

reclaiming *her own seamen* out of merchant ships on the high seas, was demanded by Mr. Madison, of Great-Britain, as a condition of granting a suspension of arms only, those doubts must be entirely removed by the following additional facts.

Mr. Monroe, when he denies that Lord Castlereagh understood Mr. Russell and our government aright, refers to his explanatory letter of July 27th by the British packet *Althea*, in which he says, that the original proposition is fully explained. On examining that letter, we find it again asserted, that "the orders in council, illegal blockades and impressments, were the principal causes of the war, and if they were removed, you might stipulate an armistice."

The only differences between this new explanatory letter and the former one are the following :

1st. Mr. Russell was authorized, by the last letter, not to insist upon a *written* stipulation to be contained in the instrument declaring the armistice, but he was especially directed to procure an "informal understanding, so as to admit of no mistake," that impressments should be instantly discontinued.

2nd. He was to make the government of Great-Britain distinctly to understand, that all stipulations, as to the exclusion of British seamen from our ships, must ultimately depend on Congress, whose consent would be necessary to give validity to the bargain diplomatically agreed upon.

When we come to the consideration of the reasonableness of the several proposals, we shall resume this fact, and ask, whether from the very acknowledged uncertainty of the temper of congress on this delicate subject, it would have been expected of Great-Britain that she would yield so ancient a claim for the advantage of a promise which the maker of it avowed he had no power to fulfil, and where the execution of it rested upon the good will, and good faith of such men, as Seaver and Cutts—and Bibb and Troup—and Grundy and Clay—and Wright and Nelson?

Another proof that our government never contemplated *even an armistice*, but upon condition that Great Britain would get down upon her knees, put on the penitential garments, and renounce the error of her ways, will be found in a still later letter from Mr. Monroe to Mr. Russell, assigning the reasons why the president rejected the early, and for us, very favourable offers of Sir George Prevost and Mr. Foster, for an armistice.

This letter, dated August 21st, states, that, "As a principal object of the war is to obtain redress against the British practice of impressment, an agreement to *suspend hostilities*, even before the British government is heard from on that subject, might be considered a relinquishment of that claim."

A pretty curious sort of reasoning, and one for aught we see, which would forever put an end to all Armistices!! For one party or the other might always urge that the agreement to the armistice would be considered a relinquishment of his claims, and therefore, that the other must, as a preliminary even to discussion, put him in possession of what he demands, otherwise he could not in honour negotiate.