

(Continued from page 7.)

character of the blockade. Mr. Seward pens his reply on May 2—i. e., 11 days before the Queen's proclamation of neutrality. He says:—

"In acknowledging the receipt of your note of the 30th ult., on the subject of the blockade of the ports in several of the States, I deem it proper to state for your information:—

"1. That the blockade will be strictly enforced upon the principles recognized by the law of nations.

"2. That armed vessels of neutral states will have right to enter and depart from the interdicted ports."

Now, observe, first of all, the blockade was not, as Mr. Seward now pretends, a municipal closing of the ports; it was "a blockade on the principles recognized by the law of nations," and the fundamental principle of that law is that no blockade can be declared except where a war exists.

But, again, what is the meaning of the words "neutral States?" Mr. Seward writes to the same effect to Lord Lyons on May 9:—"It will be seen that there are yet five or six days for neutrals to leave."

It is not a little amusing to see how the "neutrals" of the "blockade" of 1861 became the "strangers" of the "closing of the ports" in 1867. On May 2, 1861, no Government had issued a proclamation of neutrality, why does Mr. Seward talk of "neutrals?" Why but because the word "neutrals" flowed to his pen spontaneously as the natural and necessary result of a state of "open, flagrant civil war," and of a "blockade to be enforced on the principles recognised by the law of nations?" If there was no war, and if there were no belligerents on May 2 and May 9, 1861, how came Mr. Seward at these dates to be treating all foreign States as "neutrals?" Who first uttered that terrible and odious word, "neutral," for which we are now called to account; who first "baptised" England as a "neutral?" Was it Mr. Seward, in his official despatches on May 2 and May 9; or was it the Queen of England, in her proclamation of neutrality, on May 13? If Mr. Seward could inform the English minister on May 9 that in five or six days all neutrals would have to leave, how comes it to be such a hostile act on the part of the English government to issue a proclamation of neutrality four days after? Has Mr. Seward ever read the fable of the wolf and the lamb? We can perhaps hardly be surprised that Mr. Seward maintains that the blockade is no proof of war, since he contends that there might be neutrals, but there ought to have been no neutrality. The question, in short, which Mr. Seward wants us to refer to arbitration is whether, when he served a notice on us as neutrals, we were entitled to issue a proclamation of neutrality.

I think, after this review of Mr. Seward's language in 1861 and 1867, I am entitled to ask whether the annals of the intercourse of civilized nations present any example of a similar contradiction between the language of the same minister with reference to the same facts at different objects? I cite these passages not mainly as a revelation of Mr. Seward's ideas of diplomatic consistency; I adduce them as a proof that this is a question on which we cannot be expected to submit to arbitration. No man is entitled to call upon you to submit a question to arbitration when you hold under his own hand the admission that his claim is unfounded. I cite these despatches of Mr. Seward to prove that not only in Europe, but in America, there was no one who doubted—and least of all did Mr. Seward doubt—that a civil war

in the fullest sense of the word existed before the English proclamation of neutrality was published, that that proclamation was consequently justifiable and necessary, and that the assertion that it created the American civil war is one which is too absurd to be made the foundation of a reasonable claim for arbitration.

If this letter were not already too long, I might point out the singular absurdity of mixing up the question of the recognition of belligerent rights with the claims in the case of the Alabama. Even Mr. Seward hardly pretends that at the time the Alabama sailed civil war did not exist, and that the United States had not treated the South as belligerents. The "premature recognition then, even if it was a sound ground of complaint, could have nothing in the world to do with the case of the Alabama.

There is another point which seems to have escaped Mr. Seward's acuteness. If there was no war, there was no right of belligerent capture. Consequently, all the American condemnations of English vessels for breach of blockade, contraband, &c., are illegal; and therefore all these captures must be restored, with costs and damages. I really hardly know why, on this footing, we should not take Mr. Seward on his own ground, for the balance of compensation due would be immensely in our favour.

Sir, no man values at a higher rate than I do the friendship of America. I hope, as far as it has come within my sphere, I have done what I could to contribute to the maintenance of that friendship. But the friendship of nations, like that of individuals, can only be safely and permanently founded on the basis of mutual respect. Where we are wrong, let us confess it; where the question is doubtful let us refer it; where we are clearly in the right let us assert that right like men. I think I know something of the American people, and I am sure that it is not by timidity or vacillation that you can win their friendship or purchase their respect. Their own position among mankind is due to the astonishing fortitude with which in circumstances of weakness and difficulty they have ever vindicated the rights of an independent nation. They respect in others what has constituted their own greatness. I believe that a war between England and America would be the greatest calamity which can befall not only either nation, but the whole of mankind. But depend upon it, Sir, in a great cause timidity is not the path which leads to peace. Danger, like death, pursues those who fly it most:—

"Mors et fugacem persequitur vitum
Nec parci timellus juvenem
Populibus timore tergo."

If the Government of the United States quarrels with us on the question of the recognition of belligerent rights, it can only be because they are determined in any event to quarrel with us. I do not belong to the political party of which Lord Stanley is an eminent ornament. But on the question where the reputation and the safety of the country are involved I can recognise no distinction of party. I see in the Government of the Queen nothing else but the legitimate representative and guardian of the honour of the English nation. I believe that on this question the Government are emphatically in the right. I, therefore, protest against anything which may tend to weaken their hands or to impair their credit.

Nothing is more likely than such a course to produce the very evils which persons like Lord Hobart desire to avert. It encourages a belief that the opinion of England is distracted, and incites the American Government to hope that by persisting in such claims they will ultimately prevail. In off-

ering fair terms of accommodation on every point which could be regarded as doubtful, and opposing a firm front to unjust and unreasonable demands, the Government have done their duty by the nation, and earnestly hope that they will receive the support they are entitled to expect from a just and a courageous people.

HISTORICS.

January 18th.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

During the week ending Feb. 15th, we have received, on account of subscriptions, as follows:—

TORONTO.—Gen. S., C.B., \$2; Lt.-Col. G., \$2; Major F. E. D., \$2; Capt. P., F.B., \$2; Ensign R. Y. E., \$2; J. S. McD., \$1; Dr. L., \$2; Capt. E., 25 cts.; Lt. W. D. R., 25 cts.; H. J., 25 cts.; Lt.-Col. R. S. S., \$2.25; Ensign H. S., \$2; Lt. W. J. R., \$1; Lt. D., \$2.

HAMILTON.—Capt. C. A., \$2; J. A., \$1; Lt. J. J. M., L.M., \$2; Lt.-Col., V.B.M., \$2; Col. Sergt. W. S., \$1; Captain G. B. S., F.B., \$2; Mr. J. H. R., \$2; Dr. T. W., (Sur. F.B.), \$2; Sergt.-Major J. B., 50 cts.; Alex. I., \$1.

ANCASTER, (Ont.)—Lieut. W. D., \$2.

GUELPH.—Capt. H. H. S., \$2.

METCALFE, (Osgoode)—Lieut. J. H., \$1.

ALTON.—Dr. J. K. R., \$2.

BRANTFORD.—W. P., \$1.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

NOTICE.—All communications addressed to the Editor of the VOLUNTEER REVIEW, must be accompanied by the correct name and address of the writer, to insure attention.

CIVIS, Guelph.—Thanks. Your remarks are just and pertinent: local jealousies should not be allowed to interfere with the matter of Volunteer accommodation.

MR. B., Ottawa.—The article is being translated, and will appear in our next.—We would be obliged for more of the same kind.

I. C., Hamilton.—Will be very happy to see you, and rectify the mistakes of which you complain.

W. P., Brantford.—If you send us the date of the missing number, we will try and supply it.

Admiral Farragut has been *seized* in Florence, and the Italian Journals insist that he is there on some mission of great importance. It is feared there is not now the remotest prospect of that evacuation by France of the Roman States which the Queen was advised to say in her speech last November was desirable. Civita Vecchia is being fortified as if it were a permanent French possession; under the pretence of sanitary considerations, Viterbo has been occupied; and the officers of the French army of occupation—amounting in its reduced state to 8,000 men, and susceptible of indefinite augmentation in a few hours—talk habitually, we are told, as if war were inevitable and imminent.