

right of impressment, on the high seas, in favor of our flag ;—that she was anxious to arrange the subject.

It further appears that the British ministry called for an interview with Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, on this topic ; that they stated the nature of the claim, the King's prerogative ; that they had consulted the crown officers and the board of admiralty, who all concurred in sentiment, that under the circumstances of the nation, the relinquishment of the right was a measure, which the government could not adopt, without taking on itself a responsibility, which no ministry would be willing to meet, however pressing the exigency might be. They offered, however, on the part of Great Britain, to pass laws making it penal for British commanders to impress American citizens, on board of American vessels, on the high seas, if America would pass a law, making it penal for the officers of the United States to grant certificates of citizenship to British subjects.— This will be found, in the same documents, in a letter from Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney to Mr. Madison, dated 11th of November, 1806. Under their peremptory instructions, this proposition, on the part of Great Britain, could not be acceded to by our ministers. Such, however, was the temper and anxiety of England, and such the candor and good sense of our ministers, that *an honourable and advantageous arrangement did take place*. The authority of Mr. Monroe, then Minister at the court of Great Britain, now Secretary of State, and one of the present administration, who have recommended war with England, and assigned impressments as a cause, supports the undersigned in asserting, that it was honourable and advantageous : for in a letter from Richmond dated the 28th of February 1808, to Mr. Madison, the following expressions are used by Mr. Monroe.— “ I have on the contrary always believed and still do believe that the “ ground on which that interest (impressment) was placed by the “ paper of the British Commissioners of 8th November 1806, and “ the explanation which accompanied it, *was both honourable and advantageous to the United States*, that it contained a concession in “ their favor on the part of Great Britain, on the great principle in “ contestation, never before made by a formal and obligatory act of “ their government, which was highly favourable to their interest.”

With the opinion of Mr. King so decidedly expressed, with the official admission of Mr. Madison, with the explicit declaration of Mr. Monroe, all concurring that Great Britain was ready to abandon impressment on the high seas, and with an honourable and advantageous arrangement, actually made by Mr. Monroe, how can it be pretended, that all hope of settlement, by treaty, has failed ? how can this subject furnish a proper cause of war ?

With respect to the subject of blockades, the principle of the law of nations, as asserted by the United States, is, that a blockade can only be justified when supported by an adequate force. In theory this principle is admitted by Great Britain. It is alleged, however, that *in practice* she disregards that principle.

The order of blockade, which has been made a specific ground of complaint by France, is that of the 16th of May, 1806. Yet, strange as it may seem, this order, which is now made one ground of war