and imprisonments of our seamen;—by haughty, perfidious and contemptuous disregard of our remonstrances and demands of justice;—and, especially that the recent Burnings of our ships on the high seas by an armed squadron, and at a moment too when she promised a pause in her hostilities, and a reparation for her wrongs, reflect disgrace on the Government that countenances, & on the Government that would submit to them, that they call forth but one sentiment in our bosoms,—a *Spirit of Vengeance*;—and that, unless the negociations now pending should speedily eventuate in an honorable adjustment of these aggressions, we trust that our Government will, in due season, mete out the same measure to France, which they are about to mete out to G. Britain.

6th. *Resolved*, That the thanks of this Meeting be tendered to all those Members of Congress who have stood by their Country at this crisis, and are preparing to strike a blow at her enemies.

Resolved, That a copy of these Resolutions, be addressed to the President of the U. States, and to the Speakers of both Houses of Congress.

J's. BARBOUR, Chairman.

WM. MUNFORD, Secretary.

On motions, severally made, the thanks of the Meeting were then presented to the Chairman and Secretary, for the manner in which they had performed the duties of their respective appointments.

Resolved, That a copy of these proceedings be inserted in each of the Newspapers published in the City of Richmond.

J's. BARBOUR, Chairman.
WM. MUNFORD, Secretary.
Richmond, May 30th, 1812.

REPUBLICAN MEETING.

At a meeting of Republican citizens held at the State House, agreeably to public notice on Saturday the 30th May. William Kilty, Esq. was called to the Chair, and John S. Skinner, appointed Secretary.

The purport of the meeting was stated by the Chairman in a short and appropriate address. He observed that the citizens were assembled in order to determine on the expediency of expressing in a public manner their sentiments on the present posture of affairs.

That it was at all times their right to make such an expression and that it became their duty so to do when any important crisis occurred. And that such a crisis appeared then to have arrived.

That it was not considered necessary to enter into a recital of the injuries which we had sustained in our foreign relations, which were unfortunately too well & too generally known.

That they had long occupied the attention of the general government, and that preparation had been made for the state of war, which they were likely to produce, notwithstanding our earnest desire to remain at peace. But that with respect to Great Britain there was reason to believe that every hope of an honorable peace had vanished, and that we had only to choose between war and disgraceful submission.

That without entertaining any doubt of the wisdom or patriotism of the constituted authorities, it was nevertheless proper that the people themselves in the different sections of the States should freely & explicitly declare their opinions.

That this had already been done in the city of Baltimore, and in other parts of the union, and that it was an example proper to be followed.

It was further observed, that if our representatives should be forced to the alternative of war, it was proper they should be assured that the hearts of their constituents were with them, and that they would be supported in every measure and every sacrifice which the honour and safety of the country might demand.

The chairman concluded by expressing his confidence that the Republican citizens who were assembled would on such an occasion and on such a question be united in their sentiments, and in the manner of making them known, and by assuring them of his aid and concurrence.

A committee was then appointed consisting of

J. Stephen, R. Ghiselin, Lewis Duvall, Dennis Claude, N. Brewer, W. H. Marriott and Joseph Sands for the purpose of drafting resolutions expressive of the sentiments of the meeting in regard to the present interesting crisis in our national affairs.

The committee having retired after some time returned & reported the following preamble and resolutions which were read to the meeting by the Secretary and *unanimously* adopted:

WE, a portion of the Republican citizens of Anne Arundel county and the city of Annapolis, assembled for the purpose of taking into consideration the solemn importance of the present crisis of public affairs; feeling with a just indignation the lawless violence and unprovoked outrages which have been committed upon our most sacred rights as a free and independent nation, and believing that those rights can only be protected from further infringement and violation by an immediate and strenuous exertion of the physical force of our country, embrace the present occasion of declaring to our fellow citizens, our oppressors and the world, the deep sense we feel of the monstrous iniquity and cruel injustice which have been practised upon us by the inexorable tyranny and frantic ambition of the government of Great Britain — At the same time it is a duty which we owe to our own feelings to declare in the strongest terms the indignation excited in our bosoms by the conduct of the rulers of France; who, regardless of the principles of national faith and candor, seem to be governed by an exclusive regard to the advancement of their own interests, the gratification of their ambition and the aggrandizement of their fortunes. From both of these belligerent powers we have sustained the most serious injuries; against both we have cause of the most heavy complaints; and accommodation with one, every ray of hope seems to be extinguished; an adjustment of our differences with the other, we trust is not yet impracticable; nor can we forget the broad lines of distinction which mark the conduct of those governments in the nature of the injuries they have inflicted upon us. Both, it is true, have violated the sacred rights of property; but our precious and inestimable rights of *personal liberty and security* have also been trampled upon by the government of Great Britain.— To redress these injuries, and prevent their recurrence, the constituted authorities of our country have resorted to negotiation, and adopted every means consistent with the national dignity and honor: All these efforts to obtain justice and a respect for our rights as a free people, having been hitherto used in vain with the British nation, and the course of those measures, which have been recently adopted by the general government indicating a prospect of war with that power; *Therefore*

Resolved, As the opinion of those here assembled, that the conduct of our constituted authorities, in the management of our foreign relations, and the endeavors they have used to obtain from the belligerent powers justice and indemnity for the past, and security for the future, merit the thanks, confidence and support of the American people.

Resolved, That should it be necessary for the vindication of our rights as a free and independent nation against the injustice and oppression of either of the belligerents, to appeal from the tribunal of reason to the power of the sword, we pledge ourselves to our country in the most solemn and fervent manner, to act as freemen conscious of the value of our rights, and determined to defend them.

Resolved That a copy of the proceedings of this meeting be forwarded by the Chairman to the President of the United States —and that the same be published in the Maryland Republican of this City.

True Copy.
JOHN S. SKINNER, Sec'ry.

MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

I lay before Congress copies of letters which have passed between the Secretary of State and the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Great Britain.

JAMES MADISON.

June 5th, 1812.

CORRESPONDENCE

(ON THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.)

Mr. Foster to Mr. Monroe.

Washington, June 4, 1812.

SIR—Since I had the honor of seeing you at your office yesterday, I have perceived an article in the public prints, stated to be extracted from an English newspaper and purporting to be an official declaration of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, that the orders in council will be and are absolutely revoked from the period when the Berlin and Milan decrees shall, by some authentic act of the French government, publicly promulgated, be expressly and unconditionally repealed. A considerable time has now elapsed since by order of my government I had the honor of urging to you the expediency of procuring such an authentic act from the French government, and in all probability the above declaration may have been issued in the confident expectation that the government of the United States would have been able to produce it ere this.

At all events, sir, considering the important nature of the above mentioned article and the probability that I shall have soon to be the organ of some official communication to the American government in relation to it, I cannot but trust that no measure will meanwhile be adopted by the Congress, which would defeat the endeavor of procuring a complete reconciliation between our two countries.

Should any embarrassments arise in consequence of the declaration on the subject of the proposed revocation of the Orders in Council, above alluded to, resting at present upon a mere statement in the newspapers, it will no doubt occur to your recollection, that on the enactment of those orders a measure was taken by Congress for the purpose of meeting them when they were as yet known but through the public prints.

I have the honor to be, &c &c.
(Signed) AUGS. J. FOSTER.

Mr. Foster to Mr. Monroe.

Washington, June 4th, 1812.

SIR—I must rely upon your candor to feel for the embarrassment into which your note of this day thrown me.

Willing to comply with the request contained in it, I yet cannot but be sensible that in making any portion of a dispatch from his majesty's Secretary of State to me the subject of a correspondence between us, I should not be justified to my own government. I believe there is no example of a correspondence of such a nature, and I should be very loth to establish the precedent.

When I had the honor to make the communication of Lord Castlereagh's dispatch to you, in consequence of its being left to my own discretion to do so, I did it because I had reason to think, from the number of letters which then remained unanswered at your office, such accommodation, if made through a note, might have shared the fate of the rest. You will recollect that it was at your own request that I acceded to the dispatch being communicated to the President; and that it was also at your instance as being the only regular way in which the subject could come before the American government, that I determined to write to you a note founded upon it. You were aware at the latter end of last week, that such was my determination, which I repeated to you through Mr. Graham who called upon me on the 30th ultimo, to ask me when I contemplated sending it to your office. The note must have reached you and been read before any message could have been sent from the executive to Congress.

I cannot, sir, consider my note as liable to the charge of ambiguity which you now impute to it. The abandonment of our most important maritime rights is more extensively than ever connected by France with the demand of a repeal of our orders in council, and while you are entirely silent as to how far America concurs with her on this point of vital interest to Great Britain, without even a prospect of a reply from you to our just complaints, as expressed in my note on the coincidence of the attitude taken by America with the hostile system of France, I cannot but be aware of the difficulties to which I should expose myself in entering into an explanation on any insulated passage in it. I might, perhaps, by continued silence on your part, never afterwards have an opportunity of making further explanation and you are well aware how frequently points taken unconnected with what precedes or follows them are liable to misconstruction.

But, sir, a reason paramount to every other, for my not committing myself to an explanation on any single topic, without the discussion between us were to be continued, is the publication of the highly important declaration of his royal highness, the Prince Regent, to which I had the honor to allude in my note to you of this morning. You will there find stated, in as explicit and authentic a manner as language can convey, the ground upon which his majesty's orders in council will be revoked. I cannot, it is true, as yet, refer you officially to this document, but I may now be in the expectation of receiving it in a formal shape within a very few days, and together with it every explanation possible which you may require.

I have the honor, &c.
(Signed) AUGS. J. FOSTER.

The Hon. James Monroe, &c. &c.

(COPY)

Mr. Monroe to Mr. Foster.

Department of State, June 6, 1812.

SIR—I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 4th instant. The receipt of that of May 30th, has already been acknowledged.

As these letters relate to the same subject, the orders in council, I shall take both into view, in this reply.

I am not disposed to make any unnecessary difficulty, on account of the informality of the document alluded to in the last letter. If the declaration of the Prince Regent was such as to afford the satisfaction desired, it would be received, in any form entitled to credit, with great interest, as a token of just and friendly sentiments in your government towards the United States. But nothing is seen in that act, of the character which you impute to it. Without removing a single objection to the principle on which the orders in council were issued, and have been maintained, it affords a complete justification of the demand heretofore made on your government for their repeal.

The British government has complained, that the United States demanded the repeal of the orders in council on a conditional repeal of the French decrees, although the French condition required nothing of Great Britain which she ought to have consented to; and was, moreover, a condition subsequent, and not precedent; and it now proposes to repeal the orders in council conditionally also, with this difference, that the condition on which their repeal is to be made, is a condition precedent and not subsequent, & is likewise one which G. Britain has no right to claim.

This condition requires that the French decrees shall be absolutely and unconditionally repealed, that is, that they shall be repealed according to explanations given, not only as they related to the United States, but as to all other neutral nations; and also as they prohibited a commerce in British manufactures, with the enemies of Great Britain.

So far as the French decrees violated the neutral commerce of the United States, we had a right to demand a repeal of them. To that extent we did demand their repeal, and obtained it. The repeal was declared by an authentic and formal act of the French government, and communicated to this government, by the Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Paris, and to the British government by their Minister Plenipotentiary at London, and has moreover been officially published within the United States. The authenticity of the repeal was placed beyond all controversy, and the official manner in which it was communicated to your government ought to have been satisfactory to it. A general repeal of the French Decrees in favor of all neutral nations and of such parts of them as prohibited a trade with France and the countries under her control, in British manufactures, the United States have not demanded, because they had no right to demand it.

The United States have required of G. Britain no more than they required of France; namely, that her unlawful edicts should be repealed so far as they related to us. To a compliance with this demand your government has prescribed conditions, the mere recital of which is sufficient to shew their injustice. The United States can never suffer their rights to be violated by Great Britain because the commerce of her enemy is not regulated to suit her interest and policy.

If the Duke of Bassano's report to the Conservative Senate of France, published in a French newspaper, be sufficient evidence that the French decrees are now in force, it is not perceived on what ground the high evidence which has been afforded of their repeal could have been resisted.

It is further made a condition on the proposed repeal, by the declaration of the Prince Regent, that it shall take effect at a future uncertain day; and that the orders in council should be again in force on a contingency of which the British government as to be the sole judge. If this were a ground on which the United States could call upon France to repeal her decrees in case they were still in force as to them, surely the French repeal, to take effect on a future specified day, and whose revival was not provided for on any contingency whatever, was a ground on which their call on Great Britain to repeal her orders in council in respect to the United States, ought not to have been resisted.

In reply to your insinuation, that the demand made on your government to repeal its edicts which violate the neutral rights of the U. S. is made in concert with France, to obtain from G. B. an abandonment of maritime rights, it is sufficient to refer you to documents which have been long before the public, and particularly to the letter of Mr. Pinkney to the Marquis Wellesley of January 14, 1811, protesting in the most pointed manner against looking to any other source for the opinions and principles of the U. S. than to the U. S. themselves. Let me repeat, with respect to the orders in council, that all we demand is, that they cease to violate the neutral rights of the U. S. which they have long violated and still violate on the high seas. Should they be continued to France in any form which may not violate these rights, or as to any other neutral nation to which they may be applicable, it would be for such nation and not for the U. S. to contend against them.

The report of the French minister on which this declaration of your government is founded, affords no proof that the French government intended by it to violate its engagement to the U. S. as to the repeal of the Decrees. It evidently refers to the continental system, by the means relied on to enforce it. The armies of France can be of no avail either in the support or violation of maritime rights. This construction is the more justifiable from the consideration that it is supported by corresponding acts of the French government, continued from the time of the repeal, and by communications to the minister plenipotentiary of the U. S. at Paris to the date of that report.

I beg you, sir, to be assured that it is painful to me to have imposed the least embarrassment on you, by the correspondence on the difference between the tenor of Lord Castlereagh's letter to you, & yours founded on it to me. I continue to persuade myself, however, that you will become sensible, that with a knowledge of the extent given by your government to the conditions on which alone its orders will be repealed, and that this extent, was always contemplated by your government, it was impossible for the President to be inattentive to the fact, or withhold it from the legislative branch of the government; I have to add, that had it been proper for him so to have done, the late hour at which your note was received, not till the noon of the 1st inst. was not in time to be considered in relation to the message sent to Congress on that day.

With great respect and consideration,
I have the honor to be, &c.
(Signed) JAS. MONROE.

(On the subject of Impressed seamen.)

MR. FOSTER TO MONROE.

Washington, June 1, 1812.

SIR—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th ult. in reply to my note of April 15, relating to a seaman who had been encouraged to desert from his majesty's schooner Gleaner, by certain of the inhabitants of the city of Annapolis, and containing an offer, which I shall always be very happy to repeat, of using my best exertions to procure the discharge of such seamen as have been impressed on board his majesty's ships and can be legally claimed by the government of the U. States.

The circumstances which attended the instance mentioned in my former letter of April 5th, when several seamen of the same vessel (the Gleaner) were under the very eyes of their officer, and in a manner exceedingly insulting to his feelings, assailed the endeavors of the same people to engage them to desert, is not adverted to in your letter; but I suppose I am to conclude, from the tenor of it, that no remedy can be applied in such cases by the constituted authorities of the country, which is very much to be regretted, as it leaves the commanders of ships of war who may have despatches to convey on shore in American ports continually exposed to have their boats' crew seduced from them with impunity, and tends to shew, more than ever, the disagreeable necessity under which they are of endeavoring to recover them from on board of the merchant ships in which such seamen afterwards engage themselves.

I do not pretend, sir, to justify the captain of the British ship of war who refused to deliver the American deserter, mentioned in your letter, not knowing the circumstances under which he acted.

It will no doubt however occur to you, that if you could state a single instance where crowds have collected round an American officer on his landing in England, with a view to insult him and entice his men to abandon him, as is too often the practice in the United States such an instance would be more directly in point.

I have now, sir, the honor to lay before you, by order of his royal highness the Prince Regent, the enclosed papers (No 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,) relating to English seamen who have been detained, against their will, on board of certain ships of war of the United States, which have of late visited Great Britain; and to express his royal highness's sincere belief, that these several sources of complaint have originated without the concurrence or participation of a state with which he is so anxious to preserve an amicable intercourse, as well as his conviction that the government of America has only to be informed of the fact to take prompt and satisfactory measures for the correction of the practice.

The American government will perceive, from this friendly communication, that it is not on this side of the water alone that the inconvenience necessarily resulting from the similarity of habits, language and manners, between the inhabitants of the two countries, is productive of subjects of complaint and regret. These are however, at the same time natural and strong inducements for a conformity of interests, and most particularly for a readiness to give and receive mutual explanations upon all subjects of difference.

I have it in charge to repeat to you, sir, for the information of your government, that the government of his royal highness the Prince Regent will continue to give the most positive orders against the detention of American citizens on board his majesty's ships; and that no difficulties, beyond what are requisite for clearly ascertaining the national character of individuals, whose cases are brought before the lords commissioners of the Admiralty, will be interposed to prevent or delay their immediate discharge.

The Earl of Liverpool, while he held the office of his Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs ad interim, was commanded to make known the case of William Bowman, stated by the affidavit of his wife to be forcibly detained on board the U. States' ship Hornet. The departure of this vessel precluded Mr. Russell from making the necessary representation to the commanding officer of the Hornet. As, however, Mr. Russell will have probably stated, the circumstances of the case to this government, I am in hopes there will be no difficulty in obtaining his release.

On the papers enclosed, those marked No. 1. consist of a copy of a letter from Admiral Sir Roger Curtis, commander in chief at Portsmouth, to Mr. Croker, the secretary to the admiralty, enclosing a copy of the deposition upon oath of Charles Davis, an Irishman by birth, who was lately serving on board the U. States' frigate Constitution under the name of Thomas Hollands; and of a letter from Captain Hall, of his Majesty's ship Royal William, to Admiral Sir Roger Curtis, giving on account of the same Charles Davis, & of his escape from the Constitution frigate.

No. 2. contains the copy of a letter from Captain Hall to Sir Roger Curtis, transmitting a statement of the names and descriptions of 28 British seamen on board the Constitution and Wasp.

No. 3. contains a copy of a letter from Sir Roger Curtis to Mr. Croker, stating the real name and birth place of William Smith, who ran away from the U. States' Constitution, and who proves to be a native of England and whose name is John Taylor.

No. 4. contains the copy of another letter from Sir Roger Curtis to Mr. Croker, transmitting the affidavits of George Warren and Daniel Murphy, British seamen who ran away from the Constitution and Hornet; and of the wife of William Bowman, who is alluded to above.

And No. 5. contains the deposition upon oath of John Taylor, mentioned in No. 3.

The correspondence between the Earl of Liverpool and Mr. Russel, on the subject of Bowman, I do not enclose, concluding that Mr. Bussell will have already transmitted copies of it to his government. You will, however, find in No. 4. the statement of the circumstances attending Bowman's forcible detention.

I have the honor to be, &c. &c. &c.
(Signed)
AUG. J. FOSTER.

MR MONROE TO MR. FOSTER.

Department of State, June 8, 1812.

SIR—I have had the honor to receive your letter of June 1st, with the papers enclosed, relating to several British seamen who are stated to have entered into the naval service of the United States.

Without repeating what I had the honor to state to you in a personal interview respecting the deserter from the Gleaner, and the conduct of the armed party from that vessel who pursued him some distance into the country; I shall confine my remarks to your complaint of the detention of British seamen in American vessels, twenty eight of whom are said to be on board the Constitution. Although the fact cannot have been admitted on the evidence produced, because it is contrary to the laws of the U. States, yet it will be enquired into. It is also possible that the seamen so detained, admitting the fact of their detention, may have become legally American citizens, in which case they must be protected as such. The government of the United States can make no distinction between native and naturalized citizens as has been already remarked to you. I repeat also, that your government cannot object to this rule, because a British statute naturalizes, *ipso facto*, all alien seamen who shall have been two years on board a British ship of war, and considers them, equally with natives, within the allegiance, and entitled to the protection of G. Britain.

The principal object of your letter seems to be, to find some analogy between the American practice with respect to seamen and the British practice, and to deduce from the former a justification of the latter. Permit me to note the difference, or rather the contrast between them.

The regulations of the U. S. prohibit the enlistment of aliens into their vessels of war. No such regulations exist on the side of G. Britain.

Enlistments, by force or impressment, are contrary to the laws of the U. States. This mode of procuring crews for public ships is not only practiced by Great Britain within her legal jurisdiction, but is extended to foreign vessels on the high seas, with abuses which aggravate the outrage to the nations to whom the vessels belong.

Most of the states composing our Union have enacted laws providing for the restoration of seamen abandoning the service of merchant vessels, to which they were bound by voluntary engagement. If no provision has been made for the surrender of deserters from public ships, it is because such deserters, although in many instances forced into