

Having disposed of your financial mis-statements, let me now demand upon what authority you have ventured to assert that "by my intervention people were employed to break the law of the United States, and that by my hands they were paid for so doing." I deny the accusation. I ple 3, before the people of England—Not Guilty. I demand the proof, and, if ever I see England again, will call upon you to produce it before your own Constituents, or acknowledge the injustice of the accusation.

I was sent into the United States in the Spring of 1855, not to violate the law, but to ascertain the value of certain representations made by parties in that country, that thousands of men wished to come lawfully, peacefully, and without any infringement of law, or offence to the authorities, into the British Provinces, there to enlist in the service of the Queen. That duty—one of some hazard and delicacy—I performed: and I challenge you, if not in the presence of Parliament, before the empire of which we are citizens, to prove against me one illegal act, done or instigated in the United States, during the two months that I spent in that country.

It is true that the District Attorney laid before the Grand Jury of New York, a Bill of Indictment against me for a misdemeanour. Nobody who knows the state of feeling in the city at the time, or the devotion of that functionary to the interests of Russia, will doubt his anxiety to sustain it—but he could not. It is true that a clerk in my employment, was arrested and tried at Philadelphia—but he was honorably acquitted, the Judge deciding that no violation of law had been committed. What right have you then to assume that I, or any person over whom I had legitimate control, violated the laws of the United States? In British Courts of Justice you were taught to presume the innocence of persons, arraigned with all the formalities of law, until their guilt was proved. You reverse the rule. You assume the guilt of a British gentleman, who, for two months, walked the streets in the midst of his enemies, and the enemies of his country, and whom they dared not try; and of another, who when tried, was honorably acquitted.

The only extenuation that I can discover for such folly or injustice, is to suppose that the wretched Philadelphia pamphlet, containing the trial of one Henry Hertz and Emanuel C. Perkins, has misled 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, showing 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 LeMarchant 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 Depot 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 show one act done by Sir Gaspard LeMarchant, 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. Burghal fixes the date of our joint infraction of your neutrality laws on or about the "10th or 12th of March." On the 11th of March I received a letter from Mr. Crampton, which I give verbatim. Let the world at large judge whether the writer of it was at the time conspiring with me to violate the neutrality laws of the United States.

"Washington, March 11, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR—

I enclose, for your information and guidance in the matter in which you are engaged, an opinion which, at my request, has been drawn up by an eminent American Lawyer, in regard to the bearing of the neutrality laws of the United States, upon the subject. This gentleman is also very well acquainted with the practical operation of the law in this country, influenced as it always is, more or less, by the prevalent feelings of the day, and the action of the press. I have entire confidence in the correctness of his views. You will perceive that what can be done in the U. S. either by agents of H. M. Government directly, or by American citizens or residents, is restricted within very narrow limits; and that great caution will be required to avoid even the least appearance of employing any device for eluding the law. I have entire confidence in your prudence and discretion in this respect, but I would beg of you to inculcate the utmost circumspection upon all those with whom you may have to communicate upon this important subject; and to explain to them clearly the true bearings of the case.

I am, my dear Sir, yours truly,

J. F. CRAMPTON."

Having, I trust, sir, taught you a lesson of accuracy and circumspection, I beg now to remind you that there was a time when it was necessary to send troops from England to British America—when American sympathizers swarmed upon our frontiers with rifles in their hands, and when not \$100,000 but £2,000,000 Sterling had to be expended to preserve these Colonies from the rapacity of the people whose slanders you so readily endorse—whose cause you are so prompt to espouse. Perhaps a little of the zeal in defence of our own nationality and laws which is now profusely expended upon foreigners, might have been appropriate to that period, but I cannot charge my memory with any very vehement Parliamentary displays.

The Cedar built vessels of Bermuda pass buoyantly over the waves of ocean, and perfume them as they go. You are always buffeting the billows of strife, and leaving a flavor of bitterness behind. Let me, in conclusion, advise you to cultivate hereafter a better opinion of your fellow-creatures—to display a more generous and genial spirit, and not to suppose that, even with the Atlantic between us, you can take improper liberties with

Your Obedient Servant,

JOSEPH HOWE.