THE TIMES ON MASON AND SLIDELL.

A turn of the wheel, which the American Cabinet has managed to make as sudden as possible, brings us a new question. The four American gentlemen, who have got us into our late trouble, and cost us probably a million a-piece, will soon be in one of our ports. Any day or hour we may expect to hear of their arrival at Liverpool, and their journey to the metropolis. Like the rest of their countrymen, they believe themselves to be of immense importance to their cause, whatever it may be. Neither side can give England the smallest credit for understanding or wishing to understand, or having the capacity to understand, the rights of their case; and so nothing will serve them but there must be somebody always dinning in our ears some details or platitudes to which the speakers attach a special value. Federalist after Federalist, Confederate after Confederate, has arrived in this country in the full persuasion that if he were once permitted to occupy the attention of Lord Palmerston or Lord Russell night and day for a fortnight or to fill a page of the *Times* every day for that period, England would at least begin to have an inkling of the case, and would rush to the aid of the Federal or the Confederate cause. These two commissioners and their secretaries are not unlikely to think even more of their importance than other similar arrivals, having witnessed in their own persons the rabid anxiety of their Northern countrymen not to let them be seen or heard in this island. To the sedate English mind this ridiculous rivalry for the exclusive possession of the British ear is only an older version of what is often witnessed in our nurseries. A fearful uproar of words, screams and blows reaches the mother, who hastens to allay the tumult. When she arrives she finds all confusion, and Master John and Master Tom each with a tale of outrages and provocations, each resolved to have the last word, and afraid of nothing so much as that the other should get a hearing. The parent sees enough to be sure that both were abundantly in the wrong, but that it is impossible to adjudicate between them. The general impression in this country is that both sides in the States have acted as ill as could be, and that it is not for England to decide which of them bears the palm for insolence, outrage, treachery and folly. However, Messrs. Mason and Slidell will not be easily persuaded but that they can throw much new light on the rupture, and on its bearing upon our interests. If we will only be so good as to shut both our eyes and ears to everybody and to everything else, and take in for gospel all that they say, we shall at least be in a condition to form an opinion on this quarrel, and the only opinion we can possibly come to is that we must immediately recognize the Southern States, send a fleet to break up the blockade, sweep the Northern commerce off the sea, and finally assist to inaugurate Mr. Jefferson Davis in whatever city of the whole Union he would prefer for that purpose.

How, then, are we to receive these illustrious visitors? Of course they will be stared at, and followed, and photographed, and made the subject of paragraphs. There is no help for that. Mr. Thomas Sayers cannot walk the streets with a friend, or ask the Mayor for permission to put up a booth in a market place, but the crowd immediately conclude the rough, hard-visaged, ill-favored pair to be the Confederate Commissioners. Messrs. Mason and Slidell, with their two secretaries, though not so handsome and graceful as their countryman Blondin, would certainly fill the Crystal Palace if they proposed to address the visitors there on the merits of their cause. But, for the benefit of the discriminating—for the guidance of the minority that prefers at least a respectable idol, and that does not wish to throw away its confidence and applause, we may as well observe that Messrs. Mason and Slidell are about the most worthless booty it would be possible to extract from the jaws of the American lion. They have long been known as the blind and habitual haters and revilers of this country. They have done more than any other men to get up the insane prejudice against England which disgraces the morality and disorders the policy of the Union. Their hatred of this country has been their stock in trade. On this they have earned their political livelihood and won their position, just as there are others who pander to the lower passions of humanity. A diligent use of this bad capital has made these men what they are, and raised them to the rank of Commissioners. It is through their life-long hatred and abuse of England that they come here in their present conspicuous capacity. The nation under whose flag they sought a safe passage across the Atlantic—the nation that has now rescued them with all her might from the certainty of a dungeon and the chance of retaliatory murder, is that against which they have always done their best to exasperate their countrymen. Had they perished in the cell or on the scaffold, amid the triumphant yells of the multitude, memory would have suggested that their own bitter tirades had raised the storm, and that their death was only the natural and logical conclusion of their own calumnies and sophistries.

So we do sincerely hope that our countrymen will not give these fellows anything in the shape of an ovation. The civility that is due to a foe in [illegible] all that they can claim. We have re- [illegible] good for evil, and, sooth to say, we [illegible] exceedingly sorry that they should ever [illegible]ation to choose what return they will [illegible]r the good we have done them. They [illegible]e for their own interest, in order, if possible, to drag us into their own quarrel, and, but for the unpleasant contingencies of a prison, rather disappointed, perhaps, that their detention has not provoked a new war. When they stepped on board the Trent they did not trouble themselves with the thought of the mischief they might be doing an unoffending neutral; and if now, by any less perilous device, they could entangle us in the war, no doubt they would be only too happy. We trust there is no chance of their doing this, for, impartial as the British public is in the matter, it certainly has no prejudice in favor of slavery, which, if anything, these gentlemen represent. What they and their secretaries are to do here passes our conjecture. They are personally nothing to us. They must not suppose, because we have gone to the very verge of a great war to rescue them, that therefore they are precious in our eyes. We should have done just as much to rescue two of their negroes, and, had that been the object of the rescue, the swarthy Pompey and Cesar would have had just the same right to triumphal arches and municipal addresses as Messrs. Mason and Slidell. So, please, British public, let's have none of these things. Let the Commissioners come up quietly to town, and have their to say with anybody who may have time to listen to them. For our part, we cannot see how what they can have to tell can turn the scale of British duty and deliberation. There have been so many cases of peoples and nations establishing an actual independence, and compelling the recognition of the world, that all we have to do is what we done before, up to the very last year. This is now a simple matter of precedent. Our statesmen and lawyers know as much on the subject as Messrs. Mason and Slidell, and are in no need of their information or advice.

PRINCIPALSHIP OF THE NEW COLLEGE.—It is contemplated by several influential parties in the Free Church to propose the Rev. Dr. Candlish as Honorary Principal of the New College, in room of the late Principal Cunningham. It is understood that, should the reverend Doctor accept the appointment, it will not be necessary for him to resign his congregational charge, or to conduct any of the classes. In the event of Dr. Candlish declining this honor, it is believed that the Rev. Dr. James Buchanan, the senior Professor in the New College, will be nominated for the Principalship. We believe it is also in contemplation to propose the Rev. Robert Rainy, of the Free High Church, to the vacant Professorship.

EXTRAORDINARY CHURCH COLLECTION.—On Sunday forenoon the Rev. Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, preached in the Free College Church, Glasgow, in connection with a special appeal for the reduction of the debt on that church, when the unprecedented sum of £2,630 was put into the collection plate. This collection is the largest ever made upon any day in any church in Scotland. The office-bearers of the church contributed amongst them the munificent sum of £1,100.—*Glasgow Herald.*

Glass, Elliott & Co., who made the Atlantic cable, have offered to the English Government to lay another from Milford Haven in Wales to Halifax, by July, 1862, and to guarantee its efficiency during one year for £700,000.

Queen Victoria asked Lord Derby once why he had given one Scotch lord the Order of the Thistle, instead of another. The other was rich and influential, but by no means intellectual. "I was afraid," said the sly premier, "that if I gave it to Lord —, he would *eat it!*" The Queen is said to have highly relished the Premier's wit.

San Francisco news is of still cont nued immense floods; more than 3,000,000 of acres being then under water. 4,500 head of cattle and sheep have been drowned this winter; but it is expected that one result of so much washing will be more gold dust next season.

The Colonial Presbyterian
AND PROTESTANT JOURNAL.

ST. JOHN, FEBRUARY 6, 1862.

MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

As the House of Assembly is so soon to meet, we take the opportunity of informing the readers of the *Colonial Presbyterian*, that they will be kept fully informed in regard to the sayings and doings of their Representatives, particularly in the popular branch. Our correspondent last year presented a series of admirable sketches of our M. P. P.'s, and we feel warranted in saying that he will do equal justice to these gentlemen during the approaching session. He will pay particular attention to the NEW MEMBERS, who will naturally feel desirous of justifying the choice of their constituents. We trust that our new members are already arranging, at least, the common places of their maiden speeches, which they may rest assured will all be transferred, at least all that is worthy of the honour, "as large as life" to our columns! From a thoroughly impartial stand point and an entirely untrammeled position, we shall reprint and comment on all public matters, and it will not be our fault if the members of the House of Assembly do not distinguish themselves, or if the people fail to appreciate the oratorical legislative and executive gifts and graces of their chosen representatives.

ABOUT LOYALTY, HOSPITALITY AND GRUMBLING.

How eesy it is to mar a graceful act! We have thanked many a gentlemanly donor, from the bottom of our heart, for the considerate nature of his refusal in a particular case. We have mourned over the necessity of accepting a subscription from some mean soul or some unmitigated bear. Diversity of sentiment is to be expected and invited among the real friends of all good and creditable movements; but when parties who have had no hand in originating or in carrying out such efforts, and whose sentiments are of a coarse and vulgar mould, attack some generous act, or craftily set up some rival project at an inconvenient season, it requires a considerable amount of self-restraint to know how to deal with them. We feel that we must suffer humiliation abroad: our only consolation is that we cannot be misunderstood at home, and that such manifestations only go to show that some good work has been performed.

By the letters addressed to us from various sections of this Province, we learn that the festal welcome extended to Her Majesty's troops on their arrival in this city, at this season of the year, and the present conjuncture of affairs, has been particularly gratifying to the loyal subjects of the QUEEN in this part of her dominions. It is felt that the officers and men to whom the hospitality of our citizens has been extended, are no doubtful heroes. It is understood that the history of the several regiments to which they are attached would form no inconsiderable part of that heritage of glory which is the common heir-loom of all true British subjects. It is felt that all the parties connected with these entertainments—the contributors, the managers, the eloquent and patriotic speakers, have all done credit to themselves. It is known that the officers and men have highly appreciated the compliment, and that the honored "Guards" have been made, to a certain extent, to forget that they had left the roast-beef and plum-pudding of old England behind them. And yet the voice of the "grumbler" is heard! Tell it not outside of St. John. Publish it not in any other portion of Her Majesty's dominions. Let not the record of our humiliation be whispered in the British Isles, or if the mortifying story must be told, let the *status* of the grumblers as to elevation of sentiment and refinement of taste be also made clear as the noon-day sun: let the bane and antidote go together.

The time was, when the soldier, the sailor, the miner, the cabman, and various other like classes of society, were looked upon as a species of machinery—useful indeed to the body politic, but otherwise of no particular account. They were expected to perform a certain amount of work, were paid for it, and there the matter ended. No social sympathy was extended to them, no smile of friendship cheered them, no social recognition awaited them. A great gulph separated classes in society, whose common interests were nevertheless identical. When the genial author of the "Deserted Village" wishes to portray an entirely exceptional character, he tells us that—

> The broken soldier, kindly bade to stay,
> Sat by his fire, and talked the night away;
> Wept o'er his wounds, or tales of sorrow done,
> Shoulder'd his crutch, and show'd how fields were won.

But nearly all classes of Society have begun to forget the hard exclusiveness of former years. The Queen, herself, has never been more happy than in receiving a drink of milk or a piece of bread and butter in some Scottish peasant home, as a pretext for performing some returning act of kindness. The soldier, the sailor, the miner, the cabman, have found new friends in the uppermost social circles. Their physical condition and their spiritual needs have alike been taken into account, and a feeling on the part of these classes that, so far from being despised, they held a high place in the affections of their more fortunate fellow citizens, has paved the way for such benevolent efforts. Moved by such considerations of sympathy, loyalty and hospitality, many of the citizens of St. John, without regard to creed or party—the ladies being prominent in the graceful act—desired to see assembled at the same festal board the officers and men who represent British power among us, and the citizens who rejoice in the protection of the flag "that has braved a thousand years." This object has been accomplished in a way which leaves little to regret, and much to be proud of, and yet, we have with shame to repeat, the voice of the grumbler is heard. Well, let it even be so. There is no new thing under the sun. Incongruities will never cease in this ill-assorted world of ours. NERO fiddled when Rome was in flames, so let the grumblers grumble on, while our citizens do honour to the "heroes of a hundred fights," to the hospitable and loyal city in which their lot has been cast, and to our noble QUEEN.

MR. URQUHART, whose hatred of Lord Palmerston is of the nature of monomania, has started the hypothesis that Prince ALBERT was taken off by poison! Utterly baseless and absurd as is the idea, which does not profess to rest upon anything in the shape of evidence, it has obtained favor in one or two obscure British journals, and has been made the subject of a long leading article in the *Boston Journal*, which remarks that the subject tends to cast light on English political parties. Of course the motive ascribed to the Premier is that he might rule the nation with less restraint, the Prince being out of the way. We trust that Lord Palmerston is very sensible how slight his tenure of life is, and that other and better thoughts are no strangers to his bosom.

It appears from the list of articles from New Brunswick, intended for Exhibition in London, as published by Mr. Stevens, Secretary of the Agricultural Board, in the *Globe* and other papers, that our Province will be most creditably represented. We *saw* the representation made in 1852. It was a truly primitive affair, and seemed to indicate the existence on the Western side of the Atlantic of some such place as Partridge Island! It will be different this time. We shall not be able to exhibit any bars of gold, but we will be able to show *how gold may be acquired.*

NEW BRUNSWICK BECOMING KNOWN ABROAD.

No in[illegible]ligent person can have failed to observe the growing knowledge and appreciation of New Brunswick, which appear in British estimates of this Province within the last few years. Our clipper ships have long been favorably known. Our forests have been deemed only too prolific. Our mineral wealth has occasionally been heard of. Our fisheries have been referred to as the subject of international negotiation. Our central position, and its importance in a commercial and strategetic point of view, have been glanced at occasionally by Downing street officials; Canadian Governors-General; by gentlemen desirous of speculating in the construction of an inter-colonial railroad, and by New Brunswick merchants, in their visits to England and intercourse with prominent Englishmen. Upon the whole, however, for many years past, our Province has not received that attention which it deserved in England, and this has arisen mainly from a want of acquaintance with the climate, resources, and people of this Province. Very recently we notice a change for the better. The change which has taken place in English sentiment since the visit of the Prince of Wales, has been very marked. The letters of the *Times'* correspondent have been of vast service to this Province. They have led not only the "leading journal" itself, but all the influential English, Irish, and Scottish newspapers, to notice New Brunswick in highly appreciative terms. We do not know that by any amount of expenditure we could have put ourselves in the same prominent way before the world, as was done by the publication of the letters detailing the circumstances connected with, and related to, the Prince's visit to this city, and to the capital of the Province. The renewal of the project to secure an inter-colonial railroad has operated in the same direction. The risk of war with the United States, and partial preparation for it, if they have lessened the material resources by which such a public work might be aided, have conspired to impress its necessity upon the minds of the governing classes in England, without respect to party considerations—a matter this of the most vital importance. A remarkable proof of this, and of the advantages we have derived from agitating this question, from colonial contact with English minds, is proved in an article which appears in the current number of *Blackwood's Magazine.* It opens in the following terms:—

The probability of a war with the Northern States of America makes us anxious to inquire what the condition of our colonies in that quarter of the globe is at present, and what assistance they may expect to receive from the mother country during the winter months.

Having passed a portion of last autumn in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Canada, we may perhaps be able to throw some light upon a subject which just now is one of great national interest.

Early in September a conversation took place in our hearing on board one of those excellent steamers which ply between the rapids of St. Anns—the scene of Moore's "Canadian Boat-song"—and the town of Ottawa, the new seat of Government for the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

The party consisted of a distinguished officer in the English army on full pay; a merchant, resident at St. John, New Brunswick; an Englishman well "posted" in public affairs *at home;* and a member of one of the Colonial Legislatures.

These gentlemen we will for brevity call respectively—"Miles," "Mercator," "Civis," and "Senator."

They were all proceeding to Ottawa,—Miles to make a report on certain Government works; Mercator to see his partner, who was engaged in the lumber-trade; Civis for curiosity, information, and fishing; Senator for the purpose of conferring with a contractor respecting the extension of railways in his own Province.

These gentlemen, after a good dinner, and other etceteras, become both good talkers and listeners, and proceeded to the discussion of colonial, and imperial and colonial questions, in a very agreeable manner. "Mercator" shows how unjust it would be on the part of England to leave these Colonies as the unaided defenders of their long international boundary, in the event of a war with the United States, and he maintains that the colonists are as loyal as the people of Middlesex. "Senator" refers in evidence of this allegation, to the feeling evinced during the period of the Crimean war. "Civis" promulgates erroneous English sentiments on these points, and doubts if a United States invasion of Canada would be very injurious or successful. "Miles" takes a military view of the subject, and says:

"But supposing we were at war with the States, they would threaten by railway our New Brunswick frontier, from Bangor in the State of Maine. At Richmond they could, by sending troops from Portland, intercept our railway between Montreal and Quebec, and from this point to Detroit, in the extreme West, they would have lines along every inch of their border, communicating with the great seats of industry and population.—Boston, Lowell, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and the Atlantic Coast."

"Civis" replies that reinforcements would be sent from England, but "Miles" asks in the event of the difficulty occurring in winter, how could this be done with sufficient expedition when the St. Lawrence is frozen, and "Mercator" remarks that the rate of insurance risks after November shows what is thought of the perils of the navigation of the St. Lawrence after that date. These remarks open up the prominent subject of discussion. "Miles" confirms "Mercator's" estimate of the St. Lawrence, and adds: "Then again, if we were to look for help from Halifax or St. John, I believe the road from Fredericton to Riviere du Loup, the point where the Grand Trunk terminates, is narrow and bad, and would offer many difficulties to an army in the winter."

SENATOR—"From the Lake Temiscouata to the St. Lawrence it is new, and, I have heard, good; at any rate it ought to be an excellent one, for it has cost the province a very large sum of money."

MILES.—"Is it macadamised?"

CIVIS.—"Oh dear, no! It is a common clay road, with ruts in places two feet deep, many of which are capacious enough to inter a file of grenadiers.

"The country is covered by dense forests, only thinly populated, and buried in ice and snow for at least four months in the year."

MERCATOR.—"In peace we have a ready access to Canada through Portland, in the State of Maine, over a railway to Quebec, which is leased to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and worked by them. This of course would be closed to us in war, and we should therefore be confined during the winter to one route—namely, that through New Brunswick, which Civis seems to have lately seen."

CIVIS.—"I shall not forget it in a hurry. About a fortnight ago I passed over it all with a friend, in travelling from St. John to Quebec."

MILES.—"Then, as we are speaking of the defences of Canada, will you give a description of your journey, for there is nothing so important connected with that subject as the means of transport through New Brunswick?"

"Civis" then narrates the experiences of a journey in August from St. John to Fredericton, thence to Woodstock, Grand Falls, and ultimately to Riviere du Loup, in terms which would hardly satisfy the *Woodstock Journal.* "Civis," however, has a keen eye for natural scenery, and a warm appreciation of Lake Temiscouata.

If there were on its pleasant hills a few inhabitants like those at home, Temiscouata would, I fear, make some of our Scotch lakes hide their diminished heads, and even render it advisable that Killarney should avoid watering her colonies quite as much as she does if she wishes to retain her rank amongst the sweet waters of the globe. It is right to state, however, that a great part of "Civis's" troubles arise from the region of the stomach, which is the medium through which Englishmen, and perhaps most men, are led to view all sublunary affairs. The name of Major Tupper always comes up in connexion with these inter-colonial journeys.

"The great drawback to travelling in New Brunswick is the bad food which one is obliged to eat; and [illegible]ous advantages, as we should, in situation over [illegible]ners of the prairies and the Mississippi [illegible]valley.

CIVIS.—"If the advantages are so great, how is it that this railway had not been built before now?"

MERCATOR.—"Chiefly for the reason which Senator has assigned; but we think we have a right to ask the mother country to help us."

CIVIS.—"I fear the doctrine of subsidies to Colonial Governments is exploded, and that the present Chancellor of the Exchequer is one of the most determined enemies to its revival."

SENATOR.—"I cannot understand how such a friend to peace as Mr. Gladstone can object to the promotion of an object that, by relieving the colonies from a weakness that invites aggression, will perhaps some day prevent a war, one year's expense of which would perhaps pay for two or three railways from Halifax to Quebec."

MERCATOR.—"When we get to Ottawa, I think I shall be able to show Civis that, if the mother country will comply with the request which will be made upon her Chancellor of the Exchequer this winter, she would not only not lose, but save several thousands per annum."

Thus ends this important dialogue on the affairs of British North America, but the writer in *Blackwood* (who appears to be "Mercator") continues the subject, recapitulates the history of the efforts made to obtain the line of railroad in question, the advantages accruing to England, and then affirming that if the road "never would pay a cent beyond working expenses" "the mother country would be ten thousand pounds a year richer for the required guarantee than without it," and concluding in the following kind and encouraging words:—

A golden opportunity now offers itself of completing this great work; public attention is drawn to the locality. The whole nation must feel the necessity for it; the anxiety which pervades us all as to the safe arrival of the army that has just left our shores, and which we are told is supplied with every appliance that can make it formidable to our enemies, would be considerably allayed if we were certain that it could with ease, and without risk, reach it destination. At any rate, let the work be begun. We think we have shown that it can be accomplished without cost to this country; and we believe that, independently of military considerations, it would tend more to establish our supremacy on the American continent, than anything that a bountiful Providence has hitherto given us the means of accomplishing.

Our space is more than exhausted, nor would anything but the great interest of the subject have induced us to refer to it at such length. We cannot conclude, however, without expressing the gratification that we feel that such discussions are being carried on in such influential quarters. The results to this portion of Her Majesty's dominions cannot be otherwise than beneficial, and what deserves specially to be noticed is that these discussions originate in connexion with our own efforts by Delegation and otherwise, to promote the construction of an inter-colonial railway.

SHALL WE SYMPATHIZE WITH THE NORTH, OR WITH THE SOUTH?

Although the writer of the following letter does not favor us with his name, yet as he appears to be an educated gentleman of some "skill of fence," and as he mentions the name of a revered friend and honored instructor, we cheerfully insert his letter:—

[To the Editor of the Colonial Presbyterian.]

SIR—In your paper of the 9th January there are two articles—one on the death of the lamented Dr. Cunningham, whom my family knew something of; the other, quotations from your own paper in reference to "sympathy" with the North *vs.* the South. It is with the latter I propose to hazard a few words with you, but not *malâ parte*—expressing, however, surprise, from your great advantages in various Universities, that you should appear to have allowed prejudice to override judgment. Doubtless you will admit that from truth nothing can really follow but what is *true.* Well, I cannot but demur at some of your propositions in your *sympathetic* paragraphs—if they were true, your conclusions would unquestionably be true also. Now, it remains to be proved that the South had no cause for the course they have taken in separation; for, please observe, they have not taken offensive operations *extra limites,* and, as I have already said, it remains to be proved that what they have done is without cause. On the whole, it appears to me, that you are bound by the terms of your proposition to prove that no "oppression" has been exercised by the North; in other words, that the Morrill Tariff, and the general course of the legislative majority of the North, has been fair and just to the South; if not, it would seem that they had cause, perhaps just cause. You must also prove, I apprehend, that the Government of the North has been "beneficent."

As to the "misfortunes" of the North, that is not a happy term, and will require grave consideration and explanation. Also, it must be shown that the *slave traders* of New York are "the friends of human freedom"—that the Federal Government has been honest and sincere in all negotiations and all their endeavors (if they ever have endeavored), *to suppress the Slave trade.* To my mind, they stand, North and South, as thief and receiver. Is this the "misfortune" of the North, or is it not rather the love of filthy lucre? Depend upon it, sir, the North and South are not without great and glaring faults. This *civil* war looks very like a solemn judgment from heaven on both parties; and it may be just retribution, for the bringing down of that absurd, unjust, and haughty democratic pride and vain boasting, almost against Heaven, which cannot be acceptable to the Divine Being.

Let us steer clear of undue partialities; and we should also take care, I humbly think, logically that our premises are true: if not, when an argument carries the face of truth with it, and yet leads the public into mistake, it looks like sophism.

Please excuse these plain but honest remarks.

M. E. N.

It will be seen by the foregoing letter that the writer does not succeed in adducing, detailing, and proving any acts on the part of the Federal Government, which could warrant the revolutionary movement of which the attack on the Federal fortress of SUMTER was the fitting accompaniment. It also appears that M. E. N. is unaware of the fact that South Carolina, the leader in revolt, assigns no other reason to justify her in the sight of heaven, in breaking up the Federal Union, than that slavery was endangered, and the election of "a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery." Our correspondent does not seem to be aware that precisely similar ground is taken in those curious documents, called "Ordinances of Secession," which have emanated from the other revolted States, and that Vice-President STEPHENS, one of the best of the Sou[illegible] leaders, declares that the *differentia* of the [illegible] federation is that its key-stone is the gran[illegible]sophical and religious principle, or "key-st[illegible]e" as he calls it, of the SLAVERY of the African race. With such facts before our eyes, it will hardly do to present such an after-thought as the "Morrill Tariff," or "the general course of the Legislative majority of the North," as an explanation of the rebellion. The fact that the South, with only a third of the free population of the Union, had long governed the country, has given to it eleven Presidents out of sixteen, seventeen judges of the Superior Court out of twenty-eight, fourteen Attorney Generals out of nineteen, sixty-one presidents of the Senate out of seventy-seven, twenty-one Speakers of the House of Representatives out of thirty-three, eighty foreign ministers out of one hundred and thirty-four, and so on through all the other departments—this facts shows how sadly oppressed the Southern States have been, and how small a voice they had in the making of tariffs and the general government of the country! As to the New York slave-traders, we admit that under the *regime* of pro-slavery Administrations, they carried on their vile traffic with impunity. Their prospects have greatly altered for the worse under the Lincoln Administration. For these and other reasons, the Editor of this Journal feels unable to justify the Southern rebellion, and holds that the cause of the Federal Government is that of law, order and right.

INTERESTING DESPATCHES ON THE TRENT AFFAIR: LORD RUSSELL'S REPLY TO SECRETARY SEWARD.

Our English papers publish some additional despatches from the English to the Washington Government. They reflect high honour on the dignity, the urbanity, the honesty and ability of the British Cabinet. The first despatch from Lord Russell to Lord Lyons commences in the following terms:

Foreign Office, Dec. 19, 1861.

My Lord: Mr. Adams came to me to-day at the Foreign Office at three o'clock. He said he came to ask two questions which concerned himself personally.

I interrupted him to ask him whether what he was going to say was by order of his Government, or from his own sense of what he ought to do.

Mr. Adams answered that the proceeding was entirely his own, but that he had with him a despatch from Mr. Seward which he was authorised to read to me if he should think fit to do so. It appeared, he said, from that dispatch that the Government at Washington had not authorized the capture of the two insurgents, Mason and Slidell, and that the United States Government stood quite uncommitted at the time of sending the dispatch.

I said that if the dispatch did not enter into any controversy with regard to the case of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, I should be glad to hear it read.

Mr. Adams then proceeded to read the despatch.

Here Lord Russell recites Mr. Seward's *first* despatch to Mr. Adams, with the tenor of which our readers are already acquainted. Lord Russell then proceeds:

In answer to Mr. Adams, I touched upon most of the points treated of in the dispatch. I did not think it necessary, however, to recur to the case of Mr. Bunch.

[illegible]n regard to the Confederate privateer, I said that I could not see that our conduct had been different from that of France and Holland, or of Spain. The Sumter had been refused coal from the government stores at Trinidad, but had been allowed to get coal and provisions from private merchants. The same thing had taken place at Martinique and Curacoa. I did not find that the rule of 24 hours had been observed in practice, but there would be little difficulty in coming to an agreement on this point.

In regard to the export of arms and ammunition to the Confederate States, I had lately read the opinion of the Attorney General, and believe it was in entire conformity with the provisions of the Foreign Enlistment Act; warlike equipment of a vessel was prohibited; the loading a vessel with arms and ammunition was not prohibited. But, in point of fact, a much greater amount of arms and ammunition had been sent to the Federal States, where there was no obstacle to the export or the import, than to the ports of the Confederate States, which were blockaded. Mr. Adams admitted this to be the fact, and said he had refrained from pressing a more rigorous compliance with the Foreign Enlistment Act for this reason.

Lord Russell then states that he made Mr. Adams acquainted with the nature of the despatches he had written to Lord Lyons on the Trent affair, that the latter was directed to talk the matter over with Mr. Seward two days before leaving the despatch, that in the event of an unfriendly solution, Lord Lyons was to leave Washington in seven days, but he was not to mention this part of his instructions to Mr. Seward, lest they might appear to assume the form of a menace. The despatch concludes thus:

I said that I thought the explanation that the Government had not authorized the seizure would stand in the place of an apology.

But the essential condition was that Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell should be given up to Lord Lyons.

Mr. Adams said that if the matter was stated to Mr. Seward in the manner I had explained he hoped for an amicable termination of the difference; he thought that if the Government of the United States insisted on maintaining the act of Captain Wilkes, the United States would be abandoning their doctrine and adopting ours.

Mr. Adams asked me a further question, which he said I might decline to answer; it was whether, if Lord Lyons came away, a declaration of war would be the immediate consequence.

I told him nothing was decided on that point; we should wait for a reply from America, and then decide upon our course.

I stated to Mr. Adams the substance of M. Thouvenel's despatch to M. Mercier, as I had heard it from M. de Flahault.

Mr. Adams said that the French Government had always been very consistent in their maintenance of the rights of neutrals. He added that he could not pay our Government the same compliment.

I said I would dispense with compliments if this matter could be amicably arranged.

We parted on friendly terms. I am, &c.,

(Signed) RUSSELL.

The next despatch is a formal note of Lord Lyons enclosing Mr. Seward's long despatch. Then comes Lord Russell's reply to Mr. Seward. It is dated January 11, and commences by reciting Lord Russell's former despatch on the *Trent* affair, in which the English Cabinet demand reparation. It then proceeds:

Proceeding at once to the main points in discussion between us, her Majesty's Government have carefully examined how far Mr. Seward's note and the conduct it announces complies substantially with the two proposals I have recited.

With regard to the first, viz., the liberation of the prisoners with a view to their being again placed under British protection, I find that the note concludes by stating that the prisoners will be cheerfully liberated, and by calling upon your lordship to indicate a time and place for receiving them.

No condition of any kind is coupled with the liberation of the prisoners.

With regard to the suitable apology which the British Government had a right to expect, I find that the Government of the United States distinctly and unequivocally declares that no directions had been given to Capt. Wilkes, or to any other naval officer, to arrest the four persons named, or any of them, on the *Trent,* or any other British vessel, or on any other neutral vessel, at the place where it occurred or elsewhere.

I find, further, that the Secretary of State expressly forbears to justify the particular act of which Her Majesty's Government complained. If the United States Government had alleged that, although Capt. Wilkes had no previous instruction for that purpose, he was right in capturing the persons of the four prisoners, and in removing them from the Trent on board his own vessel, to be afterwards carried into a port of the United States, the Government which had thus sanctioned the proceedings of Captain Wilkes would have become responsible for the original violence and insult of the act. But Mr. Seward contents himself with stating that what has happened has been simply an inadvertency, consisting in a departure by a naval officer, free from any wrongful motive, from a rule uncertainly established and probably by the several parties concerned, either imperfectly understood or entirely unknown. The Secretary of State goes on to affirm that for this error the British Government has a right to expect the same reparation which the United States, as an independent State, should expect from Great Britain or from any other friendly nation in a similar case.

Her Majesty's Government having carefully taken into their consideration the liberation of the prisoners, the delivery of them into your hands, and the explanations to which I have just referred, have arrived at the conclusion that they constitute the reparation which her Majesty and the British nation had a right to expect.

It gives Her Majesty's Government great satisfaction to be enabled to arrive at a conclusion favorable to the maintenance of the most friendly relations between the two nations. I need not discuss the modifications in my statement of facts which Mr. Seward says he has derived from the reports of officers of the Government.

I cannot conclude, however, without adverting shortly to the discussions which Mr Seward has raised upon points not prominently brought into question in my dispatch of the 30th of November. I there objected, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to that which Captain Wilkes had done. Mr. Seward, in his answer, points out what he conceives Captain Wilkes might have done, without violating the law of nations.

It is not necessary that I [illegible]here discuss in detail the five questions abl[illegible]y the Secretary of State; but it is necess[illegible]hould say that Her Majesty's Governme[illegible]Mr. Seward in some of the conclusions [illegible]has arrived. And it may lead to a better understanding between the two nations on several points of international law which may, during the present contest or at some future time, be brought into question, that I should state to you, for communication to the Secretary of