when the account of the ectly stated in Mr. Stee subject of the 'Carohe undersigned," with us incidentally alluded stevenson's note of the veen the two Govern-

se of the "Caroline," between Mr. Stevenin September, 1839, m her majesty's Govmade in May, 1838, swer; and if so, with a that Mr. Forsyth, in tions on that matter is with Mr. Fox, the 's Government with-

overnment; and yet, ok place on the 12th affair of the "Caro-Government, in any

the following con-

hat even before Mr. ted, Mr. Stevenson of the opinion of Caroline" had been ted that the underuvey the opinion of the United States; his having deemed tance and result of

ch as they did not Stevenson was innd they were coneu the minister of eu the minister of w to a preliminary formal discussion epare the way for

trong opinion extime, have been najesty's Governved any such inuthority to speak and acts are not at, by its silence, ons expressed by 15

Now the undersigned does not of course mean to say, that the opinions so expressed by Mr. Fox, and by himself, were final and conclusive decisions of her majesty's Government in the case, although that given in writing by Mr. Fox was as strong and unequivocal as words could well convey ; and it is obvious that those opinions, having been expressed before the date of Mr. Stevenson's note, of May, 1838, could not at any rate have been decisions upon the demand made in that note. And as those opinions had been founded upon the information which her majesty's colonial authorities had then transmitted to Mr. Fox, and to her majesty's Government, it was possible that counter-statements, forwarded upon information collected by the United States Government, might satisfy her majesty's Government that their first view of the case, and their first opinion regarding it, however strong that opinion might have been, were erroneous. The undersigned therefore does not mean to say, and never has contended, that either his conversations with Mr. Stevenson, or Mr. Fox's note to Mr. Forsyth, ought to have precluded the demand which was afterward made by Mr. Stevenson's note of 1838.

But the undersigned contends that that demand was made with a previous knowledge, on the part of the United States Government, of the views and opinions of her majesty's Government, as to the transactions to which the denand related.

The undersigned has further to remark, that the words of Mr. Stevenson's note of May, 1838, distinctly prove that the Government of the United States did not entertain any doubt whatever whether the capture and destruction of the "Caroline" had been the unauthorized act of individuals, for which such individuals were to be made responsible in their private capacity, or whether it had been a public act, done by persons in the service of the British Government, and obeying superior authority, and for which, consequently, the British Government was to be responsible, because the specific complaint of Mr. Stevenson was, that the act was committed "by a portion of the British forces stationed at Chippewa;" and that "it was planned and executed with the knowledge and approbation of the liente ant governor of Upper Canada," and that it was "the invasion of the territory and sovereignty of an independent nation, by the armed forces of a friendly power:" and the specific demand which Mr. Stevenson made was, "that the whole proceeding should be disavowed and disapproved, and that such redress as the nature of the case obviously required should be promptly made," by the British Government.

The undersigned therefore maintains, that the very contents of Mr. Stevenson's note of 1838 preclude the United States Government from attempting to make Mr. MoLeod, or any other British subject, personally answerable for any share they may be supposed to have had in the destruction of the "Caroline;" and that Mr. Forsyth was mistaken in saying, as he did in his note to Mr. Fox, of the 26th of December, 1840, that up to that time the United States Government had had no authentic announcement that the destruction of the "Caroline" was a public act, of persons in her majesty's service, obeying the order of superior authorities; for Mr. Forsyth would have found that authentic announcement in the note of his own plenipotentiary, presented in pursuance of instructions from himself, so long ago as May, 1838. But while on the one hand the undersigned contends that the