FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FROM LONDON PAPERS RECEIVED AT THE OFFICE OF THE MERCANTILE ADVERTISER BY THE BRITISH PACKET.

[We present our readers with the following, as the most interesting article to the People of the United States, which our late London papers furnish us with.]

LONDON, Feb. 18.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

AMERICA.

The order of the day being moved,

Lord Grenville rose to bring forward his long expected motion for the repeal of the Orders in Council, as far as they affect the United States of America.—His Lordship began by recalling to the recollection of the House, the opinions he had invariably expressed during the course of the last session on that subject: the intention he had avowed of bringing forward a motion grounded on the evidence then recently taken at the bar, and which motion would have been similar in many respects to that which he should have the honor this day of submitting to their Lordships. If he had forborne to bring forward that motion, it was because reports had gone abroad at the time as grateful to his feelings, as, if realised, they would have proved beneficial to the interest of the Country, viz. that Ministers had altered their minds respecting America, and were disposed to resort to measures less calculated to alienate from us the good disposition of the American government and people. Sorry he was that such reports had no foundation in fact. Sorry he was, that his majesty's government should have persisted in a system, which he had no hesitation in saying, was a direct violation of the laws of nations, a flagrant infringement of the eternal principles of justice. Such is the light in which he had all along considered that system; but when he found it persevered in after the proposal of the American government in August last, he must now, moreover, designate it as an act of egregious folly, the result of the most unexampled ignorance. In August last, America proposed to you to repeal or suspend her embargo, as far as it affected British commerce, if you would rescind your orders in Council as far as they affected the commerce of America. The proposition you have rejected, and by rejecting it, you incur the odium and the blame of being the cause of the embargo and of the continuance of all the evils consequent upon that measure. All that has been argued on this question, and all he had advanced respecting it at different times, it was by no means his intention now to repeat. He should confine himself simply to the statement of two questions, viz. was it just, politic, and wise, to refuse the offer made by America in August last, and thereby prolong the existence of the evils that must arise from the present state of our relations with America? Or is it prudent now to revise that fatal determination, and return to sounder councils, and less hazardous measures?

By the unjust and shameful procedure we had adopted, we put a stop to the neutrality of Europe, we enabled the enemy more effectually to exclude our commerce from the Continent, than perhaps he ever imagined he should be able to effect: but America still remained, and opened to us in another quarter of the globe, a market for all our commodities, a supply of all materials of our industry, from which the enemy, with all his immense power on the Continent of Europe, had no means of debarring us. Yet instead of softening and smoothing down every difference that arose between the two countries, instead of pursuing a policy that must have attached America to our alliance and our interest, we have done every thing to inflame and exasperate her, every thing to estrange her affections, and indispose us towards her interests. Such is the direct tendency of the policy which his majesty's present ministers seem resolved to pursue. How different is it from that which the wisdom of Mr Pitt adopted in 1783, which since that period has been pursued and acted upon, which when he had the honor of being called to his majesty's Councils, he had endeavored to re-establish, by the adjustment of a commercial treaty, founded upon the reciprocal interests of the nations. But now instead of cultivating that connection, instead of fostering that system of reciprocity, it would appear to be now the plan of ministers to alienate America, and force her into the arms of France. If this was impolitic and unwise from the beginning, how much must it be felt so since the offer of America in August last. Respecting the nature of that offer, the strongest misrepresentations have been made. It has been asserted in that house, that in her negociations with France, and with this country, respecting the repeal of the French decrees, and of the orders in council, America had manifested a decided partiality in favor of France. By these assertions, he had himself been entrapped into a belief they were well founded, and in consequence of that conviction, he had made use of expressions respecting men and measures, which he was now most anxious to retract. What could be the motive of the misrepresentations of this matter which was so easily sent abroad, and so industriously propagated, he would not take upon himself to say; but he felt it his duty fully and accurately to inform himself upon the subject, and the result of his enquiries has abundantly satisfied him that the misrepresentation he alluded to, had nothing in the world to warrant them. He should undertake to prove not only that the words of the president of the United States relative to the pending negociations were misinterpreted, but that from irrefragible documents he would demonstrate that there were no grounds whatsoever for the charge of partiality on the part of America towards France, to the prejudice of this country. The Noble Lord then proceeded to read the passage in the speech of the president of the United States to Congress, which relates to the negociations with the two governments, of France and England.

The noble Lord also read the report made by congress in answer to the president's address, and argued, both from the text of the speech and the comment upon it, the report to prove that instead of any partiality towards France, the terms proposed were rather more favorable to England. The tenor of the instructions from the American government to their Ministers at Paris and at London, the noble Lord likewise, refered to as containing still stronger proofs of the impartiality of America, or rather of her inclination to side sooner with England than with France. From all these documents, it appeared, and it was put in still a stronger light in a letter from Mr. Canning to Mr. Pinkney, which however, does not appear among the papers on the table, that America held out nearly the same terms, couched in nearly the same language to both governments.—To France she observed, that if the French government did not repeal their decrees, while England revoked her orders in Council, America must be forced into a contest with France; in other passages of the correspondence, the word "War" was expressly made use of. Indeed not only did a perfect impartiality respecting the government appear to guide the proceedings of America, but a fair and full consideration of them would induce every unprejuiced mind to think, instead of much being offered to France and little to England, the reverse was the case, and that much had been offered to England and little to France.

By listening to the offer in August last, England might have secured two advantages—the repeal of the Embargo, and the next to a certainty, of having America as an ally in the war against France; while France in the first instance, had the offer but of one advantage; these were considerations which he could not too strongly recommend to the serious attention of their Lordships. Let the offer of America in August last, be candidly considered.—Let the advantages of embracing it, and the evils that must result from rejecting it, be maturely weighed. This was the great object he had in view; and to which he must again implore the serious attention of their Lordships. In order to attain that object, he should now move an humble Address to his Majesty, the drift of which was to pray his Majesty would be graciously pleased, while the door for negociation was still open, to adopt such measures as might tend to restore our wonted relations with America, and to re-establish the former footing of our commercial intercourse with that country. The Address moved by the noble Lord was very long, and refers to most of the transactions which have taken place between this Country and America, for the last two years.

Lord Bathurst answered the Noble Mover, and went into a detail of all his arguments; he contended that the Orders in Council arose of necessity from the French Decrees, and said, that so far from their being the cause of the American Embargo, that in fact the Orders in Council were not known in America until the 26th December, and and before that day the Embargo had taken place. He next adverted to the accounts laid on the table, and insisted that they proved we had suffered no diminution in our revenue in consequence of the Non-Importation Act, which was a thing totally distinct from the Embargo; with respect to the want of flaxseed, that the Noble Lord has stated was an irremediable mischief for the linen manufacture of Ireland. It was true that at the present moment it might occasion inconvenience, but that would only be of a temporary pressure, for large quantities were in our own settlements in North America; but at present it was frozen up in the river St. Lawrence, and could not arrive until June, which certainly would be too late for the present sowing season. It was, however, an evil not likely to recur, because, in addition to this supply, large tracts in Ireland were now sown with seed designed purposely for future sowings. It would also appear, by reference in the papers before the House; that although, in consequence of the Embargo, and the ports being shut in the Baltic, that the importations from them had been but small; yet to counterbalance it, we had imported from our own Colony of Canada, more of timber, lumber, and all those articles which we usually obtained from the closer ports, than we had before imported from those States. This, he need not say, was one advantage arising from the Embargo, as it led us to improve our own resources, and rendered us independent. His Lordship then adverted to the justice and expediency of the Orders, and argued, that they were perfectly according to the law of nations, and it was the necessary consequence of the state of warfare, that neutrals must suffer in the enjoyment of their Commerce when their neighbors were engaged in warfare.

Lord Sidmouth defended the legality of the Order of the 7th of January 1806 which related to the coasting trade,, which he said a neutral had no right to carry on for the benefit of one of the belligerents, at the expence of the other. For a neutral could acquire no new rights by the state of war; and that was a trade which in peace he could not pursue. But he insisted that a new æra arose in the question when the Americans offered to rescind their Embargo, with respect to us, and continue it only with respect to France, if we would abandon our Orders in Council, he thought then it became the duty of this country to attempt conciliation, and to that pacific proposition, we ought to assume a suitable disposition to conciliation. He insisted that as it was not done, Ministers had shewn a hostile disposition, and therefore, he concurred in the motion of his hon. friend.

Lord Melville said he should not intrude upon their lordships' time; but he wished to observe, that the question seemed to be wholly misunderstood, both by the noble mover and the noble Viscount (Sidmouth.) The one said that his object was to discuss the entire merits of the case; the other, that he was desirous of submitting to the notice of his majesty, the distrust he felt of the persons at the head of government; the former alluding to the transactions, and the latter to those who were concerned in conducting them. He (lord Melville) should have thought it more manly to have taken a direct course, instead of attempting to pass a vote of censure thus blended, in which the real design was rendered obscure. He resisted this address, because it was an unnecessary interposition of the house, during a negociation now pending with the United States. Other motives he had for opposing the motion of the noble baron, which he would briefly explain: the origin of the orders in council was the edicts of Berlin, which violated all the maritime rights which had been recognized in Europe for centuries. The first proceedings in consequence of those edicts was on the 7th January, 1807, and the nature of it had been misapprehended. The rule of the war in 1756 was supposed to be the effect of the order in council; but if this were all, the order itself would have been unproductive and nugatory; if such were the whole result, it would have been incompetent to encounter the Berlin decrees, which extended not only to France but to all nations dependant upon her authority. The rule of the war of 1756 might merely be considered as a coasting regulation; the orders in council were founded on the just principle of retaliation, and so they were correctly explained in Lord Howick's admirable letter on the subject. He (Lord Melville) had stated that the Berlin edicts were a violation of all maritime and neutral rights. But there were neutral duties as well as neutral rights.—A neutral state should hold the balance even between the belligerent powers; and if this duty were neglected, the neutral rights would be forfeited. Lord Howick properly contemplated these duties; and seeing the preference which must be given to France under the operation of the edict, he properly observed, that he could not rescind the order in council until these edicts were revoked: and he added, as fitly, that under other circumstances, to abandon the order in council would be to resign the best principles of our maritime rights. Why should not these just maxims be regarded. Could the flimsey correspondence between Gen. Armstrong and the French minister, at Paris, vindicate their surrender? It was no wonder that France was mortified and America disappointed; for before the salutary operation of the orders in council, the whole produce of the colonies of the former was conveyed to Europe by the shipping of the latter.

The orders in council had undergone a long and laborious discussion; unless their lordships meant to abandon all that they before respected, they could not now repeal them, unless, admitting the measure to be correct, they had seen so much mischief in the mode of its execution, as to obstruct all its beneficial tendency. But no such objection had been mentioned, and he believed no such existed. It was said, that by the correspondence on the table, between Mr. Pinkney and Mr. Canning, it appeared that if the orders in council were rescinded the Embargo would be withdrawn. Were we, on such a proposal, to desert what was considered so essential to the preservation of our maritime rights? Were we on such an obscure intimation, to resign what we and our predecessors in office deemed to be so important to our highest interests? He was no advocate for prejudicing America. God forbid that he should ever consider that the adversity of America was the prosperity of Great Britain; on the contrary he thought that the prosperity of the one was now, and would be for a long while, conducive to the welfare of the other. If all Asia and Africa and Europe, this kingdom excepted, were with America, and this country against her, it would not be so advantageous a situation for her as if we were with her, and all the rest of of the globe opposed to her, and he hoped she would so far understand her true interests, and shew her correct views of them by her future conduct towards us. Never was there a period more favorable to a close union between Great Britain and the American States than the present (hear! hear!) but this desirable purpose was not to be attained by revoking the orders in council on the feeble grounds now stated. He could not coincide with the noble mover, he could not on this occasion condemn ministers without applying the same condemnation to their lordships, who had deliberately sanctioned the measures represented in this address as unjust and impolitic.

Lord Auckland in reply to the last speaker observed, that the treaty to which he alluded was in point of fact concluded, though not formerly published, before any question arose about the Berlin decree.

The Lord Chancellor took a review of the history of the proceedings which led to the Berlin decree, the orders in council, and the embargo: He insisted that it was evident the whole was meant to destroy us, through the medium of our commerce, being found unassailable in other points.

Lord Erskine condemned the measures of administration, and argued, if we had adopted the offer made by Mr. Pinkney, we should have opened an amicable intercourse with America, and that France must either have recalled her decrees, or have been forced into a state of hostility with America.

Lord Liverpool went through the documents before the house, and argued that the Americans had acted with great partiality. He cited the instructions to the ambassadors in England & France, and agreed it was evident that they wish to aid the latter to pursue every hostile measure against us, provided only, they would relax a little, but from us, they demanded, nothing short of a peremptory recall of our orders. He then adverted to the state of our West-Indies, and said the Embargo had proved what before was never believed, namely that our islands could subsist without any intercourse with America.

Lord Grenville replied at some length.

The question was then put to Lord Greenville's address, upon which the house divided.

Contents present,		21
Non Contents,		51
Proxies,	30—	70
Proxies,	51—	115
Majority,		45

Adjourned at half past 3 o'clock.

For the Star.

MR. SMITH,

Having seen in your paper of the 4th inst. the rejected resolutions of the meeting held at Centreville, on the 18th March—and for fear that wrong impressions may be made on the minds of the people, I will endeavor to give the reasons why they were not adopted.

The gentlemen who offered and supported these resolutions were federalists—they said that they conceived themselves (as republicans) called upon by the notification in the Star, to convene with their fellow-citizens. How they could think so, I know not; for one specified object of the meeting was to "put to flight the enemies of democracy." These words, I think, ought to have and I believe did convince them that the invitation was not intended for any of the federal party. I have heard one of those gentlemen repeatedly say, that he was "a republican, but not a democrat." Could he then think himself called upon?

The author of the call well knew the inveterate hatred of that party to Mr. Jefferson, and that they would not agree to approbate the conduct which will immortalize his memory. I will now advert to the resolutions themselves: Some of them, I must confess are very good, and ought to have been adopted, had they have come from invited members of that meeting, and had they not been substituted by better, reported by the committee. Their 3d resolution went indirectly to criminate the administration of Jefferson. The prelude to their resolutions stated that they were supported by important reasons. This I deny; and to prove they were sophistical, I need only mention that they had not more than eight advocates. I now ask these gentlemen (I mean the federal orators of that day) to point out any cases where our late President deviated from the rules of administration, laid down in Mr. Madison's Speech, which they so highly commend? I challenge them to shew a solitary instance of his departure from them. The gentlemen in their zealous endeavors for the augmentation of their party, have commited themselves—they would wish to damn one president for acting as they wish another to do. What inconsistencies characterize the federal party! What were the views of the federalists in meeting the democrats of that day? They were either to embarrass their proceedings, or to display the oratorial abilities of the triumvirate. Having given what I conceive were the causes of the rejection of the federal resolutions, I beg leave to subjoin a few remarks relative to domestic manufactures.

It may be easily observed, when any proposition is made for the encouragement of these, that there are some persons who appear to be touched in their very vitals, fearing that their beloved mother country's interest may be affected thereby. When they can adduce no reasons why we should not hearken to the advice of the proposer, they throw out some ironical insinuations against him—they term him a "flax-breaker," and the like. This epithet, although intended to convey opprobrium, I glory in. Probably were I in the country where such folks ought to be—a country where ranks and titles, and not merit, are the standards of greatness; and where perhaps these men might attain to the office of butlers to some lord or earl, I might feel something like shame. But thanks to the Supreme Governor of the Universe, I was born in a land of equality.

It is said by some that we can procure from Great Britain, our clothing at less expence than we can manufacture it. One would think that these men's minds were wholly absorbed in the calculation of the rule of "Loss and Gain," and that the real interest, the honor and independence of their country, never once entered their heads. Shall we be so penurious as not to render our country independent, because our first step towards it is a little expensive? I hope not, for it ill becomes freemen.

NORVAL.

Queen-Ann's County, April 10, 1809.

It is one of the distinguishing and characteristick phenomena of the present time, that the most sequestered portions of the earth have been visited by the scourge of war. Places and countries where hostility has been unknown for ages, have been made the scene of carnage, or of desolation. The sands of Egypt and the deserts of Syria; the plains of Apulia and the rocks of Asturias, the mountains of Norway, and the frozen, or abandoned wastes of Lapland; all these, in turn, are visited by Napoleon, either in person or by his delegates. the river Kienci, to the left bank of which the Swedes have now been driven, is nearly in the 66th degree of latitude, and only a few miles from Tornea, at the northern termination of the Gulf of Bothnia. Never have any armies hitherto met on this inhospitable shore, which has suffered sufficiently from the penury of nature, without undergoing the additional miseries of the sword.

London paper.

"The Federal Republican" of yesterday morning with its usual regard for truth, informs; that seamen cannot be had in sufficient numbers to carry on the small portion of commerce permitted; and, intimates, they have sought refuge in foreign nations, instead of applying to the labors of agriculture and the arts, as the republicans have constantly stated. From whence they would infer "that the embargo has not perserved our seamen."

It is fact—that there are more than 3000 seamen now in port waiting for employment.

It is fact—that very lately a large number of man were enlisted in this city for the U. S. service and sent to Washington, &c.

It is fact—that about 400 seamen have sailed from this port since the 15th instant.

It is fact—that scores of them come in from the country every day; and that many return rather than risk their liberty on the ocean.

It is fact—that many prefer ten dollars per month on land, to 30 dollars per month on water in the present state of things.

It is fact—that the wages of seamen are high (about $30) and it is very certain, they ought to be so. Every man's profit should be in proportion to the risks he runs.

It is morally certain—that notwithstanding the risk, as soon as the present high wages are known through the country, that this city will have a great many more seamen than will find employment even at reduced prices.

We say the "embargo has preserved our seamen," and that no man can, with justice, deny it. Hundreds of seamen have various trades; they are at work at these, and cannot in a moment abandon them admitting they felt perfectly free to risk themselves among the harpies of Europe.

Balt. E. Post—March 24.