

NEW-YORK TRIBUNE.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEB. 12, 1852.

Topics of the Morning.

[The following matters, occurring in the City, or received by Mail or Telegraph, will be found, more or less at length, in our columns this morning.]

In the Senate, after the receipt of the correspondence concerning the Prometheus, and the transaction of some preliminary business, the joint resolution concerning the Irish State prisoners was taken up, and Mr. Seward, of this State, made a powerful speech in favor of it. After he had concluded, Slavery, which seems to sit on every generous movement of the human heart like a nightmare, raised objections through Badger, Mason, &c., and the Senate adjourned without action.

In the House, the Peace measures kicked up another row. Whoever christened them Peace Measures must have been thinking of Rory O'More's philosophy of dreaming—they go by contraries. The actors in this Peace farce were Messrs. Giddings, of Ohio, and Stanly, of North Carolina. We can only regret the occurrence of such scenes in our National Legislature.

In our State Senate nothing of much moment transpired.

The Senate, at Albany, has confirmed Gov. Hunt's nomination of Dr. Morris as Health Officer of this port vice Dr. Doane, deceased, and Vaché, momentarily appointed by outsiders. A deadly shooting case in Cumberland, Maryland.

Vessel bilged at Stratford, Conn. The ice on the Susquehanna, is beginning to refuse to carry Railroads any longer.

A letter from Kossuth to Gov. Boutwell, of Massachusetts.

The death of Alderman Tiffany, of Buffalo, will be noticed with regret. The New-York Common Council will remember his kindness on their visit at the opening of the Erie Railroad.

The Gen. Chapin bail forfeited in Maryland is being inquired after by the Legislature of that State. It has perhaps caught the fugitive fever.

The Hudson at Albany is getting high, though it takes nothing but cold water.

Bidders for contracts on the Canals, unsuccessful before the Canal Board, are carrying their bids to the Courts. See case at Fond.

The Rhode Island Senate has voted in favor of the Maine Law.

On the Sixth Page a number of Literary Notices will be found, with extracts from the works reviewed. Bristed's work on English and American Universities; Mutterings and Musings of an Invalid; and France by Sir James Stephen, are among the number. There are also reports of Ralph Waldo Emerson's lecture on Power, and Dr. Dewey's on Human Destiny, and two interesting letters from our Washington correspondent.

Kossuth's speech before the Legislature of Ohio will naturally attract attention. It is on the Seventh Page, where will also be found a report of Hon. E. D. Culver's speech at the Temperance Rally on Tuesday evening; a column of Mail Gleanings; Kossuth in Cincinnati; Fire at Saratoga; some City Items, Shipping Intelligence, &c.

To Correspondents. N. Upton, Columbus. Yours is received but we do not mention the name of your Post Office and State.

Should we have the Maine Law? That we shall have it from our present Legislature, we cannot predict; but, 'we won't have anything else.' No thirty-gallon abomination can be turned down the throats of the earnest advocates of Temperance; and, even if the Legislature should pass it, (as it will not,) we repudiate it in advance, and will be in no way responsible for it. What the Temperance men demand is not the regulation of the Liquor Traffic, but its destruction; not that its evils be circumscribed (idle fancy) or veiled, but that they be, to the extent of the State's ability, utterly eradicated. Such a law are all willing to stand under and (if such be its fate) fall with; but no shilly-shally legislation can endure, and it would be good for nothing if not to the heads of the distillery; put out the fires of the distillery; confiscate the demijohns, bottles and glasses which have been polluted with the infernal traffic; but no act screening great mischief-makers and acting down on little ones can possibly be fastened on the advocates of Temperance. They disown and loathe it.

For our own part, we are opposed to legalizing the manufacture or sale of intoxicating Liquors for Medicinal, Mechanical or any other purpose. There is no need of it, and great harm in it. That Alcohol may be useful in various contingencies we do not dispute; for Arsenic, Opium and other poisons are so; and it is not probable that this single member of the family should have no good end whatever. Let Alcohol—pure, undiluted Alcohol—be manufactured and sold without license; let doctors and others use it as they shall see fit; but this undisciplined poison no one would drink; and we protest against all tampering with, coddling up and disguising it so that the ignorant, the simple, the victims of depraved appetite, shall be tempted to imbibe it where they would reject the naked poison. All such weavings of snares for the feet of the unwary is indefensible, is demonic, and ought to be prohibited by law.

But the People are not ready for such stringent legislation. Well, Sir, if you think they are not, take hold and help us make them ready! We maintain that they are, and that the Maine Law, in all its primitive rigor, would be sustained by Fifty Thousand Majority of the Legal Voters of our State, and carried into full execution within a year after its passage. Legislators! will you oblige us by submitting it to the People?

At all events, we stand on '54 0r fight.' The struggle is only begun at its rate, and will be prosecuted through a series of years whether the Maine Law passes this winter or not. As to 'breaking down the party' and all that, it would be

just the same whether the Law passes this winter or not. Temperance men and Rum-sellers will keep their eye on the main chance, and let Politics ride behind. The next Legislature will be chosen with express reference to the Maine Law, whether it shall or shall not have been previously enacted. We believe the enactment of the Law now, by driving thousands out of the traffic, will render the question far less troublesome hereafter. But, now or hereafter, the Maine Law must come! We, who demand it, are willing to work and able to wait. We have just tried five years of 'Moral Suasion,' and find that Rum has gained on us every day. We shall now try five years' Legal Suasion, if necessary, and see how that will operate. Gentlemen politicians! choose whether to stand with us or against us, but do not imagine any fence will last long enough to hold you in an equivocal position. The fight is on, and will continue until it is clearly and finally decided whether Rum or Temperance shall prevail in the State. Unless you believe Rum is to be the victor, why not take your stand at once for Temperance, and have the question settled?

A Vital Movement in Germany. Questions of supreme importance are now warmly discussed in Germany, and deserve a careful attention even here.

When Germany entered upon the policy of protecting home industry she was poor, weak and dependent. Manufacturers she had few, and her supplies came from England. By means of this policy, she has become wealthy and powerful, and at this day is a formidable competitor with England in the market of the world, for the sale of articles for which she formerly had to look to that country.

In this process the entire people of Germany have been gainers, not merely in respect of physical comfort and independence, but in respect of political power and liberty. For the liberty and power of the people always increase as they increase in wealth.

The most considerable representative of protection has been Prussia. She long stood alone on that ground. But the neighboring states gradually came in, one after another, until, in 1834-5, the existing German Customs' Union was formed. To this, several States which at that time still stood out, have since given their adhesion, and last September, Hanover, which, from its connection with England, had most stiffly refused to join a league which was not favorable to British supremacy any more than to the dogmas of what is called free-trade, at last came in and concluded a treaty with Prussia, which rendered it and its allies virtually members of the Customs' Union. This Union expires by its own limitation on December 31, 1853, and Prussia has already given the necessary official notice of its termination.

Austria has never been a member of the Union. Her system of duties has been not protective, but prohibitive; and the consequence was that while she excluded German manufactures from the markets of Italy and Hungary, she was deprived of the advantages of free access to the German sea-ports. This system she has, however, just abandoned, by a general reduction of duties, down to the level of the tariff of the Customs' Union.

Having done this, the Imperial Government summoned to meet at Vienna, on the 2d ult., a body of Delegates from the different States of Germany, to consider a plan for uniting the entire Empire of Austria with Germany under one system of Customs. The Conference met on the appointed day. Prussia was not represented, but some dozen other States and free cities were. Among these were Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, Wurtemberg, and the Hanseatic towns. The proceedings were opened by a speech from Prince Schwartzberg, the Austrian Premier, in which he held up the commercial advantages which a suitable arrangement would confer on both parties, at the same time that he disclaimed the idea of hostility to the Customs' Union. On the contrary, it was rather the wish of Austria as far as possible, to come into that Union and to see all Central Europe united under one tariff. The Austrian propositions were then laid before the Conference, and up to our last advice had been the subject of its daily deliberations. It was supposed the matter would be finally completed in the Conference by the 1st inst.

These propositions are briefly that a treaty shall be made between Austria and the Italian States which are already included in its Custom-House organization on the one part, and Prussia and the States of the Customs' Union on the other, to commence on Jan. 1, 1854, and to continue till Jan. 1, 1859. This treaty is regarded as merely preparatory to a full union of the entire Custom-House administration of the two parties, the conditions of which Austrian proposes for discussion by the Conference, and which is to go into effect at the date fixed for the expiration of the treaty. Meanwhile, under the treaty, a commission is to be appointed to render the duties levied by the two parties as nearly equal as possible, to settle disputed points, and to prepare for the definite union of 1859. For the present it is proposed that all raw materials, bread-stuffs, fruit, wine and fuel shall go free of duty between the parties; articles on which they impose equal duties, when imported from abroad, or where there is an inequality which does not exceed 5 per cent, are to enjoy a reduction of 25 per cent, when imported from one side to the other; all other products enjoy a reduction of 10 per cent;

in foreign ports the two parties shall be represented by the same Consuls, though any nation on either side has the right to appoint Consuls of its own where it deems proper; and navigation is to be free, each party treating the vessels of the other like its own.

Such are the proposed features of the treaty which Austria now offers to make, and which a very great part of Germany is ready to accept. Indeed, we do not see how its acceptance by all Germany can be avoided. It is true that Prussia has sent no representatives to the Conference, that a great hostility to Austria prevails among a considerable portion of her people, and that they dread nothing so much as coming under Austrian influence. But on the other hand, it has ever been a favorite object of Prussian policy to extend the Customs' Union, and certainly a fairer chance for extending it could not be offered. There is nothing in the terms proposed by Austria, or the manner of proposing them, which can justify a rejection of the proposal; and it is a fact of some significance that the Prussian ministerial journals, which were at first disposed to attack the scheme in bitter language, have been imperatively restrained by their Government. The tone of the German free traders—who, like other doctrinaires and mere theorists, pursue their abstract idea without regard to existing facts,—also indicates a very great probability that the project will be carried out. They would not be likely to lose their temper so far as they do, if the chances were not decidedly against them.

It is not necessary to say that this scheme is not the product of any love for England. In effect it must amount to the exclusion of England from the Continental markets, at the same time that it builds up the industry of Germany and Austria into proportions of power and independence that Great Britain can never overcome. Holland, Belgium and Denmark must soon come into this mighty Union; and it will not need to exist long in order to give a blow to the British monopoly and the British power to control and disturb the commerce of the world from which England can never recover. Let it be organized, and let the United States return to a healthy commercial policy and that power will soon be overthrown forever, and a grand and solid advance made toward universal liberty and self-government.

To the people of Germany and of Austria, and especially of Hungary, this Union will be a blessing; it will give them the advantages of genuine free trade; it will stimulate industry; increase and equalize wealth and prepare the way for that sort of popular freedom which needs no army for its defense, and which no usurper dare assail.

A correspondent inquires why we do not show up the inconsistency of those high-pressure advocates of free trade with England, who are now before Congress to ask for protection for their own lines of steamships. It might be easy to do what he proposes, but we fail to see the propriety of assailing these new converts to a sound doctrine, and are rather disposed to stand by and see how they will come out in their endeavors to counteract and change a policy they have done so much to establish. Only after they have succeeded we shall expect them to turn around and help us complete the change of which their own success is but the beginning, and which needs to be effected in respect to other departments of enterprise and industry quite as much as in respect to steamships. We count on Messrs. E. K. Collins & Co., Mortimer Livingston, and The Journal of Commerce to help us in pushing the cause of protection generally, just as soon as they have got what protection is necessary to sustain our lines of ocean steamships against the British competition.

NORTHERN TRAVEL.—Our first winter journey to Albany was made (via Newburgh,) in 1838, and occupied three days; our second (in 1839) involved two days' hard riding, including most of the intervening night. On Monday we went up (via Hudson River Railroad) between 8 A.M. and 2 P.M., and yesterday we came down even quicker, leaving Saratoga Springs at 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ (in company with passengers who left Castleton, Vt., three hours before) left Albany a little past 11, and were set down in Chambers-st. at 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ P.M.—in time to do a pretty fair day's work. The Harlem Road, we understand, runs through from Albany and Troy in about the same time—five hours.

Our City owes a debt of gratitude to her spirited citizens who, within the last few years, have, at their own heavy risk and cost, opened Railroad communications with the North and with the West—with the heart of our State and its extremities—so that one may leave our City any morning and reach almost any village in the State in the course of the next day, in a third of the time and at less than a third of the cost which would have been required in 1840. These Railroads have mainly been built by men who knew that they were serving the public to their own loss—who took the stock, not because they wanted it, but because some one must take it or the Roads would not be built. And they were not merely ridiculed for their folly in so doing, but robbed at every turn through rascally extortions for damages by and who, of those whose lands they traversed, and many of those were actually and largely benefited by these improvements and would not have sold their property after their completion for the prices at which they previously held it, were yet so selfish and dishonest as to exact hundreds and often thousands of dollars for the right of way. But for this legal robbery, by men who have a great horror of spoliation and 'Socialism,' the Hudson River Road might now have its double track nearly complete on the strength of its past outlay, with its stock nearly or quite at par. We trust both it and the Erie will go to par soon, as we are sure they would even now if the Country were enjoying that Industrial activity and prosperity which the Tariff of '42 would have insured it. The success of the New-Haven and of the Wes-

tern strengthen our hopes that our newer and equally important Roads whose stock is yet depressed, will soon feel the impulse of prosperity.

THE DUTIES ON CIGARS.—We learn by the letter of a correspondent that a meeting of the Journeymen Cigarmakers of Suffield, Conn., was held on Saturday, the 17th ult., when a petition to Congress was adopted, praying for protection against the importation of foreign, and especially German, cigars. The protection asked for is 40 cents per lb. instead of the present ad valorem duty. Samuel N. Reid was Chairman of the meeting, and Henry Gettier, D. W. Corbin, James Aldrich and Wm. Cox were appointed a Corresponding Committee.

ENGLISH MINISTER.—It is announced officially by The National Intelligencer that Hon. John F. Crampton has been appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from Great Britain in place of Sir H. L. Bulwer. Mr. Crampton is an Irishman.

THE LATEST NEWS.

By Telegraph to the New-York Tribune.

Southern Telegraph Office, corner of Hanover and Beaver-sts.

XXXIII CONGRESS.—First Session. SENATE.—WASHINGTON, Feb. 11, 1852. The SENATE met at 12 $\frac{1}{2}$.

THE CHAIR laid before the Senate a reply of the Secretary of State to the Resolution of the Senate, calling for information concerning the loss of the Russian Court, confined in Siberia for a pretended crime. They represent further, that four hundred others are similarly confined in Siberia, owing to errors of the Russian Courts.

Mr. BADGER presented numerous petitions for additional compensation for taking the Census.

MR. CHASE and others presented similar petitions.

MR. UNDERWOOD presented the petition of two adopted citizens of the United States, residing in New-York, representing that the brother of one of them had been confined in Siberia for a pretended crime. They represent further, that four hundred others are similarly confined in Siberia, owing to errors of the Russian Courts.

MR. UNDERWOOD changed his motion, so as to refer the petition to the Judiciary Committee.

MR. BUTLER.—I object to that. [Laughter.] You are not in earnest, are you?

MR. UNDERWOOD said he was. [Laughter.]

MR. MASON asked if the petitioners were known.

MR. UNDERWOOD said he knew nothing of them, personally.

MR. MASON.—Then I would lie on the table. Agreed to.

THE CHAIR laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, with copies of instructions sent to the American Minister at London, and copies of the correspondence between Mr. Lawrence and the British Government concerning the Russian affair. The correspondence, &c., was not read, but was ordered to be printed.

MR. SEWARD reported a bill granting a register to the ship Obed Mitchell, of New-York, now called Kate Napier, and it was ordered to be engrossed.

MR. CLASS offered a resolution, which was adopted, and ordered to be engrossed.

MR. CLEMENS introduced a bill changing the time for holding United States Courts in Alabama, and it was ordered to be engrossed.

THE RESOLUTION of sympathy for the Irish exiles was then taken up, when MR. SEWARD proceeded to address the Senate, and said this proceeding is neither incongruous nor inopportune, inasmuch as it requires the assent of both Houses of Congress to the approval of the President of the United States. Thus it becomes a national act. It recommends clemency to the Irish patriots imprisoned in Van Diemen's Land, and urges for the formation of Great Britain to influence her conduct.

It is therefore a national appeal to the magnanimity of that power. I think the act defensible on grounds of abstract justice, and upon due consideration of the facts of the case. The correspondence, in first place, that it is not altogether novel in principle and character. The patriots in the penal colony are suffering for an effort honestly made to restore their fatherland to freedom and independence.

The sympathy of the United States for them, springs from the same source with the sympathy which this country has habitually manifested on similar occasions toward revolutionary France in 1793, 1830 and 1848, and the South American Republics, Greece, Poland, Italy, Germany and Hungary. Even in form, this proceeding assimilates to intervention of the United States in behalf of Louis Braille and his companions, when in exile in Asia Minor.

The interest expressed by this resolution in Smith O'Brien is not merely personal. It is the reverential compassion of a free and generous people for a fallen nation. The cause depends on the character of the nation which has declared American Independence. Independence depends on our whole Colonial experience, in vindicating the abjuration of allegiance to the British throne.

Ten centuries ago Ireland was a distinct sovereign power, with adequate laws of its own, and she was guilty of one enduring crime, the crime was proximity to British shores. Ireland, moreover, had one great misfortune; she had remained many centuries unconquered and unconquered. Her crime provoked English jealousy, and her misfortune produced endless divisions into sects and classes, and invited the invader. England, on the contrary, had been successfully subjected by the Romans, Danes, Saxons and Normans, and had acquired the habit of conquering the world by arms and discipline, which, combined with the energy resulting from a mixture of races and ambition inspired by an insular position, have enabled her almost to have the world in her power.

At the very moment when as chroniclers relate, the Norman King of England, Henry the Second, was causing in his mind to conquer the adjacent island, because it was commodious for him, and its inhabitants were so near to him, he was being attacked by a deposed Irish Prince to reconstitute him on his throne.

Of course the invasion did not result in the restoration of the fugitive, nor did it in the conquest of Ireland. Her crime provoked English jealousy, and her misfortune produced endless divisions into sects and classes, and invited the invader. England, on the contrary, had been successfully subjected by the Romans, Danes, Saxons and Normans, and had acquired the habit of conquering the world by arms and discipline, which, combined with the energy resulting from a mixture of races and ambition inspired by an insular position, have enabled her almost to have the world in her power.

At the very moment when as chroniclers relate, the Norman King of England, Henry the Second, was causing in his mind to conquer the adjacent island, because it was commodious for him, and its inhabitants were so near to him, he was being attacked by a deposed Irish Prince to reconstitute him on his throne.

Of course the invasion did not result in the restoration of the fugitive, nor did it in the conquest of Ireland. Her crime provoked English jealousy, and her misfortune produced endless divisions into sects and classes, and invited the invader. England, on the contrary, had been successfully subjected by the Romans, Danes, Saxons and Normans, and had acquired the habit of conquering the world by arms and discipline, which, combined with the energy resulting from a mixture of races and ambition inspired by an insular position, have enabled her almost to have the world in her power.

At the very moment when as chroniclers relate, the Norman King of England, Henry the Second, was causing in his mind to conquer the adjacent island, because it was commodious for him, and its inhabitants were so near to him, he was being attacked by a deposed Irish Prince to reconstitute him on his throne.

Of course the invasion did not result in the restoration of the fugitive, nor did it in the conquest of Ireland. Her crime provoked English jealousy, and her misfortune produced endless divisions into sects and classes, and invited the invader. England, on the contrary, had been successfully subjected by the Romans, Danes, Saxons and Normans, and had acquired the habit of conquering the world by arms and discipline, which, combined with the energy resulting from a mixture of races and ambition inspired by an insular position, have enabled her almost to have the world in her power.

At the very moment when as chroniclers relate, the Norman King of England, Henry the Second, was causing in his mind to conquer the adjacent island, because it was commodious for him, and its inhabitants were so near to him, he was being attacked by a deposed Irish Prince to reconstitute him on his throne.

Of course the invasion did not result in the restoration of the fugitive, nor did it in the conquest of Ireland. Her crime provoked English jealousy, and her misfortune produced endless divisions into sects and classes, and invited the invader. England, on the contrary, had been successfully subjected by the Romans, Danes, Saxons and Normans, and had acquired the habit of conquering the world by arms and discipline, which, combined with the energy resulting from a mixture of races and ambition inspired by an insular position, have enabled her almost to have the world in her power.

and the few apologetic natives, and just five hundred and twenty years after the first invasion, and as the close of a desperate and memorable battle on the banks of the Boyne, Ireland capitulated to the Government of the Pale, stipulating, nevertheless, for liberty of conscience, which was solemnly guaranteed by the treaty of Limerick, and confirmed by William and Mary, the common Sovereigns of non-united Ireland, but England persisted in her policy, and changed the only means employed, perfidiously breaking the covenant of peace, she substituted a disfranchising penal code for her armies, and the sword of the conqueror was replaced by the scaffold. Burke describes the atrocities of that system, in the following prophetic language:

"It is a system well digested and well disposed in all its parts, and calculated to produce the most abject servitude, well fitted for the impoverishment and degradation of the people, and the debasement of human nature itself." The after history of Ireland is a record of the most unvarnished and unrelenting despotism, and in 78, when the exigencies of the Empire were alarming, the British Parliament, in the most solemn manner, renounced its usurped supremacy, and declared, with the consent of the King, that the rights claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of Ireland, shall be, and are established, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questioned.

Ireland exulted for one delicious moment, in National independence regained, but the Nationed and therefore demanded an option of the penal code and the Government of the Pale, in the interest of England, refused both. Discontent spread deeply and widely. Emmet, Fitzgerald, and their associates in '98, conspired to raise the standard of rebellion, but were betrayed, and revolution was crushed. The British Government assumed that the Irish people had tried the experiment of self-government, and proved themselves incompetent. They sent down to the Parliament of the Pale, in 1801, a broken and ailing man, and gave up its severed and pernicious existence, and so Ireland, in name united, was then in fact absorbed by the British Empire, with a manager representation only.

The Telegraph, which works quite unintelligibly to-day, here omits a paragraph.

The Protestant ministry in the Imperial Parliament, interfered from the sad failure of the men of '98, that the possibility of a martial revolution had passed away, at least for a time.

It is a system well digested and well disposed in all its parts, and calculated to produce the most abject servitude, well fitted for the impoverishment and degradation of the people, and the debasement of human nature itself." The after history of Ireland is a record of the most unvarnished and unrelenting despotism, and in 78, when the exigencies of the Empire were alarming, the British Parliament, in the most solemn manner, renounced its usurped supremacy, and declared, with the consent of the King, that the rights claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of Ireland, shall be, and are established, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questioned.

Perhaps neither system would have proved effective, even had union and harmony continued. Certain it is, that when the people divided both systems, and the British Empire itself, was broken in two, a General, on a pilgrimage to Rome, and O'Brien is a prisoner in Van Diemen's Land. Simultaneously with their failure, poverty and pestilence went forth throughout Ireland, and the people, with their Irish and English rights, established by a national or doubt, that never on earth was revolution more necessary or more just than it would have been in that most unhappy land. It is not my purpose in this review to hinder the cause of the Irish, or against the Protestants of Great Britain. I do claim aid disband the partnership in regard to history.

The ruin of Ireland has justly filled England with not only sadness, but a fearful apprehension of the British Empire itself. O'Connell was a Catholic. O'Brien is a Protestant. Rage of sects has long since died away in the agony of a catastrophe which has brought on all alike promiscuous and indiscriminate distress.

The policy of England was the error of the age, and the fault of systems. This is her sufficient apology; but on an occasion like this, Ireland is entitled to be distinguished as a people, and to our respect and our sympathy. That sympathy derives intenseness from the conceded genius and the proverbial virtues of Irish people.

The plains of Waterloo and Rights of Quebec bear witness to the greatness of the Greek, the Greek, they have, in their political decline, enchanted the world with wit and song and eloquence; confident and generous to a fault, while in their whole history does not occur an instance of the indulgence of unwarlike ambition.

Is not then the tribute proposed by this resolution due from the United States on such an occasion to such a people? I shall be answered, that question of clemency is not in our power, for Great Britain. True, but man and nations are awayed by persuasion. It may be said that while as individuals we may lawfully sympathize we cannot express sympathy as a nation—this is a serious error. A nation may sympathize in unwarlike sentiment, but shall not exercise active benevolence. There is only one code or morality for mankind, in all circumstances, conditions and relations, and its direct and comprehensive obligations are to the good of all men, citizens and individuals, and sects; but it is said that we may not lawfully intervene in the affairs of another sovereign State.

So indeed we may not, for injudicious purposes, or even for beneficent ones by force, but under law of nations, as perfected on Christian principles, the several civilized States are regarded as constituting one great Commonwealth. While no one can rightfully interfere with the domestic affairs of another, or interfere with the conduct of its domestic affairs, there is still allowed and enjoined the practice of national courtesies, hospitalities and agreeable and charitable offices.

Montesquieu says that the laws of nations are founded on the principle that nations in peace ought to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests. Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter.

Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.

Again, it is said that this will become a precedent for mischievous intervention against us hereafter. Certainly, we do not distrust our own wisdom in the future. Let us believe, then, as we ought, that our success in this cause will be a precedent for us to do for each other the most good, and in war the least harm possible, without injuring their own real interests.