

and for all the calamities which followed to themselves and to mankind.

The prolongation of the war, which is the ground on which General Grant claims his consequential damages, and which he now imputes wholly to the attitude and conduct of Great Britain, was once imputed by the same authority to a very different agency. In a letter to Mr. Washburne, dated Aug. 16, 1864, and published for the purpose of influencing the then approaching Presidential Election, General Grant said, "I state to all citizens who visit me that all we want now to ensure an early restoration of the Union is a determined unity of sentiment North. * * * * With this drain upon them (the rebels), the end is not far distant if we will only be true to ourselves. Their only hope, now, is in a divided North. * * * * I have no doubt but the enemy are exceedingly anxious to hold out until after the Presidential Election. They have many hopes from its effects. They hope a counter-revolution. They hope the election of a peace candidate. In fact, like Micawber, they hope for something to turn up." The letter, which may be seen in the *Rebellion Record*, contains not the faintest allusion to any Southern hopes fed by Great Britain, or by any allies or sympathizers other than the Democratic party at the North. It would seem, therefore, that when damages for the prolongation of the war are levied, the Democratic party at the North should, at least, be called upon to contribute its share.

Mr. Sumner's charges were embodied by Mr. Fish in a despatch which Mr. Motley was directed to read to Lord Clarendon. Lord Clarendon did not meet this attack on the honour of the country, nor have his successors met similar attacks with the dignity which sound policy as well as self-respect and regard for the national character required. But he sent an exhaustive and conclusive reply to Mr. Fish's statement. This reply was published in England, but in America it was

suppressed by Mr. Fish. One great difficulty in dealing with the people of the United States is that the facts do not reach them. They are fenced by their politicians and journalists against unwelcome truth, and thus they are led blindfold into the designs of men for whom they themselves profess no respect.

After another period of moral war, aggravated by ill-timed and humiliating demonstrations of cordiality on the part of Great Britain, negotiations were resumed and ended in the Treaty of Washington, which was not only to settle all differences and restore halcyon days between the two nations, but to open a new era for humanity by introducing the great principle of international arbitration.

When the terms of the treaty were made known it became at once evident that the British negotiators by consenting to a retrospective modification of international law had compromised the rights and impaired the security of neutrals, whose interests are at least as deserving of protection as those of powers which involve the world in war. Still the apology tendered on the part of Great Britain for the escape of the *Alabama* was well received; the feeling of the people in the United States appeared good; and there was a general tendency among Englishmen to accept the treaty as the best practicable termination of the state of moral war.

Soon, however, it transpired that the British Commissioners had submitted to a peremptory refusal of the Americans to consider the Fenian claims. It may safely be said that the failure to detain a single vessel, furtively built by a foreign power, in time of war, and under all the difficulties incident to the maintenance of neutrality between passionate and unscrupulous belligerents, will bear no comparison in point of criminality with the deliberate permission and encouragement, through a series of years and in time of peace, of an organi-