

would not take it in that light. They (the guests and entertainers) would think they were not received in New York, Philadelphia, and Rochester as men should meet men speaking the same language as themselves, as cricketers should meet cricketers, as Americans should meet Englishmen. Therefore, do I raise my voice, or rather pen, 'unaccustomed as I am,' &c., &c., to refute the construction that most likely will be put upon the sentence in question; and how can I do it better than by giving *verbatim* the opinion of two of the Eleven (their names are at your service if you want them, one was present at the banquet, the other was not), as to their reception and treatment by the New Yorkers?

"No. 1.—'Upon my soul, sir, we thought they never would have let us come away. Morning, noon, and night it was 'Where is P., where is L., where is J.?' We were quite bored with their hospitality.'

"No. 2.—'Stand treat? I don't think any one of us ever paid a copper, out of our own hotel, for either a drink or a smoke.'

"I shall be in England, wind and waves permitting, next Spring, and believe me it will be no fault of mine if one erroneous idea remains in the heart of any Englishman with regard to the treatment and reception of the English Eleven in America.

"Yours, dear sir, &c., &c., M."

---

LETTER FROM "MORTON PRICE."

*Reply to "Veritas"—Heenan and Sayers—Umpire and the Derby—Devoy and Mitchell—Phelan, Roberts, and Berger, in the International Matches.*

"MY DEAR SIR,—I fear that my reply to 'Veritas,' in your edition of the 11th inst., must have in some way 'riled' that gentleman, as I find him using my name entire and by *instalments*, in his various pen-and-ink skirmishes, to such an extent, that I may shortly be expected to be looked upon as a species of 'household word' by those who read your correspondence. I don't object, but must here say it is not graceful or courteous to *call names*! Since last writing to you I have re-perused 'Veritas' rejoinder, and take so much umbrage at one