The New Orleans Bee.

No. 75 Camp[s] Street. NEW ORLEANS, THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 17, 1862. Vol XVII—New Series Vol XXIV.—Whole No. 12,631.

NEW ORLEANS:
THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 17, 1862.

THE FRENCH QUESTION IN MEXICO.

We have published, upon this all absorbing topic, the views of the French press and of the British Parliament. Alongside of them, the policy of the Spanish Government upon the question has not been touching than it is important. In the sitting of the Spanish Congress of the 11th ultimo, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the inquiries of Mr. Olozaga on the policy of the Government, with regard to Mexico, made the reply published below: "The documents which we have published lately, upon this vitgid question, have an unequal significance; and when the historian comes to record the events which have led to the disgraceful intervention in Mexico, they will keep important material for his consideration. It is under the title of official documents that we have reproduced them in fair in our journal. The Minister of Foreign Affairs proceeds to answer Mr. Olozaga as follows:

The acts of the Government have been censured by M. Olozaga with a degree of acrimony even surpassing that of foreign States. He would have us believe that the warm Action produced a deep impression in the country, while the expedition to Mexico passed almost unnoticed. I think, however, that the entry of the Spanish troops into San Juan d'Ulloa made some little sensation, as you must all remember. The Mexican expedition was a necessity, not only because it was earnestly solicited by the Mexicans residing in Europe, *and especially by those in Paris*, but also because there exists in those regions a republic which threatened the Mexicans with absorption. Hence the expedition combined in 1859. *The object was, therefore, the maintenance of the integrity of the Mexican territory.* When M. Olozaga asserts that Spain had a concealed motive for undertaking that expedition, and pronounces the existence of a secret convention I cannot but ask him whether he thinks the Government would not, after the conference at Orizaba, have been anxious to reveal such convention public! But *no convention has ever existed*, except that of 31st of October.

What was the origin of that convention? Spain could not go alone to Mexico; we could not do otherwise than not conjointly with the two other Powers. The refusal to satisfy the claims of Spanish, French and English creditors, the murder of the subjects of the three Sister menaces and violences towards their representatives, made intervention in Mexico a duty, *but reserving them without any afterthought of putting the least restraint on the establishment of that republic as to their external affairs.* The convention was clear. The obligations of the Powers signing it were well defined, especially on the point of not interfering in the internal affairs of Mexico. Our intention was to promote a cessation of hostilities between the contending parties in Mexico. Why! Because we hoped that, by adopting a determined mode of election, an assembly would be formed capable of giving the country a stable government. Was not that a noble object? Would it have been worthy of three great Powers to go to Mexico merely to obtain satisfaction for grievances? To sanction these ideas the government began by giving instruction to its plenipotentiary. Does M. Olozaga find anything mysterious in these instructions? Does not every line express the thought of Spain that the integrity of the Mexican territory must be maintained? With respect to the dispatch of the 21st October, in which *the French Ministry broaches the gigantesque* of erecting a throne in a foreign Prince in Mexico, what was the answer of the government? Why, actuated by its attachment to dynastic interests and the honor of its country, it replied that Spain would not be pleased to see that throne occupied by any but a Bourbon Prince. We are told that this answer was long delayed.

It is true that we had been before *indirectly apprised of the existence of a wish to establish a monarchy in Mexico*: but the government had no official knowledge of the fact, and the treaty made no allusion to any such matter. On the contrary, it plainly stated that the expedition was not going to Mexico to make any change in the government, by force, and the Queen's government always understood that the independence of the Mexican people should be respected in their political movements for reconstituting their government. How then can M. Olozaga have entertained the thought that we were going to Mexico to establish a monarchy for an Austrian prince? Among the many absurd rumors which have been current was one to the effect that the Spanish government originated the idea of a monarchy in Mexico. When the question as to what form of government would best suit Mexico was under consideration, the Queen's government expressed a preference for monarchy, but insisted on the necessity of leaving that point to be freely decided by the Mexicans themselves. We have always so, and that we would take no part in forcibly establishing a government opposed to the freely expressed will of the country. I am astonished that M. Olozaga should throw doubts on the conduct of the Governor General of Cuba. When the expedition was ready the government informed the friendly Powers of the step it was taking with regard to Mexico. This communication led to the signing of the convention; but when the government was able to notify this fact to General Serrano and send him instructions with the royal orders appointing the chief of the expedition and recommending him to delay its departure, it was too late: the expedition had already sailed. On receiving the dispatches the Governor-General sent a steamer which he hoped would be in time to prevent the squadron from going to Vera Cruz. This hope was disappointed. Nothing was done, however, contrary to the treaty of 31st October, nor was there any motive of mistrust in the departure of the expedition. Nothing in M. Olozaga's speech has astonished us so much as his blaming the appointment of the Count de Reus to the command of the expedition. At the meeting of the Plenipotentiaries at Vera Cruz, the question was started as to whether the claims of the three Powers ought to be jointly and collectively supported. That question was brought forward by the consequences *of the demand of the French Plenipotentiary for the payment of a sum of thirteen millions of dollars, being the amount which the house of Seckler & Co. had lent to President Miramon.* The Spanish Government and those especially of that republic as to their external affairs. The convention was clear. The obligations of the Powers signing it were well defined, especially on the point of not interfering in the internal affairs of Mexico. Our intention was to promote a cessation of hostilities between the contending parties in Mexico. Why! Because we hoped that, by adopting a determined mode of election, an assembly would be formed capable of giving the country a stable government. Was not that a noble object? Would it have been worthy of three great Powers to go to Mexico merely to obtain satisfaction for grievances? To sanction these ideas the government began by giving instruction to its plenipotentiary. Does M. Olozaga find anything mysterious in these instructions? Does not every line express the thought of Spain that the integrity of the Mexican territory must be maintained? With respect to the dispatch of the 21st October, in which *the French Ministry broaches the gigantesque* of erecting a throne in a foreign Prince in Mexico, what was the answer of the government? Why, actuated by its attachment to dynastic interests and the honor of its country, it replied that Spain would not be pleased to see that throne occupied by any but a Bourbon Prince. We are told that this answer was long delayed.

It is true that we had been before *indirectly apprised of the existence of a wish to establish a monarchy in Mexico*: but the government had no official knowledge of the fact, and the treaty made no allusion to any such matter. On the contrary, it plainly stated that the expedition was not going to Mexico to make any change in the government, by force, and the Queen's government always understood that the independence of the Mexican people should be respected in their political movements for reconstituting their government. How then can M. Olozaga have entertained the thought that we were going to Mexico to establish a monarchy for an Austrian prince? Among the many absurd rumors which have been current was one to the effect that the Spanish government originated the idea of a monarchy in Mexico. When the question as to what form of government would best suit Mexico was under consideration, the Queen's government expressed a preference for monarchy, but insisted on the necessity of leaving that point to be freely decided by the Mexicans themselves. We have always so, and that we would take no part in forcibly establishing a government opposed to the freely expressed will of the country. I am astonished that M. Olozaga should throw doubts on the conduct of the Governor General of Cuba. When the expedition was ready the government informed the friendly Powers of the step it was taking with regard to Mexico. This communication led to the signing of the convention; but when the government was able to notify this fact to General Serrano and send him instructions with the royal orders appointing the chief of the expedition and recommending him to delay its departure, it was too late: the expedition had already sailed. On receiving the dispatches the Governor-General sent a steamer which he hoped would be in time to prevent the squadron from going to Vera Cruz. This hope was disappointed. Nothing was done, however, contrary to the treaty of 31st October, nor was there any motive of mistrust in the departure of the expedition. Nothing in M. Olozaga's speech has astonished us so much as his blaming the appointment of the Count de Reus to the command of the expedition. At the meeting of the Plenipotentiaries at Vera Cruz, the question was started as to whether the claims of the three Powers ought to be jointly and collectively supported. That question was brought forward by the *consequences