

0178

56-7

11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

A
 DISCOURSE
 ON THE
 CONDUCT
 OF THE
 GOVERNMENT
 OF
 GREAT-BRITAIN,
 IN RESPECT TO
 NEUTRAL NATIONS,
 DURING THE
 PRESENT WAR.
 The SECOND EDITION.



L O N D O N :
 Printed for R. GRIFFITHS in *Pater-noster Row*. M.DCC.LIX.

ON THE
C O N D U C T
OF THE
GOVERNMENT of GREAT-BRITAIN.

IT is unhappy for the Race of Mankind, that those Collective Bodies, into which it is divided, should be subject to the same Passions and Animosities, as the Individuals, of which They are composed, and not have, like them, some Visible Superior Tribunal, which might hear and compose their Diffensions: This might perhaps prevent those Appeals, which are too frequently made to the Sword, where the Events of War alone decide the Cause, and the Sentence, which passeth on the Transgressor, brings also to the injured Party a large Share of Misfortunes, in the Execution of it. The Welfare of Mankind however requires, that this necessary Evil should be confined within the narrowest Bounds; and that a Trial, where the Proceedings are so destructive, should be made as short, and as equitable, as the Nature of it will admit: It is the duty therefore of those, who are

[4]

not called upon by some just Motive to concern themselves in the Dispute, to be extremely attentive to their Conduct, that They may not thereby contribute to render the Contest unequal: As far as Man is concerned, it is Force alone, on which the Decision depends; to add therefore by any means to the Power of one Party, is, manifest Injustice to the Other, and besides is highly injurious to the rest of Mankind; since it necessarily tends to spread Discord among Nations, and from a single Spark of Contention to light up a general Flame.

It might be hoped, that a Duty like this, enforced by such powerful Motives, would be universally observed; and that no private Inferior Interest could induce any Power to transgress it: if some little Profits, the Object of greedy Individuals, should perhaps arise from the Violation of it; can a Nation in general reap a Benefit, where Public Justice receives a Wound? To act in opposition to This in hopes of some present Advantage, is, to establish a dangerous Example, which may hereafter prove injurious to Ourselves; it is to untie the only Band which holdeth Nations happily together, and to banish mutual Confidence from the various Communities of the World.

Such however hath been the mistaken Conduct of some Neutral States during the present War.—France consented to the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, that She
might

[5]

might the more securely pursue the Objects of her Ambition; and that under the Disguise of Peace She might extend and fortify her Possessions in a Part of the World, where her Arms in time of open War had always, till then, been unsuccessful: For this Purpose She had artfully contrived, that the American Rights should not be determined by that Treaty, but be left to the Consideration of Commissaries, to whose Decisions She never meant to pay any Regard.—Canada was her Vulnerable Part: This therefore She resolved first to strengthen, and then to enter again with more Confidence into War: while We were employed in debating our Rights, She took more effectual Means to end the Contest in her Favour; She sent frequent Supplies to America; She seized and fortified the Passes and Navigable Rivers of that Country, drove the English from their Possessions, and built Forts on the Dominions of Great-Britain: When the Design was thus far advanced, England saw it in all its Terrors, and with Spirit determined to support her just Rights: Though forsaken now in her Distress by those Allies, who owe their Independancy to her Protection, She feared not in such a Cause to stand alone against all the Efforts of France; She sent forth her Naval Strength, but the Enemy soon rendered the Attempts of that ineffectual, by resolving never to try its Force: In what Manner was She now to employ it?—ONE
only Object remained worthy of its Attention, and that
was

[6]

was to destroy the Trade of the Enemy, and to intercept the Succours, which She sent to her Dominions in America.—Though this would not crush at once the Evil, it would stop at least the Sources, that fed it, and might in the End contribute to induce the Enemy to consent to a reasonable Peace.

France endeavoured again to obviate this Stroke by her Policy. She took off the Tax of 50 Sous per Ton, which She always chuses to keep on Foreign Freightage: She opened even her American Ports, and admitted other Countries to that choice Part of her Commerce, which by her Maritime Regulations She hath at other times so strictly reserved to herself. Neutral Nations seized at once on the Advantage, and opened to the Enemy new Channels for the Conveyance of those Riches, by which the War was to be nursed and protracted: Under the Banner of Friendship they thus served the Cause of the Adversary, whose Wealth secured by that Protection would have passed safe and unmolested through our Fleets; if Britain again raising her Spirit, had not resolved that by this means her Naval Power should not be rendered useless, and seized on the Property of the Enemy, which She found on board Neutral Ships.—It is well known however, that her Conduct in this respect hath not been Universally approved, and that some Neutral Nations think, they have a Right to carry in their Vessels unmolested the

[7]

the Property of our Adversaries.—As I here differ with them in Sentiment, This is the Point, on which I intend to discourse.

Great and wise Governments have always been Jealous of National Glory: It is an Active Principle, which properly cultivated, operates in Virtuous Actions through every Member of the State; To preserve this therefore in its Purity, is, the Duty of every one, who loves his Country.—Can it then be wondered, that the Native of a Kingdom, always celebrated for its Public Spirit, and its upright Faith, at a time, when these are called in doubt, should Interest himself in its Defence? No Indecent Charges shall here be urged against other Countries, it is meant only to vindicate the Honour of our Own: It is to be lamented, that the Necessity of Affairs should at such a Season have given Occasion to this Dispute, particularly, with that Ancient Ally of England, who hath so often fought with her under the same Banner, in support of the just Rights and Privileges of Mankind: The Zeal of any Government to encourage the Industry of its People, is, what a British Pen can never disapprove: The Principle is Noble, and merits even our Applause; I only mean to shew, that the present Object of it is not just.

I shall therefore examine the Right, which Neutral Powers claim in this respect, first, according to the
Law

[8]

Law of Nations, that is, according to those Principles of Natural Law, which are relative to the Conduct of Nations, such as are approved by the Ablest Writers, and practised by States the most Refined.—I shall then consider the Alterations, which have been made in this Right by those Treaties, which have been super-added to the Law of Nations, and which Communities, for their mutual Benefit, have established among themselves.

The Right of Protection then must have its Foundation in some Law, and, when considered in relation to any particular Case, It must be founded on that Law, by which the Interests of the Parties Concerned are generally determined, and which hath Force in that Place, where the Right of Protection is claimed. Thus in the present Case, if Neutral Nations have any Right to protect the Property of the Enemy, It must take its Rise from those Laws, which are the established Rules of Conduct between Nations, and particularly on that Element, where this Right is supposed to be exerted. No Civil or Municipal Institutions, and much less the Privileges arising from them, can here take place; they have no Force but under the Dominion of those, who agreed to their Establishment. The Question then is—How far according to the Law of Nations doth this Right of Protection extend?—To answer this clearly, we must observe,

[9]

observe, that Governments can have succeeded to no other Rights, but such, as their respective Members enjoyed in a State of Individuality; and that one Nation is now to another, as it were in a State of Nature, that is, in the same Condition, in which Man was to Man, before They entered into Society; the Right therefore of Protection, which Individuals would have enjoyed in such a Situation, is the same, which Governments can claim at present:—An Individual then in a State of Nature, would have had an undoubted Right to protect his own Person and Property against any Attack;—But if I am engaged in Contention with another, would He then have had a Right to protect Him against me?—most certainly not;—since He would thereby deprive me of a Right, which the Law of Nature, for my own Security, would in such a Case give me, of seizing the Property of this my Enemy, and destroying His Person; If He thought my Conduct manifestly injurious, so as to call for general Resentment, He would on that account become my Enemy himself; but as long as he calls himself a Neuter, to act in this manner against me would be no less absurd than unjust:—Such therefore and no more is the Right of Protection, which Governments enjoy at present in those Places, to which their own Dominion doth not extend; They have succeeded to the Rights only of their respective Members, and by consequence These alone They can protect.

[10]

But it will be asked,—From whence then arises the Right, which Governments always enjoy of protecting the Property of the Enemy within the Precincts of their own Country?—It is a Consequence of the Right of Dominion; unless therefore their Dominion extends over the Ocean, the Right of Protection cannot there take place: Dominion gives a Right of enacting Laws, of establishing new Jurisdictions, and of making all, (whether its own Subjects or those of other Countries) submit to these, who come within the Pale of its Power: Here then the Trial, which the Law of Nations gives, is, as it were, superseded; and any Proceedings upon it would of course be unjust; But as soon as you are out of the Verge of this particular Jurisdiction, the Laws thereof, and the Privileges which attend them, cease at once, and the general Laws of Nations again have their Force: Here the Property even of an Ally hath no other Protection than what these Laws allow it; being joined therefore to the Goods of an Enemy, it cannot communicate its Protection to these, since the same Law, which gives Security to the first, allows you to seize and destroy the Latter. These Reasonings are exemplified by a Common Fact;—Within the Precincts of the Dominion of any Government, you are not at Liberty to search the Ships of any Country; but is not this Liberty universally and immemorially practised over all on the main Sea? and wherefore is this Search

[11]

Search made, but that, according to the Law of Nations, all are here answerable for what They may convey?

There is something analogous to this in most Civil Governments. Few Countries are without some Places, which enjoy a Right of Protection from the general Laws of the State, such as Palaces, Houses of Religion, and the like; and this Right generally arises from some Pretence to an exclusive Jurisdiction; as long therefore as any particular Property remains within the Verge of these, however justly it may be the Object of the Law, it is not subject to the Power of it; but suppose it conveyed from hence into the Public Roads, beyond the Precincts of this particular Palace, or Convent; the Protection it received would vanish at once, and the general Laws of the Community would fully then have Force upon it. Thus the Protection, which Governments can give within their Dominions, extends not to the Sea: The Ocean is the Public Road of the Universe, the Law of which is the Law of Nations, and all, that pass thereon, are subject to it without either Privilege or Exemption.

If this Manner of reasoning should not clearly establish my Point, I can appeal in support of it to the Ablest Writers on Public Law, who will be found to have decided the Question in my Favour.

C 2 And

[12]

And first I will produce the Testimony of that learned Native of Delft, who wrote so nobly on the Freedom of Navigation to serve his Ungrateful Country. In one of the Passages, which are now before me, it is remarkable, how much he labours to give the greatest Extent to the Rights of Commerce; and yet with all his laudable Byas to this favourite Point, He is clearly of Opinion, that the Ship of a Neutral Nation cannot protect the Property of an Enemy: He manifestly Implies †, that the Vessels even of Allies, are subject to Condemnation, on account of the Enemies Property, with which they are laden; when it appears, that this Property was put on board them with the Consent of the Owners of the Vessels, but not otherwise. His words are, “*Neque Amicorum Naves in prædam veniunt ob res Hostiles, nisi consensu id factum sit Dominorum Navis;*” and producing several Authorities in confirmation of this Opinion, he afterwards adds, “*Alioqui res ipsæ solæ in prædam veniunt;*” but if the Enemies Property should be found Laden on board a Neutral Vessel, without the Connivance of the Owner, in such Case, “*That Property alone, is Lawful Prize:*” And speaking again in another Place on this Point, he says, that if the Wrong done me by my Enemy is manifestly unjust, and that any one by affording him Succours should encourage him in his Enmity against

† Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, Lib. 3. C. 6. Sec. 6. in Notis.

[13]

against Me, “*jam non tantum civiliter tenebitur de damno, sed & criminaliter, ut IS, qui Judici Immunitenti Reum Manifestum eximit †.*” A fine and animated Manner of expression, which shews how clear the Opinion of this great Author was upon the Question.

To the Testimony of Grotius I shall add that of Bynkershoek, a Native also of Holland, and whose Sentiments in point of Maritime Jurisprudence Barbeyrac often prefers even to those of the former; and what makes his Opinion at this time of great Importance, is, that He wrote principally for the Use of the Courts and States of the United Provinces, and generally confirms, what He advances, by their Judgments and Resolutions. He speaks expressly in favour of my Point: “*Ratione consultâ,*” says He ‡, “*non sum qui videam, cur non liceret capere Res Hostiles quamvis in Navi Amicâ repertas, id enim capio, quod Hostium est, quodque Jure belli Victori cedit.*” Upon attending to all the Reasons, which occur to me on this Point, I cannot discover why it should not be lawful to take the Property of an Enemy, though found on board the Ship of a Friend; for I take that only which belongs to the Enemy, and which by the Rules of War, is always ceded to the “*Captor.*”

† Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, Lib. 3. cap. 1. §. 4.

‡ Bynkershoek *Questionum Juris Publici*, Lib. 1. cap. 14.

[14]

“ Captor.” He then affigns this Reason alfo for his Opinion, that as it is lawful to ftop on the Ocean any Veffel, though She carry the Colours of a Neutral Nation, and to examine by her Papers, to whom She really belongs; and in cafe She appear to be the Property of an Enemy, to feize her as Lawful Prize; fo he can fee no Cafe, why this Rule fould not extend to the Effects, which any Ship may have on-board; and, if the Goods of an Enemy fould lie there concealed, why They alfo by the Right of War fould not be taken and condemned: He even declares it to be his Opinion, that the Owner of the Neutral Veffel fould in fuch a Cafe lofe the Price of the Freight; a Severity, which the English Courts of Admiralty never praftife, where fome particular Circumftance doth not require it.

I fhall add to thefe the Opinion of Albericus Gentilis, efteemed the ableft Writer on National Jurifprudence, till Grotius bore the Palm from Him; and His Fame in this refpect was fo great, that Philip the Third of Spain, appointed him perpetual Advocate for his Subjects in all Cafes, which they might have depending in the Courts of England. This Author ftates a Cafe, where the Tufcans had taken the Effects of the Turks, at that time their Enemies, which they found on-board fome English Ships; and He determines, that the Turkish Goods are Legal Prize, but that the Captor
muft

[15]

muft pay the Freight to the English. “ Tranfeunt
“ Res,” fays He*, “ cum fuâ Causâ, Victor fucce-
“ dit in locum Victi, Tenetur Etrufcus pro toto
“ Naulo.” The Property of the Enemy paffeth to
the Captor, but all its Confequences attend it; the
Goods juftly belong to him, but he muft pay to the
Freighter all, which the Enemy would have paid, to
whofe Right He hath in every refpect fucceeded.

To enter particularly into the Sentiments of any more Writers on this Subject, would be equally tedious and unneceffary: It will be fufficient to mention the Names alone of fuch others, as are in favour of the Question.—Among thefe I find Heineccius †, no lefs famed for his Knowledge of Laws, than for his Learning in what are the beft Expositors of Laws, the Antiquities of Governments.—Zouch ‡, who for many years prefided in the Courts of Admiralty of this Kingdom.—Voet §,—Zuarius §,—and Loccenius **, all of them Writers of Reputation, and whofe Opinions are univerfally relied on by all, who treat on Public Jurifprudence.

I might

* Albericus Gentilis De Advocatione Hispanica, Lib. 1. cap. 28.
† Heineccius de Navibus ob Vecturam Veitarum Mercium Commiffis, cap. 2. §. 9.

‡ Zouch de Judiciis inter Gentes, Pars 2. §. 8. cap. 6.

§ Voet de Jure Militari, cap. 5. N. 21.

§ Zuarius de Ufu Maris, Confil. 11. N. 6.

** Loccenius de Jure Maritimo, Lib. 2. cap. 4. N. 11.

[16]

I might indeed have wholly omitted the Sentiments of these learned Individuals, since we shall find, that Great Communities themselves have confirmed our Opinion both by their Laws and by their Practice.— It will not be proper on this Occasion to look far back into the early Annals of the European States; when the Government of these were yet in their Infancy, the Advantages of Commerce were but little understood, and of course the Rights of it were not sufficiently regarded; War was then too much the Season of Rapine, and They, who entered into it, meant less to conquer, than to plunder. As soon however as some better Order began to be introduced into these Affairs, it then became usual for each Party at the Commencement of the War to publish a Declaration, wherein he specified, what kind of Trade he would permit Neutral Nations, to carry on with his Enemy; and the Regulations of these were sometimes attended to, and sometimes not, either as the Interest of the Party Neutral inclined him to submit to the Restraint, or as the Power of the Party Belligerent enabled him to enforce the Execution of it. True it is, that the Prohibitions, which these Declarations contain, are various, according to the Sentiments of the different Governments, which made them; and on that account, they are perhaps too unsteady a Foundation, on which to establish a Right: There plainly however follows

[17]

follows from hence one powerful Inference in our Favour, that not one can be found amid all this Variety, which ever permitted Neutral Nations to protect the Property of the Enemy: This Branch of Freightage they all agree unanimously to prohibit.

The Free States of Italy cultivated first the Interests of Commerce; before any Vessel had as yet passed the Cape of Good Hope, and a shorter Passage had been discovered to the East-Indies, Venice and Genoa drove the principal Trade of the World, and dispersed the Manufactures of Asia to the different Parts of Europe; It naturally followed, that these two Commercial Republics soonest understood and defined the just Rights of Navigation; Their Maritime Constitutions still remain collected in the Consolato del Mare; and the Reputation of these was so great, that as the Laws of Rhodes were once to the Romans, and the Laws of Oleron to the Western Parts of Europe, so these Italian Laws became of force universally to all the Nations, which border on the Mediterranean Sea: These have determined the Point expressly in our Favour; In one of them it is asserted, “ Se la Nave o Navilio, che
 “ pigliato farà, fusse di amici e le Mercantie, che lui
 “ porterá, faranno d’inimici, lo Armiraglio della nave
 “ o del navilio armata, puo forzare & constringere
 “ quel Patrone di quella Nave o di quel Navilio,
 “ che lui Pigliato haverá, che lui conquella sua Nave gli
 D “ debba

“ debba portare, quello, che di fuoi inimici fara ;” “ If
 “ the Ship or Vessel, which shall be taken, belong to an
 “ Ally, and the Merchandise, which she has on-board,
 “ belong to an Enemy, the Captain of the Armed Ship
 “ may force or constrain the Master of the Ship or Vessel,
 “ which He has taken, to carry into some Port for
 “ his Account, the Effects of His Enemy, which are
 “ on-board ;” and it is afterwards added, that the
 Master of the Vessel must be paid for the Freightage of
 the Goods of the Enemy †.—And such was not only
 the constant Purport of their Laws ; but the Practice of
 their Governements was always conformable to it.
 Their Historian ‡ tells Us, that in the War between the
 Venetians and the Genoese, the Ships of Grecians, who
 were Neuters, were always searched, and the Enemies,
 who lay hid in them, were taken out, and made
 Prisoners.

It is unnecessary to dwell longer in giving a further
 Detail of the Conduct of every Nation in this Respect ; I
 will therefore confine myself to those, who are most concerned
 in the present Dispute ; and will shew, that as
 England claims no more at present, than what She always
 enjoyed, so France and Holland have constantly supported
 the same Opinion, whenever their Interest required it.

It

† Il Consolato del Mare, c. 273.

‡ Nicep. Gregoras, Lib. 9.

It was in the Reign of the first Edward, a Prince,
 who thoroughly understood the Rights of his Crown,
 and had a Spirit equal to the Support of them, that
 Philip the Fair of France, being engaged in a War
 with the Duke of Burgundy, the French Admiral
 took the Ships of several Neutral Nations, which were
 passing through the British Channel into the Ports of
 Flanders : Great Complaints were made on this head,
 and Commissioners were appointed to examine into
 the Conduct of the Admiral ; a Libel was there presented
 against him by almost every trading Nation of
 Europe ; the Record † of this is still remaining ; and
 if Neutral Nations had at that time pretended to enjoy
 the Right of protecting the Property of the Enemy,
 and that the Effects, which they carried on-board their
 Ships, could in no Case, except in that of Contraband,
 be made Lawful Prize ; We might well expect, that
 this Right would here have been claimed and asserted ;
 Fear could not in this case have prevented it ; for all
 the World, except France, was on one Side of the
 Question ; but the Record contains no such Claim :
 The Injured demand their Right on a different Principle,
 because the Ships were taken on those Seas,
 “ where the Kings of England (saith the Record) have
 “ time out of Mind been in peaceable Possession of
 “ the Sovereign Lordship, with Power of appointing
 “ Laws,

D 2

† Sir Edward Coke's Fourth Inst. chap. 22.

[20]

“Laws, of prohibiting the Use of Arms, of giving
 “Protection, as Occasion should require, and ap-
 “pointing all things necessary for the maintaining
 “Peace, Justice, and Equity, among all, as well
 “Foreigners, as Natives, who Navigate those Seas ||.”
 Here then the Right of Protection is placed on that
 Basis, on which alone it can properly be founded, the
 Right of Dominion; no other Pretence is offered; and
 if I may be allowed to sum up the Evidence, as their
 Names are written in the Record, “Genue, Cate-
 “loigne, Espagne, Alemaine, Seland, Hoyland, Frise,
 “Denmarch, Norway, & plusours aultres lieux del
 “Empier,” all join here in asserting the Principle, on
 which I first established my Argument.

The Annals of Edward the Third afford still other
 Facts in favour of my Opinion: This Prince added to his
 Military Accomplishments great Sagacity in the Science
 of Laws, and uncommon Attention to the Commercial
 Interests of his Kingdoms: In the second Year of his
 Reign He confirmed the Charter of Privileges, which
 some of his Predecessors had before granted to Foreign
 Merchants, and particularly to those of the Hanse-
 Towns †, who were at that time the greatest Freighters
 of the Western Parts of Europe; This Instrument may
 well be considered as a sort of Maritime Regulation,
 by

|| See all this more fully stated in the Record.

† Rymer's *Fœdera*, tom. 4. p. 361.

[21]

by which England meant to direct her Conduct at that
 time in Affairs of this Nature: In this, Liberty of
 Navigation is fully confirmed; Foreign Merchants are
 allowed to carry their Goods, whether purchased within
 the Kingdom, or without, “Quocunque voluerint;”
 but with this Exception, “præterquam ad Terras no-
 “toriorum & manifestorum hostium Regni nostri ‡;”
 and some Offences being afterwards committed against
 this Charter in the succeeding Wars, It was again re-
 newed in the same manner in the 6th Year of this
 Reign: In both these Instances the Exception is ex-
 press, that no Trade whatsoever should be permitted
 with the Enemy; but this good King, perhaps through
 a Principle of Justice, and his ardent Love to Com-
 merce, seems to have practised this Right with more
 Moderation, that is, in much the same manner, in
 which the Government of England claims it at present:
 For in his Wars with Scotland, some Ships of Great-
 Yarmouth having taken several Vessels belonging to
 the Burgeses of the Town of Bruges, “Prætendentes
 “Bona in iisdem existentia fuisse hominum de Scotiâ;”
 he directed his Precept to the Sheriff of Norfolk †,
 commanding him to set at Liberty, and to cause full
 Restitution to be made of the Ships, and of such of
 the Goods, as belonged to the Merchants of Bruges;
 and that he should detain only that Part of the Cargo,
 which was the Property of the Scotch, his Enemies.
 We

‡ Rymer's *Fœdera*, tom. 4. p. 516.

† Ibid. p. 328.

[22]

We find also, that when Queen Elizabeth was engaged in War with Spain, She seized several Vessels of the Hanse-Towns, which were entering into the Port of Lisbon; and She urged among other Arguments the Charter above-mentioned in defence of her Conduct: She was in this respect so satisfied of the Justice of Her Cause, that the Threats of the German Empire and other Neutral Powers could not oblige Her to relinquish Her Right; and tho' She might perhaps on this Occasion give too great Extent to it; yet it is remarkable, that Monsieur de Thou, who was himself a great Lawyer, and had long sat in the first Court of Judicature in France, even, when he blames the Conduct of the Queen in this Affair, passeth his Censure upon it not as defective in Justice, but only in Policy: "In tam alieno tempore," says He †, "Rerum prudentiores existimabant, imprudenter factum esse a Regina & ab Anglis."

We have as yet mentioned the Conduct alone of those English Princes, who knew how to assert their Rights, and who ruled their People with Glory; but we shall find that even under a Weaker Government, and in a Later Period, this Right of seizing the Property of the Enemy found on-board Neutral Ships hath been fully claimed and practised: When Villiers Duke of Buckingham presided over the Naval Affairs

† Thuanus, Lib. 96.

[23]

of England, and to gratify his own private Resentments had engaged his Country in a War against Spain, the British Fleet under Pennington took several French Vessels, to the Number of between Thirty and Forty, which had Spanish Effects on-board; They were brought into the Ports of England, and our Courts of Admiralty condemned the Goods of the Spaniards, as Legal Prize, but ordered the Vessels of the French to be released, and the Freightage to be paid to them. This Conduct was avowed by the Court of England, and a full Representation of it transmitted by the Lord High-Admiral to the Administration of France: About fifteen Years after this, when the French themselves were at War with Spain, the Navy of France took a great many English Ships, which were laden with the Property of Spaniards; and their Courts of Admiralty condemned not only the Enemy's Effects, but the English Ships, which conveyed them: The Earl of Leicester, then Ambassador in France, made great Complaints on this head; He was answered, that the English always acted in the same manner; and this Reply being transmitted to the Earl of Northumberland, at that time Lord High-Admiral, He consulted upon it Sir Henry Martin, the best English Civilian of that Age, and the most versed in Maritime Jurisdiction; and by his Advice he returned to Lord Leicester the following Answer, which at the same time proves the constant Opinion, and shews the Moderation of the British

[24]

British Admiralty on this Point: "That," says He †, "which is alledged by the French to be practised in our Court of Admiralty, is absolutely denied; and that neither the Law nor Practice hath ever been here to confiscate the Goods of Friends for having Enemies Goods among them: We are so far from doing any such Act of Injustice, as when in time of War we have met with any such Prizes, the Freight hath always been paid by the Taker for those Enemies Goods, that He took, and those, that belonged unto Friends, were duly restored to them."

Thus much may suffice to shew the Conduct of the People of England:—History will also prove to Us, that Holland hath always exerted the same Right:—At the beginning almost of that War, which the United Provinces sustained in support of their Liberties, and even before their Sovereignty was as yet fully established, the People of Zealand scrupled not to carry into their Ports all such Neutral Vessels ‡, as were conveying the Effects of the Enemy, under pretended Names from Flanders into Spain; and the Courts of Admiralty of that Province adjudged the Spanish Property to be Legal Prize; and tho' they released

† The Sidney Papers, Algernon Earl of Northumberland to Robert Earl of Leicester, Nov. 5, 1640.

‡ Historia Belgica Metereni, Lib. 5. Cambden, Anno 1575. Zouch. de Judicio inter Gentes, Pars 2. §. 8. c. 6.

[25]

released the Neutral Ships, They made them no Compensation for the Freightage; among these there were some English Vessels, and Queen Elizabeth, angry that so young a State, and one, which had placed itself under her Protection, should in any degree interrupt the Commerce of her People, at first shewed the Effects of her Resentment, by seizing their Ships, and imprisoning their Merchants; the Zealanders upon this made Reprisals; several English Vessels were detained, and their Commanders put under Confinement: To endeavour at some Settlement of this Affair, the Queen sent over to Holland Mr. Robert Beal her Secretary; and for the same Purpose the Prince of Orange dispatched a Minister to London; by these means the Dispute at last was compromised; the Ships and the Prisoners were on both Sides released; but the Queen never obtained the Restitution of the Enemies Goods, which were taken on-board the Vessels of her Subjects: This Fact is worthy of Observation, not only, as it relates to the Conduct of Holland, but as it shews, how far a Princess thought herself obliged in Equity to yield, whom Historians have always described as positive in her Temper, and, whenever her Right was concerned, of a very tenacious Disposition.

Holland, whenever She was engaged in War, almost constantly pursued the same Conduct: She sometimes even prohibited the Commerce of Neutral Nations

E beyond

[26]

beyond all Justice and Moderation. In the year § 1599, when the Government of Spain first prohibited the Subjects of the United Provinces from trading to the Ports of that Kingdom, a Liberty, which had unaccountably been allowed them, from the Commencement of their Revolt to that Period; the States General, in Revenge, published a Placart, forbidding the People of all Nations to carry any kind of Merchandise into Spain; the Words of Grotius, in the Relation He has given of this Affair in his Belgic History, are very full and express, "Per Edictum (says He) veltant Populos quoscunque ullos Commeatus resve alias in Hispaniam ferre; si qui secus faxint, ut Hostibus faventes vice Hostium futuros:" This Placart They publickly notified to all Kings and Nations, for this Reason, as the Historian expresses it "ne quis Inscitiam excusaret." The Consequences of this Notification deserve also our Attention; the Historian continues, "Paruit Rex Galliaë, ac si quis suorum sex intra Menses in Hispaniam navigaret, professus est privatum Periculum fore." Henry the Fourth at that time King of France, though delivered then from all his Distresses, and arrived at the Summit of all His Power, scrupled not to submit to this Placart, and gave up the Interests of all His Subjects, who should attempt within six Months to transgress it; the Historian concludes, "Cæteri (Reges) silentio transmiserunt;" the other

§ Grotii Historiarum, Lib. 8.

[27]

other Powers of Europe made no Clamorous Complaints against this Measure of the States; in Silence They passed it over: How unlike was this Conduct to that of Holland at present!—Charles the Second, in a Letter to the States General, of October 4, 1666, charges them also with a remarkable Violence of the same Nature: Being at War with some Asiatic Princes in the East-Indies, they seized all the Ships and Goods of the English Merchants, which were trading to those Countries; and the Dutch Governours scrupled not openly to profess in their Declarations, "Qu' ayant depuis peu annoncé la Guerre aux Princes, avec qui ils avoient dessein de trafiquer, cette Guerre devoit par consequent leur interdire tout Commerce avec les dits Princes †."

I omit citing many other Instances of their Conduct in this particular, lest I should appear tedious, especially as one Fact still remains, which is alone sufficient to evince the Opinion of Holland on this Point; and the which I the rather chuse to mention, as it happened even after the Dutch had by their Negotiations endeavoured to establish, as a general Maxim among Nations, that the Goods of an Enemy under a Neutral Banner should pass unmolested.—At the Commencement of that War, which broke out immediately after the Revolution, when the first Grand

E 2

Alliance

† Charles the Second's Letter to the States General, Oct. 4, 1666.

[28]

Alliance was formed against France, Holland entered into a Convention † with England to prohibit totally the Commerce of Neutral Powers with the Enemy: In the Preamble of this, They assign publicly their Reasons for it; they say, “ that having declared War
 “ against the most Christian King, it behoves them
 “ to do as much Damage, as possible, to the common
 “ Enemy, in order to bring him to agree to such
 “ Conditions, as may restore the Repose of Christen-
 “ dom; and that for this End it was necessary to in-
 “ terrupt all Trade and Commerce with the Subjects
 “ of the said King; and that to effect this, They had
 “ ordered their Fleets to block up all the Ports and
 “ Havens of France;” and afterwards, in the Second
 and Third Articles of this Convention, it is agreed,
 “ that they would take any Vessel, whatever King or
 “ State it may belong to, that shall be found sailing
 “ into or out of the Ports of France, and condemn
 “ both Vessel and Merchandise as Legal Prize; and
 “ that this Resolution should be notified to all Neu-
 “ tral States.” Such therefore was at this time the
 avowed Opinion of Holland, and England was induced
 to join with Her in this Convention, exceeding thereby
 those Bounds of Equity and Moderation, which She
 had almost always practised in this Point before, and
 which She will, I hope, most faithfully observe for the
 Future. The Northern Crowns, who were particu-
 larly

† Convention concluded at London, August 22, 1689.

[29]

larly affected by this Prohibition, contended very vehe-
 mently against it: In answer to their Objections were
 urged, the Circumstances of Affairs, the Danger of
 Europe, and the Mighty Strength of that Ambitious
 Power; which, if some extraordinary Effort was not
 made, would bring Mankind under its Subjection. It
 is remarkable, that Puffendorf †, who owed his For-
 tune and Employments to one of these Northern
 Crowns, was of Opinion in this Case against them;
 and thought that the Convention might be justified.
 It is not meant here at present, either to censure or to
 commend it: Circumstances may sometimes make a
 Thing to be lawful, which considered by itself, would
 be unjust; but such Times are truly unhappy, when
 Necessity must be pleaded in support of a Right.

It remains, that I now enquire into the Conduct of
 France: My Proofs || on this Head will be clear;
 They are indeed nothing less than the Public Laws of
 that Kingdom: By some very old French Ordinances
 it is declared, not only, that the Enemies Goods shall
 be adjudged to be lawful Prize, but that the Neutral
 Vessel which carries them, or the Property of any Ally,
 which shall be joined with them, shall be joined also in
 the

† See a Letter of Puffendorf in Jo. Groningii Bibliotheca Universalis
 Librorum Juridicorum, p. 105.

|| See the Ordinances of France, Francis I. 1543. c. 4. 2 Henry III. d.
 1584. c. 69.

[30]

the Condemnation. It has always been a Maxim of the Courts of Maritime Jurisdiction of France, "Que la Robe d'Ami confisque celle d'Enemie;" and so clear were They in this Opinion, that the Laws, which established it, were repeatedly enacted in the Reigns of two of their Kings, Francis I. and Henry III.—That the Practice of the French Marine hath in this particular been conformable to their Laws, may be proved by a thousand Instances: I shall select one upon the Authority of a Minister of Holland, which will shew, what their Conduct was in that Spanish War, which preceded the Pyrenean Treaty. In a Letter of Monsieur Boreel from Paris, to Monsieur De Wit, December 26th, 1653, "On tient ici," says He, "pour Maxime favorable a leurs Interests, que leurs Enemies ne doivent recevoir ni Defense ni Service des Sujets de leur H. H. P. P. en transportant de chez Eux quelques Merchandises ou Commodités ou d'autres, qui seroient pour le Compte de l'Enemie, sous peine, au cas qu' Ils les trouvent dans les Batiments Hollandois, qu' Ils seront de bonne Prise, & qu'on les puisse enlever des dits Batiments & les confisquer."

But it is not the Old Laws of France alone, that thus determine this Point, their more Modern Regulations confirm it: one of the last and greatest Services, which Colbert performed to his Country, was

[31]

the Establishment of a System of Naval Laws, the wisest and best digested, which the Spirit of Legislation hath ever yet produced; it is observable, that although the Ordinance, which contains these Laws, was registred in 1681, several Years subsequent to those Treaties, by which France agreed, that Neutral Vessels should protect the Property of an Enemy, Yet it pays no Attention to them, and establishes the contrary Doctrine. This proves how little Regard France always shew'd to that Article.—The Words of the Ordinance expressly condemn not only the Enemies Goods, but the Neutral Ship, which carries them: "All Ships (saith the Law †) which have Goods on board, that belong to the Enemy, shall be good Prize."—These Laws continue still to be observed in France: At the Commencement even of the present War, the French Government deliver'd to Mons. Berkenrode, the Dutch Minister at Paris, a Memorial, "Contenant les Precautions" (as the Title expresses it) "que doivent prendre les Negociants Hollandois conformement à l'Ordinance de la Marine & aux Reglements de la France, pour eviter que leurs Navires soient declarés de bonne Prise." In the Preamble of This, the Words of the abovementioned Law are repeated, and the same Rule of Condemnation is declared to be still in Force: And the seventh Article of the Memorial lays even a greater Restriction on Neutral Commerce, than the Ordinance of 1681 seems to

† Naval Ordinance of 1681, Title 9, Artic. 7.

[32]

to have intended ; it is there said, “ Si les Navires Hollandois transportoient des Merchandises du Cru ou Fabrique des Enemys de la France, ces Merchandises seroient de bonne Prise, mais le Corps du Navire seroit relaché.”—By this Memorial therefore, every thing which is either of the Growth or Manufacture of the Enemies Country, when found on board the Ships of Holland, though the Property does not appear to belong to the Enemy, is declared to be Good Prize. The same Restriction evidently extends to all other Neutral Traders §.—Is not this almost a total Prohibition to Neutral Powers, of any Commerce with the Enemies of France?

Let us now look back, on what has been said : The Deduction, which I have made, hath I fear, been tedious ; but the Importance of the Subject by force led me into it :—I flatter myself however, it has appeared, that Reason, Authority, and Practice, all join to support the Cause, I defend :—By Reason, I have endeavoured to trace out those Principles, on which this Right of Capture is grounded ;—And to give that Weight to my own Sentiments, which of themselves they would not deserve, I have added the Authorities of the Ablest Writers on this Subject ;—And lastly, I have entered largely into the Conduct of Nations, that I might not only lay thereby a broader Foundation for

4

this

§ See the Preamble of the Memorial.

[33]

this Right, but that I might the more fully illustrate, by the extravagant Pretensions of other States in this respect, the present Moderation of England : No Age or Country ever gave a greater Extent to the Commerce of Neutral Nations, and we have seen that most in the same Circumstances have confined it within much narrower Bounds.

There remains still however one Objection to what has been said, and That of so plausible Cast, that I cannot leave it without an Answer : It has been pretended, that the Liberty of Navigation is destroyed by means of these Captures, and that a violent Restraint hath been put on the Lawful Industry of Mankind. The Liberty of Navigation, in fair Construction, can mean no more than the Right of carrying to any Mart unmolested the Product of one's own Country or Labour, and bringing back the Emoluments of it : But can it be Lawful, that you should extend this Right to my Detriment ; and when it was meant only for your own Advantage, that you should exert it in the Cause of my Enemy ? Each Man hath a Right to perform certain Actions, but if the Destruction of another should follow from them, would not this be a just Reason of Restraint ? The Rights of Mankind admit of different Degrees, and whenever two of these come into Competition, the lowest in the Scale must always give place to the Higher ;—but you will say, that You have a

F

Profit

[34]

Profit in doing this ; if however it is otherwise unjust, will that Consideration convert it into a Right?—If you mean that your own Commerce ought to be Free, the Right is not in the least denied you ; but if under this Disguise you intend to convey Freedom to the Commerce of the Enemy, what Policy or what Justice can require it? What can Neutral Nations desire more, than to remain amid the Ravages of War in the same happy Circumstances, which the Tranquillity of Peace would have afforded them? But can any Right from hence arise, that you should take Occasion from the War itself to constitute a new Species of Traffic, which in Peace you never enjoyed, and which the Necessity of One Party is obliged to grant you, to the Detriment, perhaps Destruction, of the Other? If this Right was admitted, it would become the Interest of all Commercial States to promote Dissention among their Neighbours ; the Quarrels of others would be a Harvest to Themselves ; and from the Contentions of others They would gather Wealth and Power.—But after all, the Rights of Commerce are not the real Cause of this Dispute ; and Liberty of Navigation is only a fair Pretence, which Ambition hath thought fit to hold forth, to interest the Trading States of the World in its Cause, and to draw down their Indignation upon England ; This is not the first time, that a Deceit, like this, hath been practised : When the Power of Spain was at its greatest Height, and Elizabeth wisely contended against

[35]

against the mighty Designs of Philip, the Capture of some Vessels belonging to the Hanse Towns gave Occasion to a Contest of this Nature : But They were the Emissaries of Philip, that then blew up the Flame, and pretending a Love to Commerce, promoted the Ambitious Projects of their Master : The Queen of England published an Apology for her Conduct, and This was answered in a virulent and abusive Manner, not from any of the Hanse Towns, but from Antwerp, a City under the Dominion of Spain, and it seemed to be written (says Thuanus) “ per hominem Philippi
 “ Partibus addictum, non tam pro Libertate Naviga-
 “ tionis et in Germanorum Causâ defendendâ, quam
 “ in Hispanorum Gratiam, et ad Reginae Nomen pro-
 “ scindendum :” The Interests of Commerce were the pretended Cause of this Dispute, but the real Cause was the Interest of Philip ; the pretended Design was to preserve the Liberty of Navigation, but the real End was to serve the Cause of Ambition, and to destroy the Government of England ;—This Case need not be compared with our own at present ; The Resemblance is too Obvious.

Here then we might rest our Cause, if the Law of Nations was the only Foundation, on which this Point could be argued ; But the Bands of Equity having been found alone too weak to hold the Nations of the World to their Duty ; their Interest taught them to

[36]

renew and confirm these by Contracts among themselves, and frequently to add thereto certain mutual Advantages, greater than what the Law of Nations singly would have allowed them:—Let Us consider therefore, what Influence These may have in the present Case;—Whatever they are, I mean to give them all the Force, which Reason or Justice can require: If our Ancestors have betrayed the Interest of their Country in granting any Privileges of this Nature, We, who have succeeded to their Rights, are bound to abide by their Concessions; It is the Happiness of Great Kingdoms, whose Power is equal to the Support of their own Independency, to be able to act up to those Principles, which Necessity hath often forced little States unhappily to abandon: Those scandalous Maxims of Policy, which have brought Disgrace both on the Name and the Profession, took their Rise from the Conduct of the little Principalities of Italy, when, distressed by the successive Invasions, which France and Spain made upon them, They broke or conformed to their Leagues, as their own Security obliged them; and their refined Shifts and Evasions formed into Systems by the Able Doctors of their Councils, have composed that Science, which the World hath called Politics, a Science of Fraud and Deceit; by which Kingdoms are taught to be governed on Principles, which Individuals would be ashamed to profess; as if there could be no Morality among Nations, and that Mankind, being formed into
Civil

[37]

Civil Societies, and collectively considered, were set free from all Rules of Honour and Virtue:—Maxims like these I mean to avoid; To follow them would bring Dishonour on my Country.

It must then be allowed, that there are Articles in some of our Maritime Treaties with other Nations, which have stipulated that, “All, which shall be found
“on board the Vessels, belonging to the Subjects of
“those Countries, shall be accounted Clear and Free,
“although the whole Lading or any Part thereof shall,
“by just Title of Property, belong to the Enemies of
“Great-Britain;” Such an Article is inserted in those Maritime Treaties, which Great-Britain hath made with France † and Holland ‡: It has also by some been supposed, that the Subjects of the Crown of Spain have a Right to enjoy a Privilege of the same Nature; Certain however it is, that no such Article, as that above-mentioned, can be found in the Maritime Treaties between that Country and Great-Britain, and particularly in that of Madrid of 1667, which is the principal Maritime Treaty, at present in force between the two Kingdoms; but as a Mistake in this respect may possibly have arisen from a false Interpretation of two Articles in the Treaty of Madrid, which
declare

† Treaty between Great-Britain and France, 24th February, 1677.
Art. 8. N^o. 1. in the Appendix.

‡ Treaty between Great-Britain and Holland, 1st December, 1674.
Art. 8. N^o. 2. in the Appendix.

declare in general ||, that “ the Subjects of the two
 “ Crowns respectively shall have Liberty to traffic
 “ throughout all Countries, cultivating Peace, Amity,
 “ or Neutrality with either of Them, and that the said
 “ Liberty shall in no wise be interrupted by any Hin-
 “ drance or Disturbance whatsoever, by reason of any
 “ Hostility, which may be between either of the
 “ said Crowns and any other Kingdoms;” and as the
 Liberty here stipulated may by some erroneously be
 imagined to extend so far, as to grant a Right to
 carry freely the Effects of the Enemy; it will be pro-
 per here to remove this Error, and to stop a little to
 shew the true Design and Meaning of these Articles:
 This Explanation is at present the more necessary, as
 it will tend to illustrate the true Sense of other Stipu-
 lations of precisely the same purport, which may be
 found in several of our Commercial Treaties, and
 particularly in the first and second Articles of that with
 Holland, of December 11, 1674: a wrong Inter-
 pretation of which hath already given Occasion to
 great Confusion and much false Reasoning upon the
 present Question.

It cannot, I think, be doubted, that, according to
 those Principles of Natural Equity, which constitute
 the Law of Nations, the People of every Country must
 always have a Right to trade in general to the Ports
 of

¶ Treaty of Madrid, 1667. Art. 21 and 22. N^o. 3. Append.

of any State, though it may happen to be engaged in
 War with another, provided it be with their own
 Merchandise, or on their own Account; and, that
 under this Pretence, They do not attempt to screen
 from one Party the Effects of the other; and, on con-
 dition also, that They carry not to either of Them any
 Implements of War, or whatever else, according to
 the Nature of their respective Situations, or the Cir-
 cumstances of the Case, may be necessary to them for
 their Defence. As clear as this Point may be, it has
 sufficiently appeared by the Facts deduced above, that
 amid the Irregularities of War, the Rules of Equity,
 in this respect, were not always enough regarded; and
 that many Governments, in time of War, have often
 most licentiously disturbed, and sometimes prohibited
 totally, the Commerce of Neutral Nations with their
 Enemies: About the middle therefore of the last Cen-
 tury, when the Commercial Regulations which at pre-
 sent subsist between the European Powers, first began
 to be formed, it became absolutely necessary to call
 back the Attention of Governments to those Principles
 of Natural Right, from whence They had strayed;
 and to fix, and determine, what was the Law of Na-
 tions, by the Articles of their respective Treaties:
 For this Purpose, the Negotiators of that Age, inserted
 in their Commercial Regulations, Articles † to the same
 Purport,

† Treaty of Commerce between France and Holland, 1662. Art. 26
 and 27. Treaty of Commerce between England and Holland, Feb. 17,
 1668.

Purport, as Those above-mentioned, asserting, in general, a Right to trade unmolested with the Enemies of each other; and these They usually placed among those Articles of general Import, which are commonly first laid down in Treaties, as the Basis, on which the subsequent Stipulations are founded: The Rule therefore of Equity in this Case being thus defined, They came afterwards to erect upon it such Privileges, as that Rule alone would not have allowed them; and among the rest, some Nations, as their Interest prompted them, granted mutually to each other, by new and express Articles, the Right of carrying freely the Property of their respective Enemies. These last Articles therefore must be considered as wholly distinct in their Nature from those before-mentioned, and in their Meaning totally different: The first are in Affirmance of an old Rule; the last create a new Privilege;—Those only confirm a Right, which was determined by the Law of Nations before; These make an Exception to that Law:— If they both imply the same Sense, why are both so often found inserted in the same Treaties †? Would the Repetition in such a Case have been necessary? and to what Purpose were new Articles added to grant a Privilege, which was already included in the Terms of the preceding? The same Ex-
ception

1668. Art. 1 and 2. Treaty of Commerce between England and Holland, Dec. 1, 1674. Art. 1 and 2. Treaty of Commerce between England and France, Feb. 24, 1677. Art. 1 and 2.

† See the Treaties mentioned in the last Note.

ception also of Contraband Goods, is again repeated in the last Case, as well as in the former; and shews clearly, that the Property, which is the Object of the Exception in the different Articles, must likewise in its Nature be different; the one relates to the ordinary Means of Traffic, which every Nation enjoys, its own Produce or Property: the other to the Property of the Enemy.

But this Point is still more clearly explained by the Assistance of other Treaties, where Articles of the same Force, as the 21st and 22d of the Treaty of Madrid, are inserted, and the Intention of them fully made appear from the subsequent Parts of the same Treaties.—In the Treaty of Commerce between Great-Britain and Sweden, of the 21st of October, 1661, it is stipulated, by the 11th Article, that “ it is by no means
“ to be understood, that the Subjects of one Confede-
“ rate, who is not a Party in a War, shall be restrained
“ in their Liberty of Trade and Navigation with the
“ Enemies of the other Confederate, who is involved
“ in such War;” and then in the Article, which immediately follows, the Meaning of these Words become manifest beyond a Doubt; it is there so far from being supposed, that the Liberty here granted can be so interpreted, as to imply a Right of conveying the Effects of an Enemy, that the very Attempt to practise it un-
G der

[42]

der Favour of this Liberty, is there called a † “ Fraud;” and as a “ most heinous Crime,” is ordered “ to be “ most severely punished;” and to prevent any Collusion in this respect, the Vessels of both Parties are required to be furnished with Passports, “ specifying, “ of what Nation the Proprietors are, to whom the “ Effects on-board them belong.”—And in the Treaty of Commerce between Great-Britain and Denmark, of the 11th of July, 1670, a Right of free Trade with the Enemy is stipulated in the 16th Article; and afterwards, by the 20th Article, the Extent of this Right is made apparent: Here the Means are set down to prevent the Designs of those, who, under favour of this Stipulation, should attempt to protect the Effects of the Enemy; and the Illegality of such a Practice being supposed, as not necessary to be expressed, the Article then declares, “ but “ left this Liberty of Navigation and Passage for “ one Ally, might, during a War, which the other “ may be engaged in, by Sea or Land, with any “ other State, be of Prejudice to such other Ally; “ and the Goods belonging to the Enemy be fraudulently concealed, under the colourable Pretence of “ their being in Amity together; to prevent therefore “ all Fraud of that sort, all Ships shall be furnished “ with Passports;” the Form of which is there set down,

† See the Treaty of Commerce between Great-Britain and Sweden, Oct. 21, 1661. Art. 12, and Passport.

[43]

down, and is the same as that mentioned above.—From these Treaties then it manifestly appears, that by a general Stipulation in favour of Trade with the Enemy of another Power, Negotiators never intended to imply a Right, to carry freely the Effects of that Enemy; but that to establish such a Right, it is necessary to have it expressly mentioned. The 21st and 22d Articles therefore of the Treaty of Madrid, in which Liberty of Traffic to the Countries of the Enemies of Great-Britain is thus in general stipulated, can be explained to grant to the Subjects of the Crown of Spain no other Right but that of carrying on without any injurious “ Molestation” or “ Disturbance,” such Traffic, as would otherwise be Legal according to the Law of Nations; and by this Law, in time of War, it never could be Legal to protect the Effects of an Enemy;—a Privilege however like this Great-Britain hath consented to grant in her Commercial Treaties with France and Holland: The first of these is put an end to by the present War; it remains therefore that I now discourse on this Privilege, as it is stipulated in the British Treaties with Holland; and I propose to shew that here also it is extinct.—But to give a fuller View of my Subject, and to shew the Origin and Intention of this Privilege, it will be necessary to enter a little into the History of it, and to relate the manner, in which the Article, that grants it, was first admitted into Treaties.

When the United Provinces had put an End, by the Treaty of Munster, to that long War, which They had so nobly maintained in Support of their Liberties, and had happily crowned their Labours by obtaining a full Acknowledgment of their Sovereignty: Delivered from the Cares of War, They wisely turned their Thoughts towards the Arts of Peace: After long Contentions among themselves, their Commercial Provinces had at length obtained the greatest Lead in the State; the Interest of Trade was of course the Principal Object of their Councils; Their Armies were reduced; All, who favoured War, were no longer in Credit; and the Views of their Ministers terminated chiefly in giving Permanence to that extensive Traffic, which had supported them through all their Distresses, and to the Effects of which They principally attributed all their Power and Freedom.

They were indeed at this Time so fully Masters of almost all the Commerce of the World; that They had little else to do, but to preserve the Possession of it: the Public was on this Occasion amused with a new Species of Policy, the Offspring rather of Avarice, than Ambition, desirous of keeping the rest of Mankind in Indolence, that it might more fully reap the Fruits of its own Industry; where Wealth was at least the first Object in View, though in the End it might be accompanied

accompanied by its Usual Attendant, Power: The Arts which they practised to preserve their Fisheries, and to secure to themselves alone the Trade of the Asiatic Spices, are well known, and not at present to our Purpose: They urged loudly the Freedom of Navigation, till They had made it free indeed for Themselves; but they have been charged with practising a Different Doctrine on the other Side of the Line, to what They professed on this; and with seeking to establish an Exclusive Trade on those very Seas, whose Freedom from Papal Grants, and Spanish Pretensions, the Pen of their Grotius had so ably defended.

There was however another Species of Commerce, which demanded their Attention even more than either of the former; as it was not only a profitable Branch of Traffic in itself, but as it greatly tended to the Security of the rest, by being the Principal Basis of their Naval Power: This was the Trade of Freightage, or the Carrying-Trade, the Subject of our present Discourse.—To understand their Views in this Respect, We must first take notice of the Foundation, on which their Policy was built: They had succeeded to the Hanseatic Traders, in becoming the Carriers of the World: Long Possession had therefore furnished them with great Numbers of Sailors and Ships; and to these They added, uncommon Parsimony, and Industry, the natural Endowments of their People; These made them

[46]

them contented with Small Profits, and enabled them to carry the Manufactures of each Country, even cheaper, than the Natives of it themselves: With such happy Circumstances in their Favour, They were sure of making this Branch of Trade wholly and perpetually their own, if they could, by their Negotiations and Policy, establish two Points;—The first was, that no Nation should grant to its own Natives any Privileges in relation to Freightage, which the People of Holland should not equally enjoy.—And as the Consequences of War would otherwise frequently interrupt the Course of this Traffic, They laboured to obtain, as their second Point, that, whenever any other Nation was engaged in War, They might then enjoy, as Neuters, the Right of protecting the Property of its Enemies.—These Points, once obtained, would open a larger Field, on which their Industry might exert itself, than what They could otherwise of right pretend to enjoy: They were wise, however, in endeavouring to obtain it: No Nation besides themselves had more Shipping, than what was equal to the Carriage of their own Manufactures; They alone therefore could carry on the Freightage of other Countries, and largely reap, when their Neighbours were at War, the Advantages proposed.

The Regency of Holland laboured with great Perseverance for the Establishment of these two Points:

Their

5

[47]

Their Great Minister De Witt †, filled all his Instructions and Dispatches with every Argument and Motive, which his active Mind could invent, in support of these favourite Maxims: They were willing to give up any Temporary Advantage to gain that, which, once acquired, would prove for Ages an everflowing Spring of Wealth. By their Negotiations They earnestly laboured to induce France to comply with their Desires in these Respects; but Here they were a long while unsuccessful: In opposition to the first Point of their Policy, Fouquet, while He was at the Head of the French Marine and Finances, established the Tax of 50 Sous per Ton on all Foreign Shipping; and endeavoured thereby to encourage and augment the Freightage of his own Country; and when, upon his Disgrace, Colbert succeeded to his Employments, this Tax of 50 Sous was almost the only Part of the former's Policy which the latter thought fit to adopt. It is amazing with what Zeal and Application the Ministers of Holland contended for the Abolition of it: France at length relaxed her Severity on this Head, not so much to favour the Trade of the Dutch, as in Compliance with the Interests of her own. Colbert's great Schemes to improve the Manufactures of his Country had met with better Success, than his Plans for the Augmentation of its Marine; and the frequent Wars, in which his Ambitious Master involved His Kingdoms, gave:

† Lettres de Monsieur de Witt passim.

[48]

gave repeated Checks to the Freightage of his People. France therefore at last found it necessary to give a larger Vent to her Manufactures, by opening her Ports to Foreign Vessels; and for this Purpose, She took off the Tax of 50 Sous, by the Treaty of Ryswick, as far as it related to the Ships of Holland alone: And since that time, She has regulated her Conduct in this Particular, as the Interest of her Trade requires.—In time of War, She always remits this Tax, as She is then forced to make use of the Freightage of Neutral Nations, Her Naval Power not being equal to the Protection of Her Own;—and in time of Peace, She preserves the Tax, or not, as the Increase or Diminution of Her Shipping requires, always giving the greatest Encouragement to her own Marine, which is consistent with the Preservation of Her Manufactures.

France consented sooner to the other Point of Dutch Policy, and granted by Treaty, to the Vessels of Holland, as Neuters, the Right of protecting the Effects of an Enemy: The Laws of France indeed have continued always to determine against this Right; and in this respect therefore their Laws and Treaties have contradicted each other: Some very ancient Ordinances of that Kingdom (as we have shewn above) had adjudged as Lawful Prize in this Case, not only the Enemies Goods, but had joined also in the Condemnation, the Neutral Vessel, which carried them; the last however

of

5

[49]

of these Points was remitted as early as 1646, by a Temporary Treaty then made with Holland; the Neutral Vessel, and all the Effects of a Friend found on-board it, by this were ordered to be spared: By a subsequent Negotiation, Holland endeavoured to get this Privilege farther confirmed and extended: It was one great Part of Monsieur Boreel's Employment in his long Embassy at Paris: At last, however, in the memorable Treaty of Defensive Alliance between Holland and France, of the 27th of April, 1662, this Favour was obtained in its full Extent; by the 35th Article †, it is reciprocally agreed, that all which shall be found on-board the Vessels of either of the Contracting Parties, "encore que la Charge ou Partie d'icelle fut aux Enemies, sera libre et affranchie." This Article was again renewed by the Marine Treaty of 1678, and by several subsequent Treaties; the Marine Treaty of December the 21st, 1739, was the last in which it was inserted: This continued in force during part of the last War, but in the Year 1745, the French Government declared this Treaty void by an Act of Council; and it hath never since been renewed: France, from the Condition of her Marine, could certainly reap no Advantage from the Insertion of this Article in her own Treaties; but it was wise in her to endeavour to establish the Point, as a general Maxim

H

of

† See the Treaty in the Letters of D'Estlade, tom. 1.

[50]

of National Law among other Countries; Experience hath proved to her the Use of it in Time of War.

But Holland most exerted her Policy to bring that Nation to a Compliance with her Maxims, whom She most apprehended as her Rival in Trade: The scandalous Ignorance of the English Ministers in point of Commerce, and the little Attention, which they paid to the Interests of it, gave such Advantages for some time to the Dutch, that more Vessels of that Country were seen in the Ports of our Colonies, than even of our own; The Shipping of England from the Reign of Elizabeth had been in a constant Decline; We should hardly have believed that in the Reign of Charles the Ist, England could not have furnished more than three Merchant Vessels of 300 Tuns, if Sir Josiah Child had not affirmed it: The Time at length arrived, when we were to be put in this respect on an Equality with our Neighbours, and to vindicate (as it were) the Advantages of our own Industry and Produce to Ourselves; In 1651, The Parliament of England passed into an Ordinance that Noble Strain of Commercial Policy, called since The Act of Navigation; Mr. St. John returning about this time from his Embassy at the Hague, became the happy Instrument, which Providence made use of, to accomplish this Great Work †; resenting highly the Refusal, which had there
been

† Ludlow's Memoirs, Vol. I. Page 345.

[51]

been given to his Proposals, and the Insults, which had been offered to his Person, He warmly solicited, and at length induced the Council of State to move the Parliament to pass it; the Committee sat five Days in forming it; and it was at last published by Order of the House with great Pomp and Ceremony at the Royal Exchange: The Dutch were so sensible of its Consequences, that it was the principal Cause of the ensuing War; They called it in a Manifesto † published soon after, "A Vile Act and Order:" At the Negotiations for that Peace, which put an end to the War, De Witt laboured with his usual Industry and Acuteness to procure the Abolition of it; His Efforts were happily in vain; They, who made the Law, attended with Vigour to the Execution of it; The Effects of it were immediately apparent: This Act of Policy alone hath fortunately outweighed all our other Follies and Extravagancies; Though condemned by some of our Historians, and unnoticed by others, it hath proved the fertile Source of all our Naval Power; It hath operated insensibly to our Preservation, and hath been the Spring, from whence hath flowed the Wealth and Greatness of England.

Our Ancestors with equal Constancy for some time withstood the other Maxim of Dutch Policy, and would not permit their Vessels, as Neuters, to protect the Ef-

H 2

fects

† The Manifesto of Holland, 1652.

fects of the Enemy: By a very ancient and remarkable Treaty, made, when the Dukes of Burgundy were Sovereigns of the Low Countries, the contrary Opinion had long been established; In that, it was determined †, “*Quod Subditi Unius Principum Prædictorum*” (that is, Henry VIIth King of England, and Philip Duke of Burgundy) “*non adducent aut adduci facient per Mare, fraudulose, vel quocunque colore, aliqua Bona seu Merchandizas Inimicorum alterius Eorundem Principum.*” And it farther stipulated, that in case the Master of the Neutral Vessel shall endeavour by a false Report, to defraud the Captor of any of his Enemies Effects, he shall be obliged to make good the Loss sustained thereby, by the Forfeiture of as much of his Own: Frequent Applications were made before the Restoration, both to the Parliament and to the Protector, to alter the Course of proceeding in this respect; but those Heads, which formed the Act of Navigation, were too wise to consent to this; a particular Occasion however at last induced England to make the Concession; by the Treaty of Commerce made at the Hague, 17th of February, 1668, this Point was fully settled to the Satisfaction of Holland; by the 10th Article ‡ of which it was mutually stipulated, that the Shipping of each Country should carry freely the Goods of the Enemies of the other. The Circumstances of the
Time,

† *Intercursus Magnus* in Rymer's *Fœdera*, Vol. 12. Page 585.
See N°. 4. in the Appendix.

Time, and the Situation of Affairs when this Article was framed, account for its Admission into this Treaty, and very strongly apologize for the Authors of it; Lewis the XIVth had then just commenced the first Career of his Ambition, and England resolved with Spirit to throw herself in his Way; Holland was then engaged in a strong Defensive Alliance with France, from whom it was necessary to separate Her, and to make her join with England to support the Independency of Europe: The Dutch Ministers seized this fortunate Opportunity of obtaining from England the same Advantages which They had already acquired by their Treaties with France. It hath been the Policy of most Republics never to enter into any Alliance, where some Benefit doth not accrue to Themselves; and Holland could not be expected to deviate from this Maxim on the present Occasion, in Compliment to the King of England, who had always shewn but little Affection to the States; The War also with that Monarch was but lately ended, and the Wound but weakly healed: The French Treaty of 1662, besides its defensive Stipulations, contained also several Commercial Regulations, the favourite Object of Holland; these had been provisionally referred to a few Months before at Breda, with a Design to prevent any intermediate Disputes between England and Holland, until a Treaty of Commerce, which was then under Deliberation, was concluded; but unless these were
per-

perpetuated on the present Occasion, and formed into a permanent National Treaty, to which England was averse †, the States were resolved not to join in the Alliance proposed: Monf. de Witt expressly told Sir William Temple ‡ “ that the Treaty of Defensive Alliance must, for a Basis, have at the same time an Adjustment of Matters of Commerce,” and unless this could be obtained, it was the avowed Opinion of that Great Pensionary not to conclude: Influenced by the Sentiments of their Minister, the States persisted in the same Resolution; they forced at last Sir William Temple to yield the Point; apprehensive of the least Delay, and of the Uncertainties which would necessarily follow from it, He ventured to comply with their Desires, though he exceeded thereby His Instructions; a private Promise passed first between Him and Monf. de Witt, and in Consequence of that, a few Weeks after, a Treaty of Commerce was concluded. We have before observed, that in the 35th Article of the Treaty of 1662, the French consented to grant the Right of Protection to Neutral Vessels; This therefore came of course to be inserted in our Commercial Treaty of 1668; and the Advantages, which would arise from thence in favour of the Trade of Holland, were the Concessions, which England then chose to make, that She might obtain the Assistance of that Republic

against

† Sir William Temple, to Lord Arlington, Feb. 12, 1668.

‡ Sir William Temple, to Lord Arlington, Jan. 24, 1668.

against France; To what other Purpose could England at this Time establish a Rule of Commerce, which She had before so often refused, and now so reluctantly granted to the earnest Solicitations of the States? Any Benefit which the British Trade might reap from the mutual Stipulation of this Article, could never be the Object, which the Ministers of this Country had in View: The Article, considered by itself, is of the most fatal Consequence to the Power and Trade of Great-Britain; When She is at Peace, and her Neighbours are at War, She cannot reap any Benefit from it, as her own Shipping is not more than equal to the Trade of Her People;—and when on the other hand Great-Britain is at War, and her Neighbours at Peace, it tends to defeat the best Part of her Power, and to render fruitless the Efforts of her Naval Force;—while at the same time considered as a General Maxim of Right among other Nations, Great-Britain neither wants the Use of it, as She is equal in time of War to the Protection of her own Shipping; neither can her Merchants enjoy the Advantage of it, as the Employment of Foreign Freightage is in most respects directly contrary to her Laws. This Article was again renewed and admitted into the Treaty of Commerce of 1674, in consequence of its having been before stipulated in that of 1668. The Treaty of 1674, is the Maritime Regulation, which at present subsists between Great-Britain and Holland.

In this Manner therefore the Article having obtained Existence in these Treaties, we are now to consider, whether it is still in Force.

Treaties of Alliance being nothing more, than Stipulations of mutual Advantages between two Communities in favour of each other, ought to be considered in the Nature of a Bargain; The Conditions of which are always supposed to be equal, at least in the Opinion of those, who make it: He therefore, who breaks his Part of the Contract, destroys the Equality or Justice of it, and forfeits all pretence to those Benefits, which the other Party had stipulated in his favour: “ Si Pars una (says Grotius †) Fœdus violaverit, poterit altera a Fœdere discedere, nam Capita Fœderis singula Conditionis vim habent.” And Puffendorf, speaking of Conventions, says ‡, “ Nec Hæc alterum obligant, ubi ab uno Legibus Conventionis non fuerit satisfactum.”

The next Question then is,—Hath Holland complied with her Part of the Treaties or Contracts, to which she is mutually bound with England?—Hath she performed all, that she hath stipulated in our Favour?—Or hath she been deficient in the Execution of

† Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, L. 2. C. 15. Sec. 15.

‡ Puffendorf de Jure Natur. & Gentium, L. 3. C. 8. Sec. 8.

of some Article, in which the very Life of our Alliance is contained?—If so material a Part should be extinguished, it would be unnatural to suppose, that any lesser Limb of the Treaties should have Vigour; Holland in this Case could have no Pretence to require the Execution of what may have been conceded in her favour; especially, if the Performance of it would operate to the Detriment of that Ally, whose Friendship She hath forsaken.

I doubt not, but my Reader hath already answered in his own Mind the Question proposed;—that the Possessions of the Crown of Great-Britain in Europe have been attacked by the Armies of France; that in consequence of this, on the 2d of August, 1756, the British Government made to the States General in proper Form, the necessary Requisition;—that in such Case Holland is obliged by Treaties to grant immediate Succours, and after a certain Time to join with Great-Britain in open War;—that She hath not performed these Conditions, and hath therefore forfeited all Title to any Advantages, contained in those Treaties, and above all to such, as may arise from the Nature of the War itself?

I shall state however this Point something more particularly;—Holland is engaged in three different Guaranties or Defensive Treaties with Great-Britain:

The first is that Ancient Original Defensive Alliance, which hath been the Basis of all the subsequent Treaties between the two Nations ; This Treaty was designed to have been made immediately after the Triple Alliance, but the unsteady Conduct of the Ministers of Charles the second, and the unfortunate Attachment of that Monarch to the French Court, for some Years delayed it ; It was at last however concluded at Westminster the 3d of March 1678 : It is (except in two immaterial Alterations) an exact Copy of the twelve first Articles of the French Treaty of 1662 ; and both were negociated by the same Minister, Monsieur Van Beuningen. In the Preamble of this Treaty †, “ the Preservation of each other’s Dominions,” is set forth as the Cause of making it ; and the Stipulations of it are ‡, “ a mutual Guaranty of all, They already enjoyed, or might hereafter acquire, by Treaties of Peace, in Europe only :” They farther guaranty, “ all Treaties, which were at that time made, or might hereafter conjointly be made with any other Power :” They promise also, to ¶ “ defend and preserve each other in the Possession of all Towns or Fortresses, which did at that time belong, or shall for the future belong to either of them ;” and for this purpose it is determined *, that “ when either Nation is attacked or

† See the Treaty, Preamble. N^o. 5. Appen.

‡ Art. 2. ¶ Art. 3. and 4.

* Art. 5. and 1st Separate Article.

“ molested, the Other shall immediately succour it
 “ with a certain Number of Troops and Men of War,
 “ and shall be obliged to break with the Aggressor in
 “ two Months, immediately after the Party, that is already at War, shall require it ; and that they shall
 “ then act conjointly with all their Forces, to bring
 “ the common Enemy to a reasonable Accommodation.”

That Holland hath not complied with the Terms of this Guaranty is evident ;—Minorca, “ a Possession of the Crown of Great-Britain,” and which She “ acquired by Treaty,” hath been attacked ; This is One Case of the Guaranty ;—by that Attack, “ a Treaty that was made in common Concert,” The Treaty of Utrecht hath been broken ; This is a Second Case of the Guaranty ;—And by these Means, “ England hath been deprived of a Possession, which of Right belonged to her ;” This is a Third Case of the Guaranty ;—And notwithstanding all this, Holland hath not as yet granted the Succours stipulated ; And many more than two Months have passed without her having enter’d into War conjointly with England, as the Treaty requires.

The Second Species of Defensive Alliance, which subsists between Great-Britain and Holland, is that, which was first agreed to, in the Treaty of Barrier and Succession of October the 29th, 1709, and again more

particularly stipulated in another Treaty to the same purpose of January the 29th, 1713: The Design of this Treaty is the Guaranty of the Dutch Barrier on one Part, and the Guaranty of the firmest Barrier of British Liberty, the Protestant Succession, on the other; The Stipulations are ||, “ that in case either should be attacked, “ the other should furnish at the Requisition of the “ Party Injured, but at his own Expence, certain Succours there expressed; and if the Danger should be “ such, as to require a greater Force, that He shall be “ obliged to augment his Succours, and ultimately to “ act with all his Power in open War against the Aggressor.” I pretend not to make any use of this Treaty in the present Case; and only mention it to give a fuller view of the Alliances, which subsist between Us;—Here however I will indulge a Wish, that the Case of this Guaranty, as far as it relates to the Right of the Crown of Great-Britain, may never again exist: I always read with Sorrow, that there ever was a Time, when the unfortunate Dissensions of our People, in a Point, where the Whole of their Happiness was concerned, should have made it necessary to add any other Sanction to our own Laws, than such, as our own Power can afford them; These Days however of Shame now, I hope, are passed; More than Forty Years Experience of the Mildest Government must have

|| Art. 14. of the Treaty of Barrier and Succession of January 29th, 1713.

have won the most obdurate Heart to confess the present Felicity, and bless the Hand, which bestows it: When forgetting Ancient Errors, We are thus united in Defence, the Affections of his Majesty's Subjects are the Happiest Guaranty of His Right.

I come now to the last Species of Defensive Alliance, which subsists between Great-Britain and Holland; This was concluded at the Hague the 4th of January 1717; To this Treaty France was a Party: The Intention or View of it was †, “ the Preservation of “ each other reciprocally in the Possession of their Dominions, as established by the Treaty of Utrecht;” and the Stipulations are, “ to defend all and each of “ the Articles of the said Treaty, as far as they relate “ to the Contracting Parties respectively, or each of “ them in particular; and they guaranty all the Kingdoms, Provinces, States, Rights and Advantages, “ which each of the Parties at the Signing of that “ Treaty possessed;” and in a Separate Article all this is confined § to “ Europe only:” The Succours stipulated in Support of this Guaranty, are much the same as those mentioned above, first ||, “ Interposition of “ Good Offices,”—then “ a Certain Number of Forces,”—and lastly, “ Declaration of War.” This Treaty was renewed by the Quadruple Alliance of 1718, and again by the Accession of Holland to the Treaty of Hanover.

† Art. 5. No. 6. Ap. § Separate Article. || Art. 5. and 6.

[62]

Hanover of 1726, and last of all by the 3d Article of the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle.

Holland hath by no means executed the Terms of this Guaranty,—Minorca, “a Possession of the Crown of England in Europe, which She enjoyed at the signing of this Treaty,” hath been attacked; this is one Case of the Guaranty;—By this Attack, “The Article of the Treaty of Utrecht, by which that Possession was ceded to England,” hath been broken; this is another Case of Guaranty: I need not again observe, that Holland, in consequence of this, hath neither granted the Succours, nor declared War, as this Treaty also requires.

It will here, however, be objected, “that Great-Britain was the Aggressor in the present War, and unless She had been first attacked, the Case of the Guaranties doth not exist.”—True it is that the Treaties, which contain these Guaranties, are called Defensive Treaties only, but the Words of them, and particularly of that of 1678, which is the Basis of all the rest, by no means express the Point clearly in the Sense of the Objection; They guaranty in general “all the Rights and Possessions” of both Parties against “all Kings, Princes, Republicks, and States:”—so that if either “shall be attacked” or “molested,” whether it be “by Hostile Act or open War” or “in
“ any

[63]

“any other manner whatsoever, disturbed in the Possession of his Estates, Territories, Rights, Immunities, and Freedom of Commerce,” it then declares, what shall be done in Defence of these Objects of the Guaranty, by the Ally, who is not at War; but it is no where mentioned, as necessary, that the Attack of These should be the first Injury or Attack: Nor doth this loose manner of Expression appear to have been an Omission or Inaccuracy: They, who framed these Guaranties, certainly chose to leave this Question without any farther Explanation, to that Good Faith, which must ultimately decide upon the Execution of all Contracts made between Sovereign States: It is not presumed, They hereby meant, that either Party should be obliged to support every Act of Violence or Injustice, which His Ally might be prompted to commit, through Views of Interest or Ambition: but, on the other Hand, They were cautious of affording too frequent Opportunities to pretend, that the Case of the Guaranties did not exist, and of eluding thereby the principal Intention of the Alliance; Both these Inconveniencies were equally to be avoided; and they wisely thought fit to guard against the latter of these no less than the former: They knew that in every War between Civilized Nations, each Party always endeavours to throw upon the other, the Odium and Guilt of the first Act of Provocation and Aggression, and that the worst of Causes was never

[64]

ver without its Excuse: They foresaw, that this alone would unavoidably give sufficient Occasion to endless Cavils and Disputes, whenever the Infidelity of an Ally inclined him to avail himself of Them: To have confined, therefore, the Case of the Guaranty, by a more minute Description of it, and under closer Restrictions of Form, would have subjected to still greater Uncertainty a Point, which, from the Nature of the Thing itself, was already too liable to Doubt; They were sensible, that the Cases would be infinitely various, that the Motives to Self-defence, though evidently just, might not always be universally apparent; that an artful Enemy might disguise the most alarming Preparations, and that an Injured Nation might be necessitated to commit, even a preventive Hostility, before the Danger, which caused it, could be publickly known; Upon such Considerations these Negotiators wisely thought proper to give the greatest Latitude to this Question, and to leave it open to a Fair and Liberal Construction; such as might be expected from Friends, whose Interests these Treaties were supposed to have for ever united, and such on the present Occasion Great Britain hath a Right to demand.

If however we should, for the present, wave this Interpretation, and allow the Treaties to have all the Meaning, which they, who make this Objection, require, the Evidence of Facts will sufficiently prove, that

[65]

that France was the Aggressor in the present War;— If we look to America, the present War there is little more than a Continuation of the last; repeated Usurpations of the Possessions of Great-Britain, have been there the constant Employment of France, almost from the Hour in which the Treaty of Aix was signed; and these were at last followed by an avowed military Attack upon a Fort belonging to the Crown of Great-Britain, by regular Troops acting under a Commission from the Court of France—If we consider America as having no Concern in the present Question, the same ambitious Power will also be found to have been the Aggressor in the European War; France early manifested her hostile Intentions in Europe; in 1753, in direct Opposition to the express Stipulations of * three solemn Treaties, she began to restore the Port of Dunkirk; and Holland then considered this Action in such a Light as induced Her, in Conjunction with the British Government, to present a Memorial against it: France also gave another Proof of Her hostile Intentions, by Her Design to invade Great-Britain, avowed by Her Ministers in every Court of Europe, and sufficiently manifested by the Preparations which she publickly made for it. And these were likewise followed by an open Attack upon an European Island belonging to Great-Britain, an Attack upon the Island of Minorca.

K

It

* IXth Art. of the Treaty of Utrecht; IVth. Art. of the Treaty of the Hague, 1717; and XVIIth Art. of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

It seems indeed allowed, by the Opinion of the Parties concerned, that by the Attack of Minorca the European War was first compleatly opened; notwithstanding all which passed elsewhere, Proposals for an Accommodation of the American Disputes were never discontinued, nor the War considered as universal, till that Island was absolutely invaded.—As for the Captures at Sea, the avowed Cause upon which these were taken, sufficiently evince that they undoubtedly belong to the American War; They were made in Consequence of the Hostilities first commenced in America, and were seized as Reprisals for the Injuries there committed on the Property of the People of England; as such they were always declared to be taken by the Ministers of that Kingdom, and the Value of them to be, on that account, retained*; and upon Application made to Parliament soon after the Seizure of them, the Legislature expressly refused to distribute them among the Captors, as they have done in respect of all other Prizes which have been made since the War of Europe began; but even if this Distinction, which puts the Question out of all doubt, had not been made by the Ministers of England, these Captures surely can never be looked upon but as a Part of the American War: it will not certainly be denied that such a War may extend itself to the Ocean, without having changed either its Nature or Denomination; what but Captures at Sea have been the great constituent Part of every American War before

* See the British Declaration of War.

before the present; as a War upon the American Continent, must always be supported by Succours sent from Europe, it is absurd to suppose, that either Party in this Case would not endeavour, as far as he was able, to take and destroy entirely the Shipping of His Enemy, by which alone those Succours could be conveyed. Countries which have very little internal Force within themselves, cannot be defended but by such Troops as are thrown into them; to defeat therefore the only Means by which this Relief can be effected, must be esteemed as material a Part of such a War, as the Means to invest a Fortrefs are a material Part of a Siege.—But after all, these Captures were subsequent to the Restoration of the Port of Dunkirk, or the * Preparations to invade Great-Britain; and these can never be considered but as undoubted Acts of Aggression; it is not the first military Action alone, but Hostile Preparations, where the Design is apparent †, the Usurpation of another's Rights, or the Denial of Justice, which, in the Opinion of the ablest Writers, denominate the Aggressor; The Objects of the Defensive Treaties are, “ Rights, “ Immunities, and Liberties,” no less than “ Towns “ or Territories,” and “ the Disturbance” or “ Mole-
K 2 “ station”

* Undoubted Intelligence was received of This before the 27th of August, 1755, when general Orders were given to bring in French Vessels; the Lys and the Alcide were taken on the Coast of America, and are therefore in every Light a Part of that War.

† Quanquam & aliquando favor Defensionis ab illius Partibus stat, qui prior Arma alteri infert, ut si quis Hostem Invasionis jam certum, per celeritatem opprefferit, dum Ille adhuc in adparando bello est occupatus. Puffendorf de Jure Naturæ & Gentium, Lib. 8. Cap. 6. Sec. 3.

[68]

“ station” of the former, as well as “ the Attack” of the latter, are expressly declared to be Cases within the Guaranties.

A more subtle Objection, will still perhaps be made, to what has been said : It will be urged, “ that though “ France was the Aggressor in Europe, yet that it “ was only in consequence of the Hostilities commenced before in America ; with which it is determined by Treaties, that Holland is to have no concern ; and that the Rights contested at present are “ not contained in the Guaranties.”—If the Reasoning, on which this Objection is founded, was admitted, It would alone be sufficient to destroy the Effects of every Guaranty, and to extinguish that Confidence, which Nations mutually place in each other, on the Faith of Defensive Alliances : It points out to the Enemy a certain Method of avoiding the Inconvenience of such an Alliance : It shews him where He ought to begin his Attack ; let only the first Effort be made upon some Place not included in the Guaranty, and after that, He may pursue his Views against the very Object of it, without any Apprehensions of the Consequence ; let France first attack some little Spot belonging to Holland in America, and Her Barrier would be no longer guaranteed : To argue in this manner would be to trifle with the most solemn Engagements. The proper Object of Guaranties is the Preservation of some particular Country in the Possession of some particular Power. The

Treaties

[69]

Treaties above-mentioned, promise the Defence of the Dominions of each Party in Europe, simply and absolutely, whenever they are “ attacked ” or “ molested.” If in the present War the first Attack was made out of Europe, it is manifest, that long ago an Attack hath also been made in Europe ; and that is beyond a Doubt the Case of these Guaranties.

Let us try, however, if we cannot discover, what hath once been the Opinion of Holland on a Point of this Nature.—It hath already been observed, that the Defensive Alliance between England and Holland, of 1678, is but a Copy of the 12 first Articles of the French Treaty of 1662 ; soon after Holland had concluded this last Alliance with France, She became engaged in a War with England ; The Attack then first began, as in the present case, out of Europe, on the Coast of Guinea ; and the Cause of the War was also the same, a disputed Right to certain Possessions out of the Bounds of Europe, some in Africa, and others in the East-Indies : Hostilities having continued for some time in those Parts, They afterwards commenced also in Europe ; immediately upon this, Holland declared, that the Case of that Guaranty did exist ; and demanded the Succours, which were stipulated : I need not produce the Memorials of their Ministers to prove this ; History sufficiently informs us, that France acknowledged the Claim, granted the Succours, and entered even into open War in the Defence of her Ally : Here then we

have

have the Sentiments of Holland on the same Article, in a Case minutely parallel: France also pleads in favour of the same Opinion, though her Concession in this respect, checked at that time her Youthful Monarch in the first Essay of his Ambition, delayed for several Months his Entrance into the Spanish Provinces, and brought on him the Enmity of England.

If any Doubt can yet remain, about the Meaning and Intent of this Article, it may farther be proved from the Opinion of the Minister, who made it:—Immediately after Holland was engaged in the War above-mentioned, She sent to the Court of France Monsieur Van Beuningen, to press the Execution of that Guaranty, which He had himself concluded: It is remarkable, that in his Conversations on this Subject with Monsieur de Lionne, the same Objection was debated, against which I now contend: Van Beuningen treated it with great Contempt; He asked Monsieur de Lionne †, If the Pretence of the European War being only a Continuation of that of Africa, was, what the English alone alledged to deprive them of the Succours of France; or whether the French Ministry laid any Strefs upon it, as an Argument, at all to be supported. De Lionne at first gave him to understand, that He thought it of some Weight, “A quoi, Je repondis,” says Van Beuningen, “que Je ne croyois pas, que cette Objection fut serieuse, puis qu’ Il dit alors, que Celui, qui a
“ com-

† Lettre de Monsieur Van Beuningen à Monsieur De Witt, December 26, 1664.

“ commencé la Guerre en Guinée, & de la en Europe, “ n’a pas commencé de Guerre en Europe; & ne pou-
“ voit passer pour troubler la Paix & le Commerce en
“ Europe, parcequ’ Il l’avoit troublé ailleurs aupara-
“ vant;” and then he adds, “Ce, que J’ajoutai a ce
“ Raifonnement pour refuter cette Objection, resta sans
“ replique.” This was the same Monsieur Van Beuningen, who negotiated our Defensive Treaty of 1678; He made the Terms of both these Guaranties precisely alike; and We before shewed, that our own Case, at present, is exactly the same as this, on which his Opinion hath been produced.

If however the Words of these Treaties had been against the Interpretation, which hath been given them, I might justly have appealed to the Spirit of them, as alone a sufficient Foundation, on which to build my Opinion: The whole Design of all these our Alliances with Holland is to form a Barrier against the Power of those mighty Kingdoms, whose Ambition might otherwise induce them to destroy the Independency of Europe: They are, in fact, a regular Continuation of that Policy, which gave Birth to the Triple Alliance, when the dangerous Spirit of the French Councils first began to appear. To answer this great End, they guaranty the Possessions of those two Maritime Countries, who, from their Wealth, their Internal Strength, and their Incapacity of having any ambitious Views them-

[72]

themselves, are the best Security, against the Designs of others: But as the Obligations of these Guaranties are too considerable to be made use of on trifling Occasions; for this purpose, the Contracting Parties have made one Exception: The Rights of the European Kingdoms in the distant Parts of the World, and particularly in America, are very uncertain, and the Cause of frequent Dissentions; and it is well known, that Wars have there subsisted for many Years, between the Trading Subjects and Commercial Companies of the several Nations; while the Mother Countries have lived, if not in Friendship, at least in Peace; This then is the Case, particularly excepted from the Guaranty; but this Exception must always be so interpreted, as to be made consistent with the principal Intention of the Alliance:—If some great Country out of Europe should become of so much Importance, that for the Interest of Europe, it ought to remain in the Hands of the present Possessors; If the same great Disturber of Mankind, after many fruitless Attempts in his own Neighbourhood, should now turn his Thoughts another Way, and should endeavour, by distant Diversions, to enfeeble that Power, on whose Consideration the Safety of the Public very much depends, and to deprive Her of the Sources of her Wealth, which She hath always so largely expended in Support of the Common Cause; Would a generous Friend, who attends to the Spirit of his Engagements, say, that the Case of the Guaranty did

[73]

did not then exist? and, when the Reason of the Exception is vanished, Would He urge the Pretence of it, as an Excuse, for giving up the principal Point, on which the Alliance was constructed?—But if to this distant Attempt, the Enemy should add an open and avowed War in Europe, should threaten the Mother-Country with Invasion, attack her Fortresses, and take occasion from thence to spread his Armies over the Continent; Shall this pretended Exception still be urged, when the literal Case of the Guaranty is now become apparent? On this weak Foundation, Shall a wise People, under such Obligations, not only refuse to grant their Assistance, but not permit their forsaken Ally to make a full Use of his Power; holding back in this manner his Arm, when they will not stretch forth their own; and claiming from the very Contracts, they have broken, that Privilege, which they turn to the Destruction of their Ally. The Absurdity is shocking; such however is the present Case of England: Unhappy in her Friendships! She hath neither that Assistance from Allies, which They are bound by Treaty to give Her, neither is She allowed to exert even her own Force, though abandoned to her own Defence.

In this manner the Point might be determined on a general View of these Treaties; and This alone would be sufficient;—but it may further be proved, that the

L Article,

Article, on which Holland founds Her Right of protecting the Property of the Enemy, as far as it relates to the present Case, hath been particularly repealed long ago. The Treaty, in which this Article was last inserted, was concluded the 1st of December, 1674: Four Years after this, in 1678, was past that Defensive Alliance †, in which it was stipulated between Holland and England, “that if either Party should be attacked in Europe, the other should declare War against the Aggressor, two Months after He is required:” By this Treaty, therefore, two Months after England is attacked by France in Europe, and the proper Requisition hath been made, Holland must become the Enemy of the latter, as well as England; and to be the Enemy of another, means certainly to distress his Trade, and seize his Property; not, to preserve the former, and protect the latter: If this therefore is the right Interpretation of the Word, Enemy, this Article directly and positively declares, that two Months after France has attacked the European Possessions of England, the Ships of Holland shall not have a Right to protect the Effects of the French: This therefore is derogatory to the 8th Article of the Marine Treaty of 1674, and as being posterior to it, absolutely repeals it. In all Laws, (and such are Treaties, in respect to Nations) the last enacted always sets aside the former, so far as they disagree. Cicero says ‡, it ought

† Defensive Alliance of 1678.

‡ Cicero de Inventione.

to be considered, “Utra Lex posterior sit lata, nam potestrema quæque gravissima.”

But this Maxim is not necessary on the present Occasion, since the same Article is again repealed by two subsequent Treaties, in Words as positive, as can be used: For in that Treaty †, by which all the Old Alliances between the Maritime Powers were renewed immediately after the Revolution; and also in that of February 6, 1716, by which they were again renewed upon the Accession of the present Family to the Throne, the Treaties of 1674 and 1678 are expressly mentioned, and made of both a Part; and it is there declared, that “They shall have the same Force and Effect, as if they had been inserted in these Treaties verbatim; that is to say, so far as they do not differ, or are contrary to one another; yet so as whatever hath been established by any later Treaty, shall be understood, and performed in the Sense therein expressed, without any regard had to any former Treaty:” Can it then be doubted, that the Articles above mentioned are “contrary to one another,” as much as Peace and War, as much as Friendship and Enmity? Is not the Defensive Alliance of 1678, “a later Treaty,” than the Marine Regulation of 1674? And ought not therefore, according to the Words of the Renewal,

L 2 “the

† Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between England and Holland, August 1689.

[76]

“ the Article of the Latter to be performed in the
“ Sense therein expressed, without any Regard being
“ had to the Former.” Since then, the Year 1689,
this Article, as far as it relates to the present Case,
hath been twice repealed.—Thus much therefore may
suffice to shew, that the Right of Holland in this re-
spect is extinct.

There remains one more Claim to be considered ; a
Claim, which, if Report had not averred, that such a
one had been formally offered, would by no means de-
serve an Answer.—The Northern Crowns, whose Com-
mercial Treaties with Great-Britain contain not any Ar-
ticle, which gives them expressly a Right to carry the
Property of the Enemy, have endeavoured to deduce
this Right from a general Stipulation, which is to be
found in some of their Treaties, declaring, that “ they
“ shall be treated in like manner as the most favoured
“ Nation :” If Great-Britain therefore hath granted by
Treaty to any other Nation, the Right, in time of War,
of becoming the Carrier of Her Enemies ; They think
They are justly entitled to be admitted to the same Fa-
vour : Under this Pretence, They claim this Privilege
as stipulated in the Dutch Treaty of 1674 : But it has
been proved above, that the Treaty of 1674, as far as
it relates to the present Case, is no longer in force ; if
the Inference therefore was otherwise just, the Founda-
tion being thus destroyed, whatever is built upon it,
must

[77]

must necessarily fall with it. But this Stipulation of
equal Favour, from the very Nature of it, can relate to
nothing else, but such Advantages as may be granted to
Foreign Traders, by the Municipal Laws or Ordinances
of each Country ; such, as Equality of Customs, Ex-
emption from the Rigour of ancient Laws, which
would affect them as Aliens, and the Privileges of
Judges-Conservators, and Consuls ; These are the
proper Objects of Favour ; and because the whole De-
tail of these could not easily be specified in a Treaty,
for this Reason they are thus comprehended in a gene-
ral Article : If the Rights conceded by Treaties were
the Objects of this Stipulation, to what Purpose were
any other Articles added, since this would contain
them all ; and would alone include every Privilege,
which past or future Treaties could afford them ? and
can it be supposed, that any Nation meant in this man-
ner to preclude itself from the Power of exchanging,
by Treaty with some particular Country, any great
Right of its own, in return for an equal Advantage ?
or that this Right should, in such case, be universally
forfeited to the People of every other Nation, who
would thus reap the Benefit, without having been Par-
ties to the Bargain ?

But this Point is made clear beyond a Doubt, from
the Words of the Treaties themselves, where this gene-
ral Equality is stipulated.—In the Treaty of Commerce
between

between Great-Britain and Sweden, of the 21st of October, 1661, the principal one at present in Force between the two Countries; the fourth Article †, which contains this Stipulation, plainly makes it refer to such Favours only, as may be enjoyed in matters of Traffic within their respective Dominions; The Treatment, which the Contracting Parties shall there give to the Subjects of each other, is the principal Purport of the Article; it specifies many Particulars, and among the rest, it stipulates that the People of both Countries shall have “ Liberty to import and export their Goods “ at Discretion, the due Customs being always paid, “ and the Laws and Ordinances of both Kingdoms universally observed;” and then, manifestly connecting this with what follows, it adds, “ which Things being “ pre-supposed, They shall hold such ample Privileges, “ Exemptions, Liberties, and Immunities, as any Foreigner whatsoever doth or shall enjoy;” the general Equality therefore here stipulated, plainly relates to those Places alone, where the Customs of these Kingdoms are to be duly paid, and the Laws and Ordinances of them are in Force, and, that is, only within their respective Dominions: The Privileges here conceded cannot possibly have any larger Extent; and to confine the Sense of the Article still more strongly to the Explanation, which hath now been given of it, the Words, “ in the Dominions and Kingdoms of each other,”

† N^o. VII. Appendix.

other,” are twice repeated, to determine clearly, where that Trade must be carried on, to which this Favour is meant only to be granted; if however any Doubt could yet remain, in respect to this Interpretation, They who made the Treaty have given the strongest Proof, that under this Article They never intended to imply a Right of carrying the Property of an Enemy; since, by the 12th Article of this same Treaty, an Attempt of that nature is pronounced to be “ a heinous Crime,” and the strongest Provisions are made to prevent it.— In the Treaty of Commerce between Great-Britain and Russia, of the 2d of December, 1734, this Stipulation of equal Favour is inserted in several Articles †; but it appears in every one of them, to relate to nothing else, but to the particular Privileges which the Subjects of each were to enjoy, while they were trading within the Dominions of the other.— In the 2d Article, this Equality is expressly said to be granted “ throughout “ the Dominions of the contracting Parties in Europe.— In the 3d, it relates only to “ the favourable “ Reception of the Subjects of each other in the Ports “ of their respective Countries.” — In the 14th, it grants only an equal Freedom to import “ such Merchandise into each others Dominions, as is allowed to the Subjects of any other Country;” — and in the 28th, it refers only to the “ Respect and Treatment, which “ is to be given to the Subjects of one Party, who “ come

† N^o. VIII. Appendix.

[80]

“ come into the Dominions of the other.”—In the Treaty of Commerce between Great-Britain and Denmark, of the 11th of July 1670, the latest at present in Force between the two Countries, the Stipulation of equal Favour is inserted in the 40th Article; it is there said, “ If the Hollanders, or any other Nation, hath, “ or shall obtain from his Majesty of Great-Britain, “ any better Articles, Agreements, Exemptions, or “ Privileges, than what are contained in this Treaty, “ the same and like Privileges, shall be granted to the “ King of Denmark, and his Subjects also, in most “ full and effectual manner:” That these Privileges relate only to Customs and other Advantages of the same Kind, might be proved from the whole Tenor of this Treaty; but it will be sufficient to shew, that the Right of carrying the Property of the Enemy, cannot possibly be intended by it. Holland had obtained this Right in 1668, two Years before the Danish Treaty was concluded; if therefore the Stipulation of equal Favour contained in the 40th Article, could extend to an Advantage of that Nature, the Merchants of Denmark would have been immediately entitled to it, from the Hour the Treaty was signed: the Ministers of that Kingdom could not be ignorant of this; and yet in the 20th Article, They have positively forbid the Exertion of any such Right. They have even expressed the greatest Apprehension lest any Liberty conceded by this Treaty, should be interpreted to that purpose, “ lest such “ Freedom

[81]

“ Freedom of Navigation,” says the Article, “ or “ Passage of the one Ally, and his Subjects and People “ during the War, which the other may have by Sea “ or Land with any other Country, may be to the “ Prejudice of the other Ally, and that Goods and “ Merchandises belonging to the Enemy, may be fraudulently concealed under the Colour of being in “ Amity; for preventing Fraud, and taking away all “ Suspicion, it is thought fit, the Ships, Goods, and “ Men, belonging to the other Ally, in Their Passage “ and Voyage, be furnished with Letters of Passport;” and in the Passport the King of Denmark hath bound Himself to declare that the Ship and the Goods with which it is laden “ belong to his Subjects, or to others having “ an Interest therein, who are the Subjects of Neutral “ Powers,” and that “ they do not appertain to either “ of the Parties now engaged in War.”—Nothing more, I hope, need be said, to refute this weakest Pretence to a Right of carrying freely the Property of the Enemies of Great-Britain.

As there is no Article therefore, which grants a Right of this Nature, at present in Force in any of these Commercial Treaties, it is unnecessary to shew, that most of the Captures which England hath made of the Vessels of Neutral Nations, ought not properly to be referred to it, but may be justified by another

M

Part

Part of the said Treaties, where it is declared †, “ that
 “ all Goods are contraband, which are carried to
 “ Places blockaded or invested.” The Debate here
 would turn on the real Existence of the Blockade.—
 To evince this, I might shew, what Opinion the
 Dutch had of a Naval Blockade in 1630*, when
 They pretended to have blocked up all the Coast of
 Flanders, and openly avowed that They would take
 and condemn all Neutral Ships, which had the most
 distant Appearance of being bound to the Ports of that
 Country; I might also shew their Opinion of the same
 in 1689, when They declared ‡ publickly to Neutral
 Nations, that They designed to block up all the Ports
 of France.—I might observe, that as the Possessions of
 the principal Avenues to a Town, constitutes a Blockade
 by Land; and that it is not necessary, for this purpose,
 to have made a complete Line of Circumvallation; so
 by keeping great Squadrons of Ships of War cruizing
 constantly before the Ports of an Enemy, by destroying
 in this Manner totally his Trade, and preventing his
 Fleets of War from ever venturing out, except now
 and then a Ship or two by Stealth, a Blockade ought
 certainly to be considered as completely established by
 Sea.—I might farther prove the Cause from its Effects;
 and

† Art 41. Treaty of 1674, between Great Britain and Holland. The
 same Article is found in every other Commercial Treaty.

* Convention between England and Holland, 1639.

‡ Placart of June 26, 1639.

and shew, that the American Islands at least have ex-
 perienced all the Consequences of such a Situation;
 where Want of Communication with the Mother-
 Country, Distress, and Famine, fully declare, that
 They have been invested. But as this Topic may not
 perhaps relate to the Case of every Capture, and de-
 pends on the particular State of a Variety of Facts; I
 shall not dwell any longer upon it at present: The
 Question hath here, I hope, sufficiently been argued on
 Principles, which are plain and comprehensive, on
 those equitable Regulations, which Nature hath esta-
 blished among Nations, and on those particular Con-
 tracts, with which Communities have bound them-
 selves: And as I before endeavoured to prove, that
 Neutral Nations had no Right, by the former of these
 Obligations, to protect the Property of the Enemy; So
 now it hath been shewn, by what Policy the Dutch first
 obtained this Privilege;—by what Treaties it hath since
 been taken from them;—and by what Conduct They
 have lately forfeited, whatever might remain of this
 Right. It hath also, I flatter myself, appeared, with
 how little Reason other Neutral Powers, under Colour
 of any Article in their Treaties of Commerce, hav
 claimed the Enjoyment of such a Right.—Upon the
 whole, therefore, I will now beg Permission to con-
 clude, that the Naval Power of England hath been
 conducted, during the present War, with no less Justice
 than Spirit;—that the Faith of our Sovereign is as

[84]

spotless as his Courage;—and that the Honour of our Country is unblemished.

The Basis of just Complaint being thus removed, those idle Clamours, which have been founded upon it, by no means merit our Attention; To charge England with Ambition must appear so absurd to all, who understand the Nature of Her Government, that at the Bar of Reason it ought to be treated rather as Calumny, than Accusation: Possessed of every Blessing, which Civil Government can produce, She is open to no Temptation, with which Ambition might seduce Her; Pursuits of that Kind might possibly operate to the Destruction of Her Constitution, and Her System of Happiness might be subverted by the Augmentation of her Power; It must always be the Interest of England to protect the just Rights of Commerce, and to support those Principles, which promote the Labours of Mankind, since She herself can only be Great from the virtuous Industry of Her People. To obtain the largest Extent for the Exertion of this, is the Point, to which all her Policy should tend; and if ever, forsaking these Maxims, She should seek to enlarge her Power by any Acts of Ambitious Injustice, may She then, for the Welfare of the Human Race, cease to be any longer Great or Powerful! Her Courts of Maritime Jurisdiction are more wisely calculated to preserve the Freedom of Navigation, than those of any other Country;

[85]

As They are not subject to the Controul of Her Executive Power, the Passions of her Princes or Ministers can never influence the Decisions of them; and Foreign Traders have in favour of their Property all the Security, which the Nature of the Thing will admit, the Consciences of wise Men determining upon Matters of Right, whom the Threats of Power cannot affect, and who are set free, as far as possible, from all Bias and Partiality; and to the Honour of the Learned Persons, who at present preside in those Courts, one Impartial Testimony shall here be produced in their favour; Though Treaties have expressly pointed out to all, who may there think themselves injured, a regular Method of Redress before a Superior Tribunal, the Merchants and Freighters of Holland have never ventured, as yet, to bring to a Hearing, or even to put into a way of Trial, any one of the Appeals, which They have made from the Determinations of these Judges, giving hereby cause to presume, that They made them with no other Intention, but to delay the Execution of the Sentences; and conscious of the Invalidity of their Rights, They have in this Manner plainly confessed the real Equity of those Decisions, which have been passed upon them. That amid the Confusions of War some Irregularities may be committed, is a Misfortune too true to be denied, but which the Circumstances of the Case render impossible to be wholly prevented; They are the Consequences

[86]

of all Wars, not alone of the present ; To destroy the Trade of the Enemy, it is necessary to employ Privateers, which cannot always be kept under those strict Rules, to which a more regular Force is subject ; These Maritime Huffars may sometimes exceed their Commissions, and be guilty of Disorders, the Authors of which cannot always be punished, because the Nature of the Fact renders the Discovery of them difficult ; But can the Crimes of These be imputed to Ministers, whose Ears are always open to Complaints, and who labour, as much as possible, to redress Them ? The Privateers of England are already made subject to every Restraint, which Naval Policy hath as yet invented, to force them to conform to their Duty ; If however these are found insufficient, and if any more successful Means can be discovered, to prevent every unjust Depredation, by which the Evils of War may be diminished, confident I am, that Great-Britain will be the first to adopt them ; let them be consistent only with the Use of her Naval Power, and conformable to Justice, the British Legislature will enact such into a Law, and the British Ministry will attend most steadily to the Execution of them.

But after all, the wisest Regulations, on Occasions like this, cannot be expected to answer fully the End proposed ; The System of Humanity is no where perfect, but in respect to Nations its Weakness is most apparent ;

[87]

apparent ; The softer Ties of Natural Affection among these have little Effect, and no Coercive Bands of Power exist to regulate and controul their Passions ; It is the Virtue of Governments alone, on which the general Prosperity depends, and Treaties have no better Sanction, than what that Virtue can give them ; These were the Principles, from which I first commenced my Discourse ; By These the Rulers of Communities are instructed, to amend, as far as possible, by their Prudence, what Nature hath left imperfect ; Ambition or Avarice will augment the Evil, Moderation may prevent it ; Every little Inconvenience must be patiently suffered, where a superior Right makes it necessary ; The Love of our Country should never induce us to act contrary to that Love, which We ought to bear to Mankind, since the Interests of both, if they are rightly pursued, will always be found consistent with each other.

APPEN-

A P P E N D I X.

N^o. I. MARINE TREATY *between the Crowns of Great-Britain and France; concluded at St. Germain's, the 24th of February, 1676-7.*

Art. VIII. **M**ERCHANDISES appertaining to the Subjects of the most Christian King, which shall be found on-board Ships belonging to the Enemies of the King of Great-Britain, shall be liable to Forfeiture, tho' they are not contraband; and on the contrary, the Goods of the Enemies of the King of Great-Britain shall not be taken or confiscated, if they be found on board any Ships appertaining to the Subjects of the most Christian King, altho' the said Goods make up the best Part of the whole Lading of such Ships; but still with an Exception of all contraband, which when taken shall be disposed of in the Manner directed by the preceding Articles. In like manner, all Merchandises belonging to the Subjects of the King of Great-Britain, which are found on-board any Ships belonging to the Enemies of the most Christian King, shall be liable to Confiscation, tho' they be not contraband; and on the contrary, any Merchandises of the Enemies of the said most Christian King shall not be taken or confiscated, if they are found on-board any Ships appertaining to the Subjects of the King of Great-Britain, tho' the said Merchandises make up the best Part or the whole of the Lading of the said Ships; but still with an Exception to contraband Goods.

N^o. II. MARINE TREATY *between Great-Britain and the United-Provinces, to be observed by Land and by Sea, throughout all Countries and Parts of the World; concluded at London, December the 1st, 1674. Renewed by a Treaty of Alliance between the said Powers, February the 6th, 1715-6.*

Art. VIII. Whatsoever shall be found laden by his Majesty's Subjects upon any Ship whatsoever belonging to the Enemies of the Lords the States, although the same be not of the Quality of contraband Goods,

N

may

may be confiscated: But on the contrary, all that which shall be found put on-board Ships belonging to the Subjects of the King of Great-Britain, shall be accounted clear and free, although the whole Lading, or any Part thereof, by just Title of Property should belong to the Enemies of the Lords the States; except always contraband Goods: But in case any such are intercepted, all Things shall be done according to the Meaning and Direction of the foregoing Articles; and so likewise, whatsoever shall be found laden by the Subjects of the Lords the States in any Ship whatsoever belonging to the Enemies of his Majesty, although the same be not of the Quality of contraband Goods, may be confiscated: But on the other Side, all that which shall be found put on-board Ships belonging to the Subjects of the Lords the States, shall be accounted clear and free, although the whole Lading, or any Part thereof, by just Title of Property, should belong to the Enemies of his Majesty; except always contraband Goods.

N^o. III. TREATY of 1667, between Great-Britain and Spain, included in that between the said Powers at Utrecht, of November 28, 1713, and renewed by that of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748.

Art. XXI. The Subjects and Inhabitants of the Kingdoms and Dominions under the Obedience of the Kings of Great-Britain and Spain respectively, may with all Security and Liberty navigate and traffic throughout all the Kingdoms, States and Countries, cultivating Peace, Amity or Neutrality, with either of the said Kings.

Art. XXII. The Ships or Subjects of either of the said Kings shall in no wise interrupt the said Liberty by any Hindrance or Disturbance whatsoever, by reason of any Hostility which now is or may be hereafter between either of the said Kings, and any other Kingdoms, Dominions and States, being in Friendship or Neutrality with the other Party.

N^o. IV. MARINE TREATY between Great-Britain and the States-General; concluded at the Hague the 17th of February, 1667-8. Renewed by a Treaty of Alliance between the said Powers, February 6, 1715-16.

Art. X. Whatsoever shall be found laden by his Majesty's Subjects upon a Ship of the Enemies of the said States, although the same were not contraband, shall yet be confiscated, with all that shall be found in such Ship, without Exception or Reservation: But on the other Side, all that shall be found in any Ships belonging to any Subjects of the King of Great-Britain, shall be free and discharged, although the Lading or any Part thereof belong to the Enemies of the said States, except contraband Goods, in regard whereof such Rule shall be observed, as hath been laid down in the foregoing Articles.

N^o. V. A TREATY of a Defensive Alliance between Charles II. King of England, and the States-General of the United Provinces of the Netherlands; concluded at Westminster, March the 3^d, 1677-8. Renewed by a Treaty of Alliance between the said Powers, February 6, 1715-16.

Art. II. Moreover, there shall be a strict Alliance and faithful Confederacy between his Majesty and his Successors, Kings of Great-Britain, and the said Lords the States-General, their Estates and Territories, for the mutual Support and Preservation of each other in Tranquillity, Peace, Amity, and Neutrality both by Sea and Land, in the Possession of all the Rights, Franchises and the Liberties they do, or ought to enjoy, or which they already, or may hereafter acquire by Treaties of Peace, Friendship and Neutrality, which before have been made, and may be for the time to come, conjointly and in common Concert with other Kings, Republics, Princes and Cities, within the Bounds of Europe only, and no farther.

Art. III. And thus they promise and oblige themselves to be mutual Guaranties, not only of all the Treaties which his Majesty and the said Lords the States-General have already made with other Kings, Republics, Princes and States, which shall be produced on either Side, before the Exchange of the Ratifications; but also all those that may be made hereafter, conjointly and in common Concert; and to defend, assist, and reciprocally to preserve one another in Possession of the Territories, Towns and Places, which do at this time belong, and for the future shall belong, as well to his Majesty and his Successors, Kings of Great-Britain, as to the said Lords the States-General, by the said Treaties, in what Part of Europe soever the said Territories, Cities and Places shall be situated; in case his said Majesty, or the said Lords the States-General, as aforesaid, happen to be molested or attacked by some hostile Act or open War, by or upon any Pretence whatsoever.

Art. IV. The mutual Obligation of assisting and defending one another, is to be understood, and doth extend to the Conservation and Maintenance of his Majesty and the said Lords the States-General, their Countries and Subjects, in all their Rights, Possessions, Immunities and Liberties, as well in respect to Navigation as Commerce, and every thing else both by Sea and Land, which shall be found to belong to them by common Right, or have been acquired by Treaties already made, or to be made in the Manner aforesaid, with and against all Kings and Princes, Republics and States; so far forth, that if his Majesty, or the said Lords the States, in prejudice to the said Tranquillity, Peace, Friendship, or present or future Neutrality, shall hereafter be attacked, or in any other Manner whatsoever disturbed in the Possession and Enjoyment of their Estates, Territories, Towns, Places, Rights, Immunities, and Freedom

of Commerce, Navigation, or any thing else, which his Majesty or the said Lords the States-General do now enjoy, or shall hereafter enjoy by common Right, or by Treaties already made, or that may be made as aforesaid; his Majesty and the said Lords the States-General, as soon as they are informed of it, or required thereto by each other, shall do all they possibly can, conjointly to terminate the Troubles or Hostilities, and procure Reparation to be made for the Loss or Injuries done to one of the Allies.

Art. V. And in case the said Attempt or Trouble be seconded with any open Rupture, that Party of the two Allies who is not attacked, shall be obliged to break with the Aggressor in two Months, immediately after the Party that is already at a Rupture shall require it; during which time he shall use all his Endeavours by his Ambassadors and other Ministers to mediate a just Accommodation between the Aggressor and Disturber, and the Party first attacked or molested; and yet shall in the said time give powerful Assistance to his Ally, such as shall be agreed on by the separate Articles between his Majesty and the said Lords the States General; the which, though there had been no Mention made of them in this Article, shall be kept and observed, as if they had been inserted and set down therein; it being already left to the Choice of that Party of the Allies that shall be at Rupture, to continue to enjoy the Benefit of the same Succours, in case the Conjunction of the Times and the State of his Affairs shall make him prefer the Effect thereof before an open Rupture of his Ally with the Aggressor.

Art. VI. The mutual Guaranty being in this Manner promised and established, when either of the Allies comes to be attacked or molested, if the States-General of the United Provinces happen to be in, or find themselves obliged to enter into an open War; his Majesty shall in like manner be obliged to break with the Aggressor or Disturber, and to make use of all his Power, and his whole Forces both by Sea and Land, and to join them with those of the Lords the States-General, when it shall be thought expedient, in order to bring the common Enemy to a reasonable, firm, and equitable Accommodation with the King of Great-Britain and the said United Provinces.

Art. VII. And in this case the Forces of his Britannic Majesty, and of the said Lords the States-General, shall act conjointly or separately, as they his said Majesty and the said Lords the States-General shall then more particularly concert Affairs between them: they being to advise and consult together about the most proper Methods to annoy the common Enemy, whether by way of Diversion or otherwise, to the end he may sooner be brought to an Accommodation as aforesaid.

Art. VIII. The said Lords the States are to perform the same that is contained in the two Articles immediately foregoing, in case the King of Great-Britain shall be attacked or molested in the Manner aforesaid.

N.

N^o. VI. TREATY of Defensive Alliance between Great-Britain, France and Holland, concluded at the Hague the 4th of January 1717; renewed by the Quadruple Alliance of 1718; in the Accession of Holland to the Treaty of Hanover in 1726; and by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

Art. V. As the End and genuine Design of this Alliance between the said Kings and States-General, is, to preserve mutually the Peace and Tranquillity of their respective Kingdoms, States and Provinces, which was established by the last Treaties of Peace between the most Serene Queen of Great-Britain, the most Serene most Christian King, and the said High and Mighty Lords the States-General of the United Provinces, concluded and signed at Utrecht on the 11th Day of April, in the Year of our Lord 1713, it is agreed and concluded, that all and singular the Articles of the said Treaties of Peace, so far as they relate to the Interests of the said three Powers respectively and each of them in particular, as also the Successions to the Crown of Great-Britain in the Protestant Line, and to the Crown of France, according to the said Treaties, shall have their full Force and Effect; and the said most Serene Kings, and the Lords the States-General, promise their mutual Guaranty for the intire Execution of all that is stipulated in the said Articles, so far as they relate (as is aforesaid) to the Successions and Interests of the said Kingdoms and Provinces; as also for the maintaining and defending of all the Kingdoms, Provinces, Territories, Rights, Immunities, or Advantages which each of the said Allies respectively shall actually possess at the time of signing this Alliance: For which end the said Kings and States-General have consented and agreed, that if any one of the said Allies shall be hostilely attacked by any Prince or State whatsoever, the other Allies shall immediately interpose their good Offices with the Aggressor, to procure Right to be done to the Party injured, and to induce the said Aggressor to abstain intirely from all farther Hostility.

Art. VI. But if these friendly Offices should not have the desired Effect, by reconciling both Parties, and obtaining Satisfaction and Reparation of Damages within the Space of two Months; then those of the Parties contracting who shall not be attacked, shall be obliged to assist their Ally without Delay, and shall furnish the Party attacked with the Succours here-under specified, that is to say,

The King of Great-Britain 8000 Foot, and 2000 Horse.

The most Christian King 8000 Foot, and 2000 Horse.

The States-General 4000 Foot, and 1000 Horse.

But if the Ally, who shall be engaged in War, in the Manner aforesaid, shall desire to have Assistance by Sea, or shall chuse Money rather than Land or Sea-Forces, it shall be freely at his Option; the Subsidies to be furnished bearing always proportion to the Forces above specified.

And

And that no Dispute may arise hereupon, it is agreed, that 1000 Foot shall be computed at 10,000 Guilders, Dutch Money, a Month; and likewise 1000 Horse, at 30,000 Guilders of the same Money a Month, reckoning Twelve Months to the Year; the Naval Succours to be valued in the like Proportion.

SEPARATE ARTICLE. Whereas in the Treaty of Alliance this Day concluded, between the most Serene and most Potent King of Great-Britain, and the most Christian King, and the High and Mighty Lords the States-General of the United Netherlands, there is among other things a Stipulation concerning the Succours or Assistance with which the Allies are obliged mutually to help each other, in case one or other of them should be hostily attacked: Lest any Doubt should hereafter arise touching the Number of the said Succours or Assistance, by reason of the Alliances now subsisting between the Crown of Great-Britain and the Republic of the United Netherlands, the under-written Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the King of Great-Britain, and Deputies and Plenipotentiaries of the Lords the States-General, have judged it necessary to declare, as they do declare by this Separate Article, which is to have the same Force as if it had been inserted in the Principal Treaty, that the former Treaties and Alliances between the Crown of Great-Britain and the United Netherlands shall have full Effect in all their Articles, but especially in those which relate to the Succours or Assistance to be mutually furnished according to the Proportions stipulated in the said Treaties or Alliances; which Articles shall not only remain in Force, but are confirmed by this Separate Article, and the said Proportions stipulated by the former Alliances, as to the Succours or Assistance mutually to be furnished, shall be always and exactly observed, even when the above-said Succours shall be required by virtue of the Treaty this Day signed: And that as well the King of Great-Britain, as the Lords the States-General, shall, if the Case happen, have a Right to require the Succours, either by virtue of the former Treaties, or by virtue of the Alliance this Day concluded; yet so, that if the Succours should be furnished by virtue of the former Treaties, neither Party shall be intitled to ask further Assistance by virtue of this Alliance. And whereas the said Succours, as also the Guaranty mentioned in the Fifth Article of the said Treaty concluded this Day, are, by a certain Separate Article settled between the most Christian King and the States-General, restrained and limited to Europe; so likewise the same Succours and Guaranty between the King of Great-Britain and the Lords the States-General, are by virtue of this Article restrained and limited to Europe. In Witness whereof, &c.

No. VII. TREATY of Alliance and Commerce between Great-Britain and Sweden, 21st October, 1661.

Art. IV. It shall be free for either of the said Confederates, and their Inhabitants and Subjects, to enter by Land or Sea into the Kingdoms, Countries, Provinces, Territories, Islands, Cities, Villages, Towns walled or unwalled, fortified or unfortified, Harbours, Dominions or Jurisdictions whatsoever of the other, freely and securely, without any Licence or safe Conduct, general or special; and there to pass and repass, to reside therein, or to travel through the same, and in the mean time to buy Provisions and all Necessaries; and they shall be treated with all manner of Civility: It shall be lawful also for both the Confederates and their Subjects, Citizens and Inhabitants, to trade, traffic, and carry on Commerce in all Places where Commerce has been at any Time hitherto used, and in whatsoever Goods and Merchandise they please, provided they are not contraband; and they shall have Liberty to import and export them at Discretion, the due Customs being always paid, and the Laws and Ordinances of both Kingdoms, whether relating to Merchandise, or to any other Right, always observed: Which Things being pre-supposed, the People, Subjects and Inhabitants of one Confederate shall have and hold in the Countries, Lands, Dominions and Kingdoms of the other, such full and ample Privileges, Exemptions, Liberties and Immunities, as any Foreigner whatsoever doth or shall enjoy in the said Dominions and Kingdoms on both Sides.

Art. XI. Altho' the foregoing Articles of this Treaty, and the Laws of Friendship do forbid, that either of the Confederates shall furnish any Aid or Supplies to the Enemies of the other, yet it is by no means to be understood that either Confederate, with his Subjects and Inhabitants, who is not a Party in a War, shall be restrained the Liberty of Trade and Navigation with the Enemies of the other Confederate, who is involved in such War; provided only that no Goods called contraband, and especially Money, Provisions, Arms, Bombs, with their Fuzees and other Appurtenances, Fireballs, Gunpowder, Matches, Cannon-ball, Spears, Swords, Lances, Pikes, Halberts, Guns, Mortars, Petards, Grenadoes, Musket-rests, Bandaliers, Saltpetre, Muskets, Musket-bullets, Helmets, Head-pieces, Breast-plates, Coats of Mails commonly called Cuirasses, and the like kind of Arms: Soldiers, Horses with their Furniture, nor Pistols, Belts, or any other Instruments of War; nor Ships of War and Guard-ships, be carried to the Enemies of the other Confederate, on the Penalty of being made Prize without hopes of Redemption, if they are seized by the other Confederate: Nor shall either Confederate permit that the Rebels or Enemies of the other be assisted by any of his Subjects, or that any Ships be sold or lent to, or in

[96]

in any manner made use of by the Enemies or Rebels of the other to his Disadvantage or Detriment: But it shall be lawful for either of the Confederates, and his People or Subjects, to trade with the Enemies of the other, and to carry them any Merchandise whatsoever, not above excepted, without any Impediment; provided they are not carried to those Ports or Places which are besieged by the other; in which case they shall have free Leave either to sell their Goods to the Besiegers, or to repair with them to any other Port which is not besieged.

Art. XII. But lest such Freedom of Navigation and Passage of the one Confederate might be of Detriment to the other, while engaged in War by Sea or Land with other Nations, by concealing and conveying the Goods and Merchandises of the Enemies of the Confederate so engaged in War, under the Name of a Friend and Ally; for the avoiding of all Suspicion and Fraud of such sort, it is agreed, that all Ships, Carriages, Wares and Men belonging to the other Confederate, shall be furnished in their Journeys and Voyages with safe Conducts commonly called Passports and Certificates, such as are under-written *verbatim*, signed and subscribed by the chief Magistrate of that Province and City, or by the chief Commissioners of the Customs and Duties, and specifying the true Names of the Ships, Carriages, Goods, and Masters of the Vessels, as also the exact Dates, without any Fraud or Collusion, together with such other Descriptions of that sort, as are expressed in the following Form of a Safe-conduct and Certificate. Wherefore if any Person shall affirm upon the Oath by which he is bound to his King, State or City, that he has given in true Accounts, and be afterwards convicted on sufficient Proof of any wilful Fraud therein, he shall be severely punished, and incur the Penalties of Perjury. [*Here follows the Passport.*]

Therefore when the Goods, Ships, or Men of either Confederate, or his Subjects and Inhabitants, shall meet in the open Sea, or in any Ports, Havens, Countries or Places whatsoever, with any Ships of War or Privateers, or any Subjects and Inhabitants of the other Confederate, after producing their Letters of Safe-Conduct and Certificates aforesaid, nothing farther shall be demanded of them, nor any Enquiry whatsoever made with respect to the Goods, Ships or Men, much less shall they be injured, damaged or molested, but they shall be suffered freely to prosecute their Voyage and Purpose. But in case that the said solemn and stated Form of a Certificate be not produced, or there be any other just and strong Cause of Suspicion, why a Ship ought to be searched, which shall only be deemed justifiable in such Case, and not otherwise; if the Goods of an Enemy are then found in such Ship of the Confederate, that Part only which belongs to the Enemy shall be made Prize, and what belongs to the Confederate shall be immediately restored: The same Rule shall likewise be observed, if the Goods of the other Confederate are found on-board a Ship of an Enemy: If any thing be done by either Party contrary to the genuine Sense of this Article,

both

[97]

Both Confederates shall take Care, that the severest Punishments, due for the most heinous Crimes, be inflicted on such of their Subjects and Inhabitants as shall offend herein, for their Contempt and Transgression of the Royal Commands; and that full and immediate Satisfaction be made to the injured Party for all Damage and Expences (of which the most summary Proof shall be admitted) by the other Confederate, or his Subjects and Inhabitants, without any intricate Niceties of Law.

N^o. VIII. TREATY of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, between Great-Britain and Russia, 2^d of December, 1734.

Art. II. There shall be an entire Freedom of Navigation and Commerce throughout all the Dominions of the two contracting Parties in Europe, where Navigation and Commerce are at this Time permitted, or shall be permitted hereafter by the contracting Parties to the Subjects of any other Nation.

Art. III. The Subjects of both contracting Parties may enter at all Times into all the Ports, Places or Towns of either of the contracting Parties, with their Ships, Vessels and Carriages, laden or unladen, into which the Subjects of any other Nation are permitted to enter, to trade or abide there; and the Mariners, Passengers and Vessels, whether Russian or English, even though there should be any Subjects of any other strange Nation among the Crew, shall be received and treated in like manner as the most favoured Nation, and the Mariners and Passengers shall not be forced to enter into the Service of either of the contracting Parties, which may have Occasion for their Service; and the Subjects of both contracting Parties may buy all Kind of Necessaries, which they shall stand in Need of, at the current Price; and repair and refit their Ships, Vessels or Carriages, and furnish themselves with all Manner of Provisions for their Subsistence and Voyage, abide and depart at their Pleasure, without Molestation or Impediment; provided they conform themselves to the Laws and Ordinances of the respective States of the said contracting Powers, where they shall so arrive or continue.

Art. XIV. The Subjects of Great-Britain may bring by Sea or by Land into all or any of the Dominions of Russia, wherein the Subjects of any other Nation are permitted to trade, all Sorts of Goods and Merchandizes, whereof the Importation and Traffick are not prohibited; and in like Manner the Subjects of Russia may bring into all or any of the Dominions of Great-Britain, wherein the Subjects of any other Nation are allowed to traffick, all Sorts of Merchandizes of the Produce or Manufacture of the Dominions of Russia; whereof the Importation and Traffick are not prohibited, and likewise all Merchandizes of the Produce or Manufacture of Asia; provided that it is not actually prohibited by any Law.

Q. now

now in Force in Great-Britain; and they may buy and export out of the Dominions of Great-Britain, all Manner of Goods and Merchandizes, which the Subjects of any other Nation may buy therein and export from thence, and particularly Gold and Silver wrought or unwrought, excepting the Silver coined Money of Great-Britain.

Art. XXVIII. The Subjects of both Parties shall be respected and treated in their respective Dominions in like Manner as the most favoured Nation, and the Subjects of Russia which shall come into England in order to learn Arts and Commerce there, shall be protected, favoured and instructed: Likewise if any Russian Vessels shall be met with out at Sea by any English Vessels, they shall in no wise be hindered or molested by them, provided they comport themselves in the British Seas in the accustomed Manner; but on the contrary they shall be favoured by them, and have all possible Assistance given them, and that in the very Ports or Havens belonging to the Dominions of Great-Britain.

N^o. IX. TREATY of Alliance and Commerce between Great-Britain and Denmark, concluded at Copenhagen, 11th. of July, 1670.

Art. XVI. It shall be lawful for either of the Confederates, and their Subjects or People, to trade with the Enemies of the other, and to carry to them, or furnish them with all Kinds of Merchandises, (except only prohibited Goods, which are called contraband,) without any Impediment, unless in Ports and Places besieged by the other; which nevertheless if they shall do, it shall be free for them either to sell their Goods to the Besiegers, or go to any other Port or Place not besieged.

Art. XX. But, lest such Freedom of Navigation, or Passage, of the one Ally, and his Subjects and People, during the War, which the other may have by Sea or by Land with any other Country, may be to the Prejudice of the other Ally, and that Goods and Merchandizes, belonging to the Enemy, may be fraudulently concealed under the Colour of being in Amity; for preventing Fraud, and taking away all Suspicion, it is thought fit, that the Ships, Goods and Men, belonging to the other Ally, in their Passage and Voyages, be furnished with Letters of Passports and Certificates, the Forms whereof ought to be as follow. [*Here follows the Passport.*]

When therefore the Merchandize, Goods, Ships, or Men of either of the Allies, and their Subjects and People, shall meet in open Sea, Straits, Ports, Havens, Lands, and Places whatever, the Ships of War, whether public or private, or the Men, Subjects and People of the other Ally, upon exhibiting only the aforesaid Letters of Safe conduct and Certificates, nothing more shall be required of them; nor shall Search be made after the Goods, Ships, or Men; nor shall they be any other way molested or troubled, but shall be suffered with all Freedom to pursue their intended Voyage. But if this so-

lemn and set Form of Passport and Certificate is not exhibited, or there is any other just or urgent Cause of Suspicion, then shall the Ship be searched, which is nevertheless understood to be permitted in this Case only. And, if any thing shall be committed, contrary to the true Meaning of this Article, against either of the Allies, each of the said Allies shall cause his Subjects, and People offending, to be severely punished, and full and intire Satisfaction to be forthwith given, and without Delay, to the Party injured, and his Subjects and People, for their whole Loss and Expences.

Art. XL. Also it is agreed, that, if the Hollanders, or any other Nation whatever, (the Swedish Nation only excepted) hath obtained already, or shall hereafter obtain any better Articles, Agreements, Exemptions or Privileges, than what are contained in this Treaty, from the King of Denmark, the same and like Privileges shall be likewise granted to the King of Great-Britain and his Subjects, effectually and fully to all Intents and Purposes. And on the other Side, if the Hollanders, or any other Nation whatever, hath or shall obtain from His Majesty of Great-Britain any better Articles, Agreements, Exemptions or Privileges, than what are contained in this Treaty, the same and like Privileges shall be granted to the King of Denmark and his Subjects also, in most full and effectual Manner.

F I N I S.

0228

