

pamphlet, containing the trial of one Henry Hertz and Emanuel C. Perkins, has mislead you. Had you known that four months ago, in public letters addressed to the prosecuting officer, which have never yet been answered, I had exposed that poor conspiracy, shewing Perkins to have been insane and Hertz unworthy of credit, I cannot believe that you would have made the speech of which I have so much reason to complain.

Your attack on Sir Gaspard Le Marchant is even more unjust than your attack on me. That officer never left the Province of which he was the Governor, or did an act beyond his legitimate jurisdiction. He opened a *dépôt* for recruits in Halifax, on British soil—under our national flag. When Foreign officers came to him and offered their services or the services of their countrymen, they were informed of the terms upon which they would be employed and their followers enlisted. The only document which he sent into the United States, was an official public notice that men would be enlisted on certain terms *at Halifax*. Judge Kane decided that it was no violation of law to circulate this notice in the United States. If his law be sound, then I challenge you to shew one act done by Sir Gaspard Le Marchant that justifies the coarse language applied to him. As respects the Governor-General, I can only say that I do not believe your allegations. If Sir Edmund Head erred at all, in this matter, it was on the side of extreme caution lest offence should be given. Mr. Crampton has been abused unsparingly in the United States. He might, however culpable, it appears to me, be spared in the British Senate until his defence is complete, and until the peculiar difficulties and delicacy of his position are rightly understood. In a letter which I addressed to the District Attorney of Philadelphia, on the 6th of November, the conduct of Mr. Crampton, so far as it had come under my observation, was successfully vindicated. Read a single extract :

“But all these witnesses have been summoned to make out, if possible, a case against Mr. Crampton. Now I have evidence to prove the delicacy and legality of that gentleman's conduct and designs at this period, worth “a cloud of witnesses” such as you have conjured up. I produce it without the possibility of any concert with His Excellency, whom I have not seen for months, because I know that it will be weighed in the Court to which I appeal against the *ex parte* proceedings at Philadelphia. Mr. Burgin fixes the date of our joint infraction of your Neutrality laws on or about the “10th