

Gentlemen



near Frankford Monday 19<sup>th</sup> Dec<sup>r</sup>

- 31.

Unmeasured contempt for the character of Lewis Vernet as exhibited to me in a certain commercial transaction which it was my misfortune to have with him is here (in private) reiterated - but the high respectability of the parties claiming to be friends of his, who have thought proper, to address me in regard to some strictures I made on the character of the man in question, induces me to answer their letter rec<sup>d</sup>, on Saturday evening last -

will do so as briefly as courtesy will admit - You gentlemen have thought proper to place me in premises which I did not occupy - You state that I made "assertions" that his (Vernet's) authority as Governor was assumed: If you will read my article more closely I think you will find I did style him "Governor" but, expressed my "belief" that his authority was assumed - From these premises I drew my "epithets" adventurer freebooter &c warranted by the gross & wanton outrage committed on the American vessel at the Falkland Islands, which I am convinced (and I fancy the sequel will prove) the Government in whose name he is said to have acted will promptly disclaim being a party to - warranted also in my opinion from his transaction with me - You state you have documents to prove he is civil

Budds answer to Mr W & Mr B - ests  
 fue sentado a todos Lame  
 no admito por estar en  
 el Gobierno de Buenos  
 Aires -

Governor he tender (for which my thanks are due) the perusal  
of them to me. I have no desire to see, neither have I any  
object to further by the sight of them - If those documents  
are official, or notarial copies of such, I of course could  
not call his authority as "Governor" in question, but if  
emanating from him, said by him to be copies of official  
documents - his character such as it is in my estimation  
would bid me question their being genuine - From the  
phrasonology of your letter one is led to draw the conclusion  
that because he is Civil & Military Governor he and charged  
with enforcing the laws!!! of the Republic in regard  
to the Fisheries - that the outrage committed on the  
American Vessel was warranted - If this is your opinion  
gentlemen, I beg leave to differ from you -

I am not in the habit as your letter would seem to imply  
of preferring charges hastily. The "charges" against the  
said Vermet have been considered for upwards of three  
years - now published; & permit me to add gentlemen  
now reiterated; and as I have denounced Vermet in  
public, permit me in justice to myself to say, that I  
have more than once sought an opportunity to come in  
contact with him face to face to prefer the "charges"  
before recited - It was not my fault we did not meet -



It may be satisfactory to you to state that the goods which I shipped on board of the vessel of which Vernet was part owner (at least so said) and supercargo - were insured by me and the premium paid, in Montevideo for the port of Salado in the Rio de La Plata - where the vessel was notoriously bound; and in consequence of her being "wrecked" on the coast of Patagonia only distant 800 miles from her port of destination! The underwriters refused to pay and with he might for I was never possessed of the proper documents to prove my claim. This deviation was the work of the said Vernet. I appeal to you Gentlemen what would be your opinion of a man, what your feelings in regard to a transaction (I do not make this charge without being satisfied of its correctness) who should dare to break open letters not addressed to him (and in the absence of other proof this was sufficient to satisfy him that certain goods belonged to me) and in his over-honesty neglect to inform the owner of the goods that they were "wrecked" by the raging of the Elements!

You seem to express surprise that a man who conducted himself in Philadelphia with "credit" to recite a part of my own paragraph - and who you have known as honest & commendable in character from his youth up should be guilty of the transactions imputed to him

Your surprise is natural but this man is an exception in my opinion to the proverb of Solomon -

I have a document in my possession proving to my satisfaction, that my goods were not lost; I had (and may have) another proving to my satisfaction that they were not only not lost but sold and the proceeds appropriated to Vernet's use. This document I have mislaid or at present cannot find it amongst my papers accumulated during a period of nine years commercial transactions abroad, but abundant oral evidence was given when I encountered to satisfy me of his dishonesty -

Do not presume gentlemen that because I cannot lay my hand on the second document (once & perhaps now in my possession) that I recall or retract any thing I have said - I do not -



Your letter implies doubt, whether I have any documents or documents in regard to the conduct of Vernet in my possession - this is sufficient apology for me to refrain from transmitting a copy of that which I have -

You are at liberty gentlemen to use this letter in any way you may think proper -

with "due respect" your

C. N. Peck  
L. Krumpholtz

} Equam.

Obedient servant  
signed Geo. Knight Peck