headings such as these:—"Triumph of Federal policy—No embargo—No French party—A return of peace, prosperity, and commerce."

Mr. Erskine's arrange-In proportion to this ment disavowed by the British Government. enthusiastic joy were the depression in some quarters, and the indignation in others, when, on the 20th July, three weeks after the adjournment of Congress, information reached the United States that Mr. Canning had declared in the House of Commons, that the arrangement made by Mr. Erskine was wholly unauthorised by his instructions, and that the government could not ratify it. A very grave charge against the good faith of the government was advanced by the opposition in both Houses of Parliament; and, in order to rebut this, the instructions were eventually printed and laid open to public inspection. The correctness of Mr. Canning's statement was then apparent, viz.: that Mr. Erskine had acted not only inconsistently with, but in contradiction to his orders; and the opposition were silenced. A comparison of the correspondence between Mr. Erskine and the American government with Mr. Canning's despatch to the former, does indeed exhibit the alleged contradiction in a very strong light; for, whilst in the correspondence no mention is made of any condition besides the withdrawal of the Non-intercourse Act, Mr. Canning in his despatch specifies three conditions on which the recall of the Orders was to be contingent. "First-the repealing as to Great Britain, but the keeping in force as to France, and all countries adopting her decrees, so long as those decrees were continued, all existing American non-importation and nonintercourse acts, and acts excluding foreign ships of war. Second-the renunciation by the United States, during the present war, of any pretensions to carry on any trade with the colonies of belligerents, not allowed in time of peace; and, third-the allowing British ships of war to enforce by capture the American non-intercourse with France and her allies." With terms so express and positive as these before him, it seems amazing that Mr. Erskine should have ventured to conclude even a "conditional agreement" as

merely on the single condition of the withdrawal of the Non-intercourse Act as regarded Great Britain. But the British Envoy, though ready to put a liberal interpretation on his instructions, was not so venturous as might at first sight appear. Madison—so uneasy was he under his political dilemma, and so anxious to extricate himself from it even with humiliation—had, in words, conceded substantially all the demands of the British Government; to make those concessions definitive was beyond his power, as it was indispensable to refer them to Congress, which was not at that time in session. His perplexities lead us to the conviction that he would have kept his word, and done his best to obtain from Congress its sanction of his verbally expressed understanding with Mr. Erskine. That gentleman trusted to Mr. Madison's good faith: Mr. Canning, we suspect, did not. "The refusal of the English Ministry to ratify Mr. Erskine's arrangement," writes Mr. Alison, "although justified in point of right by Napoleon's violence, and Mr. Erskine's deviation from his instructions, may now well be characterized as one of the most unfortunate resolutions, in point of expediency, ever adopted by the British Government; for it at once led to the renewal of the Non-intercourse Act of the United States; put an entire stop for the next two years to all commerce with that country; reduced the exports of Great Britain fully a third during the most critical and important year of the war; and, in its ultimate results, contributed to produce that unhappy irritation between the two countries, which has never yet, notwithstanding the strong bonds of natural interest by which they are connected, been allayed." On the 9th August, in consequence of the non-fulfilment of the Erskine arrangement, the President issued a proclamation withdrawing the proclamation previously issued; thereby leaving in full effect the Non-intercourse Act both against Great Britain and France.

and her allies." With terms so express and positive as these before him, it seems amazing that Mr. Erskine should have ventured to conclude even a "conditional agreement" as he described that into which he entered; had done his country service at Copenhagen,