

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 favour 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

"the blockade further than was heretofore done, nevertheless it takes it 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 seizable 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 favorable light." On the 20th 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."