

that he not only would not have anything to do with his plans, but sent to warn off his agents, whose mere presence in Canada he would not permit.

This is the reason why the Honourable Joseph Howe, about whom the colonial papers said so much, and Lord Clarendon says so little, got no further than Niagara.

The next portion of Lord Clarendon's statement is really deserving of the deepest consideration, although on grounds purely English, and for reasons other than those connected with Crampton's case.

As against the United States' Government, it is of no weight whatever.

Lord Clarendon not being able to give any denial, by Crampton, of the charge against him, proceeds to attack the character of the witnesses, evidently without seeing that such a course would take him on to very dangerous ground.

Hertz was convicted of a misdemeanor in a United States' Court, on evidence that implicated Crampton.

Lord Clarendon assumes the right to go behind that evidence.

Now what did our Government, no longer ago than Feb. 7, 1856, lay down as a principle, connected with this very question of Foreign Enlistment, on the occasion—not of the request for the recall, but of the actual imprisoning and punishing of a British Consul by his Majesty the King of Prussia?

They said, and mark it, because the sentence in *italics* has an important bearing (as coming from Lord Palmerston) on this argument.

FOREIGN ENLISTMENT.

"Mr H. BAILLIE said—I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he has any objection to lay on the table of the House the correspondence which has taken place with the Prussian Government, relative to the employment of agents