

in 'Our Mutual Friend'—very queer in the back and weak in the legs; in short, quite unable, for want of physical power, to fight the ship." Our contemporary probably means the *Atlanta* instead of the *Albatross*. The latter did not surrender when rammed by the *Sassacus*, but the former was pretty well used up by a coned 15 inch shot, which was what so demoralized her crew, and not "the ramming she got."—U.S. Army and Navy Journal.

WHAT HAS THE TREATY DONE?

No one will deny that the agreement between the United States and England to refer their international disputes to arbitration was founded on a correct principle, and a worthy outgrowth of the advanced civilization of the two great Anglo-Saxon nations. The principle was a correct one, but we are not certain that the manner in which it was carried into practice at Washington will be productive of those desirable results which have been prophesied. While the world lasts, we hope there will remain what is called National honor, a desire to deal fairly with foreign powers, and a determination that the conduct will be reciprocated. While the horrors and losses of war are ever to be honorably avoided, no one will contend that national disgrace is preferable to war. If a nation is to be respected—if it would guard its rights and dignity—it must not shirk the responsibility attaching to their assertion.

While, then, England was desirous of avoiding war with the United States, and agreed to go to arbitration upon the disputes between her and that country, owing to her unwise concessions the looked for result will not, we think, be secured. No English Statesman would have counselled arbitration if he had known that England's unpres would have put upon record a confession reflecting on the national honor. Such, however, has been the case. Although Earl Russell utterly refused to give ear to the Alabama claims, and maintained that England had honorably fulfilled international obligations, yet we find her representatives at Washington putting their hands to a Treaty which declared just the reverse. This was excused by a desire to make sacrifices in order to remove unfriendly feelings with the United States. But why, should the sacrifices have been all on one side? England was certainly not the weak power, forced to cringe at the feet of the Americans. The sacrifice, disguised and excused as it may be, was one of national honour, to avert a war which would have been more surely removed out of question by a manly assertion of England's rights. But, grant that it was politic to make this sacrifice, what ground was there for England consenting, at the instigation of the United States, to try her alleged failure to carry out international obligations by laws which, by the code of nations, were not in force when

the breach of duty complained of was committed? Here was another surrender of national honor, yet an Englishman would contend that his country would war with the whole of Christendom before it would submit to national disgrace.

But it may be urged that this is but sentiment and that in view of the great results it were idle to dwell upon it. War between England and America has been indefinitely postponed by the signing of the Treaty, it will be argued. We are not certain of that. If we believed Americans, they were going to gobble up the Empire in revenge for the escape of the *Alabama*. When England failed to knuckle down, the American then declared that we must allow them the use of our fisheries, or fight. Neither of these threats came from respectable Americans but nevertheless they produced an effect on England which culminated in the Treaty. As it was from the *Alabama* claims thence to the Fisheries so it will be to the next thing the Americans "set their hearts upon," for Treaties are mere waste paper if a nation is strong enough or dishonest enough to disregard their provisions. What guarantee has England that the United States, having made her cat no end of dirt and wriggled from her most valuable territorial and money concessions, will cease her importunities? As to the friendly feeling which was to engender it is simply an imaginary one. The people of the United States have not one whit of friendly feeling towards England more than they had two years ago. In the very face of the Treaty which the Senate of the United States had solemnly agreed to observe the Fenian marauders were allowed to make an incursion on Canada from American soil and were unpunished for the criminal act. What boots then the expression of "friendliness" in the Treaty when the United States fail to perform their international obligations immediately after its negotiation in a case a thousand times more flagrant than the *Alabama* escape.

These reflections are forced on us at this day by the discussion of the Treaty in our Parliament. There is little doubt that the shrewd and grasping Americans while settling to their advantage the *Alabama* claims secured concessions from this country intended to pave the way for annexation. They demanded the St. Lawrence and it was given them. They demanded our Fisheries which were conceded them, nominally for twelve years but virtually for ever. They will, regardless of Treaty rights, go on, like Oliver Twist "asking for more" until Canada's surrender is demanded—*Kingston Whig*.

Congress having made an appropriation of \$50,000 for the survey of the North Pacific Ocean, the Navy Department has commenced making arrangements for the surveying expedition, which is to be under the supervision of Commander J. S. Skerrett.

CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES

The *Mobile (Ala.) Register* reproduces the following from the *Manchester (England) Courier*.—"An amusing case of 'consequential damages' having, in a small way a ludicrous resemblance to the Alabama case, has just been decided near Bath. The story is told by a correspondent of "Land and Water," and may be briefly summarized as follows. Dr. Dace, an ardent naturalist, well known in the West of England, purchased recently two fine old English black rats.—These interesting animals managed to escape from the doctor's premises, and took up their residence with a gentleman in the neighborhood, a Mr. Spokes, who was an intimate friend of Dr. Dace, and what was of more importance to the rats, an enthusiastic breeder of bantams.

The rats killed a number of bantams, and were ultimately killed by a celebrated rat-catcher named Bill Ferrat. Mr. Spokes claimed damages from Dr. Dace for the loss of the bantams, and the doctor claimed damages for the murder of his cherished rats. Arbitrators were appointed, and all seemed to go on smoothly until Mr. Spokes handed in an enormous bill—after the manner of cousin Jonathan,—for "consequential damages." The number of birds killed was thirteen, for which £13 was claimed. The following items will show the nature of Mr. Spokes' demands.—

Thirteen sittings of eggs that would have been hatched..	£13 16s 0d.
Value of prizes that would have been gained at poultry shows at Bath, Bristol and Sarum	9 9 9
Hire of Bill Ferrat, the rat-catcher, six days at 5s p.d	1 10 0
Beer and refreshments for Bill	0 10 0
Loss of time in looking after Bill Ferrat, six days	3 0 0
Four patent rat traps at 3s 6d	0 14 0
Damage to a pair of trousers during the hunt	7 0 0
New roof to out-house	13 0 0
The whole bill amounted	£61 14 0

After a great deal of wrangling Mr. Spokes withdrew his demands for "consequential damages," and accepted payment for fowls actually destroyed."

In the sitting of the German Parliament for May 27, the general debate on the Navy estimates was opened by the Director of the Admiralty, Herr Stosch, who declared that the centre of gravity of Germany's power lay in her army. It was not intended that her navy should fight great naval battles or try her strength at sea with England. The task of the German navy was to protect her coast. An iron clad fleet was sallying forth to keep the port necessary in the North sea. Bottomed vessels were required. Corvettes were being built for the merchant navy, a fleet of bottomed ships for the coast of Asia.