

men to foreigners, as it appears in each of them, is sufficient for my purpose. It is safe to say that a large proportion of those not as yet naturalized will be naturalized. They have little attachment left for the British flag. President Cleveland need be under no apprehension. They are, as Sir John A. Macdonald has found out, "in full sympathy with American sentiments and institutions," and have "ideas and expectations altogether inimical to British connection."

As we look back upon the war of 1812, there are some things which the people of New England may well wish had been otherwise. But if there were anything of disloyalty there, it all evaporated in words. A few disloyal phrases of a convention at Hartford, a little grumbling of a governor, what are they to the blaze of resplendent glory that rises from the deeds of her seamen? The men who censure the reluctance of the Federalists of that day to resent the provocation we had received from England do not always make sufficient allowance for the equal insult we were receiving from France. The party who opposed the war with England were eager enough to take arms against France. They were filled with a morbid horror of the power of Napoleon. But it was a horror into which no element of cowardice entered. They thought that in overcoming England we would overcome the last barrier against his universal empire, and that in attacking England we ranged ourselves on the side of universal tyranny against the last hope of constitutional liberty.

We can now see that they were wrong. The American people were inspired by a surer instinct than that of the Federal leaders. The final judgment of history must be that the war of 1812 was a righteous and glorious war. We were compelled to it by the impudent British pretension to search American vessels on the high seas, and take from them every man whom a midshipman should suspect, or pretend to suspect, of being a British subject. We had scarcely a friend anywhere. The haughty nations of Europe sat at their gates, scowling at the little Republic, as the five Norman champions in Scott's immortal story sat at the doors of their tents on the field of Ashby de la Zouche. The little country, not thirty years old, hurled her mortal defiance at the proudest and strongest of them all, as the young Saxon knight struck the shield of Brian de Bois Guilbert with the sharp end of his spear. We began the war after England had crushed the navy of every other power that had contended with her by sea—Holland, Spain, Denmark, France. England never had a naval war in which she was met, ship to ship, with a superiority in discipline, in gunnery, in seamanship, and in success as by us in the war of 1812. This is fully admitted by Maj. Gen. Sir Howard Douglas in his treatise on naval gunnery, the standard English authority, published with the approbation of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. This book was originally published in 1820, five years after the war ended. I have here the fifth edition, the last before the substitution of steam-vessels and iron-clads for the old wooden ships. He says:

The fleets of Europe had been swept from the face of the ocean by the gallant achievements of the British marine.

He goes on to say:

We entered in 1812, with too great confidence, into a war with a marine much more expert than our European enemies.

He then proceeds to draw his instruction for the conduct of naval engagements almost wholly from the sea fights with the Americans in the war of 1812. Look at his index:

Action, Naval: Between the Chesapeake and the Shannon; between the Avon