difficulty. There are five passages leading to the harbor, and four of these are to be closed, or are already closed with stones; the fifth will be blockaded in the ordinary manner." We give this statement, not prepared with a view to a sensation, simply as the information which is believed in by persons who have no interest in deceit.

But suppose, as will probably happen, some of the harbors of the South to be closed by the deposit of stones referred to, the effect would be but temporary. This war cannot last very long, and when it is ended the opening of the ports will depend on nothing but the expenditure of a few thousand pounds. The talk of strangling commerce and destroying the ports for all time is mere rant. The proceeding in question has all the oddness and irregularity which the American character so much affects, but it is a *bona fide* operation of warfare, and not an unmeaning threat. The Times tells us that in the development of this war we shall be witnesses of such scenes of horror as the world has not seen since men fought like wild beasts. But our contemporary exhausted his vocabulary of horror last May in similar prophecies, which are as yet unfulfilled. If he really wants to be enrolled among the guardians of the civilization of mankind he has an opportunity of showing his ambition in a field where the responsibility of England is directly engaged. Immortal minds will judge newspapers as they judge men, not by the fine sentiments they may utter, but by the aim and tendency of their conduct, and will decline to believe in the superior humanity of those who are moving heaven and earth to entangle two Christian and Protestant nations in a fratricidal war.

### The Offences of the United States Against England.

[From the London Times, Dec. 21.]

* * * * * *

First, there was the Canadian rebellion of 1837. The movement was of the very slightest nature, and nothing could be more trifling than the resistance offered before the mutineers disbanded, never to meet again, and sought refuge in the American territory. The American authorities refused to give up Mackenzie and his associates on our demand, on the ground that, although they had been guilty of robbery and murder, their offences were merely political. At the same time the government of the State of New York threw open its arsenals to a portion of its own population calling themselves "sympathizers," in order that the arms which they contained might be used for the invasion and, if possible, for the subjugation of a friendly government. For this outrage, deliberately planned and openly committed, no reparation was ever made. The government disowned the acts of the State of New York, and the State of New York disclaimed all responsibility for the proceedings of its own mob, so that the English territory was invaded by men armed through the connivance of the State and the authority of its government, and yet nobody accepts any responsibility for their acts.

The Ashburton treaty displayed the same system of overbearing violence on the one side, the same conciliatory and pacific demeanor on the other. Infinite was the abuse poured on our devoted heads and violent the encroachments on the territory which was at that very moment the object of dispute. Once more we bowed in meek humility to the tyrannical, and, instead of standing on rights which it was only too easy to support by unanswerable argument, *we elected from ourselves a nobleman well known for his American concessions and feelings*, and sure, if it were possible, to avert a coming quarrel by the most ample and unreserved concessions. Our envoy justified the confidence we reposed in him. The case of America was much assisted by the international suppression on the part of "the doctrinaire" Webster, of certain maps which appeared to give us the victory by proving the truth and justice of our demand. *We gave them the things which we never took, we surrendered, for the sake of peace, the territory in dispute*, and rather than incur any risk, we threw in the uncontested part of Lake Champlain and the commanding position of Rouse's Point, not above forty miles distant from the great city of Montreal. The parent bowed down before her offspring, and endeavored to conciliate their unjust anger and their insatiable greediness. In Oregon we for a while stood on the defensive, and threatened to maintain our rights by the sword. But this position we soon saw fit to abandon, and America once more triumphed through our extraordinary desire for conciliation. We were treated with much rudeness in the question as to the fisheries of Nova Scotia, but the most sensitive wound to which our self-love was reserved for a question which England thinks she can hardly pour forth too much blood or incur too many sacrifices. The so-called right to search for slaves had been exercised for many years by England without even the pretence of any serious abuse. The New York became a favorite depot for this infamous traffic, and the United States were suddenly seized with the burning desire to protect the honor of their flag from the visitation of English ships of war. That flag was notoriously prostituted to conceal slave-trading operations by Brazilian and Spanish vessels. But the United States insisted that, whatever might be the guilt which that flag concealed, that wickedness should be shrouded in the most perfect impunity. They deemed it more honorable that their flag should be a protection for kidnapping and murder than that it should be stopped on the high seas by Great Britain in pursuance of a mission of the most disinterested and exalted philanthropy. The law of nations was against us, and we had no choice but to yield, and this gave another and more convincing proof of our determination to abandon the most cherished objects of our policy rather than give the United States an opportunity to fasten a quarrel upon us.

*Then came the affair of the enlistment. In the very heat of the Crimean war our Minister had what, considering the results brought about, we are bound to call the indiscretion, if seeking to enlist in Canada a few recruits for our army*, reduced to scanty numbers by cold and famine, from among the German population of the United States. That America does not estimate this crime as one of very first magnitude is abundantly proved by her own conduct in filling up her armies with the people of every country, and seeming content to rely for her defence on the population of any territory except her own. It was the time of a keen Presidential election, political capital was wanted, and our Minister was grossly excited for this alleged offence; and now, *for all these outrages and insults, supported with such exemplary meekness and tenacity, what is our reward?* We are selected as the objects of an insult so strange and so groundless that all Europe, wont, as it is, to catch greedily at anything which may seem to compromise our naval superiority, cries shame upon the outrage, and agrees that it is one to which even we, well used as we have been to every species of insult, cannot possibly submit. It is not, perhaps, to be wondered at, when we consider our former forbearance, that we consider that at this moment we are actually giving effect to a paper blockade, maintained by a contemptible naval power, rather than give the slightest excuse for a quarrel, that those whom we thus earnestly seek to conciliate should believe it impossible that this last of so many insults should have an effect which all that we have suffered before has failed to produce. But it is even so. *We are assumed at last that there is little dignity or wisdom in submitting any longer to treatment which, on the part of the United States, has become habitual and traditional.* Peace can never be preserved in this way. Such conduct, like all other over indulgence, only tends to make us contemptible in the eyes of those on whom it is practised, and we shall probably be driven to give the most terrible proofs of our strength because we have hitherto used it with a degree of moderation which has caused America to doubt its existence.

### Secretary Seward's Letter of November 30, to Mr. Adams, as Read in London.

[From the London Post (government organ) Dec. 21.]

In the present state of the public mind the *craving for news from America is naturally so great, that every word that comes with any authority from the other side of the Atlantic is invested with an undue importance.* Thus it happens that because Mr. Adams has received a despatch from Mr. Seward which is of a friendly character to this country, and discusses in fair and pleasant terms the matters with which it deals, exaggeration is swift to lay hold of the circumstance and puff it up to the largest dimensions. People whispered yesterday, and then said openly, that the American government had written to disavow the act of Captain Wilkes, that Mr. Lincoln was ready to apologise, and that the whole difficulty was settled. We are sorry to have to dissipate these too easily raised illusions. They are quite unfounded, for, if we are not mistaken, the despatch in question *does not in any sense whatever*, refer to the outrage on our mail steamer. It deals only with some of the current business between the two governments.

It is quite vain to attempt to speculate with any certainty upon the momentous issue pending at Washington. All that we can fairly say we know is that if the banking and commercial classes have sufficient interest with the government, peace is tolerably secure; but if the mob is in this instance to have its sway, the worst may be apprehended.

On one thing the country may be perfectly confident. The instructions of Lord Lyons are such as become an English government. With all that is due to our own dignity, they combine such a judiciousness and temperance of procedure that the American most tender of his pride will be unable to complain of our course as menacing or haughty. Confident in the justice of our claim, and resolved to vindicate it, it becomes us to insist without rudeness and to act without passion.

### The Privateers, Pirates and Slave Traders of America.

[From the London Post (Government Organ) Dec. 21.]

Two trials have recently taken place at New York, both of which involve questions of great public importance. The first of these was the trial of the crew of the Confederate privateer Savannah, which was captured some months ago off the coast of Virginia by a vessel of war belonging to the Northern States. The delay that took place in bringing these men to trial has not been explained. Probably upon this, as upon other subjects, there was a conflict of opinion in the Cabinet at Washington. Although, however, the trial took place, but the jury, being unable to agree upon their verdict, were discharged. It is understood that there is to be a fresh trial, and the New York papers, at least the most influential portion of them, do not hesitate to assert that, should a verdict of guilty be pronounced, the whole of the crew of the Savannah will be executed as pirates.

The result of this trial it is not very easy to account for. From the time which had elapsed since the capture of the vessel in question, and the ample opportunity thus afforded for obtaining and arranging the necessary evidence, we should have supposed that a conviction was all but certain. What course the federal government would have taken in that event is a mere matter of conjecture; but it appears to us that to bring these men to trial at all was a great mistake. If the United States had joined in the famous declaration appended to the Treaty of Paris, of 1856, *by which the barbarous practice of privateering was renounced, the public trial of the crew of the Savannah would have been a perfectly consistent step.* It would been a protest of the most public and emphatic kind against the unlawful mode of warfare practised by the Confederate States. But the Cabinet of Washington has completely debarred itself from taking this high ground. It refused, five years ago, in the most formal and decided manner, to renounce privateering in time of war. It still recognizes it as one sanctioned by the general law of nations, though renounced, as between themselves, by certain European powers. *It is difficult to see, therefore, up a what principle the federal government assumes to treat as pirates the privateers of the Southern States.* It does not, at least it has not yet, sent to public trial as traitors the Confederate prisoners taken upon land. Its why distinguish between the two? They are both equally in arms against the federal government, and according to its maxims, the mode of warfare pursued by the one is quite as lawful as that practised by the other. To charge the crew of the Savannah with piracy, while Confederate soldiers taken upon land are treated as prisoners of war, is in effect to admit that there is a broad distinction between these different modes of warfare. If we could suppose that the federal government really desired to put an end to privateering we should rejoice that this distinction had been made. But we have nothing to induce us to believe that this is the case. We have every reason, on the contrary, for believing that the Northern States have no intention of abandoning this antiquated mode of warfare, and that they will not hesitate to resort to it in the event of hostilities with this country. Why, therefore, the crew of the Savannah should have been brought to trial on the capital charge of piracy, while hundred of other confederate rebels are treated as prisoners of war, it seems impossible to explain. Meanwhile, we cannot but consider it as a fortunate circumstance that the jury who tried these men did not agree. Had a verdict of guilty been proclaimed, and the capital sentence carried into effect, we cannot doubt that the Confederate States would have been provoked to corresponding acts of retaliation, and to the miseries of actual warfare there would have been superadded upon both sides a series of judicial murders. We have no sympathy with the crew of the Savannah, but it will be well for the interests of humanity if the criminal proceedings taken against them are now allowed to drop.

On November 30 a second trial for piracy took place at New York. But the charge in this case was not for privateering. The prisoner, Captain Nathaniel Gordon, was indicted for trading in slaves. He was found guilty, and in accordance with the law of the United States, sentence of death was passed upon him. No similar incident had taken place for upwards of forty years, the very severity of the law no doubt tending most effectually to defeat it. The result of this trial is stated to have taken every one by surprise, even the prisoner himself regarding it as a solemn farce. According to the sentence passed upon him, he is to be executed on February 7.

As to the law of the United States upon the subject there is no doubt. Since the year 1819 it has been a capital offence for American citizens to engage in the African slave trade, and had this law been duly enforced there would have been an end of the traffic long ago. But it is notorious that this has not been the case. The continued refusal of America to allow the right of search, under any circumstances, in time of peace, has hitherto proved fatal to every attempt upon our part, and upon that of other nations, to put down the slave trade. It is notorious that that trade has of late years been carried on principally by means of American capital, and under the American flag, which could alone protect it. Vessels were built and fitted out at New York and Baltimore expressly for the purpose, and they could pursue their lawless traffic without the risk of interruption from any cruiser except those of the Union. There is no doubt that for some time past joint stock companies have been established expressly for the purpose of carrying it on. It may be said, in short, that American enterprise and avarice has for years past supplied Cuba with slaves. What effect is this recent conviction at New York likely to have upon this disgraceful state of things? Let us hope, whether the extreme penalty of the law is inflicted or not, that it will prove salutary. It is the capitalists of the North, not the slaveowners of the South, who now encourage the African traffic. We shall soon know whether President Lincoln is true to his professions in this important matter, or whether he has adopted them for personal and party purposes.

### The Emancipation and Abolition Idea of England.

[From the London News (organ of the Abolitionists) Dec. 21.]

President Lincoln has now added his authority to the weight of the general conviction that some decision must be taken—some measure resolved on, respecting the thousands of negroes who are now threwing themselves into the hands of the federal officers, or making their own way to the Northern cities. It has been understood for some time that this negro question was to be left *an open question as long as possible, in order that even's might decide* where rulers could not agree. Four members of the Cabinet, sustained by a large proportion of the commercial class in the great cities, and by many language yers and preachers (among whom no one has been more loud and emphatic than the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Mrs. Stowe's brother), *have insisted* that the North was pledged to abide by the existing constitution, which recognizes and sustains slavery. The other three members of the Cabinet, backed by nearly the whole rural population of the Free States, all the abolitionists, nearly all the army, and the more ardent patriots everywhere, have for sometime felt and said that this question—what must be done with the negroes?—must be the turning point of the federal case. There must be an end of the recognition of slavery, or all was lost; and preparation must be made for the necessary alteration of the Constitution, by treating as men, and not as chattels, the negroes who should repair to the federal camps or ships.

* * * * * * *

Before us, in the columns of Southern journals, lie statements of the duties of good confederate citizens, and of the ground of their duty. They must drive into the heart of their territory all their slaves, cattle and pigs, and everything that goes upon legs; and they must carry such food as they have transport for; but all else must be destroyed. As the banks in the seaports would sink their gold in the sea, rather than let the invaders have it, so the planters must destroy their crops and burn their cotton. But to carry out this scheme it is necessary that the negroes should be either beasts to be driven, in company with the exen, mules, hogs and horses, or people capable of patriotism and of political guidance. They happen to be neither. They escape the good of the cattle driver, or run back at a heat to the starting place. They come with vast quantities of provisions for sale, and they show the invaders the way to the stores and the granaries. These people are increasing in numbers largely and rapidly. The federal officers must have orders what to do with them, or must be held harmless for doing what they think best, and what they do not think best is returning them into slavery. The President shows his sense of the need of a policy by proposing a new scheme. *He shows his embarrassment by proposing a scheme which is monstrous. He shows by his courting of both parties that he leaves the matter to be settled by the strongest.* Thus the people of the North have *now the opportunity they have long waited for, and can prove to the world that they are really fighting for freedom, and aiming at the abolition of slavery.*

### What England Tells France.

[From the London News, Dec. 21.]

The Paris *Patrie* of the 19th inst. receives from London the following information, which it states to be "new"—if the answer to the English note should not be favorable, Lord Lyons will leave Washington in three days and will transmit the orders of his government to Admiral Milne, who will in that case immediately leave Jamaica (?) with his squadron to take up a position at Norfolk, a Virginia port on the confines of Carolina, which will be the basis of the English naval operations. France, we are assured, will maintain an attitude of armed neutrality. Admiral Milne will leave at Havana a division of frigates destined to take part in the operations against Mexico. Seven ships of war, recently armed, have already started one after the other for the Antilles, and it is thought that all the vessels ordered to reinforce Admiral Milne will be at Jamaica from the 25th to the 30th of December. In case the Washington Cabinet should surrender the prisoners taken from the Trent, *that affair will, of course, be settled; but a new question will then be raised by Lord Lyons, viz., whether the blockade of the Southern ports is effective, and negotiations upon this point will be actively carried on.* These negotiations will be of a very different character from the first, for they will bear upon a question affecting the commercial interests of all the powers.

### Mr. Cobden's Letter on the Crisis.

The following letter—referred to in our telegraphic despatches—was received by Mr. Henry Catt, of Brighton, in reply to one inviting Mr. Cobden to attend a forthcoming meeting at Brighton, for the purpose of advocating arbitration in the existing dispute with America:—

MIDHURST, Dec. 16, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR—I regret that I cannot accept your invitation to be present at the meeting to be held next Monday, condemnatory of a war with America. When asked to address public meetings, my plight, just now, is that of a man who, having sprained his ankle, is invited to enter the lists for a foot race. Though the state of my health in other respects is good enough, I am prevented by a local affection, for the present, from public speaking.

But I am glad to hear that the workingmen of Brighton are promoting a meeting on the American question. *The object of all rational men and true patriots at this moment should be to enforce upon the government that principle of mediation or arbitration which was proposed by the British Plenipotentiary, and sanctioned by the Congress of the great Powers at Paris in 1856.* The protocols of the conference then held, which were laid before Parliament at the time, but to which few persons have now access, disclose to us the excellent motives alleged by Lord Clarendon for proposing this "happy innovation," which he designed as "a barrier against conflicts which frequently only break forth because it is not always possible to enter into an explanation and to come to an understanding."

The question thus enforced in the name of the British government was solemnly debated, every plenipotentiary taking part, and was adjourned for two days to enable Count Orloff to obtain the "definitive adherence" of the Russian government, when the following declaration was unanimously agreed to:—

The plenipotentiaries do not hesitate to express in the name of their governments, the wish that States, between which any serious misunderstanding may arise, should, before appealing to arms, have recourse, as far as circumstances might allow, to the good offices of a friendly Power.

Now is it possible that any case will ever arise to which this principle of mediation can be more applicable than the present? In perfect ignorance of what the answer of the American government may be, I will assume the worst—that they refuse to surrender the captured envoys, and offer to justify their course by appeals to international law. What can be more within the scope of the Paris resolution than that where two interested parties differ in a subtle point of international law, it should be referred to the decision of a disinterested third Power?

Looking at it even with a view to a practical redress of our present grievance, what other course offers so good a hope for success? The object desired is to place at liberty the gentlemen who were taken from a British vessel. I happen to know Messrs. Slidell and Mason personally, and to the latter I am indebted for many courtesies at Washington; and although, as they must know, *I can have no sympathy for their cause*, few persons would more rejoice than myself to see them released from an irksome confinement. But assuming that to effect this object we declare war against the federal States, and that the gentlemen are in consequence transferred from Boston harbor to the interior, does any one acquainted with America believe that it would be possible for England to release them? We could destroy each other's commerce, and spend countless treasure—we might pour out blood like water, and ruin for a generation two great civilizations; but the object aimed at could not be accomplished.

On the contrary, if we submit the question to the adjudication of a third Power, the first step will be to place the two envoys at the disposal of the recognized tribunal. Should it be decided that they were illegally captured, they will be released; if their seizure be pronounced justifiable by international law, they will be liable to detention as prisoners of war only, and not as rebels, for the government of Washington can have no right of appeal to the law of nations in justification of their act except by acknowledging the belligerent rights of the South.

But it has been said that the Washington government wish to insult us with a view to provoke a war. There may be traitors or madmen in the North who would like to see their government involved in the embarrassment of a war with England; but that a government and people, who require at this moment half a million of men in arms to meet a civil war and guard their capital, should look with anything but dismay at the prospect of a war with the most powerful maritime State in the world, is too monstrous a supposition to be seriously believed by those who pretend to entertain it.

At all events, the true test of the disposition of the American people will be the expressed willingness on our part to resort, if necessary, to the mediation of a third party. Should such a conciliatory step meet with no better response than a desire to insult and wrong us, we should be united as one man to repel the outrage, and, unless the solemn declaration of Paris is to be impotent for all practical good, and a mere dead letter, all the Powers of Europe would in such a case be ranged on our side, and ready to brand with outlawry a nation guilty of so barbarous and wanton an aggression.

Entertaining these views, I recommend the workingmen of Brighton, and all who take part in similar demonstrations, to raise their voices in favor of arbitration. The cry for peace alone is hardly enough at the present moment. What we require is peace on the principles of impartial justice; and the truest way of insuring this in case of dispute, whether in the affairs of nations or of individuals, is by calling in the services of a disinterested arbitrator. I remain, very truly, yours, R. COBDEN.

Mr. HENRY CATT.

### Mr. Buxton, M. P., on the Dangerss of a War.

[From the London Post, Dec. 20.]

Mr. Buxton, M. P., speaking on the American, question recently, said:—It is said that the dispute is not one in its nature referrable to arbitration. It is said we have received a blow in the face, that what was entrusted to us has been filched away, that the American government will have deliberately chosen violence instead of law. But we are going to war not because they repudiate international law, but because we think their law is bad. England and America are to be plunged into all the horrors of a fratridal encounter, as being the only practicable settlement of a legal case, quite as intricate, quite as doubtful, as ninety-nine in a hundred of those decided in the courts of common law. (Hear, hear.) I have in my pocket a letter from an English lawyer of great ability, *in which he expresses his persuasion that if the case were tried they would prove to be in the right.* At any rate, we know that never did two parties go into a lawsuit without each being full of conviction that all law, justice and equity was on his side. These are the objections that I find presented by thoughtful and peace loving men. There are other objections which I cannot think of without irrepressible scorn. I find it said that the Americans are so offensive that we may thank God for the chance of giving them the licking they so richly deserve. *What! are Englishmen grown so touchy, so unmanly, so thin skinned, that for a few hard words they would plunge a continent into war?* (Hear, hear.) Then, again, it is said, that if we do not go to war now, probably we shall have to go to war at some future time, and we had better draw the sword while we are up and they are down. I say that he is no statesman—he is scarcely a man—who would pledge two brother nations into a terrific war because at some unknown time, for some unknown cause, somewhere and somehow, possibly the contingency may arise of another war, and that we should be prudent to forestall that possibility by snatching at a chance of fighting while our adversary is in the agonies of distress. Words cannot express the scorn I feel for such an ungenerous—nay, I will say, such a devilish proposal. These finish the objections I have heard made; but my own belief is that the true reason why people shrink from going to arbitration is simply that the proposal is novel. I wish to God that I had the tongue of Mr. Gladstone, that I might only persuade you, but win the ears of my countrymen to adopt the noble principle for which I have been contending. But I have the comfort of feeling sure that the day is coming, and coming quickly, when that principle will be treasured among the undisputed axioms of statesmen, and when it will be with melancholy wonder that men will recall how, on a question of theoretic legal principles and precedents, England rejected the arbitration of a judge, and rushed to the violence of the sword; that when there lay broad before her a path that led at once to peace and to honor, she preferred a course that led to an awful war—with this result: that after hundreds of millions of the gains of her people had been flung to the winds, after field upon field of battle had been soaked with the blood of her bravest, after tens of thousands of her own gallant children—yes, on whichever side they fought, of her children—*had passed to death in agonies that no tongue can tell, she found at the end that she had gained no shred, no jot, no title of good or happiness for herself or for mankind.* (Cheers.)

### Hiram Fuller, the Famous New York Editor, in England.

[From the London Post (government organ), Dec. 20.]

Yesterday evening Colonel Fuller delivered an address in St. James' Hall on the subject of the civil war in America. Although the capacious hall was far from filled, there was a rather large audience, amongst whom there were some of the most distinguished Americans at present residing in this country. The chair was occupied by Dr. Charles Mackay, who briefly introduced the lecturer as a colonel in the American army and formerly editor of the New York *Mirror*.

Colonel Fuller, after a few introductory remarks, said that when, on coming to the consideration of the fratricidal war which now raged in America, he avowed himself as a follower of Webster, the great admirer of the Union, he should not be accused of too great a proclivity to secession. In discussing this subject, on which men so warmly and so widely differed, he proposed to deal with facts without obtruding opinions or hazarding predictions. He was well aware that he ran the risk of giving sectional offence in speaking on a question which twenty millions on the one side and ten millions on the other were disputing at the point of the bayonet, and which rendered every drawing room a forum and every barroom a battle field. The South asserted a right which the North denied—the right of secession. On that he had little to say—it was a question on which the greatest statesmen differed. It was enough to say that the South had a religious belief in it, and most assuredly they had proved their faith by their acts. The causes of disunion extended far back, reaching even beyond the foundation of the government. In the first place the American system was an incongruous system. The universe itself could not remain entire with two supreme powers at the head, and how could America with her seventy-four sovereignties? The first moment of the practical assertion of the right claimed by the South was the taking of Fort Sumter, in the harbor of Charleston, and the voluntary union was dissolved whilst the new doctrine of coercion was proclaimed at Washington; and that new doctrine was now preached by federal cannon and federal bayonets. The cause of secession dated far beyond the union of the old thirteen States—beyond even the doctrine of self-government laid down in the cabin of the Mayflower, and signed by thirty-one fugitive Pilgrims. The North was settled by the Puritans, the South by the Cavaliers; and in this radical fact lay the seeds of perpetual antagonism. Next to the primary differences of religion and education came the difference caused by climate and occupation. In the North men worked for a living and schemed for a future, and to such employment was natural. In the South, labor, which was seldom a luxury, became less a necessity. Manual labor was there not only irksome, but degrading; and thus, while in the North the majority paid the penalty of man's disobedience, earning their bread by the sweat of their brow, in the South they earned their bread by the sweat of their negroes. Another cause was their widely different legislative policy. The North sought for the protection of her manufacturing interest, the South was for free trade—for open markets with all the world. This was rather a financial difficulty, and in every Congress were found tariff and anti-tariff men fighting for their own pockets. He would now come to the more direct and immediate cause of the American disunion, and he pronounced it in one word—abolitionism. Abolitionism caused the war—secessionism precipitated it. The peculiar form of abolitionism was political, not social. It was the free soil party, and not the philanthropists of Boston or Exeter Hall, which had driven on secession. The free soil party was opposed to the admission of new slave States, not on moral grounds, but because every new State added two members to the Senate, who acted as a check on the laws enacted for the aggrandisement of the Northern manufacturers. Sentimental abolitionism had very few advocates in Congress, and none in the Cabinet. South Carolina wanted the manufactures of France and England duty free, and desired to pay for them in her own cotton, without having it clipped at New York on its way to Manchester. Slavery was too great a question to be flippantly disposed of at Exeter Hall, or to be wiped away by those who shed tears over the imaginary wrongs of fictitious "Uncle Toms" and impossible "Little Topsys." Slavery had ever existed in some form or other. The South profited by it and retained it. The negro who could sleep like the black snake beneath the burning rays of a tropical sun could alone work profitably in the sugar fields of the South. But "slavery," said the philanthropists of the North, "is a grievous wrong, and being implicated in it constitutionally we will root it out." So they waged a fratricidal war that four millions of Africans might be set at liberty to work, wander, steal or starve. He could testify that a happier, healthier, better fed or more lightly tasked class of laborers than the slaves he had never seen either in Europe or America. The master who ill treated his slaves was everywhere detested and avoided, and even the women who did so were sent to Coventry, and yet the Christians of the North refused to hold fellowship with the slaveholder. Antagonism ripened into hatred, and the result was open war. The malignant anti-slavery policy of the North became organic when Mr. Lincoln was elected President—he who declared that "the States must be all free or all slave States." From the moment of his election to the Presidency secession was a foregone conclusion. Having drawn a vivid picture of the state of popular feeling in the North and South after the taking of Fort Sumter, the lecturer proceeded to say that from that moment he had never heard from man or woman in the South a single word in favor of reunion. On the other hand, they showed a Spartan determination to spend their last dollar, and to shed their last drop of blood, to resist invasion; and even the women stripped themselves of their jewels to equip the army of their defenders. The Southern army was composed of all classes. In some regiments it was not unusual to see three generations, grandfather, father and son of the oldest families; and, perhaps, no army ever went into the field with so large a proportion of well educated and wealthy gentlemen. Men like these went into battle as if they were entering on single combat; and, perhaps, no truer conception of the state of feeling in the South could be gained than from the words "the spirit of resistance is up to duelling point." Women, priests and bishops were enlisted in the cause, and even the slaves asked permission of their masters to go and fight the Yankee abolitionists. The Southern States consisted of seven States, with a territory of 770,000 square miles. All hope of reconciliation had passed away. Section was arrayed against section, father against son, brother against brother. There were Irish, French and German regiments in the North; and there were Irish, French and German regiments in the South. It was no question of race, blood or religion that divided them. Let him now refer to the elements of the different armies. In the North there was a manufacturing and a trading people; the South was peculiarly agricultural. In consequence of emigration the population of the North embraced every nation, tribe and people. There were the swarms of convicts, paupers and refugees, and there the right of free suffrage gave a power which was a dangerous element in the State. Unrestricted suffrage was the fallacy. When Pontius Pilate gave the franchise to the people, they elected Barabbas, and from that day to this there were thousands of instances to disprove the popular dogma that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." The seceded States were comparatively free from the admixture of foreigners. There 400,000 white men held 4,000,000 slaves. The constitution of the Confederate States as granted was far superior to that of the federal States. It was particularly so in two respects. There was an extension of the Presidential term to six years, with a prohibition against re-election; and the appointment of all Confederate officers, except Cabinet Ministers, was for life, or during good behavior. Thus there was a check on office seeking, and on the clamorous hounds for place. By this system of place hunting the North had become a nation of politicians without a statesman being left, and thus it became worse than was conveyed in the description of the Frenchman who, having visited the United States, exclaimed, "My God, what a country—250 religions and only one soup"—(laughter)—to which a Yankee journalist retorted on France by saying, "My God, what a nation—250 soups and no religion." (Renewed laughter.) He would not attempt to unroll the horrible panorama of this fratricidal war, the bloodiest picture ever painted by the hand of time, where every gain was a loss and every victory was a defeat. Mr. Russell, of the *Times*, was a most powerful and impartial historian of the war. When he wrote from hearsay, he was entitled to only hearsay credit; but when "Our Own Correspondent" concluded his letters with "All this I saw and was part of," then the reader might rely on him. After seven months of bloodshed and slaughter there were no indications of peace, and the only hope of settling these differences seemed to be a sort of latent faith in mutual exhaustion. The North taunted the South with stealing Northern property. The South replied that when the colonies broke from England they had done the same, and had even converted the leaden statue of King George, which stood in the Bowling Green at New York, into bullets for the slaughter of the King's subjects, and had made no restitution—(laughter)—but that when the war was over the South intended to take an inventory of all property and to strike an equitable balance. They further said that they never intended to take Washington after the battle of Bull run, because the public property in that city would form too large an item in the settlement. (Oh, oh! and laughter.) The effect of the war at home had been most disastrous, except to contractors and speculators—it had disorganized, demoralized and divided the American people, while abroad it had disturbed the commercial relations of the world. In the North peace-advocating newspapers were suppressed—suspected men and women were hurried off to the bastinado. They had not, it was true, commenced hanging on either side yet, but when they did the price of hemp would go up. (Laughter.) The depreciation of real estate in New York alone already exceeded the cost of the war. Now, should the reconstruction of the Union take place, if, instead of States, departments were substituted, as in France—a solid form of government—it might render the republican theory practicable. At the bottom of all this controversy and conflict lay the great question of government—"Was it to be despotism, modelled on the idea of sovereignty, which controlled the universe, or a republic, resting on the will or caprice of the people?" Colonel Fuller concluded his address in the following words:—Thomas Hood has said

Give us an angel from Heaven—and despotism.

England to day, under the benignant reign of a Christian Queen, is realizing the better half of the poet's prayer, and now in this trying hour, when the cloud of domestic sorrow hangs over her whom God has elected to be the sovereign of a great people—Prince Albert's mourning widow, now the nation's bride—I trust there is not a heart in the British isles—no, not one in Christendom—which does not beat responsive to the universal prayer, "God Save the Queen."

Loud applause followed the conclusion of the address, which was remarkably well delivered. During several portions of it the lecturer was warmly applauded, while on the other hand some of his sentiments provoked manifestations of disapproval of a character quite inconsistent with good breeding.

### English Financial View of Investments in America.

[From the London Times, (city article,) Dec. 20.]

The disregard by the federal government of America of the principles that through recent centuries have mitigated the worst barbarities of war, has led those who are interested in private commercial and pecuniary affairs with that country to entertain some feeling of solicitude as to whether, in the event of hostilities with England, similar indifference would not be manifested to the example set by European nations in dealing with such cases. It is true the doctrines of the United States in this respect have been hitherto in full accordance with those of the rest of the civilized world, and that even so long back as 1794 they were distinctly embodied in a treaty. Supposing any respect to be still entertained for the motives and principles then avowed by themselves, there can be no reason to apprehend any dishonorable course; but the boldness with which the hitherto cherished axioms of President Madison, and of all his successors, on the right of search question, have just been disavowed and contemned, furnishes cause for fear that the present career of the United States is intended to be made remarkable, not merely by a perfect independence of the precedents of every other nation, but also of their own, when the purposes of the moment can thus be better served. Annexed is the article of the treaty referred to:—

*Extract of Tenth Article of Treaty between Great Britain and the United States of the 19th of November, 1794, commonly referred to as Jay's Treaty.*

Neither the debts due from individuals of the one nation to individuals of the other, nor shares nor moneys which they may have in the public funds or in the public or private banks, shall, even in any event of war or national difference, be sequestered or confiscated, it being unjust and impolitic that debts and engagements contracted and made by individuals having confidence in each other and in their respective governments should be destroyed or impaired by national authority on account of national differences and discontents.

Unhappily, the Confederate States of America seem little likely to show any superiority over their opponents in their sense of what is due to private rights. The system of confiscation of the property of individuals and non-belligerents was commenced on the occurrence of the present outbreak almost simultaneously in both sections of the country, and has been carried by the confederates to the extent of sequestering all the property of neutrals—Englishmen and others—situate in the Southern States, and held in trust for their owners by Northern citizens.

### The Naval and Military Preparations.

[From the London Post, Dec. 20.]

The First battalion of the Grenadier Guards, eight hundred strong, under the command of Colonel the Hon. Hugh Manvers Percy, C. B. (Victoria Cross), assembled, shortly after six o'clock yesterday morning, on the parade at the Wellington Barracks, preparatory to their departure for Southampton. After a due inspection, and after partaking of breakfast, at half-past seven o'clock the battalion left for the Waterloo Station of the South-western Railway. Owing to the death of the Prince Consort, the regimental band did not accompany the battalion to the station. On their arrival at the terminus, the men were told off in fours, and with the greatest facility—the system having been initiated by the late General Torrens—the train started at eight o'clock with its gallant burden; so that the entire battalion, each man carrying his rifle and a cooked ration, left quarters and started by railway for their destination within half an hour. The men were loudly cheered as they proceeded to the railway.

The Second battalion of the Scots Fusiliers, of the same strength, commanded by Colonel William John Ridley, left the Wellington barracks at eight o'clock, and pursued the same route, it having been arranged for the battalion also to embark at Southampton. The same excellent arrangements were observed, and, without the slightest confusion or delay, the battalion departed at half-past eight o'clock for its destination, Southampton. A finer or more efficient body of men never quitted our shores for military service abroad. We are informed that on calling over the muster roll only seven men were found wanting, and their places were promptly supplied by a reserve, which, in such emergencies, is invariably provided. The officers and men of both battalions appeared in high spirits, and looked fully up to any duty they might be called upon to discharge in our North American colonies.

The steamer Adriatic, with about seventy-two officers and 1,300 non-commissioned officers and privates of the Grenadier Guards, and the Parana, with about 1,000 men and officers of the Scots Fusilier Guards, and eighteen Royal Engineers, left the docks about two o'clock afternoon of December 19, and anchored in the river. Both vessels were to sail for their destination the next morning.

[From the London Times, Dec. 20.]

The Adriatic, Captain G. C. Nicholson, takes out the Grenadier Guards and a battery of artillery, and the military train (of which the particulars were reported yesterday). The staff of the Guards, which is composed as follows, also proceed in this ship:—General Lord Frederick Paulet, who commands the brigade; Captain George G. Gordon, of the Scots Fusileers, Brigade Major; and Captain Seymour, of the Coldstream Guards, Aide-de-camp. The following is a complete list of the officers who have embarked:—Colonel, Hon. H. Percy, V. C.; Lieutenant Colonels, M. Bruce, Lord F. Fitzroy, C. G. Ellison, A. Capel Cure, J. H. King, W. B. De Horsey, E. H. Cooper and R. Anstruther; Captains, F. A. T. Clayton, S. A. B. Earl of Carrick, C. E. Malet, Hon. J. C. Stanley, E. W. L. Wynne, W. Earle, F. W. Viscount Hood, R. H. C. D. Lowe, A. W. Thynne, L. G. Phillips, T. F. Fairfax and E. C. Nugent; Lieutenants, C. W. Pakenham, J. T. R. L. Fox, L. R. Seymour, R. C. Vyner, C. J. Herbert, C. E. H. Stanley, Hon. C. F. Crichton, F. W. Duncombe and G. P. Littleton, Quartermaster, J. Hockey; Surgeon, C. R. Nicoll; Assistant Surgeons, H. J. H. Lawrence and G. P. Girdwood; 41 sergeants and 800 men.

The Parana, Captain T. W. Sawyer, has embarked thirty-two officers and 887 non-commissioned officers and privates of the Scots Fusileer Guard, together with five officers and 120 men of the Royal Engineers. The following are the officers of the Fusileers:—Colonels J. H. E. Dalrymple and F. C. A. Stephenson, C.B.; Lieutenant Colonels the Hon. R. Charteris, H. G. Wilkinson, W. Aitchison, E. Neville, F. Baring and H. C. Fletcher (attached from the First battalion); Captains D. H. Blair, W. J. Rous, E. M. Beresford, J. Paynter, G. W. Beaumont, R. A. Cooper, W. S. Rooke, C. Shelley, J. F. Elphinstone, J. E. Ford, C. W. White and R. A. Dalzell; Lieutenants Sir R. Cunliffe, A. A. Speirs, S. J. Ram, H. Farquharson, J. H. W. Thomas, J. St. J. N. Barnes, Earl Dunmore and W. R. M. Wynne; Captain and Adjutant, G. H. Moncreiff; Battalion Surgeon, F. Robinson; Assistant Surgeons, A. G. Elkington and H. Turner.

The total number of troops who go out in the Adriatic and Parana is ninety-four officers and 2,261 rank and file, viz:—

Adriatic—Staff, 3 officers; Grenadier Guards, 33 officers, 841 men; Military Train, 15 officers, 300 men; Artillery, 6 officers, 113 men. Total, 57 officers, 1,254 men.

Parana—Scots Fusileers, 32 officers, 887 men; Royal Engineers, 5 officers, 120 men. Total, 37 officers, 1,007 men.

*As the Adriatic moved out of dock the large shields on her paddle-boxes, emblazoned with the stars and stripes, reminded everybody of the remarkable coincidence that an American built steamer, and until within a few months the property of American owners, should be one of the first employed in the transport of British troops to the Northern part of the American continent, to operate, probably, against the country in which she was built.*

On the two vessels leaving the docks the Volunteer band took up a position on the extreme end of the jetty, and as the Adriatic slowly moved past they played the appropriate