

One would naturally suppose from the fact here stated by Brown, "*that the people on the New Hampshire Grants had engaged to do the business;*" that he had been in consultation with the leaders of those people, persons who were accustomed to speak and act in their behalf and to enter into engagements for them. But this natural inference would interfere with the writer's theory that the project was wholly Brown's, by leaving it in doubt whether the capture was first suggested by him or by those with whom he had been in consultation on the New Hampshire Grants. It was, therefore, necessary for him to ignore any such intercourse with the leaders, which he does by asserting that "*the only people he, [Brown] had anything to do with were a couple of old hunters who ferried him hurriedly down Lake Champlain.*" To be sure, this places Brown in the unenviable position of making a false representation to his employers, that the people on the Grants had made a certain important engagement with him, when he had not seen them and it was consequently impossible that they should have done any such thing. Hence we are compelled to infer, that in the ethics of the "new era," upon which "the study of American history has entered," a false representation is regarded as a very trifling matter.

But let us inquire a little further into this mission of Mr. Brown into Canada, and his doings on the New Hampshire Grants. Early in the year 1775, an approaching struggle of the colonies with the mother country was clearly foreseen, and measures taken to prepare for it. On the 15th of February a resolution was passed by the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, which, after reciting that it appeared to be the design of the British ministry to engage the Canadians and Indians in hostile measures against the colonies, directed the committee of correspondence of the town of Boston, "in such way and manner as they should think proper, to open and establish an *intimate correspondence and con-*