

vate ships.—On those terms, properly secured, she offered to modify her practice of impressment. This is upon record. Mr. Monroe is bound to acknowledge this fact, for we have it under his own hand. We cannot refrain from asking the question, why this point, if now offered in sincerity, was not accepted before the War?

If it had been, as the orders in council were voluntarily withdrawn by Great-Britain, no cause of war would have remained. We shall shew in our next essay why Great-Britain did not accede to the terms offered by our cabinet. In short, we shall shew that there was only a feint—a pretence—an appearance of acceding to those terms on the part of our cabinet.

Lastly—It is evident by the *apparent* offer, (and though I shall shew it was only an offer in appearance, yet it is so far a commitment or admission of our cabinet) that we admit that Great-Britain has been always right in complaining of the enticement and enlistment of her subjects in time of war:—Because our cabinet now propose to prohibit by law the enlistment of British sailors, and surely they would not agree to this if by the law of nations, we, as a neutral nation, have a right so to enlist or employ them. Our cabinet is not made of such stuff as to give up to Great-Britain any legitimate rights. They admit therefore they have been in the wrong.

---

### NO. III.

THE PROPOSITIONS RECIPROCALLY MADE BY THE AMERICAN AND BRITISH CABINETS FOR AN ARMISTICE, AND THE REASONS ASSIGNED FOR THEIR REJECTION.

To facilitate the examination of this subject, I propose to consider,

1st. What were the specifick propositions respectively made?

2nd. In what manner they were received by the different governments including herein the answers severally made.

3d. The reasonableness of these several propositions, and replies.

If we were to decide, as to the nature of any propositions made for an armistice, either from the practice heretofore adopted by all civilized nations, or from the rules of natural justice, equity and decorum, we should certainly conclude, that the offer ought to be perfectly reciprocal; not claiming for the party who proposes it any advantage over the other to whom it is proposed; otherwise a rejection must be expected, and we must look to some other motive than the avowed one for the proposition. To expect that an enemy in time of war would voluntarily yield any point without an equivalent must be absurd—There is only one exception to this rule, and that is, where the party who makes an unequal and unreciprocal demand, has gained some great advantage in the war,