THE SPANISH ARMADA.

Preparations for the Tilt at Law.

Application of the Cuban Envoy to be Counted In—Interesting Documents.

THE NAVAL DEFENCES OF NEW YORK.

Views of Admiral Godon on the "Coming" Spanish Fleet.

History of the Naval Surveillance of the Gunboats.

The great, interesting and highly important international case of the United States vs. thirty gunboats, known as the "Spanish gunboats," is pending in *statu quo* for the present. All the parties are diligently preparing themselves for the mighty contest soon to come off in the United States Court, on which occasion the litigants declare their intention to appear "ready for the fray," each armed *cap à pie* to contest for the victory.

THE SITUATION OF THE BOATS.

Nothing new has happened in the situation of the boats, moored in the North river, foot of Thirteenth and Seventeenth streets. United States Marshal Harlow has full and exclusive possession of them, through his deputy, Mr. A. H. Winslow. A sufficient number of watchmen are placed on board the boats, and the armed tug Martin Kalbfleisch, with her gun in position, and manned by the Marshal's officers for a crew, keeps a constant lookout by day and night that none of the seized boats leave their places. The workmen of Mr. Delamater and of his sub-contractors resumed their labors yesterday morning, and scarce anything around the place would show the uninformed that something unusual was going on in the neighborhood and that here lies all the cause of so much stir in the diplomatic and legal world. Nor need it be expected that any change will come over the locality until the courts shall have finally decided the international status of these vessels and they be either released and given up to Spain or declared forfeited to the United States and brought under the auctioneer's hammer to be "knocked down," in the usual phrase, "to the highest bidder."

PREPARATIONS FOR THE TILT AT LAW.

In the office of the United States District Attorney everything was quiet yesterday with regard to this matter of the Spanish gunboats, save and except a short interview Mr. Sidney Webster, on behalf of the claimants of the boats, had with Judge Pierrepont. Early in the morning this latter gentleman, in his usual bland and affable manner, received Mr. Webster and several other gentlemen in his private office in the United States Court House, on Chambers street, and they were closeted together for quite a while. Mr. Webster had come to inform Judge Pierrepont that the counsel for the defence had concluded not to apply for leave to "bond" the vessels, that is, to have them released on sufficient security being given that they will not be employed in hostilities against Peru, but that early next week they would move in the District Court for an order to quash the writ of seizure and dismiss the libel, at the cost of the government, and thus to grant a full release and discharge of the gunboats from all further detention. The motion, said Mr. Webster, will be based on proper affidavits and other documentary evidence, which are now being prepared, and copies of which will, probably, by next Monday, be furnished to Judge Pierrepont, together with the usual written notice of motion required by the rules of the court. But as the defence wished a speedy decision of the case Mr. Webster inquired whether the District Attorney would hold them to the rule of "ten days' notice of motion, or would waive his privilege and consent to take up the issues to be raised of fact and of law within a shorter time. Judge Pierrepont remarked that he would interpose no such technical objection, would accept any notice and waive the allowance of time under the rule, but he would wish to be informed, at least one or two days before the argument, of the grounds for the motion as presented by their affidavits. This was agreed to, and Mr. Webster left. The great tilt at law in the court may, therefore, be looked forward to by about the middle of next week.

THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA IN THE FIELD.

It is the opinion of many well versed in construing and applying the law of nations and statutory enactments in intricate cases, that the government at Washington, however unwilling or undecided it may be at present, will ultimately feel the necessity of preferring officially the charge that these boats were fitted out to commit hostilities against the "colony, district or people" of Cuba, with whom the United States are at peace. In fact, it was suggested in different quarters that this case would lose much of its interest and importance, in one point of view, were this charge continued to be held back. Up to last evening Judge Pierrepont had received nothing decisive on this question from Washington, although it is assumed, and not without good reasons, that it is earnestly and studiously canvassed and investigated, in all its bearings, by the President and the members of his administration.

In order to urge the adoption of this course the "republic of Cuba," through its accredited though not yet recognized representative in this country, Señor J. Morales Lemus, has suddenly come upon the field of action, and that gentleman yesterday placed in the hands of the United States District Attorney the following documents, which need no comment as they explain themselves. Judge Pierrepont ordered copies to be made of them at once, and had them forwarded to the State Department, for the information of Secretary Fish, awaiting in the meantime what impression the statements of fact and the legal argument contained in these documents may exert upon the President and the deliberations of the Cabinet. Whether Judge Pierrepont added to these documents any views of his own could not be ascertained. But here is

SENOR LEMUS' LETTER TO MR. PIERREPONT.

HON. EDWARDS PIERREPONT, United States District Attorney:—

I desire to refer you to the affidavit of Señor Ignacio Alfaro, filed with you yesterday; to the affidavit of Francisco Xavier Cisneros, and to the accompanying opinion of counsel, to whom certain questions under the neutrality acts have been submitted, and to ask from you, as the prosecuting officer of the United States for this district, that steps be taken for the prosecution of the thirty Spanish gunboats now lying in this harbor, and lately built, fitted and armed by Messrs. Delamater & Co., with the intent that they should be employed to cruise and commit hostilities against the subjects, citizens and property of the district and the people of Cuba, as shown in the affidavit of Señor Alfaro, and which is now under the exclusive government of the republic of Cuba. For your more full information I take this occasion to inform you that the district now in the possession of the republic of Cuba, of which Manuel de Cespedes is President, includes 23,568 square miles, taking the middle of the island from sea to sea, being about two-thirds of the whole island. The whole population of this district number 522,598, as you will perceive by the table of statistics sent to you accompanying this communication, and are loyal to the government of the republic. Of this population, the entire portion capable of bearing arms, being about 165,000, are organized into armies, and as many as can be armed are in the field, carrying on warfare according to the rules of civilized nations, and have entire control of the district aforesaid, except a few Spanish garrison towns, under command of officers appointed by the civil government, organized by the people of said district.

I am advised by my counsel that the question whether or not an offence against the laws has been attempted and ought to be prosecuted is not at all a diplomatic question, but purely a question for your department entrusted with the administration of the laws and the prosecution of offences; and I therefore address my communication to you instead of to the government at Washington.

J. MORALES LEMUS,
Minister and Ext. Envoy of the Republic of Cuba.

AN INTERESTING AFFIDAVIT.

State of New York, City and County of New York, ss:—Francis Xavier Cisneros, being duly sworn, says:—I am a native of Cuba, having been born at Santiago de Cuba, and for the larger part of the last fifteen years, and until recently, have been a resident of Havana. I am living for the present in the city of New York.

I left New York for Cuba in May of this year, and I arrived there about the 11th day of that month. Between the time of my arrival and about the 1st of August I was constantly traveling in that island, and especially traversed that part of it which lies between Santi Espiritu, about the central portion of the island, and Santiago de Cuba, near the eastern extremity, a distance of about 350 miles.

This district is a portion only of the territory which is occupied and controlled by the revolutionists, and which covers more than two-thirds of the area of the island. This republican or revolutionist territory is bounded by lines extending from Santiago de Cuba, on the Caribbean Sea, near the eastern end of the island, to Baracoa, on the Atlantic Ocean; from Baracoa to Sagua la Grande, along the northern coast; then across the island to the Bay of Broa, on the Caribbean Sea, and thence along the southern coast to Santiago de Cuba. The total extent of the island is about 40,000 square miles, of which the republican or revolutionist territory just described embraces about 24,000 square miles. This territory includes some wild tracts, but for the most part is open, cultivated country. It embraces some of the larger towns of the island, and though these are still in the possession of the Spaniards the open country about them and of the district generally to which I have referred is occupied and controlled by the republicans. It is their fixed policy for the present not to attempt to hold the towns, the occupation of them by the Spaniards compelling them to withdraw large bodies from the fighting force for garrison duty.

This district also extending to the sea on both the northern and southern sides of the island embraces many considerable ports to which the Cubans have free access, but having as yet no means of thoroughly fortifying these places they have made no attempt to hold exclusive possession of them.

Within this district, between May and August, I visited almost all the military encampments of the revolutionists, which were thirty in all. At some of the camps there were as many as 2,000 men, and at none less than 250. To the best of my judgment and belief there were in all these camps, in May, about 15,000 well armed men, and in July, when I left, and when I left the island, there were, I should think, about 20,000. But besides this force of regular soldiers in camps the entire male population throughout the district which I have referred to was organized as a voluntary military force, but being without arms, cannot be brought into actual military service. All this force of the revolutionists was under the command of Quesada, the General-in-Chief, who was appointed by the Cuban Congress.

During my stay in the island there were frequent conflicts between the Spanish and Cuban forces, in many of which I participated. In the most important of those in which I took part, which occurred on the 1sth of June at Calabazas, the Cuban forces numbered about 700. The Spaniards had attacked but were repulsed and retreated. A few days before a fight had taken place, in which, as I was then informed and believe, the Cubans numbered 1,500. Many other combats took place, with various results. The condition of the country was one of constant fighting between considerable forces, and on the part of the Cubans all of the battles were conducted under the control of the Commander-in-Chief.

At the time of my visit to the island the Cuban revolutionary party had already adopted a constitution embodying a republican form of government, guaranteeing the liberty of the press, of religious worship, of education, and abolishing slavery. It had also a completely organized government, represented by a president and congress and secretaries of state, war, treasury and other civil officers and judges and bodies. The Congress was composed of eighteen delegates elected by the people from all parts of the island. It was at the time to which I refer in session, and I attended many of its meetings. The election for Governors of the States took place during my stay on the island, and were participated in by all the inhabitants of the district, including myself, except of the towns garrisoned by the Spaniards.

The capital of the republican government was at Sibanicu, a town situated in the interior in an open plain on the great central highway of the island, and approached by good roads from all directions.

The island had then also been divided by the Congress into four States—namely, Oriento, Camaguey, Santa Clara and Occidente. Governors of these States had been elected by their inhabitants, and they had assumed and were administering their offices. The government had also established and maintained a general postal service throughout all its territory; had created courts and appointed judges and sheriffs or prefects. The local judges had opened and were holding their courts. The Supreme Court of the State was not yet convened. The court administered laws which had been enacted by the Cuban Congress, and which were universally recognized and enforced throughout the territory of the Cuban government which I have described.

F. I. CISNEROS.

Sworn and subscribed to this 25th day of November, 1869, before me.—W. N. GODDARD, Notary Public, county of New York.

THE LAW EXPOUNDED.

HON. EDWARDS PIERREPONT, United States District Attorney:—

SIR—M. Morales Lemus desires me to hand you a brief note of the authorities and reasons upon which counsel have advised him that the neutrality laws forbid the fitting out of expeditions against the revolutionary party or government in Cuba. This advice has been based upon a statement of facts substantially like that made by him to you as to the general circumstances and condition of the revolution.

The first statutory declaration of neutral rights and duties was by the act of March 2, 1797 (1 Stat. at Large, 381), section three of that act forbade the "fitting, &c., of ships to be employed to cruise and commit hostilities upon the subjects, citizens and property of any foreign prince or State with whom the United States are at peace." With certain interruptions, not necessary to be noted, this continued to be the law until 1817.

In 1810 the revolted colony of St. Domingo was divided by two rival chieftains, who maintained war against each other, the government of neither of them being recognized by the United States. In 1816 the Supreme Court of New York, in Gelston vs. Hoyt (13 Johns., 141), decided that the parts of the island respectively under the government of Pehon and Christophe were not independent States within the meaning of the act of 1797, and that it was, therefore, not illegal to fit out a vessel for the purpose of assisting the one against the other. This decision being approved in the same year by the Court of Errors and Impeachments, Congress proceeded at the session of 1817 to pass an act entitled "An act more effectually to preserve the neutral relations of the United States (2 Stat. at Large, 370), act of March 3, 1817, by which they forbade the fitting, &c., of any vessel, &c., with the intent that she should be employed by any foreign prince, state, colony, district or people to cruise and commit hostilities, or to aid or co-operate in any warlike measure against the subjects, citizens or property of any foreign prince or State, or of any colony, district or people with whom the United States are at peace."

In February, 1818, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed Gelston vs. Hoyt, and on the 27th of April Congress took up and, so to speak, codified the whole subject of neutrality in the act (3 Stat. at Large, 448), which is now in force, and which re-enacted in this respect precisely the language of the act of 1817.

As the law now stands, therefore, the statutory obligation of neutrality is due to foreign princes, States, colonies, districts and peoples. It is asserted as matter of fact that a district comprising the larger part of the Island of Cuba is in a state of revolt, in which the great majority, if not all, of the people of that district participate. They have organized civil government, raised armies and prosecuted war according to civilized usages.

Mr. Morales Lemus has been advised that these facts brought the revolted Cubans and the country which they hold within the letter and spirit of the law as it relates to a "colony, district or people with whom the United States are at peace."

The argument, irresistible as it appears to Mr. Morales Lemus' legal advisers, which springs from this collocation of the law and the mischief, is still further aided by some considerations, which I shall suggest as briefly as possible, but not presume to discuss.

Neutrality has relation to war, and equally so whether it be civil or foreign war. When a nation, to maintain its sovereignty, makes war upon its own people, other nations permit that war, with its incidents, such as the blockade of domestic ports, but only on the ground that it is war and that neutral rights shall be protected by both parties. War may exist between communities irrespective of their status among States, and the rise and wrong or injurious by others is the same whether the combatants be recognized or unrecognized. This wrong was found to be without a complete remedy under the statute naming only princes and States, and accordingly the remedy was extended to the cases of "colonies, districts and peoples." This amendment was not needed to protect loyal colonies, districts or peoples from external attack, for the rulers of the ruling princes and States was not limited to their seat of government, but extended *ex proprio vigore* to all their dominions, near and remote. There must have been some other reason for the change in the law. This reason will be found in the history of the times. In 1818 the Spanish American colonies were in full revolt. The people and government of this country, first born from a revolution, sympathized with the struggle for self government. The obligation of neutrality was admitted to be due to Spain, but it was also found to be due to such communities as had declared their independence and set about preparing themselves to claim admission among independent States. The difficulty was in defining and naming those inchoate and unrecognized States, and accordingly the largest terms were used, defining them in their political, geographical and collective character. No more efficient words could have been chosen to accomplish the purpose claimed and include unrecognized belligerents within both the penalty and protection of the law.

A breach of the law contains reciprocal conditions. The ship must not only be intended to cruise against a foreign prince, State, colony, district or people, but in the service of another foreign prince, State, colony, district or people. The government has libelled the Cuba (Hornet), at Wilmington, for this offence against the neutrality laws, and has elsewhere prosecuted stringently for alleged breaches of neutrality.

Certainly if Cuba (not being a prince or State) is a "colony, district or people" for the purpose of committing the offence, she is so for the effect of suffering it. Any other interpretation makes the neutrality act, in case of civil war, both a sword and a shield in the hands of one belligerent.

All the terms of the act are construable in conformity with this interpretation. The "subjects and citizens" of an unrecognized colony, district or people are those from whom it claims or receives allegiance. Its "property" is such property, as it in fact holds and claims to own. We may be "at peace" with an unrecognized country. Peace and war are facts, and not deductions. We are at peace with the unrecognized islands of the Pacific Ocean and the tribes of Africa and Asia. We are at peace with whomever we are not at war. We sometimes communicate with these unrecognized political bodies in their assumed character without granting them any diplomatic recognition. We were formerly at war with the unrecognized Barbary States.

Immediately after the passage of the act of 1818 the Supreme Court, unaided by any act or declaration by the political branch of the government, took judicial notice of a state of war between Spain and the revolted colony, district and people of Venezuela, and yielded to the claim of Venezuelan agents the same effect and validity as to the acts of recognized States. In the case of the Estrella (4 Wheaton, 298) the Court allowed a commission issued by the unrecognized republic of Venezuela to be valid of a capture. In the case of the Josefe Segunda (5 Wheaton, 672)—Venezuela being at the time unrecognized either as a belligerent merely or as a State—the court said:—"It would be unjust, unreasonable and unjust to visit upon the innocent owners of this property the sins of a pirate; and were this allegation made out the Court would find no difficulty in making the restitution which is asked for. But is it so; was the General Arismendi a piratical cruiser? The Court thinks not. Among the exhibits is a copy of a commission, which is all that in such a case can be expected, by which appears to have been issued under the authority of the republic of Venezuela. This republic is composed of the inhabitants of a portion of the dominions of Spain, in South America, who have been for some time past and still are maintaining a contest for independence with the mother country. Although not acknowledged by our government as an independent nation, it is well known that open war exists between them and his Catholic Majesty, in which the United States maintains strict neutrality. In this state of things this Court cannot but respect the belligerent rights of both parties, and does not treat as pirates the cruisers of either, so long as they act under and within the scope of their respective commissions. This vessel, the Josefe, having been made under a regular commission of the government of Venezuela the captors acquired thereby a title to the vessel and cargo, which could only be diverted by recapture or by the sentence of a prize court of the country under whose commission the capture was made."

The principle of these decisions and others to the same effect are entirely consistent with the rule declared in Rose vs. Himely (4 Cranch, 292) and its kindred cases.

The belligerent right to neutral conduct springs from the possession of the status law, and does not need to await any formal concession by the political branch of the government. No recognition of belligerents was ever accorded to South American republics, but they were at all times treated on equal terms with Spain in the courts. Whether there is belligerence is matter of fact upon which the court when administering law will inquire. In Yrissari vs. Clement (2 Car. & Payne 223) it was decided that "it a foreign State is recognized by this country it is not necessary to support an allegation which describes it as a State; it is enough if it is in fact an existing State; but if it be not so recognized then such proof becomes necessary and may be admitted." "If a body of persons assemble together to protect themselves, and support their own independence, and make laws, and have courts of justice, that is evidence of their being a State, and it makes no difference whether they have ever belonged to another country or not if they do not continue to acknowledge it and are in possession of a force sufficient to support themselves in opposition to it."

These views are submitted in aid of M. Morales Lemus' application to you as the prosecuting officer of the government to libel the thirty Spanish gunboats now lying in this city under the law, to have been built and fitted out within the limits of the United States with the intent that they should be employed to cruise and commit hostilities against the citizens, subjects and property of the district which is now under the *de facto* government of the republic of Cuba. I am, sir, very respectfully yours,

GROSVENOR P. LORNEY.

United States Iron-Clads.

The expected visit of the Spanish squadron suggests inquiry respecting the present condition of the United States iron-clads and their availability for the defence of New York in a sudden emergency. There are twenty vessels of this class laid up at League island, in the Delaware river, and several others at the various navy yards. Most of them, however, would require several weeks to be fitted out, and were a foreign fleet to approach New York suddenly with hostile intentions, not more than half a dozen could be sent here in time to render any service. Many persons have an idea that the Spanish frigates reported to be on their way to this city, after passing the forts commanding the entrance to the harbor, might, by a threat to bombard the city, compel the surrender of the gunboats. While there is not the slightest probability of any hostile attitude being assumed by Spain in the matter, it may be stated, for the comfort of such timorous individuals, that in addition to the monitors Terror and Miantonomoh, each of which carries four fifteen-inch guns, and the torpedo boat ordered from Washington, there are present at the Brooklyn Navy Yard a number of vessels capable of preventing any offensive acts by the Spaniards. The double-turreted monitor Roanoke, carrying four fifteen-inch guns, although not in a condition to steam, could be anchored off the city, and would prove a very formidable antagonist. The frigate Colorado, carrying forty-two nine-inch guns in broadside and one eleven-inch pivot gun, could be got ready at short notice, and several other vessels also at the Brooklyn yard, although undergoing repairs, would render good service in such an emergency. The two iron-clads and the torpedo boat already ordered to New York are abundantly able to take care of Admiral Malcampo's squadron, should he make a peremptory demand for the gunboats, and the community will sleep just as soundly with the Spanish frigates in the harbor as if they carried the flag of the United States.

ADMIRAL GODON'S VIEWS.

At an interview which a HERALD reporter had yesterday with Admiral Godon, commanding the Brooklyn Navy Yard, that officer expressed his disbelief that any such squadron was on the way to New York, as reported, and gave the following interesting information in relation to the Spanish gunboat question:—

REPORTER—I have called, sir, to ascertain what naval preparations are being made in view of the approach of a Spanish squadron.

Admiral GODON—Very little is being done. The papers have already stated all that I am aware of in the matter. I do not believe that any such squadron is coming as reported, and presume that the Miantonomoh and Terror were ordered to New York simply as an ordinary precaution against a possible but very remote contingency.

REPORTER—Is it your opinion that the reports respecting the approach of the Spanish frigates are wholly groundless?

Admiral GODON—There may be one or two Spanish vessels coming to New York, but I doubt that a squadron is on its way here. Were a Spanish fleet to visit New York now, even if only for the purpose of procuring supplies or repairs, such an event would complicate the delicate question already pending between the United States and Spain, and, in view of the attitude maintained by the government respecting the Cuban matter, would be offensive to the American people. Spain has no desire to force an issue with the United States, nor does the condition of affairs in Cuba necessitate any precipitate action of this kind. I do not believe that the gunboats have anything to do whatever with the visit of any Spanish vessels to New York, except in the case of the Pizarro, which arrived a few days ago with officers and men for the gunboats.

REPORTER—You expressed the opinion that the visit of Spanish frigates to New York for supplies or repairs would complicate the question at issue. Does this apply to a single vessel?

Admiral GODON—No. A single Spanish vessel on a cruise might call at New York for supplies or ordinary repairs with perfect propriety; but, as the neutrality laws are under consideration between this government and Spain, the visit of a number of Spanish war vessels for supplies or repairs would be a very different affair. It would be regarded as hinting out an armament against Cuba, and would raise the very same questions involved in the detention of the gunboats.

REPORTER—It is stated that the Spanish vessels are coming here to have their bottoms cleaned. Would the views you have just expressed prevent their entering the dry dock for that purpose?

Admiral GODON—Perhaps not. It might be regarded as an act of commonplace courtesy to permit the vessels to clean their bottoms, and I do not suppose that any objection would be made to it. Some of the Spanish frigates may come here for that purpose that be accomplished; but it is highly improbable that the Spanish government or her officers will take any step calculated to hasten an official expression of American sympathy with the Cuban revolution.

REPORTER—What arrangements were made between your office and Marshal Harlow when he took possession of the gunboats?

Admiral GODON—As soon as the Marshal seized the vessels the surveillance by the navy ceased. They were turned over to the civil authorities and I had nothing more to do with them. Marshal Harlow wanted me to leave the gun which had been used on the naval gunboat Maria, and I turned it over to him. He also suggested that I should send a guard to prevent any violent measures being carried out, but there was no necessity for that. The Marshal did not need the gun. He could take the cylinder heads out of the engines of the gunboats or do anything he pleased to prevent their departure. I told him that the civil authorities were alone responsible for the vessels, but if violence should be attempted I would send him all the marines at my command.

A Magnificent Sensation Exploded—No Demand for the Surrender of the Spanish Gunboats at New York—Cuban Plot for Their Destruction—The Case Legally in the United States Courts.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26, 1869.

The highly exciting story that Señor Roberts, the Spanish Minister, had made a formal demand for the release of the thirty gunboats, about which so much fuss has been made lately, has just this sun foundation:—Señor Roberts called upon Secretary Fish, and in the course of a conversation, which embraced a variety of subjects, remarked that he did not feel altogether satisfied with the conduct of the United States in detaining the gunboats. This is the exact size of the so-called "speck of war," and shows how easily a molehill may be magnified into a very large mountain when people's vision become dimmed by undue excitement. Señor Roberts, in thus expressing his dissatisfaction, spoke very frankly about the grievances of his government concerning this delicate matter, but never said, or even hinted, that his government had instructed him to demand the release of the gunboats. Whether his government did so or not, it is certain that up to the present moment—and I give this on authority that cannot be questioned—Señor Roberts has not communicated any such information to Secretary Fish. It is, of course, still possible that Señor Roberts may have been instructed to make such a demand, or to do so if in his judgement he might consider it advisable, and that the prudent Minister has not considered it advisable to lay such a demand before our government in its present temper; but neither supposition is entertained seriously in official circles here. Of course, with the explosion of this sensational story of a demand for the release of the gunboats must fall also the other equally exciting statement that Señor Roberts had instructions to demand his passports in case of refusal. The facts in both those stories are purely the result of ignorance of the real steps that have been taken, and have been set afoat simply because they were regarded as the things likely to happen in a certain emergency. Now, as regards the actual seizure of the gunboats and the causes that led thereto, I am informed that some days ago information was received by the government showing a conspiracy on the part of an organized body of Cubans having in view the burning of the Spanish gunboats. The action of the government in the premises being based upon the complaints of Peru claiming the existence of war between that government and Spain, and that the departure of these boats would result in a revival of belligerent operations, the Spanish fleet was placed under surveillance last summer. The government, having no desire to assume the responsibility of the republic of these vessels, formally instituted measures of seizure, and has placed them in the courts to be tried between Peru and Spain or Peru and the contractors. This is supposed to relieve the government of a risk in the safety of the vessels and a bill of damages for the delay. Peru consequently becomes responsible, the seizure having been made upon representations from the Minister of that government. Mr. Delamater's protest, forwarded to the Secretary of State, was upon the same grounds, and was at once sent to Colonel Freyre, the Peruvian representative. The case is now considered legally in the United States courts, and, it is expected, will lead to determined litigation on both sides.