

CANADA.

" patriotism of our people, under the providence of God, the British Government was disappointed in its dearest wishes, and failed of its most cherished desires.

" ENGLAND DESTROYED OUR COMMERCE AND PROLONGED THE WAR.

" The effect of what was done and omitted to be done by Great Britain, that as a friendly nation she ought to have done, is that our commerce has been substantially swept from the seas: we had only thousands of tons at the close of the war where we had millions of tons at the beginning. No man, even now, can cross the Atlantic Ocean in a sea-going steamer flying the American flag. Another effect of the position of the British Government towards the South by giving false hopes to the Confederacy was to prolong the war, at the expense of millions upon millions of treasure and thousands upon thousands of lives. And yet we are far into the sixth year since the war was ended, without being nearer—not to say to a reparation for these wrongs—even to a practical consideration of the questions involved than we were at the day of the surrender of Lee. The Republican party is the dominant party of the country, and must remain so for the next three years at least. Upon it and upon its administration devolve the duty and the burden of bringing to a conclusion all these questions and obtaining the needed reparation, indemnification, and apology for our wrongs. Delays aid not their solution, but rather add to their complications. Time can never obliterate the deep sense of injury this nation entertains of the action of Great Britain during our war. Years only intensify its bitterness. The gaping wounds in our national honour never will close up by lapse of years. They must always remain green, open, sore, until healed by the potent salve of ample reparation and indemnification. True, it is urged by some, not too far-sighted or discriminating people, principally newspaper writers, that we should delay settlement of our claims until England gets into a war and then let loose other *Alabamas*, other *Shenandoahs*, and other *Floridas* from our ports, in the interest of the belligerent nation with which she should be at war, to prey upon her commerce, especially to make the pretext of war between herself and either of her dependencies, to have our own citizens fit out our ships as cruisers under some apocryphal flag, and thus to avenge our wrongs. The statesmanship of those who advocate such a course would seem to be this—We complain of her wrongs, and we propose to make those right by doing other like wrongs to be inflicted in safety when our enemy is crippled. Is this statesmanship? Is it magnanimous? Is such redress bold—is it manly? Nay, is it not sneakingly cowardly?

" LET US DEMAND OUR RIGHTS, AND MAINTAIN THAT DEMAND.

" Let us rather stand up in the manly strength of our nationhood, and fearlessly, boldly claim the rights which belong to us, insist upon their being respected, and that all questions between us and Great Britain be adjusted at once and for ever, so as to take away all cause of unfriendliness between two powerful nations of the earth. Let us say to Great Britain, 'Thus much we are wronged; thus much we require to satisfy the nation's honour and the nation's loss, and for that wrong and that loss thus much we must have, because it is our right and because we are able to maintain our right.' Judge ye between the two proposed modes of adjusting the Alabama claims. I say that her Government was hostile, and her hostility was harmful to the United States, and was so intended. We claim reparation for that harm done by this hostility. The question is, how are we to enforce our rights? By declaring war? By no means. The United States will never lightly declare war. We are not a war-making Government; we are only a war-carrying-on Government when war is made upon us. I would apply the same doctrine to nations that I would to individuals under like circumstances. If my neighbour takes advantage of the fact that his line lies close under my windows to build a high fence to shut out the light and air from my dwelling, in order to show his hostility to myself and family, do I stop to inquire whether he has put that fence one inch over or one inch within the line which divides his land from mine? If he has put it one inch over I may sue him in the courts of law. But there are no courts of law to adjust disputes between nations. If he has put it one inch on his own land to gratify his ill-will and injure me what is my remedy? Simply to declare him a bad neighbour, and that I will have nothing to do with him in the future save to get him out of my neighbourhood if I can, and as soon as I can, either by causing him to move or by removing myself.