

he had *demand*ed the Release of the Prisoners and the Restoration of their Effects, if that can be called a Demand of the M—r, before he wrote of it to his Court, and soon after he knew the Affair. But you see that this Release of the *Prisoners only*, was not comply'd with in *March*, and the Restoration of the Effects at no Time; this *Demand* then, if made, had no Effect on the *French*.

OUR Embassador says, in the Beginning of the second Paragraph of his first Letter, “ I find by the Paper your Lordship has sent me, these three Persons are of the Number of those demanded by Mr. Clinton, and named in Mr. *De la Jonquiere's* Letter.” Now, Sir, unless you tell me what Orders accompanied this Paper, I must still insist that these Prisoners were never *demand*ed; or, which was all I meant, and all that has been understood by it, never *released* in Consequence of a *Demand*, but a *Request*.

HIS Lordship adds also in this Letter, “ next Tuesday I will represent the Case to Mr. *St. Contest*.” But does this prove he did it, for you hear no more of it? He says in the next Letter, of *March* 8, that he had seen Mr. *Rouillé*, and given his Paper of