

# ENGLAND AND AMERICA—WHAT LORD RUSSELL DID SAY.

Accustomed to a great deal of bluster and menace from small-fry politicians and would-be agitators, it is really refreshing to read the questions of the day from the lips of a statesman whose intelligence and fine sense of honor have made him one of the ornaments of his age—such is Lord John Russell, the present representative of Britain to foreign nations. Very recently he made a magnificent speech at Blairgowrie, Scotland, in which he reviews the position of his country in its relations with Russia, France and the United States, and gives his views on Poland and Mexico. The limit of our space prevents us from giving the speech entire, and therefore we make selection of what he did say on

## THE AMERICAN QUESTION.

Well, gentlemen, I come now to another question, a question interesting to us all, a question on which I must beg for your attention, because I wish to explain some circumstances in which the character of this country, I think, has been maligned. I am speaking of what has occurred in what a few years ago were the United States of America. A few years ago we were exulting in the prosperity of that country; we were happy to see a people derived from the same ancestors as ourselves enjoying free institutions, enjoying apparent harmony among one another, and with whom we had, at least just before the civil war broke out, hardly a difference—a difference only with regard to the small island called St. Juan, and which we had proposed to refer to the arbitration of the Swiss Republic. This was the state of affairs when that which we certainly had no part in broke out; when, if I remember rightly, nine of the Southern States of America declared that they would form an independent Republic. Our course on the subject has been attacked and blamed in the bitterest terms—blamed sometimes by the Federals, and sometimes by the Confederates. The first offence was felt by the Federals. They said we had no right to grant, so far as we were concerned, to the Confederates the rights of belligerents. Well now, gentlemen, that question of the rights of belligerents is a question of fact. I put it to you whether, with 5,000,000 people—5,000,000 I mean, of free men, declaring themselves in their several States collectively an independent State—we could pass over that as a petty rebellion? Our Admirals asked whether the ships they met bearing the Confederate flag should be treated as pirates or no. If we had treated them as pirates we should have been taking part in that contest. [Cheers.] It was impossible to look on the uprising of a community of five millions of people as a mere petty insurrection, [hear, hear,] or as not having the rights which at all times are given to those who by their numbers and importance, or by the extent of the territory they possess, are entitled to these rights. [Cheers.] Well, it was said we ought not to have done that because they were a community of slaveholders. Gentlemen, I trust that our abhorrence of Slavery is not in the least abated or diminished. [Loud and prolonged cheers.] For my own part, I consider it one of the most horrible crimes that yet disgraces humanity. [Cheers.] But then, when we are treating of the relations which we bear to a community of men, I doubt whether it would be expedient or useful for humanity that we should introduce that new element of declaring that we will have no relations with a people who permit Slavery to exist among them. We have never adopted it yet, we have not adopted it in the case of Spain or Brazil, and I do not believe that the cause of humanity would be served by our adoption of it. [Hear, hear.] Well, then, it was said that these Confederate States were rebels—rebels against the Union. Perhaps, gentlemen, I am not so nice as I ought to be on the subject. But I recollect that we rebelled against Charles I. [A laugh.] we rebelled against James II., and the people of New-England, not content with these two rebellions, rebelled against George III. [Hear, hear, and laughter.] I am not saying now whether all these rebellions were justifiable or whether they were wrong—I am not saying whether the present rebellion in the Southern States is a justifiable insurrection, or is a great fault or a great crime. But I say that the mere fact of rebellion is not in my eyes a crime of so deep a dye that we must renounce all fellowship and communion and all relationship with those who have been guilty of rebellion. [Loud cheering.] But certainly, if I look to the declarations of those New-England orators—and I have been reading lately, if not the whole, yet a very great part of the very long speech by Mr. Sumner on the subject, delivered at New York—I can I cannot but wonder to see these men, the offspring, as it were, of three rebellions, as we are the offspring of two rebellions, really speaking like the Czar of Russia, the Sultan of Turkey, or Louis XIV. himself, of the dread crime and guilt of rebellion. [Loud laughter and cheers.]

Well, gentlemen, there came another complaint, and the complaint came this time from those so-called Confederate States, who said that we had, contrary to the Declaration of Paris, contrary to the general international law, permitted a blockade of 3,000 miles of the Southern coast of America. It is quite true we did so. It is quite true—and there, perhaps, there seemed at least a plausible

reason for complaint—that though this blockade was kept up by a sufficient number of ships, yet these ships—many of them adopted into the United States navy and sent to sea in a hurry, and ill-fitted for the purpose—did not keep up that blockade so effectively and so thoroughly as it must have been held an effective blockade required. But still, looking at the law of nations, it was a blockade; it was a blockade which we as a great belligerent Power, in former times would have acknowledged. We ourselves had had a blockade of upwards of two thousand miles, and it did seem to me that we were bound in justice to the Federal States of America to acknowledge the blockade.

But there was another reason, I confess, that weighed with me—our people were suffering, and suffering very greatly for the want of the material which was the great support of their industry. It was a question of self-interest whether we should not break that blockade, but, in my opinion, the name of England would have been forever infamous if for the sake of interest of any kind we had violated the general laws of nations, and made war with those slaveholding States of America against the Federal States. [Hear, hear.] And, gentlemen, I am not speaking the sentiments which are peculiar to myself, or to those who have no immediate interest in the question, but these are, I am convinced, the sentiments of that noble-hearted people of Lancashire, who have lived and flourished by that industry, but who would not, I am sure, allow a single spot on the escutcheon of their nation in order to maintain that industry. [“Hear, hear,” and cheers.]

## SHIPS FOR THE CONFEDERATES.

Well, there came new complaints—a complaint on the part of the Federals that we allowed a ship to leave the port of Liverpool, which afterwards committed depredations on their commerce. Gentlemen, it would lead me far if I were to go over all the particulars of the question, but you must know that in order to prove an offence you require such evidence as can be sifted in a Court of justice, and it was not till the very day the Alabama left Liverpool that in the opinion of lawyers we had evidence sufficient to keep the vessel and crew; then I doubt whether if we had brought the evidence before a Court of law, it would have been found that we had sufficient evidence to condemn her, because, by an evasion of the law, the ship was fitted up without the arms necessary for her equipment, and these arms were conveyed to her in the waters of a foreign country, very far from the jurisdiction of England. [Hear, hear.] Gentlemen, these questions must be weighed, and I think they will be weighed, as they frequently have been weighed by the Government of the United States of America, in the balance of equity.

We knew that the Foreign Enlistment act and the whole law respecting the subject is very difficult of application. The principle is clear enough. If you are asked to sell muskets, you may sell muskets to one party or the other, and so with gunpowder, shells or cannon; and you may sell a ship in the same manner. But, if you, on the one hand, train and drill a regiment with arms in their hands, or allow a regiment to go out with arms in their hands to take part with one of two belligerents, you violate your neutrality and commit an offence against the other belligerent. So in the same way in regard to ships, if you allow a ship to be armed and go at once to make an attack on a foreign belligerent, you are yourself, according to your own law taking part in the war, and it is an offence which is punished by the law. But these questions lead, as you will see, to most difficult problems—as to whether, for instance, a thousand persons here may go out as laborers to the Federal States, and in the next place a thousand muskets may go out in another ship, and when they arrive in America, these thousand laborers, having had an understanding before, may make a formal engagement, and be armed with these thousand muskets; though, if that had been done in the Territory of the Queen, and on the soil of this country, it would have been an offence. There are other questions with regard to ships that have lately been prepared in this country, because these ships are not like ships which receive their usual equipment known in wars in times past, but they are themselves without any further armament, formed for acts of offence and war. They are steam rams, which might be used for the purposes of war without ever touching the shores of the Confederate ports. Well, gentlemen, to permit ships of this kind knowingly to depart from this country, not to enter into any Confederate port, not to enter into the port of a belligerent, would, as you see, expose our good faith to great suspicion; and I feel certain that if, during our war with France, the Americans had sent line-of-battle ships to break our blockade at Brest, whatever reasons they might have urged in support of that, we should have considered it a violation of neutrality. Such is the spirit in which I am prepared to act. Everything that the law of nations requires, everything that our law, that the Foreign Enlistment act requires, I am prepared to do, and even, if it should be proved to be necessary for the preservation of our neutrality, that the sanction of Parliament should be asked to further measures. In short, to sum up, Her Majesty's Government are prepared to do everything that the duty of neutrality requires—everything that is just to a friendly nation, taking as a principle that we should do to others as we should wish to be done to ourselves. [Loud cheers.] But

this we will not do—we will not adopt any measure that we think to be wrong. We will not yield a jot of British law or British right in consequence of the menaces of any foreign Power. [Loud and prolonged cheers.]

## COMPLAINTS OF THE AMERICANS—MR. SUMNER'S SPEECH.

And now, reverting again to the complaints, that have been made, it is singular to observe how jaundiced the minds of some of those who speak in the New-England States are on this subject of our conduct. There were some persons, members of the House of Lords, who thought fit to complain on an apparent case of grievance—and not one case, but many cases—of ships of ours that had been seized; ships in some cases passing from neutral ports, in other cases on the sea, but apparently on a legitimate voyage; and it was urged that we ought not to submit to have our vessels thus seized, and our commerce thus interrupted. I had to deal with that case, and my answer was that according to the law of nations, if a ship had an ostensible voyage to a destination which was not her real destination—if she was bound, in fact, to an enemy's port with munitions of war, the belligerents had a right to stop that vessel on the high seas. I said the law had been laid down by Lord Stowell and other great English authorities, and that now we were neutrals, I did not think it fit we should depart from a law we had laid down as belligerents. [Cheers.] I said that in America, although there were some of the local Courts which had not the authority of such men as Lord Stowell and Sir William Grant, yet there was a Court of Appeal, there was a Supreme Court in the United States which contained, and had for many years contained, men as learned and of as high reputation in the law, and of as unsullied reputation for integrity as any that have sat in our English Courts of justice, and that we ought to wait patiently for the decision of those tribunals. Now, what is my surprise to find, and what would be your surprise to find, that Mr. Sumner is so prejudiced that he brings these declarations of mine against me, saying that I have diminished the reputation of the American Courts, and that I showed myself biased against the Federal States by the declaration I then made in Parliament? [A gentleman from the Southern States among the company here ejaculated, “He is not to be believed.”] I will not detain you further on these subjects; but one remark I must make on the general tendency of these speeches and writings in America.

The Government of America discusses these matters very fairly with the English Government. Sometimes we think them quite in the wrong; sometimes they say we are quite in the wrong; but we discuss them fairly, and with regard to the Secretary of State I see no complaint to make. I think he weighs the disadvantages and difficulties of our situation in a very fair and equal balance. But there are others, and Mr. Sumner is one of them, his speech being an epitome almost of all that has been contained in the American Press, by whom our conduct is very differently judged. With regard to all these matters there are difficult questions; we may have reason to complain in some instances, and the Federal Republic of America may have reason to complain also. But let us recollect that we are, as I have said, descended from the same ancestors, that in the Courts of justice in America the common law of England is constantly studied, and the decisions of our great Judges constantly referred to as decisions to be there respected; that our Shakespeares and our Milton are to them classical books as they are to us, that we have the same inheritance of freedom, that many of our institutions, as you may see by reading that excellent book of M. De Tocqueville on America, are identical; that the same spirit of liberty animates us both; that we, after our revolutions, chose a constitutional monarchy as the best form of government, and they, after their revolutions, chose a Republic; but that thus united, having the same spirit of law, having the same spirit of literature, having the same spirit of freedom, we ought, when this unhappy contest is over, to embrace one another as friends, and that we in the Old World and they in the New ought to be the lights to promote the civilization of mankind. [Loud cheers.]

Now, gentlemen, with these feelings I own I almost lose my patience when I see men, in what is called an oration, heaping up accusation after misrepresentation, and misrepresentation after misrepresentation, all tending to the bloody end of war between these two nations. I cannot but say, are they not satisfied with the blood that has been shed in the last two years, with that field of Gettysburg where 10,000 corpses of men, most of them in the prime of manhood, were left lying stretched on the ground? Are they not satisfied with that bloodshed, but would they seek to extend to the nations of Europe a new contest in which fresh sacrifices are to be made of human life, of human interest, and of human happiness? [Cheers.] Gentlemen, I trust that that will not be the case, I know, at least, that my efforts, such as they are—weak they may be, ineffectual I hope they will not be—will be directed to keep peace between these two nations, and to do everything which I think is just and right toward these people; and ready to meet attack if we are unjustly attacked, ready to bear our part in the contest, if contest there must be, but yet believing that we ought to make every effort that all these various conflicts may end in peace, in union and in friendship, I shall at all events have the consciousness that I have

done my best to preserve peace between these mighty nations. [Loud cheers.] Gentlemen, it is a great subject; it affects the people of this part of the world and of America; it affects the future stage of civilization, it affects the well-being of the black race, whom it was the crime of our ancestors to introduce to America, and who, if these matters end well, will be, as I believe they are fitted to be, peaceable and intelligent members of a free country. [Cheers.] on behalf of whose welfare we have been ready to make great efforts, and to sacrifice much. But we will not sacrifice any of those views of ours to mere pretence. We have as strong feelings for the good of mankind as any people can have; we must maintain our own position; and my belief is that the people of what were the United States, whether they are called Federals or Confederates, will finally do us justice, and that they will observe—as, indeed, they cannot help observing—that in this free country, where there is so much discussion and so much difference of opinion, there are parties very considerable in number who sympathize with the Confederates, and other large masses—I believe superior in numbers—who sympathize with the Federals; but whether sympathizing with the one or the other, we have all embraced in our hearts that sentiment of justice—justice we will do to others, justice we expect for ourselves, and I hope I am interpreting the feelings of your minds when I say that justice ought to prevail.

The noble Earl sat down amid prolonged cheering.

[From the Richmond Whig, Oct. 7.]

## THE WITHDRAWAL OF MR. MASON—FOREIGN CONSULS MUST BE SENT OUT OF THE CONFEDERACY.

We are glad to have the authorized assurance of the *Sentinel* that the intelligence of Mr. Mason's formal withdrawal from his unpleasant and profitless post in England is believed to be correct as, “early in August last, the President instructed him to withdraw from a mission in which his services could no longer be useful to his country.” The *Sentinel* adds that from the date at which these instructions were sent, “it is apparent that this action of the President must have been based on the intelligence which reached us about the date of the refusal of the British Government to unite with that of France in placing us on a footing of equality with our enemies, by acknowledging the independence which we have so fully vindicated in the face of the world.”

Having for a long time urged this course, it would be superfluous now to express our approval of it. We only regret that action was so long delayed, and still more that it has not been as complete as the occasion called for. Why recall Mr. Mason, if the British Consuls are to be permitted to remain and exercise their functions in this country? What does this withdrawal import while we continue to extend this unreciprocated and extraordinary privilege to Great Britain? Not that we are sensible of the injustice and unfriendliness of her conduct and are determined to resent it. Not that we are forced to assert our self-respect by refusing longer to treat with deference and courtesy a Government that recognizes us only by the insults and injuries that it heaps upon us. But, apparently that the Confederate authorities are either dissatisfied with Mr. Mason personally, or have reason to believe that he is personally unacceptable to the British Government. This would be a fair and reasonable interpretation of the affair as it stands, and it might be expected as a logical consequence that some unobnoxious person would be at once sent to take Mr. M's place.

The recall of Mr. Mason was demanded by a sense of self-respect, as well as by important considerations of public policy; but these reasons require with far greater weight and urgency the dismissal of the British consuls. At most he could do no harm, beyond that of compromising our dignity; but these consuls are not only here without our leave, but they are charged with, and in contempt of our authority, and in derogation of our rights, are daily exercising the most important functions, and what is worst and most galling of all, they are in our midst and thus employed by permission obtained from the power which is waging a worse than barbarous war against us. An impertinent and insulting correspondence which has just been had with the Governor of Georgia by one of those consuls exhibits something of the extent of the powers with which they are charged and the temper of the instructions they receive.

A summary of this correspondence may be seen in another column; from which the reader will perceive that they are expected to exert a restraining power over our right to raise armies and to employ militia. Acting under authority from the Washington Government, and acknowledging no other, and receiving their instructions from the British minister to that Government, who is known to be bitterly hostile to us—those uninvited, unrecruited and intruding functionaries arrogate to themselves the sovereign privilege of prescribing to the free republics of this Confederacy the extent of their rights in providing for their own defence. They presume to bid a particular class of soldiers in service by regular operation of law, under certain circumstances, to throw down their arms. They have the effrontery to admonish us that this war against independent and sovereign States, by a people who are foreign to us, and by a