a spirit of loyalty in Nova Scotia."

John L. C. Roome, late secretary to several commanders at New York, would have had no reason to lament the war in point of gain, had not General Robertson discovered his dishonourable practice of taking fees of people for doing his official business, and compelled him to advertise in a New-York paper, that he stood ready to return the money which he had unduly taken. Whether Mr. Roome, in this matter, made his declaration with as much sincerity as Zaccheus did, is not my part to determine.

John Potts, Esq. was loyal till the evacuation of Philadelphia, then he offered half of his property to the rebels, if they would restore him to the other half—but the rebels thought the whole to be better than the half.

The Rev. H. Addison was a gentleman of large property, and a zealous good subject, and of course driven out of the country. On his arrival in England, Lord North allowed him a pension of 150l. per Ann. to support himself and son: nor would Lord North make any addition, although Mr. Addison's coachman and footman in America annually had better pensions. Disgusted at this treatment, he resigned the pension, and went back to New York, wisely judging his great estate in Maryland preferable to the scanty allowance above mentioned. He endeavoured to make his peace with the rebels, and be restored to his property. The rebels judged the world would esteem them a set of idiots, to give 30,000l. for the fidelity of a man whom the Prime Minister of England estimated to be worth only 150l. per ann. therefore would not permit the return of Mr. Addison.

Mr.

M  
 perf  
 in th  
 brow  
 and  
 and  
 Huc  
 wrap  
 it, v  
 Lipp  
 have  
 victe  
 the H

H  
 on t  
 Gen

T  
 P. 3  
 the l  
 " ne  
 as to  
 wifd  
 justi  
 have  
 If a  
 the  
 falls  
 and  
 fary,  
 impo  
 Carl  
 by

\*  
 Kno  
 P. 25.

Mr. A. Stewart, of "decent spirit and firmness," is the person, who on the trial of Capt. Lippincot did not appear in the most respectable light; for he was the man who brought a letter to Capt. Lippincot, desiring him to copy and sign it, in order to exculpate the Board of Directors, and to take the blame on himself for executing Captain Huddy. Captain Lippincot, not suspecting the design wrapped up in the letter, was sitting down to copy it, when he was arrested by the Provost Marshal. If Lippincot had copied and signed the said letter, it would have screened the guilty, and probably capitally convicted himself, for having acted without orders from the Board of Directors.

H. Peters, J. and W. Taylor, J. Blane, &c. were once on the side of Rebellion, and professed Loyalty after General Howe took possession of New York.

The Hon. Col. Willard, we are taught to believe, p. 38, is one of the most invulnerable characters among the Fifty-five. The Vindicator may thank his "dullness and malice" for being such a wretched blockhead as to seize the bull by his horns: if he had had the wisdom and candour of our Consistent Loyalist, or the justice of P. J. Livingston and N. Chandler, he would have seized him by the tail, p. 21 of Vindication.—— If any blame was to be fixed on any one concerned in the nefarious transaction of the Fifty-five, it justly falls on Col. Willard, whose situation \* at New York, and character as a Mandamus Counsellor and Commissary, gave him the opportunity, which he improved, to impose on the benevolent and tender feelings of Sir Guy Carleton. No rancour is due to, or was ever intended by Vindicator against Mr. Willard or Associates: he

\* See Mr. Willard's Instructions to Mr. Goldsberry, to apply to Knox, "as from his *situation*, and the *interest* he has," &c. VIND. p. 25.

only stated facts and drew some inferences, which have been answered with ridicule, negations, and abuse.—Col. Willard was a reputable farmer in the Province of Massachusetts-bay—did that authorise him to sign falsehoods to Sir Guy Carleton and Governor W——?—In 1774, Mr. Willard was appointed one of the Council by a Mandamus from the King; does that authorise him to sign falsehoods?—The policy of Governor Hutchinson made Mr. Willard one of the Council—from this appointment Mr. Willard's political conversion is to have its date—Many years he had been one of the Governor hunters, even from Governor Shirley's day—But did this conversion authorise him to sign falsehoods?—If Mr. Willard merits a grant of 5000 acres, I am willing he should have it—Why did he put himself on a level with rag, tag, and bob, who had no claim to such distinction?—If our Consistent Loyalist had not suffered his candour to overpower his ordinary learning, he would not have suffered his impudence to kick truth in open day, by saying Colonel Willard is not excelled in point of “strict integrity and uprightnes.” Has not Colonel Willard plainly signed papers in behalf of the Fifty five, which no man can repeat without a blush? Does “his saving Government “several thousand pounds,” while Commissary of fresh provisions, authorise him to sign falsehoods? Is this the hero of the party unaccustomed to blame? Is this your invulnerable head?—The very name of a Commissary may be disgraced by a falsehood. We are told by our Consistent Loyalist, that the Fifty-five “have sacrificed every thing but a good conscience;” and I will venture to add, that every man who justifies the letter to Sir Guy Carleton by the Fifty-five, has no conscience to sacrifice.—The boast of Mr. Willard's integrity and commissarial uprightnes brings to mind an anecdote of the King of Prussia. The King desired one of his attendants to order the Commissary to be hanged; the gentleman asked which of them? The King

King

—E

“thou

has he

pound

began

to be

are to

but no

themse

I will

of M

alift to

and th

invisib

“of h

I say

“mud

“exp

marks

me tha

to the

Englis-

“it is

invulne

Fifty-f

“in t

“stan

“dom

sistent

Willard

opinion

them.

on this

“men

“degr

“aloug

King replied, "Either of them; for they are all alike."  
 —But Mr. Willard has "saved Government several  
 "thousand pounds." Pray, Mr. Consistent Loyalist,  
 has he not saved to himself and nephew many thousand  
 pounds more than they were worth when the Rebellion  
 began? If not, he has acted out of character, and ought  
 to be sent to the King of Prussia. Colonel Willard, we  
 are told, "is well known:" so are the whole Fifty-five;  
 but no one will trust them, if they persevere in asserting  
 themselves to be "of most respectable characters."—  
 I will now leave this Counsellor, not of Arimathea, but  
 of Massachusetts-bay, desiring our Consistent Loy-  
 alist to compare his anonymous letters with page 9,  
 and then tell me if he believes the Fifty-five, and their  
 invisible Associates, "reverence their King in the person  
 "of his representative?"

I say, with our Consistent Loyalist, p. 9, "I would  
 "much rather throw a veil over their infirmities, than  
 "expose casual errors," would the writer of the Re-  
 marks on the Vindication of Governor Parr have granted  
 me that favour. But I am like a bullock unaccustomed  
 to the yoke, drawn to the battle-axe.—Doctor Charles  
 Inglis—of whom, our Consistent Loyalist observes, p. 39,  
 "it is needless to say much"—as he is the second most  
 invulnerable champion and character ranked among the  
 Fifty-five most respectable, "who have ever been steady  
 "in their duty as loyal subjects, and who have con-  
 "stantly had great influence in his Majesty's American  
 "dominions."—Could I give credit to our Con-  
 sistent Loyalist respecting the characters of Colonel  
 Willard and Doctor Inglis, I should entertain no high  
 opinion of the whole Fifty-five, nor put any trust in  
 them. How proper the saying of an ancient King is  
 on this occasion, must be left to the public: "Surely  
 "men of low degree are vanity, and men of high  
 "degree are a lie; to be laid in the balance, they are  
 "altogether lighter than vanity." We learn, he (Dr.

Inglis) was "*universally* known to *all*"—an odd phrase, but well intended, no doubt, by its author. Well, it shall be deemed good grammar—"he was *universally* known to *all* who were at New York during the late "Rebellion," even to mother Plantaine, the Captives, the distressed widows and fatherless, to the army, to the navy, and to the author of Cicero's Letters.—But was the Shunamites chamber known? or did the hungry ever turn into his house to eat bread? "He was uniformly loyal, but it is unnecessary to tell them" of it—he was active on the part of Government—not "active in his exertions,"\* as our Consistent Loyalist reports; an idiotic expression from the North of Ireland, or Goose-Creek in America. In all these things the Doctor's "character is beyond the reach of our Vindicator's malice." This may be true; but the invulnerable Doctor's character is not above nor beyond Viator's pen.

Permit me to ask our Consistent Loyalist, how Charles Inglis came into America? into the Church? and got dubbed with the title of Doctor in Divinity? These questions are "not material, although mysterious" almost "universally to all."—Some thirty years ago he made his first appearance in Pennsylvania, ragged enough, "God bless him!" as said the blind fiddler, whom the poor will rather lead about than starve. He kept an English school, knowing how to read and how to write. Herein he excelled his invulnerable brother. He was troubled with dreams and visions; for he was a visionist, and well skilled in Jacob Behmen's *darkness*. He prayed and preached at horse-races, and in seven years among sectarians got a name of being pious. The Rev. Dr. Peters of Philadelphia, the great patron of religious

\* What feats might have been done by the Doctor's passive exertions, or by his retrograde progression, must be left to the prophetic spirit of our Consistent Loyalist and future Grammarians.

whims and exotic plants, became his friend, and recommended him to the Bishop of London for holy orders; accordingly he was ordained and appointed Missionary at Dover on Delaware. Here he married and preached powerfully, having strong lungs and a new heart. Here follows a specimen of his divine harangues: "Sinners may think themselves wise in this world, but they will find themselves damn'd fools in the next." Some fanciful people at New York, hearing of our new divine by the friendship of the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, and the Rev. Mr. Duchè, invited Mr. Inglis to come and preach the Gospel at New York; because Dr. Auchmuty, Dr. Cooper, and Dr. Ogilvy, preached Morality and the Fear of God. Mr. Inglis accordingly came, and in his sermon said, "I glory in being called a Methodist, for I am not ashamed of the cross of Christ." Our Consistent Loyalist, who seems spiteful against "restless turbulence, and a levelling disposition," by the Sermon was "affected much;" and nothing would prevent a schism in the church, was the cry, but Mr. Inglis, whose spiritual knowledge was orthodox, because mysterious. Mr. Inglis, in short, became a Curate at New York, "rather to heal than exaggerate matters." Thus Mr. Inglis had "great influence." Upon the death of Dr. Auchmuty, the Rector, in 1777, Mr. Inglis was chosen Rector of New York by his *influence* constantly had with the party that brought him from Dover. Now a Rector, it was high time to kick down the ladder on which he had mounted; for it was necessary to become all things to all men, that he might *gain the more*. From this time our orthodox Rector laid aside what he formerly called Gospel Preaching, and openly announced his new conversion, "that to fear God and practise Morality was the spirit and the life of the Gospel." His old and faithful friends left him, and formed their long-threatened schism—no matter for that, since the Doctor had gained ten times as much as he

he had lost. Dr. Chandler and Dr. Cooper were so highly pleased at the conversion of this learned divine, (his learning was purely spiritual; for human education had never been his fortune,) that they recommended him to the university of Oxford to be dubbed Doctor in Divinity.—Henceforward our Rector is to be called Doctor; and it is to be hoped gratitude will prevent the Doctor from again transferring his conscience to the Methodists, if he should transfer his allegiance from his Sovereign, to any kind of new government that may spring up.—The Doctor has but little reason to complain of his losses in consequence of the rebellion, although he has lost his second wife's fortune, seeing he, as Rector, Chaplain, and Pensioner, has annually had an income of 12 and 1400l. sterling; neither of which "most probably" would he have enjoyed, had not the rebellion happened.—The Doctor, we have been told, "was *universally* known to *all*, and his property very large"—No wonder, since the Doctor was so griping, as to drag before Alderman Waddell poor loyal women and men for his surplice-fees; and "be it remembered," that the Rev. Mr. John Sayre, with a large family, and a Chaplaincy to support them, paid — shillings currency, to deliver a poor woman from an arrest and the power of our new Rector, she not having wherewithal to pay for her child's grave, but by her labour.—While such records remain, Doctor Inglis's character may be beyond the reach of Vindicator's malice; but he shall be in reach of my pity and the Prophet's character of blind watchmen, "who are "greedy dogs that can never have enough."—The following anecdote may be added:—"A certain Priest "had a legacy of 100l. left him by a bad woman, on "condition the Priest buried her body in the Chancel. "The Priest looking for his gain from that quarter, "buried the corpse, and obtained the 100l. afterwards, "to satisfy the vestry and the congregation, he went and "removed the corpse to the churchyard, and kept his  
" legacy,

" l  
" o  
dow  
wor  
" o

"  
Hal  
boy  
they  
out  
shew  
" ca

If  
servi  
with  
five  
" ro  
been  
some  
loser  
what  
passi  
not k  
Fenle  
Wan  
have  
mean  
for l  
the E  
bellic

I w  
desire  
the t  
be cu

“ legacy, because he had complied with the condition  
 “ of the will.”—Such Priests ought not to be set  
 down among “ respectable characters ;” for they are  
 worse than lukewarmness itself, “ and I will spue them  
 “ out of my mouth.”

“ Carmen, ostlers, boys, &c.” it seems, are Mr.  
 Hake’s signers against the Fifty - five, who have seven  
 boys among them ; and I wish, for their own honour,  
 they could prove they had served the royal cause with-  
 out double pay for their services, and that they had  
 shewed as much loyalty and disinterested conduct as the  
 “ carmen and the ostlers.”

If our Consistent Loyalist will reconsider the rank,  
 services, and losses of the Fifty-five, and compare them  
 with others, he will agree, that the request of the Fifty-  
 five was ill founded, unreasonable, unfair, “ ungene-  
 “ rous.”—As many dubious characters seem to have  
 been admitted in the number Fifty-five, unknown to  
 some of the signers, and several of the Fifty-five are  
 losers of much property by their loyalty to their King,  
 whatever “ casual errors” they have been guilty of by  
 passion or otherwise, I see no reason why the public should  
 not know, that Addison, Bannister, Camp, Crannell,  
 Fenley, Livingston, Longworth, Seabury, Skinner, and  
 Wanton, are ten of the greatest sufferers, and probably  
 have lost more than the other Forty-five. By this I do not  
 mean, that others of the Fifty-five are not sufferers ;  
 for I believe there are some, although nearly half of  
 the Fifty-five have had the fortune to gain by the re-  
 bellion.

I will now take leave of our Consistent Loyalist, and  
 desire him not to contend with an adversary armed with  
 the two-edged sword, whose supposed malice is not to  
 be cured by insult, injury, and inconsistencies. Well  
 had

had it been for our Consistent Loyalist, if his "second thoughts" had not appeared before his first. May the fates preserve him from any third thoughts! for, as Dr. Watts writes, "I had rather spare my foe, and melt his heart with love."

F I N I S.