

Power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States." Shortly afterwards a resolution embodying these principles was moved in Congress, but it never came to a vote. The President's message, added to the firm stand taken by the British Government, served to prevent any action being taken against the independence of the Spanish Colonies.

But in the same message occurred a passage which is often taken as part and parcel of the "Monroe Doctrine," although it really deals with a very distinct matter. The Russian Government had laid claim to the control of the North-West or Pacific Coast of North America, on the ground of prior discovery and occupation. Both Britain and the United States were interested in refusing recognition to the Russian claims, and concerted action between the two Anglo-Saxon nations was equally to the advantage of both. But this harmony of action was seriously impaired by President Monroe inserting in his message the following wholly indefensible statement. "The occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle, in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power." It is quite evident that this second doctrine has no necessary connection with the first, although both occur in the same message and both refer to the United States interests. It is certain that while Mr. Canning approved of the first, the real "Monroe Doctrine," he strongly objected to the second. What meaning was attached to the "Monroe Doctrine" by the American statesman, who probably had most to

do in framing the famous message, is shown by the following extract from a statement by John Quincy Adams (now President) in 1825, when referring to a proposed congress of American republics at Panama: "An agreement between all the parties represented at the meeting, that each will guard by *its own means* against the establishment of any future European colony within its borders, may be found desirable. This was more than two years since announced by my predecessor to the world as a principle resulting from the emancipation of both the American continents." Such is the explanation furnished by Mr. Adams who was Mr. Monroe's Secretary of State, and probably drew up his message. But it seems that even this mild and moderate view of the rights of the United States failed to receive the endorsement of the House of Representatives. For a resolution was carried before that body that the United States "ought not to become parties to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing the interference of any of the European powers with their independence or form of government; or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continent of America." On this subject it is remarked by the eminent American authority on International Law, Dr. Woolsey:—

"On the whole then (1) this policy is not a national one. The House of Representatives, indeed, had no right to settle questions of policy or of international law. But the Cabinet had as little. (2) The principle of resisting attempts to overthrow the liberties of the Spanish republics was one of most righteous self-defense, and of vital importance. But the other principle of prohibiting European colonization was vague, and if intended to prevent Russia from stretching her borders on the Pacific further