for our own use, but that we may not import, with the view or intention of afterwards exporting to the parent country. They say, this last is a direct Trade, and that the continuity of a voyage may be traced after a vessel has returned to her own country, has discharged her cargo, has paid duties, and I think one can go so far as to say that if the goods are re-shipped from this country by the original importer, though in another vessel, still it is a direct Trade, between the parent country and the colony of their enemy, and therefore unlawful.

It is easy to see, that this principle as declared, is untenable, injurious or migratory:- It is untenable, because the only known test of the termination of a voyage is the arrival of a vessel and discharge of her cargo in the country to which she belongs. It is injurious, because it deprives a citizen of the United States, of dominion over his own property:- it asserts which was never before asserted - that if two men possessing equal rights in other respects, one may ship sugar and coffee to Amsterdam, and another may be restricted merely because he was the original importer.

It is migratory, because the effect of the principle may be avoided by formal sales. If this be not sufficient to legalize the exportation, then it must follow that contracts between Buyers and Sellers (Citizens of the United States) residing here, may be examined into, in British Courts, for the purpose of ascertaining secret Trusts, respecting the division of profits, etc. Such a supposition would be unreasonable, upon any other ground than the one I assume which is that Great Britian is really desirous of restraining our export trade in Colonial Productions, and of limiting our imports to what may be requisite for a domestic supply.