

in every particular but one, and that nothing at all to the purpose of calumny. Is this then the advocate of the people of England? Is it thus he informs our judgments first, to set our passions afterwards on the side of truth and public spirit?

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.

I had intended to drop this writer here; but, on looking into the very next page of his pamphlet, I find that the second fact he asserts is stated as falsely and ignorantly as this, which you have seen so unanswerably confuted. It is concerning the Ohio company. To pass over the miserable puerilities of the French king and Scylla, of a quaker and Charybdis, with which he aims at enlivening his tale, I will state the fact shortly and truly: by which you will find, gentlemen, that he had not the smallest knowledge of the affair he was writing about; that he is utterly unacquainted with the nature and forms of business; and that no blame, in this matter, can be possibly imputed to the minister, whom he has abused with