

principle of the law
can only be
every this princi-
ever, that in prac-

specific ground of
Yet, strange as
ground of war be-
coming, viewed as
necessary to be-
ich, the American
k of this order of
is attached to it,
worthy. Let the

at the entrance of
Ostend; and from
e of all complain-
ade, enforced ac-
ay, 1806, the Em-
nister, at London,
sary measures to
rts, from the river

will show, this pa-
ause for non-inter-
places, on the
n as to these it is,
rmer and existing
oast, trade of neu-
s property and ar-
n, without a block-
ady, which Great
Why the order was
nothing to orders
deverting to papers,
et colonies and the
of the British ge-
en the cause of re-
the order of May
y of State, then our
n, was in treaty on
he spot, and at the
order was made to
unequivocally ex-

tivers and ports must
all not extend to pre-
g the property of his
approaching the said
ed ports are and ex-
one, already in a state
sidered as so contin-
laden at a port be-
n, and the vessels de-
y broken blockade."

pressed, in Mr. Monroe's letters to Mr. Madison of the 17th. and 30th^e of May, and of the 9th of June, 1806

And as late as October, 1811, the same Gentleman, writing as Secretary of State to the British minister, speaking of the same order of blockade of May, 1806, says, "it strictly was little more than a blockade of the coast from Seine to Ostend." "The object was to afford to the United States an accommodation respecting the colonial trade."

It appears, then, that this order, was, in point of fact, made to favor our trade and was so understood and admitted by the government of this country, at that time and since; that, instead of extending prior blockades it lessened them; that the country from Seine to Brest, and from Ostend to Elbe was inserted to open them to our colonial trade and for our accommodation, and that it was never made the subject of complaint, by the American government, during its practical continuance; that is, not until the first order in council; and indeed not until after the 1st of May 1810; and until after the American government was apprized of the ground, which it was the will of France should be taken upon the subject.

Of this we have the most decisive proof, in the offers, made under the administration of Mr. Jefferson, for the discontinuance of the Embargo as it related to Great Britain; none of which required the repeal of the blockade of May 1806; and also in the arrangement made during the administration of Mr. Madison, and under his eye with Mr. Erskine. The non-intercourse act of March 1809, and the act "concerning commercial intercourse" of May 1810, vest the President of the United States with the very same power, in the very same terms, both authorise him "in case either Great Britain or France shall so revoke or modify her edicts, as that they shall cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States" to declare the same by proclamation. And by the provisions of one law in such case, non intercourse was to cease; by those of the other it was to be revived. In consequence of power vested, by the first act, the arrangement with Erskine was made and the revocation of the orders in council of January and November 1807, was considered as a full compliance with the law and as removing all the anti-neutral edicts. The blockade of May 1806, was not included in the arrangement, and it does not appear, that it was deemed of sufficient importance to engage even a thought. Yet under the act of May, 1810, which vests the very same power, a revocation of this blockade of May, 1806, is made by our cabinet a *sine qua non*; an indispensable requisite! And now, after the British minister has directly avowed that this order of blockade would not continue after

"The following are extracts from these letters. In that of the 17th May, 1806: he thus speaks of that blockade. It is "couched in terms of restraint and professes to extend 'to blockade farther than was heretofore done, nevertheless it takes from many ports, already blockaded, indeed, from all East of Ostend, and West of the Seine, except in articles contraband of war and enemies property, which are seizureable without blockade.—And in like form of exception, considering every enemy as one power, it admits the trade of neutrals, within the same limits, to be free in the productions of enemies colonies, in every, but the direct route between the colony and the parent country." Mr. Monroe adds, "It cannot be doubted that the note was drawn by the government, in reference to the question, and if intended as the foundation of a treaty must be viewed in a favourable light." On the 30th of May, Mr. Monroe writes to Mr. Madison, that he had been strengthened in the opinion that the order of the 16th was drawn with a view to the question of our trade with enemies colonies, and that it promises to be highly satisfactory to our commercial interests."