

phrase in Mr. Monroe's letter of the 27th of Oct. to Sir J. B. Warren, as denying the intention to demand the relinquishment of impressment as a preliminary—We know they are mistaken, and that government do not *even now* pretend that they are ready for an Armistice, unless the practice of impressment be *first* relinquished—The clause on which doubts have arisen is this, Mr. Monroe in his letter to Sir John B. Warren, says, "Lord Castlereagh in his note to Mr. Russell, seems to have supposed, that had the British government accepted the propositions made to it, G. Britain would have suspended *immediately* the exercise of a *right*, on the mere assurance of this government that a law would be afterwards passed to prohibit the employment of British seamen in the service of the United States; and that Great-Britain would have no agency in the regulation to give effect to that proposition." "Such an idea," he adds, "was not in the contemplation of this government, nor is it to be inferred from Mr. Russell's note; but least such an inference should be drawn, subsequent instructions were given to Mr. Russell with a view to obviate every objection of the kind alluded to. These instructions bear date 27th July, and were forwarded by the British packet *Althea*."

Now, what is it that Mr. Monroe means to deny? That the relinquishment of impressment was an absolute preliminary? Or that it was not expected that Great-Britain should have no voice, *no agency in the terms of the act of Congress* which might be passed to regulate them? We say clearly the latter—We prove this by the new instructions of July 27th to Mr. Russell, which are given in the documents, and which expressly stipulate, that impressment must be instantly abandoned as a preliminary to an armistice.

It however provides that Great Britain shall be consulted as to the terms of the provision restricting the employment of British subjects.

This then, and this only is the point which Mr. Monroe meant when he said that Lord Castlereagh misunderstood the claims of our government—This is further proved by the very same letter to Sir John B. Warren, which is dated only sixteen days since, in which it is added "that a *suspension* of impressment *during the armistice* seems to be a *necessary* consequence—It cannot be presumed, while the parties are negotiating, that the United States would admit the right, or *acquiesce* in the practice of the opposite party." This alone settles the question as to *what was demanded*, but we shall remove all doubt hereafter.

#### NO. IV.

##### THE SEVERAL PROPOSALS FOR AN ARMISTICE CONSIDERED.

If any doubts should still remain on the mind of any one, whether the absolute and entire discontinuance of the practice of