

## DYNAMITE WARFARE.

conspirators who concoct them are to be found within the limits of the United States, where they burrow like serpents, and direct in secret their hostile expeditions against the government and people of England, including defenceless women and children. We assume also, that the act of one or more men in attempting to destroy public buildings, or to kill public officials, for the purpose of changing the political condition or conduct of a nation, is an act of private war against that nation, and that it is none the less an act of war because large numbers are not openly engaged in it, or because armies are not in motion under insurrectionary standards. If, then, one of these secret dynamite expeditions is fitted out within this country, and departs hence to England to do its fiendish work there, it is substantially the same in principle as though a military expedition had been fitted out in this country, and had sailed for the purpose of making an attack upon the military and naval forces of Great Britain. Now, we understand it to be a principle of international law that one friendly nation owes a duty to every other friendly nation—not, indeed, that of an insurer against the fitting out and departure of warlike expeditions against such friendly nation—not an obligation to prevent such a result absolutely and at all events, but a duty to use reasonable diligence to that end. It was upon this ground that the Geneva Arbitration awarded damages to this country as against England, for allowing the Confederate cruiser, the Alabama, to escape from one of her ports for the purpose of preying upon our commerce. The question which the recent occurrence of these dynamite outrages presses upon us at the present time is, Have we performed our duty to England in this regard? It is difficult to say that we have. Funds have been publicly collected in this country for years, by O'Donovan Rossa and his gang, for the avowed purpose of attacking England by secret expeditions of this kind. It is idle to say that we perform our duty to a friendly nation when, having every reason to believe that such expeditions are furnished and fitted out in this country, we take no measures to discover and arrest them. It is no answer to England that our laws do not enable our officials to arrest and punish such

conspirators. What concern has England with the state of our municipal law? When we allege the defects of our laws as a reason for not performing our duty to a friendly power, that power is entitled to make answer in the thunder of cannon. With shameful negligence, in 1867, we allowed a military expedition to organize in the northern part of the State of New York, with the greatest publicity, for the purpose of invading Canada. It did invade Canada. A battle was fought with it on Canadian soil, in which a number of Canadians were killed. A monument stands in the city of Toronto with their names inscribed upon it. It will stand for ages as a monument of American bad faith and shame. Some things, it is true, were to be said in our favour then. The Alabama claims were unsettled. The St. Albans raid was fresh in our memories. But our duty was plain and unmistakable. The St. Albans raid was a secret affair, for which the Canadian government was not responsible. The Canadian people had no more to do with the escape of the Alabama than the people of Australia or Cape Town had. They were neighbours, Christians and honest people, who had not offended us, and we owed them, on common principles of honesty and humanity, the duty of seeing that a body of men were not permitted to organize on our side of the River St. Lawrence for the purpose of crossing over and killing them. Plainly, we have not discharged our duty in regard to this dynamite business, and unless we wake up to a sense of that duty, we shall forfeit the right to a decent position in the family of civilized nations.—*Central Law Journal.*