Daily Evening Bulletin.

GIBSON PEACOCK, Editor. OUR WHOLE COUNTRY. F. L. FETHERSTON, Publisher.

VOLUME XIX.---NO. 230. PHILADELPHIA, FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1866. DOUBLE SHEET, THREE CENTS.

EVENING BULLETIN.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING

(Except Sunday) at

No. 329 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia,

BY THE

"EVENING BULLETIN ASSOCIATION"

PROPRIETORS,

GIBSON PEACOCK, CASPER SOUDER, Jr.,
F. L. FETHERSTON, ERNEST C. WALLACE,
THOMAS J. WILLIAMSON.

The BULLETIN is served to subscribers in the city at 3 cents per week, payable to the carriers, or $6.00 per annum.

MARRIED.

MERCER—FINN—On the 11th instant, by the Rev Thomas Brainerd, D.D., Mr. Robert J. Mercer, Jr., o Philadelphia, to Miss Mollie E. Finn, of Nashville, Tennessee.

SOUTH—CLINTON—On Thursday evening, Jan. 11th, by the Rev. Wilbur F. Paddock, George W. South, of New York, to Mary E., only daughter of Edwin Clinton, Esq., of this city.

WILKINS—HAND—On the 11th instant, by the Rev. Dr. Dorr, Joseph R. Wilkins, Jr., to Mary L., daughter of James C. Hand, Esq.

WRIGHT—NAGLE—On the 11th instant, by the Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Mr. John K. Wright to Miss Mary Josephine, second daughter of Dr. G. L. Nagle, of this city.

DIED.

CHRISTY—Suddenly, on the 9th instant, Wm. M. Christy, aged 46 years.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral from his late residence, Spruce street, below Fortieth, on Saturday morning, at 8½ o'clock, without further notice. Funeral services at St. James's Church, West Philadelphia.

DINGEE—On the 10th instant, Ida Moore, daughter of Catharine and the late Edmund Dingee, in the 6th year of her age.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend the funeral from the residence of her mother, No. 934 North Seventh street, on Saturday afternoon, 13th instant, at 2 o'clock.

DUNNE—The relatives and friends of the late Harry H. Dunne, of Schuylkill county, are respectfully invited to attend his funeral on Saturday, the 13th, on the arrival of the morning train from Pottsville. To proceed to Laurel Hill.

LOWRY—On the morning of the 12th instant, Mrs. Henrietta Lowry, widow of the late Robert K. Lowry, of Baltimore.

Her relatives and friends are invited to attend her funeral from her late residence, No. 1805 Pine street, on Monday morning, the 15th instant, at 10 o'clock, without further notice. [Baltimore papers will please copy.]

LICHAN—On the 12th instant, Charles Lichan, in the 40th year of his age.

The relatives and friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend his funeral from the residence of A. Saurwein, Fifth street, between Lombard and South, on Sunday afternoon, at 3 o'clock.

MAPES—On Wednesday, Jan. 10th, after a protracted illness, Prof. James J. Mapes, of Newark, N. J., in the 60th year of his age.

The funeral service will take place on Saturday, the 13th instant, at three o'clock, at his winter residence, 46 Bleecker street. His friends and those of the family are respectfully invited to attend.

MOORE—On the 8th instant, at Washington, D.C., Mr. A. D. K. Moore, formerly of Philadelphia.

His male friends are invited to meet the funeral at Ronaldson's Cemetery, on Saturday morning, at 12 o'clock precisely.

PRATT—On the 11th instant, in his 19th year, Rowland Parry, only son of Erasmus C. and the late Sophia T. Pratt.

The friends of the family are invited to attend the funeral from No. 1618 North Fifteenth street, on Monday morning, 15th instant, at 10 o'clock. To proceed to Woodlands Cemetery.

WHITE MOREENS FOR SKIRTS.
Green Watered Moreens.
6-4 and 5-4 Green Baize,
White Cloth for Sacks.
White Evening Silks.
EYRE & LANDELL, Fourth and Arch.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

REV. J. H. SUYDAM WILL PREACH THIS evening, January 12th, in Trinity M. E. Church Eighth street, above Race, 7½ o'clock. 11*

PLATT OIL COMPANY will hold its annual meeting, on THURSDAY, the 25th instant, at 11 A.M., at the office 250 Chestnut street.
jal2,18,24* G. W. HUNTER, Secretary.

AN ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING of the BERRY FARM OIL COMPANY will be held at the office, 238 South Third street, on MONDAY, 15th inst., at 3 o'clock.
jal2-2trp* W. HACKER, Secretary.

HOWARD HOSPITAL, Nos. 1518 and 1520 Lombard street, Dispensary Department. Medical treatment and medicines furnished gratuitously to the poor. se23

ELDER KNAPP will preach at Rev. Dr. Jeffrey's church, corner of Fifth and Buttonwood streets, Wednesday evening, Sermon No. 2, upon "Universalism." Thursday evening upon "Dancing" and Friday evening to "Parents, especially to Mothers." ja10-3trp*

A LECTURE WILL BE DELIVERED THIS (Friday) EVENING, at 8 o'clock, at the ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS, Chestnut and Tenth streets, by PROF. WILLIAM HOWARD DAY, of New York, before the ASSOCIATION OF ALUMNI OF THE INSTITUTE FOR COLORED YOUTH, subject—"The Proscribed Races of France, Spain and America." Those desirous of obtaining a seat should go early in order to secure the seats. Admission, 25 cts. 1t*

OFFICE WEST PHILADELPHIA PASSENGER RAILWAY COMPANY, Northwest corner FORTY-FIRST and HAVERFORD streets,—PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 9th, 1866.

The Board of Directors have this day declared a Dividend of FIVE PER CENT. on the capital stock for the last six months, clear of all taxes, payable on and after the 19th inst.

The books for the transfer of Stock will be closed until that day.

SAMUEL P. HUHN, Treasurer.
ja11-f-m-w-s-rp4t

OFFICE OF THE LEHIGH COAL AND NAVIGATION COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA, December 21st, 1865.

LOAN FOR SALE.

IN SUMS TO SUIT PURCHASERS.

The Loan of this Company, due April 1st, 1884, interest payable quarterly, at the rate of six per cent. per annum.

This Loan is secured by a mortgage on all the Company's Coal Lands, Canals, and Slackwater Navigation in the Lehigh river, and all their Railroads, constructed and to be constructed, between Mauch Chunk and Wilkesbarre, and branch roads connected therewith, and the franchise of the Company relating thereto.

Apply to SOLOMON SHEPHERD, Treasurer,
de21-rptf2 122 South Second street.

SECOND NATIONAL BANK OF PHILADELPHIA, FRANKFORD, Jan. 11, 1866.

At the annual meeting of the Stockholders of this Bank, held on the 9th inst., the following gentlemen were elected Directors for the ensuing year:

NATHAN HILLES,
GEORGE W. RHAWN,
BENJAMIN ROWLAND, Jr.,
EDWARD HAYES,
BENJAMIN H. DEACON,
LEWIS SHALLCROSS,
CHARLES E. KREMER,
JOHN COOPER,
WILLIAM ERVIEN.

At the meeting of the Board of Directors, held this day, NATHAN HILLES was unanimously re-elected President.

WILLIAM H. RHAWN, Cashier.
ja12-6t

UNION NATIONAL BANK, PHILADELPHIA, January 11th, 1866.

At the annual election for Directors, held on the 9th inst., the following gentlemen were elected Directors for the ensuing year:

DAVID FAUST,
J. BINNEWANGER,
A. L. BONNAFFON,
ISAAC BARTON,
W. H. SOWERS,
R. D. WORK,
M. J. DOHAN,
GEO. W. BLABON,
GEO. W. GROVE.

And at a meeting of the Board of Directors held this day DAVID FAUST was unanimously re-elected President, and

N. C. MUSSELMAN, Cashier.
ja12-3t

AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE Contributors of the HOUSE OF REFUGE, held pursuant to public notice, WEDNESDAY, January 10th, 1866, the following gentlemen were unanimously elected to serve for the ensuing year:

PRESIDENT,
THOMAS EARP.
VICE PRESIDENTS,
JAMES J. BARCLAY,
JOHN M. OGDEN.
SECRETARY,
ALEX. HENRY.
TREASURER,
CHAS. E. HAVEN.
MANAGERS,

John Farnum,	Isaac R. Smith,
John W. Claghorn,	Daniel L. Collier,
Henry Perkins,	Gavin H. Woodward,
Wm. Shippen, M. D.	Charles Wheeler,
John Robbins,	Charles Ellis,
Alexander Fullerton,	Alfred M. Collins,
Casper Wister, M. D.	Thos. L. Kane, of McKean county, Pa.
Geo. M. Troutman,	J. Pringle Jones of Berks county, Pa.
Wm. S. Perott,	John L. Atlee, M. D., Lancaster county, Pa.
Arthur G. Coffin,	
Nathaniel B. Browne,	
Thomas A. Budd,	

G. H. WOODWARD, Sec'ry.
1t

SPECIAL NOTICES.

SPRING GARDEN STREET M. E. CHURCH—(Rev. A. Cookman, Pastor).—Deeply interesting services are being held in this Church, Twentieth and Spring Garden. This evening Rev. Wm. Butler, D. D., Missionary to India, and Rev. Bishop Janes will be present and officiate. Services at 7½ o'clock. The public are invited. 1t*

THE MANUFACTURERS' NATIONAL BANK, PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 12, 1865.

At an election held at the Banking House on Jan. 10, 1866, the following gentlemen were elected Directors to serve the ensuing year:

JOHN JORDAN, Jr.,
CURWEN STODDART,
MICHAEL MOYER,
JOHN GILBERT,
EMMOR WEAVER,
LEWIS HABENLEN,
D. D. JONES,
LEWIS ROYER,
JNO. G. REPPLIER.

And at a meeting of the Board held this day JOHN JORDAN, Jr., was unanimously re-elected President.

N. W. WOODWARD, Cashier.
ja12-3t

CITY NATIONAL BANK OF PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 12, 1866.

At an election held on the 10th of January 1866, the following named stockholders were elected Directors of this Bank:

WILLIAM G. HUGHES,	S. D. WALTON,
JOSIAH KISTERBOCK,	A. BOYD CUMMINGS,
CHAS. W. TROTTER,	CHARLES E. LEX,
GEO. W. FAHNESTOCK,	COFFIN COLKET,
JOHN BAIRD,	FREDERICK WILCOX,
THOMAS POTTER,	J. P. WETHERILL,
C. HENRY GARDEN.	

And at a meeting of the Directors this day, WILLIAM F. HUGHES, Esq., was unanimously re-elected President.

G. ALBERT LEWIS, Cashier.
ja12-3t

FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' NATIONAL BANK.—PHILADELPHIA, January 12, 1866.

At an election held on the 10th of January, 1866, the following named Stockholders were elected Directors:

S. A. MERCER,	FRANCIS TEFE,
EDWIN M. LEWIS,	WILLIAM M. FARR,
JOHN ASHHURST,	LINDLEY SMYTH,
ANTHONY J. ANTELO,	WILLIAM H. MERRICK,
BENJ. A. FARNHAM,	WM. H. WOODWARD,
JAMES R. CAMPBELL,	RICHARD C. DALE,
	PEMBERTON S. HUTCHINSON.

And at a meeting of the Directors, this day, S. A. MERCER, ESQ., was unanimously re-elected President, and EDWIN M. LEWIS, ESQ., Vice-President.

W. RUSHTON, JR. Cashier.
ja12-10t

NATIONAL BANK OF THE NORTHERN LIBERTIES, PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 12, 1866.

At the annual election for Directors of this Bank, held the 10th inst., the following gentlemen were duly elected:

JOSEPH MOORE,
JOSEPH B. MYERS,
CHARLES J. SUTTER,
EDWIN H. FITLER,
JOSHUA LIPPINCOTT,
JOSEPH W. MILLER,
JAMES N. STONE,
MICHAEL BAKER,
ISRAEL PETERSON,
WILLIAM OVERINGTON,
ALEXANDER M. FOX,
JAMES BIDDLE,
CHARLES YOUNG.

and at a meeting of the Board, held this day, JOSEPH MOORE, Esq., was unanimously elected President.

W. GUMMEY,
11t Cashier.

AT A MEETING OF THE CITIZENS OF the TWENTY-FOURTH WARD, it was decided to erect a suitable Monument to the memory of the late Captain COURTLAND SAUNDERS, of Company I, 121st Pennsylvania Volunteers (Corn Exchange Regiment).

This was regarded as a fitting tribute from the friends and neighbors of one who, in his life, exhibited so many virtues, and, in his death, offered so noble a sacrifice in the cause of his country.

The undersigned, having been appointed a Committee to carry this decision into effect, have concluded to erect a Monument of appropriate design over his remains at the Woodland Cemetery; and they invite those who desire to join in this Testimonial, to hand their contributions to any one of the Committee. It is desired that the name should accompany each contribution, as it is intended to erect this Monument not only upon a liberal scale, but to have it represent the feeling of respect for the deceased so universally entertained among those who knew him.

N. B. BROWNE,	A. J. DREXEL,
SAMUEL FIELD,	HENRY HOD,
HENRY C. TOWNSEND,	CLARK CROSS,
HENRY C. LEA,	CLARK H. CLARK,
E. SPENCER MILLER,	HENRY C. GIBSON,
	DAVID PAYNTER,

PHILADELPHIA, Jan., 1866. ja6 rp-6t*

SOLDIERS' FAMILIES.

The immediate Relief of the Soldier, the Widow, and the Orphan, in their own homes, is the only object we have in appealing to you for pecuniary co-operation. Such families are numerous, and their terrible destitution is known only to those who visit their humble homes, their damp dark cellars and cold, cheerless garrets.

Rev. WM. MCELWEE, Pastor of the Fifteenth Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia, and extensively known by the name of "City Pastor," has been devoting much of his time, by his pen and personal labors, during the last two years, for the benefit of this needy and deserving class. Convinced that our citizens have a heart in such a work, and stand ready to aid it when appealed to, and finding that the calls for aid are daily increasing, and that funds are needed to meet them, I am earnestly solicited to contribute my mite, daily to aid this noble and Christ-like work. *I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; thirsty, and ye gave me drink; naked, and ye clothed me.*

All contributions will be acknowledged in the public papers.

Send contributions to

Rev. WM. MCELWEE,
"City Pastor."
Superintendent of Immediate
Aid for Soldiers' Families,
Residence, 1341 Lombard Street
Philadelphia.

Mrs. CITY PASTOR, Superintendent of Clothing Department and of Visitation and Distribution.

Miss H. MOONEY, Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Supplies and Distribution.

"We know CITY PASTOR, are acquainted with work, and cordially recommend his cause and himself as worthy of the aid and confidence of our citizens

"JAMES POLLOCK,
"ALEXANDER HENRY,
"JAMES ORNE,
"HENRY D. MOORE."

ja12fr&sa-strp2

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF BRICKLAYERS.—The International Convention of the Bricklayers of North America, assembled in this city, on Monday morning, at Royston Hall. This is the second meeting of the organization, the first convention having met in Philadelphia last year. The following is a list of the delegates present: Baltimore, C. C. Mott, Jesse Ogle and John T. B. Slater; Philadelphia, Jared D. Bitting, Joseph Hackney and J. T. Akin; St. Louis, Thomas Mockler; Brooklyn, N Y., John H. O'Rourk and John S. Frost; East Brooklyn, N. Y., George Quinn; New York city, John Cortier and Patrick Brazil; Jersey City, N. J., John White; Cincinnati, Ohio, Napoleon Paler and Joseph Cassiday; Richmond, Va., John Hammond. The following gentlemen were elected officers for the ensuing year:—President, John A. White, of Baltimore; Vice-president, John S. Frost, of Brooklyn; Secretary, J. Edward Kirby, of Baltimore; Treasurer, Joseph Hackney, of Philadelphia, and Sergeant-at-arms, J. E. Tayman. The greater portion of the day was occupied with the organization, appointing of committees, and the transaction of business of interest only to the craft. In his annual report the president favors the "eight hour" system of labor. In honor of the meeting of the convention in Baltimore, and with a view of properly entertaining the delegates from abroad, the bricklayers of Baltimore gave a grand ball last night at the New Assembly Rooms. The convention will probably be in session three or four days, but the business transacted will be entirely of a private character.—*Baltimore Sun.*

A YEAR'S BUSINESS IN CHICAGO.—The Chicago papers publish the year's statistics of trade and commerce. The following items are interesting: The money expended on buildings in 1865 was $6,950,000. The total valuation of property is $64,709,177, and the tax levied is $1,294,000. The lumber receipts were 614,000 feet, exclusive of shingles, laths, and telegraph poles. The wool receipts were 7,690,000 pounds; hides, 18,000,000; lake fish, 95,000 packages; coal, 346,000 tons; flour, 1,860,000 barrels, and wheat, 9,465,000 bushels.

LIBERAL.—Flavel Mosely, of Chicago, who during his life gave much of his heart and time to the cause of popular education, left by his will $10,000 to be added to the Mosely School Fund, for supplying school books to needy children in the public schools of the city, besides $30,000 in other forms for the education of the "friendless," and $20,000 to other objects of benevolence.

THE SHENANDOAH.

Correspondence Between Mr. Adams and Earl Clarendon.

Recapitulation of the History of the Rebel Pirate.

How an Innocent Merchant Vessel was Converted into a Cruiser.

The British Government Requested to Put the Crew on Trial.

Earl Clarendon's Reasons for Declining to Accede to this Request.

Unconciliatory Tone of His Despatch to Mr. Adams.

The Difference Between American and British Neutrality.

The Canada's mails, bringing the Adams-Clarendon correspondence, in reference to the pirate Shenandoah, have arrived. The entire series of letters is too voluminous for publication to-day, but we give the most important portions. On the 21st of October Mr. Adams wrote to Earl Russell complaining of the British origin, equipment and manning of the Shenandoah, as well as of the origin, &c., of the Alabama, and the rescue of her crew by the British yacht Deerhound. Mr. Adams denounced these affairs as flagrant outrages against neutrality, and gave details proving his assertions. On the 7th of November Mr. Adams wrote to Earl Clarendon, requesting that the Shenandoah, which had arrived at Liverpool, be given up to the United States authorities. On the 11th of November, Earl Clarendon wrote to Mr. Adams that the Shenandoah had been delivered to the United States Consul at Liverpool, but that the officers and crew being "all foreigners" they were allowed to depart from the vessel with their effects. On November 14th Mr. Adams replied to Earl Clarendon, complaining of the "disingenuous" way in which the pirates had been released by the British authorities. Several other letters passed between the ministers in reference to this question, and in regard to the Alabama and the yacht Deerhound. The remainder of the correspondence we give below. Letter No. 9 is as follows:

MR. ADAMS TO THE EARL OF CLARENDON.—(Received Nov. 18).

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES, LONDON, Nov. 15, 1865.—*My Lord:* I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a note from your predecessor, the Right Hon. Earl Russell, dated the 20 inst., in reply to one which I addressed to him on the 18th of September last, on certain important questions now under consideration between Her Majesty's Government and that which I have the honor to represent.

It is with the most profound regret that I am thus compelled to open my relations with your Lordship in a spirit of controversy. I can only urge in extenuation of this proceeding the great importance of the subjects under consideration—not simply as between two countries, but from their wider bearing on the future relations of all nations on the globe. Furthermore, I flatter myself that, from the contraction necessarily going on of the topics under treatment, we may, before long, arrive at some sort of termination of a discussion already on my part, I fear, rather tediously protracted.

His Lordship's note appears to be substantially confined to the consideration of two classes of facts, both of them connected with the establishment, if more general principal of the law of nations—to wit, the obligation of a neutral country to belligerents to do everything within its power to maintain its neutrality inviolate. This doctrine appears to your Lordship to be fully acquitted by the adoption of such measures as the neutral itself may judge sufficient, without regard to any remonstrances of the belligerent. And without entering into argument on the abstract question, he contents himself with vouching in the conduct of the United States in past cases in full justification of the course taken by Great Britain, and complained of by the United States in the progress of the late war. The chief of the cases relied upon by his Lordship is that in regard to certain claims for indemnity for injuries done to the commerce of Portugal by vessels illegally fitted out in the United States.

In order to define the nature of the question, thus raised, it would seem to be proper first to note how far his Lordship and I are agreed. After which it may more clearly appear wherein we are so unfortunate as to differ.

But consenting to cite the language and the action of the United States Government in the Portuguese case so freely as his Lordship does as a precedent to justify the like course of Her Majesty's Government now drawn into question, it is obvious that he must have given to them the high sanction of his approbation.

On my side, I have already, in a preceding note, expressed it as my opinion, that the grounds taken in that case by my government were irreconcilable.

It necessarily follows that on this point we are fully agreed. Where there is no difference it is obviously superfluous to continue an argument.

Here I would beg permission to observe that in all the previous examination of this topic I have carefully abstained from the task of affirming that a neutral power is absolutely responsible for the injurious consequences of any and every violation of neutrality that may originate within its territorial limits, without regard to the circumstances attending each case. The proposition which I have affirmed, and still do continue to insist upon, is, that a neutral is responsible for all injuries which may so ensue to a friendly nation when it fails to exercise all the means in its power for prevention, and constitutes itself the sole judge of the extent to which it will refuse to resort to stronger ones within its reach, when the old ones are proved by the injured party to have been wholly inadequate to the emergency.

With the light shed by this explanation, I now propose very briefly to set forth those points in the respective action of the United States towards Portugal and of Great Britain towards the United states, where in they appear to me to differ so essentially and radically as to make it impossible to bring them within a reasonable parallel.

1. The United states did not recognize the insurgents in South America as belligerent until the fact of the presence of their armed vessels was made patent to them on the ocean. But Great Britain did erect the insurgents in the United States into a belligerent before they showed a vessel on the sea, before they organized an army on land, and before they had done a thing but declare an intention to do what they never subsequently executed.

2. Upon the first notice given to the Government of the United States that the neutrality of their ports was violated by South American insurgents making outfits in connection with their own citizens, they immediately put in force the provisions of the existing law; prosecutions were instituted against the foreign agents, as well as citizens; and decrees of restitution were obtained from the judicial tribunals in the cases of captured property. In other words, nothing was left undone that energy could do to bring to bear existing preventive legislation against these offenders.

One particular instance of the desire to perform these obligations is worthy to be presented to your notice, more particularly inasmuch as it incidentally explains as well the public sense of the extent of the obligation of a neutral power in similar cases, as of the responsibility entailed from an insufficient performance of it.

It appears that some of the insurgent emissaries, in conjunction with desperate adventurers of the United States, went to the extent of seizing and occupying two different spots on the American coast, neither of them within the recognized jurisdiction of the Union, nor yet within that of any responsible Power. Here they made bases from which to conduct their hostile operations against the commerce of Spain and Portugal, very much in the manner, but not nearly with so much success, as Liverpool in this kingdom and the port of Nassau were made bases of, against the commerce of the United States, by insurgent emissaries during the late war. These proceedings soon attracted the attention of the President, who dwelt upon the necessity of adopting prompt measures of prevention in his annual recommendations to Congress in the year 1817. The matter was referred in course to the consideration of a Committee of the House of Representatives, which made a report recommending that these establishments should be at once suppressed by force, if necessary.

"Among the reasons given for resorting to this summary proceeding are the following, to which I ask a moment of your Lordship's attention:

"The immediate tendency of suffering such armaments, in defiance of our laws, would have been to embroil the United States with all the nations whose commerce with our country was suffering under these depredations; and if not checked by all the means in the power of the government, whould have authorized claims from the subjects of foreign governments for indemnities at the expense of this nation, for captures by our people in vessels fitted out in our ports, and, as could not fail of being alleged, countenanced by the very neglect of the necessary means of suppressing them."

It would be difficult to express in more forcible language the principle established by the law of nations than is done in these sentences. The action recommended was, moreover, performed so promptly, that soon afterwards the President, in a special message, was enabled to announce that the piratical establishments at Amelia Island and at Galveston had been suppressed. The paramount necessity had been thought to justify the exercise of power even over territory not within the national jurisdiction.

But when I turn my attention to the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government as they are noted in the dreary list of my representations and complaints contained in the printed memorandum furnished to me with His Lordship's note of the 2d inst., when I perceive a real justice to have been so seldom done and so often defeated, however good the intentions may have been; when I note the omission of all reference to the endless remonstrances made by myself against the establishment of a naval bureau in Liverpool, conducted by insurgents mentioned and particularized by name; because not a single step was ever taken either to prevent their action or to punish them, I cannot but be sensible of a difference in the preventive action of the two countries in similar circumstances, which would ever forbid me from classing them together in one connection for a single moment.

3. It is not, however, denied that, in the one case as in the other: several cases of illegal outfits took place which the existing laws proved inefficient to prevent or punish.

In that of the United States the representative of the aggrieved Power made at once a direct appeal to the Government stating the cause of the difficulty, and soliciting a new movement for the purpose of obtaining from the requisite and more stronger powers of prevention; to which that Government immediately responded by recognizing the justice of the complaint, and at once adopting the suggestion.

If Her Majesty's Government has at any time in this struggle followed that example it has escaped my observation. I should be glad to be corrected when I affirm that it has done the directly opposite thing.

Here I may be permitted for a moment to refer to a passage of his Lordship's note, which appears to have been called out by a phrase in Mr. Seward's dispatch venture to give of the consequences that might ensue to the world if neutral nations constituted themselves the sole judges of the degree in which they had done their duty under a code of their own making. To this phrase his Lordship is pleased to retort as follows:

"Yet, as far I can judge, your Secretary of State always maintained that the United States, as a neutral Power, were the sole judges of the degree in which it had done its duty under a code of his own making."

To which I would beg permission to observe that his Lordship can scarcely presume me to mean that, in the literal sense, my country does make its own code of laws. What I did mean to do was to distinguish by this term a country which was ready to accept suggestions from foreign powers, for an improvement of a code designed to give them the protection they are entitled to by treaties as well as international law. Now, no nation is determined to abide by its own system without regard to external representations. By keeping in mind this distinction, in connection with the fact already stated of the action of my government, it will be seen at once that his Lordship is in error when he declares that "our Secretaries of State" (meaning those of the United States) "made themselves the sole judges of the degree in which the country had done its duty under a code of their own making." So far was this from being true that they admitted that the country had not done its full duty, and they proceeded to amend the code at the suggestion of a foreign Power that claimed to be aggrieved. Hence it is that the "code" was "not of their own making."

If there be a shadow of doubt left on this point I will proceed to dispose it by the following facts:

On the 20th of December, 1816, M. Correa de Serra addressed these words to the Secretary of State:

"I apply, therefore, to this government, in the present instance, to a friendly nation, to require satisfaction which the Constitution of the United States has not perhaps enabled them to give, but because I know that the supreme Executive of this nation, all powerful when supported by law, is constitutionally inactive when unsupported by law. What I solicit of him is the proposition to Congress of such provision by law as will prevent such attempts for the future."

To which application Mr. Monroe, then Secretary of State, replies as follows on the 27th of December, 1861:

"I have communicated your letter to the President and have now the honor to transmit to you a copy of a Message which he has addressed to Congress on the subject, with a view to obtain such an extension, by law, of the executive power, as will be necessary to preserve the strict neutrality of the United States in the existing war between Spain and the Spanish Colonies, and effectually to guard against the danger in regard to the vessels of your sovereign which you have anticipated."

And on the 13th of March, Mr. Rush, then acting Secretary, writes to him as follows:

"The Act of Congress passed on the 2d of this month to preserve more effectually the neutral relations of the United States, being upon the subject brought under consideration in your letter to this department of the 20th of December last, I have the honor, by direction of the President, to transmit for your information the enclosed copy of it. The President feels sure that your Sovereign will perceive in the spirit and scope of its provisions a distinguished proof of the care which animates this nation to maintain with his dominions and subjects the most harmonious relations."

But when I turn to the other side of the picture, and view the action which Her Majesty's Government has thought it proper to take in answer to similar representations made by me on behalf of my government: when I observe that the appeals to the existing law have been almost uniformly met by a kind of stereotype inefficacy: and when, upon my making representations as to the expediency of further legislation to enlarge the powers of the government to an extent adequate to the emergency, I find that I am positively declined it seems to me that here again the parallel sought to be made utterly fails.

I would respectfully ask whether, in the correspondence just laid before your Lordship, there be any language similar to that which his Lordship in one of the notes which he did me the honor to address to me, used to me:

"Surely we are not bound to go on making new laws *ad infinitum* because new occasions arise."

Here I would respectfully submit that if his Lordship be right in his assertion that new laws *ad infinitum* are not required by new occasions, it is difficult to explain the reason for the enactment of so many legislative bodies and such multiplied statute books, if the government which I represent would not have so repeatedly acceded to the solicitations of Her Majesty's Government as it has done, to "make new laws for new occasions," under any other plea.

But I am in candor bound to observe that, even in this doctrine, there has been during the late struggle a singular variation in the practice of Her Majesty's Government, which I ask your Lordship's permission to point out.

At a very early date the exposed nature of the frontier bordering upon Canada became so much a subject of anxiety to my government that I was instructed to bring the matter to the attention of his Lordship, with a view to the establishment of more effective preventive measures on the Canadian side than were thought to be then within their reach. To that end, in the early part of December, 1863, in a conversation which I had the honor to hold with his Lordship, after explaining the reasons of my government for the danger apprehended in this quarter, I proceeded to propose the adoption of a form of law on the part of Canada, resembling that which had been enacted on our part in 1838 to meet a similar emergency then happening there. It is true that for a considerable period I had no reason to presume that this proposal had been more favorably received than any other of the same kind I had been called to make. But when, one year later, information was received of the extreme peril into which Canada had been thrown by the violent enterprise executed by some of the insurgents established in that province upon the peaceful town of St. Alban's, I then had the satisfaction of learning from his Lordship that the suggestion had been adopted so far as Her Majesty's Government had recommended to the authorities of Canada to procure the enactment of the suggested law.

In this case, then, it is clear that the imminent danger of a rupture between the two countries had brought on an acknowledgment of the necessity of going on to "make a new law to meet a new occasion." But surely Her Majesty's Government would not be willing to give even a color to an inference that nothing be a necessity to avoid a war would be a sufficient motive to induce it to recognize an obligation to make a new law. If the reasons for the suggestion were equally valid in all cases, I fail to perceive upon what principle the nature of the answer should be made to depend upon the merely accidental pressure of the circumstances attending the moment it was made.

Without pressing this topic further, I would then beg to observe that in any event, however the facts attending the Portuguese claim as now explained may be viewed, one thing is indisputable, and that is that there is a wide divergency in the nature of the two cases sought to be brought together. It is plain that neither in the commencement, nor in the proceedings under the existing laws, not yet in the mode of treating the suggestion of new legislation, was there any resemblance whatever in the tone or the action of the respective governments. Hence I am constrained to arrive at the conclusion that, whatever may be thought of the conduct of the Government of the United States in its relations toward Portugal, there is no parallel to it in that of Great Britain toward the United States, by which the latter may be cited in the way of justification. Considered as a precedent, for which alone the case seems to have been quoted by his Lordship, I must insist that the evidence entirely fails to establish its authority.

On a general review of these marked differences, considered in the light of the rule of international law laid down at the outset of this letter, it may now be said that one government appears to have done all that it was reasonably asked to do, and that it could do, to preserve its neutrality, while the other certainly could have done more, but deliberately refused and accepted the responsibility of that refusal.

Hence, I must respectfully submit that before his Lordship concludes to adopt the language used by the United States in answer to Portugal, he should be prepared with proof to show that he has likewise adopted the action on which they based it.

I should here gladly close my portion of this long controversy if it were not that his Lordship has, in his note to which I now have the honor to reply, thought fit to open a new matter which I cannot decline to notice.

It has happened in the course of this extended discussion that he has, on more than one occasion, deigned to give me the benefit of his examination on various points of history in my own country. In the first instance, his Lordship was pleased to apprise me that Spain had never received any compensation for the claims of her citizens against the United States. By the aid of a little light I think I succeeded in dispersing that illusion, so that it has not been made to appear again. Again, his Lordship was pleased to inform me that the Enlistment Acts of the respective countries were in their main provisions similar and coextensive. Here I respectfully pointed out to his attention the fact that certain important provisions were contained in the one that were not to be found in the other; provisions which we, at least, regarded as having proved in practice the most efficient in the whole law.

His Lordship, in the note to which I am now replying, has been kindl enough to take notice of this difference, and goes on to describe the nature of the provisions he had overlooked: but it appears to be only for the purpose of trying to convince me that in my statement of their superior efficacy I am utterly wrong. Hence the argument appears to follow somewhat after this fashion; His Lordship having proved to his satisfaction that those provisions of the law which Her Majesty's Government did not adopt were as susceptible of evasion as all the others which it did adopt, it must necessarily follow that Her Majesty's Government were fully justified in declining a proposal to make any amendment whatever of its existing statute.

To which I would respectfully venture to reply that, even had the result proved to be as supposed, yet the position of Her Majesty's Government, if it had consented to make the experiment would have been, at least to my eye, infinitely stronger than it is now. It might then have replied to all complaints as the United States replied to Portugal, that everything in its power had been done, even to the extent desired by the complaining party. Whereas, by a refusal to recognize the justice of the request, it appears to have placed itself in the attitude of a party deliberately assuming the responsibility of declining to use those powers legitimately within its reach wherewith to fulfil its most imperative obligation.

But I am constrained to go further, and affirm that I can by no means subscribe to the opinion which his Lordship is pleased to express as to the ineffective nature of the provisions of the law to which he has referred. It is not without extreme surprise that I find him use the precise language respecting it which I beg permission here to quote:

"Now, I contend, first, that for ten years these provisions proved utterly inefficacious to prevent the fitting out of privateers at Baltimore, as shown by the fact that the complaints of the Portuguese Ministers of captures and plundering by American privateers were more frequent and extended to a large amount of property after 1818 than they had done from 1816 to 1818."

It is difficult for me to describe the high degree of astonishment with which I have read these lines.

In opposition to this grave affirmation of facts, which I must beg leave to observe no attempt is made to sustain by any distinct evidence I am driven to take the liberty to affirm on my own side, first that there is not a little of specifications to show that the fitting out of privateers continued in any appreciable sense for ten years after the year 1818; and, secondly, that no presence of that kind is to be found in any of the official remonstrances of the representatives of Portugal, to which I have had access, with one single exception, which I propose presently to notice.

In relation to the point of the efficiency of the law, I shall direct in opposition to his Lordship's reasoning as to what it might be, to confront that which, in the mind of M. Correa de Serra, the person through whom all the transactions passed during much the largest part of the period in question, and who had every opportunity to be familiar with them, it really was.

On the 4th of February, 1819, about two years after it had gone into operation, he deliberately used the following language:

"This law, so honorable to the spirit of justice of the government that enacted it, has also been found in practice the most useful of the laws existing on this subject. Unhappily the continuance and recent aggravations of the evils it was intended to remedy seem to render it necessary that this law may continue in force for some time. I apply, therefore, to this government in order to obtain the continuance of this law, so necessary to the peaceful trade of the subjects of my sovereign, and so honorable to the character of the United States, perfectly confident that my request is recording to the just and friendly intentions of the chief Magistrate and legislators of the Union, and conducive to the consolidation of good harmony between my Sovereign and the United States."

On the 4th of June, 1820, he again writes to the Secretary of State, as follows, thanking him for still more effective legislation:

"Permit me, Sir, to profit of this occasion to offer my thanks to this government for the law that prohibits the entrance of privateers in the most important ports of the Union, and for the other that declares piracy the landing and committing outrages ashore in foreign lands. I acknowledge the salutary influence of the Executive in obtaining these ameliorations."

Nevertheless, I have the great deference with which it is my desire, as well as my habit, to bow to the judgment of his Lordship, if I find myself so unfortunate as to be constrained to express an humble opinion in this case of conflicting authority, I cannot in candor disguise my conviction that the correct view is most likely to be that of M. Correa de Serra.

But, however efficient this law may have been found to be by M. Correa de serra, at so late a date as the 4th of June, 1820, it is now gravely affirmed that it so wholly lost its efficacy for the ten years following, that more property was captured after it was thus before, and the complaints of the Portuguese Minister for these captures and plundering were more frequent than ever.

The natural corollary, should this statement be sustained, would be that, assuming the exertions of the Government to have continued the same, instead of imparting the efficacy of the old law, the addition of the new provisions must have only made it more worthless than it was before, upon which logic might doubtless be based a very good justification to Her Majesty's Government for declining to try further legislation altogether. But, unfortunately, the whole argument falls to the ground when its base disappears. It is not denied that some outfits escaped from Baltimore after the year 1818. But it is denied that the complaints made for captures after that time bore any fair proportion to those made before. It never has been pretended that any law could be made so perfect, or any vigilance could be so complete, as to put an end to the efforts of profligate and desperate men. The grave error into which his Lordship has fallen appears to have originated in an *ex parte* letter written by a Minister from Portugal at Washington, thirty years after the date of the events, in which letter and the caption of a list embracing the names of vessels captured, he includes them vaguely within two distant dates of 1816 and 1828. It is, however, remarkable that in the letter itself, containing his own recapitulation of the facts, no date of a capture is given later than 1820. By turning to the original representations made by his predecessors the same fact distinctly appears. I have carefully examined those representations to trace the dates of the claims embraced in that list, and find much the greater proportion included within the period of residence of M. Correa de Serra ending in that year. So also of the gross amount of value assigned in 1828 as an indemnity for all the damage done during the entire period, which is less than $300,000, I find a great proportion embraced in an early and more trustworthy representation made