

Mr. Buller's duties would hardly allow him to investigate candidly the conduct of the American government.

A more careful inquiry must have led him to different conclusions.

Facts at complete variance with Mr. Buller's statements. Further confirmation of the above.

Further confirmation of the above.

Extract from a New York journal.

Considerations of our right to follow the brigands to their own country.

Ground assumed on this subject by the American minister at London.

Occupation of Navy Island considered by Mr. Stevenson a case of civil war.

Consequence of such arguing.

No country affords more striking examples in point than the United States.

Pensacola and Barancas taken possession of by Americans in time of peace.

Their occupation justified by the American government.

Extract of President's message on the Seminole war.

people, having the most ample opportunity of informing himself correctly, and although on his return to England in the latter month he passed through a considerable portion of the United States, where he might have corrected any error which he had inadvertently fallen into, yet it is to be supposed that he was so much engaged in the important duties imposed on him as Chief Secretary to the Lord High Commissioner, the Earl of Durham, that he had not time to investigate so closely as otherwise he might have done, the conduct of the government of the Republic; and knowing what that government ought to have done, he has too hastily assumed that it had performed its duty. A more careful inquiry, which it must be admitted it is rather singular he omitted to make, would have proved to him that the "Law of Neutrality" to which he refers had not been kept, but had been wholly disregarded; that no "gentleman" or any other man had been prosecuted and convicted for infringing that law; that the American army had not been doubled to keep that law; that, in fact, no addition whatever had been made to it for any such purpose, or any other purpose; that the opinion of the people of the United States, from one end of the country to the other, was not with us, but decidedly the reverse; and that it was wholly incorrect to say that the Americans dared not hold a sympathizer's meeting in any town in the United States, —these meetings being of constant occurrence throughout the principal towns of the adjacent country, and through several of which Mr. Buller passed, although, probably, not at the moment they were assembled.

Lest it should be imagined that this contradiction of the accuracy of Mr. Buller's statements requires confirmation from more disinterested parties, your committee will give an extract from the leading journal of the state of New York, remarking on the speech of the learned gentleman when the report of it first appeared on this side the Atlantic:—

"The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel animadverted severely on the conduct of this government, in relation to the inroads into Canada, but the President was defended by the Ministers, Lord Brougham and Mr. C. Buller, an attaché to the Durham Mission. The latter gentleman, indeed, stated circumstances in favour of our policy, with which ourselves are unacquainted, such as, that this government had doubled the army to prevent the assaults on Canada, and one or two other facts unheard of before."—*Morning Courier and New York Enquirer*, Saturday, 23 March 1839.

Similar remarks might be quoted from many other journals of the Union, but upon a fact so obvious and undeniable, it cannot be necessary to cite them.

But your committee are disposed to regard with far greater alarm and apprehension certain principles advanced by the government of the United States, in respect to our right to pursue the brigands who may invade the provinces, and attack them within the limits of those States.

The ground assumed by the American minister in London, in relation to the destruction of the "Caroline" steam-boat, if admitted, would at once place these provinces in a situation that would wholly disable them from effectually protecting themselves from foreign aggression; Mr. Stevenson assumes that the invasion of Upper Canada by the armed force, under the command of one of his fellow-citizens, Van Rensselaer, at Navy Island, was a case of civil war, existing at the time within the province; that civil wars are not distinguishable from other wars, as to belligerent and neutral rights, and therefore not being able to deny the fact; but admitting it, as he does, to be true, that the steam-boat in question was engaged in the service of the invaders, and had communicated with them from the United States shore three times in the course of one day, he nevertheless asserts that we were not justified in following her to her place of shelter at Schlosser, and destroying her there. As a consequence of such mode of arguing, if Mr. Stevenson be right, it must follow that the government of the United States is of opinion that if all the steam-boats lying at Buffalo, some 50 in number, had been engaged in bringing men, munitions of war, and other aid from that place to the armed body of invaders on Navy Island, there was nothing illegal in such acts, and that our troops would not have been justified in pursuing them into the States, and destroying them wherever they could find them. Your committee have no apprehensions that any such doctrine will be admitted by Her Majesty's Government if the occasion should occur requiring its discussion; and if precedent were necessary to controvert it, there is no country whose history affords more striking examples in point than that of the United States, many of which, if it would serve any useful purpose, might be noticed in this place; one only, however, will suffice.

In May 1818, Pensacola and the Fort of Barancas, in West Florida, belonging to the Spaniards, were taken forcible possession of by the American troops, in a time of peace between the two countries—the former "with only the show of resistance," the latter by capitulation; the garrisons of both being conveyed to the Havana, at the expense of the American government.

The occupation of these Spanish possessions was justified by the government of the United States, on this occasion, upon the ground, that as almost the whole of the tribe of Seminoles inhabited the country within the limits of Florida, Spain was bound by the treaty of 1795 to restrain them from committing hostilities against the United States; "that as she was unable to fulfil this obligation, her inability to maintain her authority over the territory and Indians within her limits ought not to expose the United States to other and greater injuries," and that, where the authority of Spain ceased to exist, the United States had a right to pursue their enemy, on a principle of self-defence.

"The right of self-defence," says the President (in one of his messages to Congress, upon the subject of the Seminole war) "never ceases; it is amongst the most sacred, and alike necessary