

constituted three quarters of their crews, we find them talk of stipulations to *exclude British seamen* ! ! Do you believe them in earnest ? No—when you come to the provisions of the bill, you will find them require (as Mr. Madison said they always should insist) that a seaman naturalized but one day before, or resident here two years, should not be considered a *British seaman*.—Great-Britain knows these pretensions—She knows that three successive negotiations have failed ; one with Mr. Pinkney, nineteen years ago, one with Mr. King, twelve years since, and the last with Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, five years since, from the difficulty of proposing any remedy for *mutual* abuses of acknowledged rights. What these proposals were we shall shew hereafter.

---

NO. VIII.

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICE OF FRANCE, AS TO RECLAIMING HER OWN SEAMEN.

It may perhaps be said, as it was by some persons in relation to the Berlin and Milan decrees, that the practice of France ought to be no justification to Great-Britain. We admit this to be true in some cases, and with some qualification—But when we are discussing the *existence of a right*, under the laws of nations, we have no better mode of ascertaining it, than the long established usage of the greatest states in Europe. If France, under all her latter monarchs, has set up the same principles, and has watched over the preservation of her seamen with a much *more jealous and severe eye*, than Great-Britain has done, we think it goes far to establish the existence of the *right* for which Great-Britain contends. If the two great rivals of Europe have, in all their maritime wars, united in admitting any *one principle*, I think we may say of it, that it has much more claim to the place of an unquestioned right, than many of the dogmas which are laid down as such by the writers on public law.

I shall shew that France holds the doctrine of allegiance being perpetual—that she is *peculiarly jealous of the claim* over her seamen, and is even cruel in her laws, refusing them the right of expatriation—that while she recognizes, as does Great-Britain, both in her own practice and in that of other states, the right of *naturalization*, she undertakes to deny that this can give any new claims to protection to the *naturalized person* against his *own sovereign*. We shall shew that she goes farther, and denies to neutrals the right to *naturalize her enemies*, so as to protect them against *her arms*. Lastly, it will be seen that by repeated edicts she authorizes the seizure of her own seamen in time of war, in her *own ports*, on board of neutral vessels—and *at sea*.

The authority I shall cite will be Mons. Le Beau, now *superintendent*, in Paris, of the details of the laws relative to the marine and colonies. I have, however, in every case taken (not the inferences of M. Le Beau) but the laws and ordinances themselves,