

mous opinion of the House of Representatives, as shown by Banks's bill on neutral relations. The *direct* representatives of the people are thus regarded as of no consequence, which reminds us of Queen Elizabeth telling the House of Commons not to trouble themselves with affairs of State, but to attend to their own business.

Whilst adverting to that bill, to amend the neutrality laws, the question may be asked, why it was framed so as to make it unlawful to sell an *armed ship*, whilst declaring it to be lawful to sell a ship, adapted for war purposes, and also to sell the armament separately? It will be perceived that although by that bill it is unlawful to furnish, fit out, and arm a ship, (all these three things must be combined to constitute the offence,) it is perfectly lawful to build and sell a ship adapted for war purposes.

That is directly antagonistic to the last portion of the first rule, which runs thus: "A neutral government is bound, first, to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a power with which it is at peace, and also to use like diligence to *prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use.*"

The question as to the constitutional power of the President and Senate to make laws of the highest magnitude and importance, without the consent of the House of Representatives, deserves grave consideration.

Our claims are clearly unjust. Why should we adhere to them? It is open to us now to declare that, even assuming them to have been rightful *when first presented*, they have become *extinguished by the restoration of the Union*, wherefore, we ask, that the treaty shall be abrogated. England, no doubt, would consent to that, upon a withdrawal of the claims.