BALTIMORE, July 23.

ENGLISH NEWS.

The Ariadne, capt. Leeds, arrived yesterday in 36 days from Liverpool, brings London papers to the 12th of June inclusive, & Liverpool dates to the 15th. The markets at London & Liverpool were flat; prices for flour and wheat continued as per last quotations, with little variation; other American articles wereinthe same state

Trials of some of the ringleaders in the late riots, especially in Lancashire, were going on.

The papers are crowded with parliamentary debates, which are generally uninteresting.

Lord Liverpool is made prime minister, and has organized a cabinet of the devoted disciples of the late Mr. Percival, and of the deadliest foes of America and of Irish catholic emancipation.—Even "my lord" Wellesley & Mr. Canning have been excluded——As friends to toleration and to the happiness of Ireland, we regret that the whigs have not come into power in England; but as Americans, the character of the new cabinet excites in us neither pleasure nor dissatisfaction. We have always been of opinion, that America must *enforce* respect to her rights and her honor from *every* British administration.

We have been favored with the following partial list of American vessels left at Liverpool by the Armata.

Liverpool Packet: Union: Ann; Marcellus; Bainbridge: Maria Penn, for N. York: Aristomenes; Mary and Susan; Eliza Ann: Fanny; Charles: New Galen: Hunter: Euphrates; Tom Hazard: Stranger, for Archangel; Minerva; Anacreon: Rising Sun: Georgiana: Mount Vernon: Indian Hunter, for New Orleans: Cornelia: Phoenix: Aristides: Jane: Recovery: Fame: Evergreen: Honestus: Elixa Barker; Pomona: Magdalen: Northern Liberties: Venus: Monsoon: Perseverance: Constellation: Sarah, for Archangel: St. Lawrence: Geelet: Wm. and Martha, for Amelia: Belvidere, for Archangel: Richmond: James Wells: Chas. for New York: Franklin: Neptune: Ossian: Washington: Argo: Rover: Good Intent: Superior: Rubicon: Lady Madison: Packet: Merchant: Advance: John Adams: Cannon: Almira: John.

House of Lords were occupied on the 10th June in examining witnesses on the subject of the orders in council.

An alarming fire broke out [charged to incendiaries] in the Rope House, at the Dock Yard in Plymouth. 400 feet only of the building, which was 1400 feet long was saved by great exertions—the machinery most destroyed—damage estimated at more than $100,000—The Packet from New York with May mail had arrived.

The King's health mental and bodily, remained the same. His birth day [71 years old] was privately celebrated by the Royal Family at Windsor.

The loan was to be 22 millions; bidding to be on the 10th June.

No actual engagement between the French and Russian armies; but advancing.

LONDON, June 11.

NEW CABINET.

Earl of Liverpool, first Lord of the Treasury; Mr. Vansittart, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Eldon, Lord Chancellor; Earl Hartrowby, President of the Council; Lord Castlereagh, Secretary of State (foreign); Sidmouth, Home Secretary; Bathurst, Secretary of War; Lord Melville, Admiralty; Earl Westmoreland, Privy Seal; Lord Buckinghamshire, Board of Controul, Lord Mulgrave, Ordnance.

Corn Exchange, June 12.——Supplies of Wheat inconsiderable—Wheat fine, 140 a 144s.—Flour fine, 110 a 115s.

LONDON, June 9.

From a French Gentleman who has arrived, we received yesterday the following instrument, dictated in the accustomed spirit of Bonaparte on the eve of a new war. It is we understand, published from the French head quarters in Prussia. *Morn. Chron.*

PROCLAMATION.

FRENCHMEN!—I am again called upon to wage war with the north.

SOLDIERS!—I myself will lead you against the Russians.

In the commencement of July, I shall be present in St. Petersburg, and I will mark out to the Emperor Alexander the fit boundary of his dominions.

Poland shall be the future barrier, to place it beyond the power of the cabinet of St. Petersburg again to ruin it.

NAPOLEON.

June 10.

Royal Exchange, Wednesday night.

INTELLIGENCE FROM THE BALTIC.

The Orion's convoy has got safe through the Belt. Letters continue to mention the opening of the Russian ports. The Russians are said, on good authority, to be at Memel, and the French at Pillau. The French occupy all the forts of Prussia they are in possession also of the sea ports, with a view to facilitate the entry of grain. About 150 vessels from Pillau, &c. had entered Riga for grain, the exportation of which is prohibited by the Russian government: the same prohibition is enforced in Prussia also.

June 12.

Prices of Stocks this day at one—3 per ct. red 58 3 4 8 8 12; 4 per ct. 72 2 3 3 4; Exch. bill [3d ¼] ½ dis; Consols for act. 59 3 8.

Viscount Sidmouth was yesterday sworn in at the Privy Council Secretary of State for the Home Department, in the room of Mr. Ryder.

Earl Bathurst was sworn in the Secretary of State for the War and Col. Department, in the room of the Earl of Liverpool. The noble viscount and earl received the seals of office accordingly. Earl Hartrowby was introduced and conducted to the Presidency of the Council, in room of Viscount Sidmouth.

Courier.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 11.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Mr. Rose gave notice, that he should move, to-morrow, that the house do, on Monday next, take into consideration the evidence relating to the Orders in Council.

Mr. Brougham supposed that the right hon. gentleman was not aware of his notice which stood for Tuesday next.

Mr. Rose was perfectly aware of that notice, and wished to take the sense of the house on the propriety of it.

THE ADMINISTRATION.

General Gascoigne wished to ask the Noble Lord Castlereagh, if the Administration about to be formed was in such a state of forwardness as to preclude the necessity of the motion of which he had given notice?

Lord Castlereagh said, all the offices of Government were certainly not yet filled up; but they were expected to be filled up without further delay. The War and Home Departments were placed under Earl Bathurst & Viscount Sidmouth—(Hear, Hear!)

Gen. Gascoigne, then withdrew his notice.

ADDRESS.

To the Prince Regent on the New Administration.

Mr. Wortley, from the transactions of the last 3 weeks had been induced to move an address to the Prince Regent. He wished to express the sense of Parliament, that the government formed since Mr. Perceval's death was such as could not expect to possess the confidence of the House and of the nation.—The negociation with Lords Grey and Grenville had, as it ought to come to nothing, Mr. W. then moved, "That an humble address be presented to the P. R. thanking H. R. Highness for his gracious answer to the address of the House of Commons; and lamenting that his endeavours to form an administration on an extended basis had failed: but hoping that H. R. H. would avail himself of an opportunity which might occur of giving additional strength to his government."

Lord *Milton* moved to amend the resolution, "imploring the Prince Regent "no longer to defer forming such an administration as would be at once entitled to the support of Parliament and the country."

For the amendment,	164
Against it,	289
Maj. in favor of Ministers,	125

Mr. Wortley's motion was then negatived, and the House adjourned at half past three in the morning

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER

No. I.

The declaration of war against G B has been received by the people of the U. S. in a way in the highest degree reputable to them. They have generally felt as a free people ought to feel, the solemnity of the act. The unrivalled prosperity which they have so long enjoyed; their good will to all mankind and consequent indisposition to find an enemy where they looked for a friend; the bold consciousness of their rights, with their indignant endurance of injuries and insults, have all conspired to impress them with feelings very different from those that in most other modern nations springs up at the dictation of men who have no sympathy with the public welfare. Hence War with England has been received by the people with the same spirit in which it was declared by their representatives. We perceive in neither the dominion of revenue ambition or avarice. On the contrary our admiration is equally excited by the cool decision of public councils and the dispassionate award of public opinion. With both, the necessity from which it flowed is felt as its only justification.

It is not my purpose to illustrate or insist on this necessity. It is enough for me that I feel it myself, that it is felt by a vast majority of my fellow citizens, especially by those who are systematically and on principle the most pacific; and that the measure is actually adopted by the legitimate organs of the Constitution.

Whatever diversity of opinion may have existed before the final step was taken, is now superseded by other and higher considerations. The period of deliberation is past; action must follow. The long war of words is at length brought to a close, and conduct must henceforth be the test of motives.

Paradoxical as the remark may at first sight seem, the only rational object of war is peace. The fact is that an honest government never *goes to war*. It only follows, and that from an imperious necessity in the course pursued by its enemy. The wrongs which it receives; the violences perpetrated or threatened, are substantially, the commencement of the war; and it is to chastise their authors and prevent their repetition, that it reluctantly unsheathes the sword, the sole remaining instrument for restoring peace, which in other words consists in a recognition and observance of its rights of sovereignty. With regard to ourselves, it follows, that, although we have been the first to *declare* war, Great Britain was the first to *wage* it.

Peace, then, is still, as it ever has been, and as I trust it ever will be, our object.—Degenerate and lost will be our lot, whenever it shall cease to be our polar star.

The great question is, how to obtain peace; not that ignominious state of submission, falsely so called, which consists in the tame endurance of continually and wrong, but that substantial state of security that guarantees to industry its honest pursuits and the fruits of its labor.

I answer that peace is to be regained by vigor, by united exertions, by personal sacrifices, by the faithful observance of the laws of the land, by the rigid punishment of their infractions, by the display of a spirit that can look danger in the face without being appalled.

We have a government wisely organized and ably administered. We have a right to look to our rulers for sound laws, and for their faithful execution. But it ought not to be concealed, that in a period of war, to a free people, the vigor of public opinion is invaluable. It is the proud distinction of such a people to be governed eventually by public opinion alone. They have given existence to their government; they have selected their rulers; it is their interests which are to be protected, their rights which are to be secured, their honor which is to be maintained This sentiment is the *primum mobile* of the whole political machine Under such a government every man is in the constant possession of, and should in critical periods be in the habitual exercise of a portion of the national sovereignty: Not a year elapses without his being called upon to select a fit agent for the discharge of high political trusts, and not a day that does not call upon him to aid by his voice or his arm in giving effect to the measures adopted by those that are placed at the head of affairs.

A war with a foreign nation should put down for the time all minor interests. Not that we should sacrifice our independence of opinion; but we should manifest our difference of opinion with temper We should act, as we are, like a band of brothers In every thing that regards the common enemy there should be an indivisibility in our actions. In a nation where the interests are common, where there is no monopoly of power or wealth, a great majority of the people must, politically speaking, be virtuous, and there is no danger of their want of union and acting together. But this is not enough; the vicious, and such there are in the best communities, must learn the duty of co operation; Callous to honorable feeling, they must learn, that as they are integral parts of the physical strength of the nation, it is impossible for them to be permitted, in the trial of that strength with a foreign foe, to remain either idle or treacherous spectators. This instruction must reach them through the medium of public opinion. When the liberties of a nation are at stake neutrality is treason, and public opinion discharges its honest function when it covers with contempt the wretch that refuses to share common dangers and privations. What! when the best blood of the country is prodigally lavished when the best tallents are actively engaged in arduous and toilsome services, when the charms of retirement and the order of business are sacrificed to active and perilous duties, shall the worthless part of the community be not only suffered to enjoy the fruits of these complicated labors and losses, but likewise to disseminate falsehood among the people, to traduce virtue and to paralize action?—Such depravity must have its antidote—not in the laws, except in extreme cases, but in public opinion. I would not, with Solon, make it a capital offence to be neutral, but I think it the indisputable right of every community, a right too which ought to be exercised in momentous periods, to brand with contempt the man who, instead of obeying the call of his country, is steadily pursuing his own grovelling interests. Let such a being be permitted to speak and act as he pleases, provided he keeps himself within the pale of the law. He has a political right to do so. But let him recollect that the same right belongs to his fellow men, and that they may, and I trust in God will, point to him that finger of scorn which will sink him below the level of the brutes that surround him.

No, sir, the interests, the rights, the honor of a nation are not to be sported with. For their unrighteous violation, tyrants have been hurled from their thrones; and for their abject disregard, in trying times, degenerate citizens may be made to feel the insignificance, to say no more, which cannot fail to be the lot of any one whom public sentiment overwhelms with a just indignation.

CATO.

FROM A LONDON PAPER.

MOST DREADFUL CATASTROPHE.

Newcastle upon Tyne, May 26.

Yesterday, one of the most terrible accidents on record, in the history of collieries, took place at Falling near Gates——Branding Esq. the member for this place, which was the admiration of the district for the excellence of its ventilation & arrangements. Nearly the whole of the men were below, the second set having gone down before the first came up, when a double blast of hydrogen gas took place and set the mine on fire, forcing up such a volumn of smoke as darkened the air to a considerable distance, and scattered the immense quality of small coal from the upper shaft. In the calamity ninety men and boys perished, the remains of eighty six of whom are still in the mine, which continues unapproachable. Meetings are to be called at Newcastle and the neighbourhood to raise subscriptions for the widows and orphans of the sufferers.

The Madrass Journals mention, that one of the largest tygers ever seen in that part of the world was killed at Sankerry Droog, by capt. Moore and lients. Birch and Nelthorpe. In the course of a few months it had destroyed an hundred head of cattle, &c. besides four children—Sixteen balls were lodged in its body before it fell; it measured from head to tail 15 feet, and was 43 inches in height.

Mr. James Major, a great manufacturer from Manchester, in England, has arrived at Boston, with his family, in the brig Thomas, from Liverpool.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

REVIEW

OF AN ADDRESS of George Sullivan, Martin Chittenden, A. Bigelow, Elijah Brigham, Wm. Ely, Josiah Quincy, Wm. Reed, Samuel Taggart, Laban Wheaton, Leonard White, Rickard Jackson, jun. Elisha R. Potter, Epaphroditus Champion, John Davenport, jun. Lyman Law, Jona. O. Mosely, Timothy Pitkin, jun. Lewis B Sturges, Benjamin Tallmadge, H. Bleeker, James Emott, Asa Fitch, Thos. R. Gold, James Milnor, H. M. Ridgely, C. Goldsborough, P. B. Key, P. Stuart, John Baker, James Brackenridge, Jos. Lewis, jun. Thos. Wilson, A. M'Bryde, and Joseph Pearson, members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to their constituents, on the subject of the war with Great Britain. Pp. 35. Alexandria, printed by S. Snowden, 1812.

BY A REPUBLICAN.

A man who would carefully observe the political practices of parties in the United States, could not doubt but that the *people* are *sovereign*. Every thing proves it. They are every where cajoled, flattered; and attempts are continually made to bias their understandings. Such is the fate of *all sovereigns*. Whatever is the source of power and honors of wealth and rank in a state, is assailed by factions, who struggle for precedence; and just in proportion to their want of true merit, they invent artifices to delude the nation or blind the King.

It is this pursuit of power which has urged the gentlemen of the federal party in Congress to utter a pamphlet of thirty-five pages from a press at Alexandria, and to disseminate it, with unexampled profusion among the good citizens of the United States. They call it an address to their constituents, and it professes to embody the *reasons* of the federal party in Congress against the present war between the United States and Great Britain.

In the true spirit of imposture, the pamphlet begins with certain naked propositions, unsupported by argument & partly unfounded in truth. Such, for example, is the very first sentence of the address. "A republic has for its basis the capacity and the right of the people to govern themselves." Thus the gentlemen set out; and, for an occasion so solemn, the remark is altogether frivolous. As to the *right* of the people, in any country, to govern themselves, it is certainly indisputable; and it is quite as certain that in all sorts of governments they *do* rule; either in a form of simple, unarmed majority; or in the more formidable shape of an armed and disciplined minority. The remark, therefore, in this respect, means nothing; and it means, if that were possible, less when we come to the point of *capacity*, if by capacity be meant an universal sense in the community of what is right and proper to be done in affairs of government; for if that capacity universally existed, there would be no *parties* in the country. Every one knowing the *right* from the *wrong*, there would be no room for the misrepresentations of demagogues; and so parties would cease of necessity.

The true basis of a republic, is the *happiness* of the people. The general capacity of the people is fully competent to appreciate their happiness; and it is this capacity of appreciating their happiness that constitutes them the sovereign judges of rulers in a government instituted solely for popular benefit. Here lies the true cause of responsibility on the part of their representatives; who in doing any thing contrary to the people's happiness, are made to answer for it. In this, and in nothing else, we see the saving principle of free government It is founded in human nature. The citizen who cannot accurately *reason* about political rights can easily *feel* political wrongs; and he approves or condemns measures according to that feeling; which, in an honest individual, is never deceptive.

It is, therefore, obvious, that the *happiness* of the people being the real basis of a republican form of government, the representatives of the people are responsible only for such acts of theirs as infringe that happiness: and unless the federal gentlemen can demonstrate that the abridgment of the right of speech in representatives renders the people unhappy, they will go but a little way to prove that the restraining their tongues from too great a licence, is contrary to the fundamental principle of a republic. The question which they broach, is not one at all affecting the rights of the citizens; but a mere question whether a representative shall be allowed to talk at all times, sense or nonsense, at his mere will and pleasure?

The right of speech is nothing in itself; it is the proper *use*, or the *abuse* of it, that makes it valuable or otherwise. What do the fine prosopopeias, the swelling bombast of a partizan orator, signify to the happiness of the people? Too much speech is as pernicious as too little. If the circle of felicity in the bosom of the community is not circumscribed, where is the evil?

But, then, this pamphlet tells us, that "on the momentous question of war with Great Britain the right of public debate, in the face of the world, and especially of their constituents, has been denied to the representatives." Here it is admitted that the *right of debate* was not precluded; but that only, it was not permitted "*in the face of the world*, and especially of constituents." And because they could not talk in the *face of the world*, the federal gentlemen would not talk at all Now, when we consider that all congressional argument, to be *effective*, must operate to the conviction of the representative body alone, it would seem that a debate with closed doors would be the most desirable of all things for a good logician: because, in that case, he would have the members by themselves, and might instil into them the persuasive deductions of his reasoning. If, therefore, the federal gentlemen did not like this closed door opportunity of debate, it shews that their object was not to convince the understandings of the representatives of the people, and thereby prevent the war, but that their desire was to influence the passions of the people themselves. There was no hindrance to debate when the doors were shut; but the federalists themselves "*declined discussion*." This admission is fatal to their argument.

At page 4, of this federal address, will be found the following confession: "The intention to wage war and invade Canada, had been long since *openly* avowed. The object of hostile menace had been *ostentatiously* announced." The reader is desired to mark this passage, and to impress it on his mind that the federalists acknowledge the determination to go to war had been, for a long time, announced; *openly* avowed by the majority. Indeed, every body must remember the fact; for the avowal was treated with much ridicule by the opposition both in and out of Congress. Well, then; the resolution to go to war with Great Britain was avowed; the federalists admit that it had been, *long before the secret part of the session*, avowed *openly* and *ostentatiously*: yet what did these same federalists do when that avowal was made? The doors were then open; they might have spoken in the face of the world and of their constituents at that time. Did they do so? No! They were *dumb*. It was their marked policy to be *silent*.—The truth of this is notorious. At Washington, when the doors of Congress *were* open, when the question of war was fully announced, when the Committee of Foreign Relations made their report in part, when every measure proposed on the side of the majority *inevitably* led to war; what was the conduct of these federal addressers then? Why—let them blush! if they can—they were caricaturing a legislator that stood up for the country; they were giving countenance to two or three caricaturists at Washington, who were employed to depict Mr. Porter on the back of a terrapin! This was the occupation of *honorable* men, when the doors of Congress *were* open—yes, *open*, in the face of the world, in the face of their constituents, and when the subject of war was stated "as for *debate*" The republicans *invited* discussion: *they* spoke on the topic; & spoke so much, without being answered by the opposition, that a republican member (I think it was Mr. Bibb, of Georgia,) threatened to call the *previous question* on his own political friends, if they did not decline further speaking, seeing that the federal representatives had decided not to speak at all. Thus, the federal gentlemen not only "declined discussion" when the doors were shut; but they "declined discussion" when the doors were open.

When the question of war came up—*not* for *discussion*, but for *decision*—these very same men, who had *waived* the right of debate at the proper period of the session—these very same men, who, for at least *six months*, had a fair opportunity to speak to the subject, complained of *tyranny* because, when the moment to *act* had arrived, that moment to which the majority had uniformly pointed from the commencement of the session, the opposition were not allowed to waste in idle debate the precious time of Congress; and array, by inflammatory harrangues, a party *out of doors*, against the constituted authorities!

And what greater occasion was there for discussion at last than at first. None.—The addressers (at page 4) confess that "*no one reason for war was intimated, but such as was of a nature public and notorious.*"—If all the reasons for war were notorious before the doors of Congress were shut, and the federal members refused to discuss the question then, with what face can they conjure up a necessity for subsequent debate, and cry out *danger to freedom!* from a temporary secret session? Why, if they would not speak when the subject was open for *discussion*, did they think it tyrannical to close the doors upon them when the question was proposed for *decision*?

Yet, in fact, there was no infringement of the right of debate. The pamphlet does not say there was. It concedes that the federal gentlemen *might* have spoken on the subject of war both in open and secret session. They complain then, of their own negligence. If men will not speak when doors are open and will not speak when they are shut, what propriety is there in a complaint of closed doors?

In one thing I have perfectly agreed with the addressers: But I must refer to it again: It is "the *responsibility* of the representatives to their constituents." In this is to be found the justification of the majority. They were responsible to the nation for their acts: they were responsible, as well for what they did themselves, as for what they *suffered* the *minority* to do. If, then, a minority manifested a disposition to trifle with the rights, and honor, and interests of the country; if the minority, at a critical period, demonstrated an intention to adhere to no system for public benefit but contemned and burlesqued every thing that was done or attempted to be done; if the same minority, like a spoiled child, grew only worse by indulgence; were the majority to give way to such a temper? Were they to yield to the whims, and the caprices, and the absurdities, of that minority? Did not the responsibility of the majority render it necessary for them, at the moment they were proceeding to action against an enemy, to cut all frivolous altercation short, and at the peril of their responsibility go on to the consummation of the great object they had in view?

It is worthy of remark, with what special *tenderness*, (at pages 5 and 6) the addressers touch upon subjects of the very first importance. I allude to the restrictions upon commerce & to the mission of John Henry. With regard to the first, if any thing can prove a fervent devotion to peace, it is the embargo and non-importation laws. Those were acts, operating on the *feelings* of our enemies through their *interest*, and they were resorted to, in the first instance, to avoid an appeal to arms. The history of the restrictive policy of the administration demonstrably shews, that, had it not been for the systematic opposition of the federal party (with a few honest exceptions) in & out of Congress, that system must have brought our enemies to our own terms. Whoever will take the trouble to recollect the immense prices to which flour was raised in the West Indies and in Europe, the tax that we thereby [illegible]