Shall subjects to whom these royal and parliamentary affurances have been folemnly made, longer folicit for that protection and indemnity to which the laws of the land give them an undoubted right? Will Parliament longer withhold from them the justice it has afforded to every other person in their predicament, ever fince the establishment of the present government? What plea or pretence can justify the distinction, and vindicate a treatment of them as men out of the protection of the laws? What crime have they committed which can justify fuch unprecedented partiality? They have committed none, unless innumerable acts of the most affectionate loyalty to his Majesty, and the most undaunted zeal in supporting the rights of Parliament, be those crimes. Can such acts be really

[71]

really criminal in the opinion of Parliament, after having excited the Loyalists to commit them; after having declared the law which commands them, and pledged its faith for the protection and indemnity of the persons committing them; after having suffered their fortunes to be confiscated by the rebel States through a want of the protection due to them, and after it has facrificed their property to the benefit and safety of their fellow-subjects, without having made compensation?

To these arguments we will only add, that by the treaty, the independent sovereignties of the American States were unconditionally confirmed, and consequently the sanguinary laws by which the Loyalists were attainted. These laws remain in force to this day, and the American States stand justified, by the treaty of peace, to put those of them to death who shall appear within their jurisdictions. A number of them have been imprisoned and cruelly treated, and with difficulty escaped the ultimate punishment which those laws instict.

Now, although it is allowed that the British government might lawfully dispose of the property of its subjects for the public safety, making