FROM COBBETT'S POLITICAL REGISTER.

"If I were asked what ought to be done to prevent war with America, I should say:—first repeal the orders in council; but I am far from supposing that that measure alone would be sufficient. Indeed, it seems to me, that the impressment of American seamen must be abandoned."

TO THE PRINCE REGENT,

ON THE DISPUTE WITH AMERICA.

Sir,

During the time that I was imprisoned for two years in Newgate for writing about the flogging of the local militia, in the town of Ely, and about the employment of German troops upon that occasion, I addressed to your Royal Highness several letters, the object of which was, *to prevent this country from being plunged into war with America.* I took great pleasure in offering you advice, which I thought would be beneficial to my country; and, of course, I have experienced great sorrow at seeing that advice has not been followed, and that in consequence of its rejection, we are now actually in a state of war with our brethren across the Atlantic.

Those corrupters and blinders of the people, the hired writers, do yet attempt to make their readers believe, that we are not at war with the Republic of America. They it is, who have hastened, if not actually produced this war; for they it was, who reviled the American President, and who caused it to be believed here, that he and the Congress *dared not go to war.* What pains, alas, have I taken to convince your royal highness of the folly and falsehood of these opinions! Though my mind was busied with the means of raising the thousand pounds to pay TO THE KING, (and which you have received from me in his behalf,) I let slip no occasion to caution you against believing these representations. I told you (and you might as well have believed me) that the *American* people were *something*,—that *they* had a say in the measures of government—that they would not suffer themselves to be plunged into war for the gain of a set of lazy and rapacious fellows; but that if their country's good demanded it, they would go to war; and that such war would, in all probability, be very calamitous.

While I was telling you this, your late minister, Percival, was laughing at the idea of America going to war; and his opinion was upheld by all the venal scribes in the kingdom; that is to say, by nineteen twentieths, perhaps, of those all who write in newspapers, and other political works. That we really *are at war* with America, however, the following document clearly proves. The American Congress declared war in due form; they passed an act making war against your royal sire and his people; their government issued letters of marque and reprisals; but still our hirelings said that there *was no war.* The following proclamation, however, issued by an American General from his head quarters in Canada, which province he has invaded, put the fact of war beyond all doubt:

[Here follows the proclamation of General Hull.]

He, sir, who will not believe in this would not believe though one were to rise from the dead. This is an animating address, and it is, at least, possible that it may prove the forerunner of the fall of Canada, which, when once gone, will never, I believe, return to the English Crown.

The fact of war being now ascertained beyond all doubt, the next thing for us to think of is, the means by which we are to obtain peace with this new and most formidable enemy. The hired writers, unable any longer to keep from their readers the fact that war has taken place, are now affecting to treat the matter *lightly*; to make the people of England believe, that the Americans will be driven out of Canada; that the people of America hate the war; and that, at any rate, the Congress will be obliged to put an end to the war when the intelligence of the repeal of our orders in council shall arrive at the seat of the American government.

These being the assertions now most in vogue and most generally listened to, I will give your royal highness my reasons for disbelieving them. FIRST, as to the probability of the Americans being baffled in their designs upon Canada, if the contest was a contest of *man to man*, upon ground wholly neutral, I should say that the advantage might be on our side; but, I am not sure it would; for, the Americans have given repeated proof of their courage. They are, indeed, known to be as brave as any people in the world. They are too, volunteers, *real* volunteers, in the service they are now upon. The American army does not consist of a set of poor creatures, whom misery and vice have made soldiers, it does not consist of the offcasts and outcasts of the country. It consists of a band of freemen, who understand things, and who are ready to fight for what they understand; & not of a set of half cripples; of creatures that require to be trussed up in order to prevent them from falling to pieces. It is the youth; the strong, the active, the hardy, the sound youth of America whom our army in Canada have to face; and though I do not say, that the latter will be unable to resist them, yet I must say, that I fear they will not, when I consider, that the Americans can with ease pour in a force of *forty or fifty thousand men*, and when I hear it stated, that we have not above 14 or 15,000 men in Canada exclusive of the militia, upon whom I do not know what degree of reliance is to be placed. After all, whoever, the question of success in the invasion of Canada, will, as in the cases of France and Holland, depend wholly upon the people of Canada. If they have reason to fight for their present government, if they be convinced, that a change of government would *make their lot worse*, they will of course, rise and fight against the invaders; & then our commander may safely set Gen. Hull at defiance; but, if the people of Canada should have been inveigled to believe, that a change of government would be for their benefit, I must confess that I should greatly doubt in our power of resistance. It will be quite useless for us to reproach the people of Canada with a want of zeal in defence of their country. We have reproached the Dutch, and the Italians, and the Hanoverians for the like; but, sir, it answers no purpose. Such reproaches do not tend to drive out the invaders; nor do they tend to deter other nations from following the example of the invaded party. What a *whole nation* wills, must, sooner or later, take place.

As to the SECOND assertion, that the people of America hate the war, I must say, that I have seen no proof of such hatred.—The Americans, being a reflecting people and a people resolutely bent upon preserving their freedom, have a *general* hatred of war, as being, generally speaking, hostile to that freedom. But, in the choice of evils, if war should appear the least evil, they will not fail to take it; and, indeed, they *have taken it*; for, in America, it is really the people who declares war; the Congress is the *real* representatives of the people; there are no sham elections; no buyings and sellings of votes and of false oaths; but the members are the unbought, uncorrupted unenslaved agents of the people, and, if they cease to speak the sentiments of those who elect them, they are put out of the Congress at the end of a very few months. It is, therefore, not only false, but stupid, to affect to believe that the war is *unpopular*, and that the *government* is odious to the eyes of the people. The whole of the government is of the people. All its members are chosen by them; and, if it ceased to please them, it would soon cease to exist. Nothing, therefore, can be so absurd as to suppose that a measure so important as that of war has been adopted *against the will of the people.*

This opinion has been attempted to be sustained upon the evidence of a riot at Baltimore, the object of which was the silencing of a newspaper, and the end of which was bloodshed on both sides. But from this fact the exactly contrary conclusion ought to be drawn. The newspaper in question was, it appears, *hostile to the war*; and therefore a riot, in order to silence such a paper, cannot be considered as a proof of *unpopularity* attached to the war. The truth appears to have been, that the editor of the paper was pretty notorious as being bribed to put forth what gave so much offence to the people, who were, upon this particular occasion, unable to imitate the tolerant conduct of their government. It was however very wrong to assail the corrupt tool by force. He should have been left to himself; for tho' this species of attack upon the liberty of the press is far less injurious to that liberty than the base attacks dictated by despotism and masked under the visor of forms dear to freedom, still it is an *attack*; it is answering statements or arguments by violence, by something other than statement and argument.—Therefore, I disapprove of the attack; but I cannot consider it as a mark of the unpopularity of the war, of the precise contrary of which it is indeed no very bad proof.

Much having, in our hired newspapers, been said of this riot; it having been represented as a proof of bad government in America, and (which is more to my present purpose) as a sign of *approaching anarchy*, tending to the overthrow of that government which has declared war against us, I must trespass a little further upon this head, to beg your Royal Highness to believe nothing that the hired men say on the subject. When the war with France in 1793; that war which appears not to promise any end; when that war began, many riots took place in England against those who were opposed to the war; many houses were destroyed; many printing offices demolished; many book sellers were put to flight; many men were totally ruined, and that too by mobs marching and burning and killing under banners on which were inscribed "CHURCH AND KING"—Now, as there was not a general anarchy to follow these things in England, I beg your Royal Highness not to be persuaded to believe that anarchy will follow the demolishing of a printing office in the United States of America, where there are more newspapers than there are in all Europe, this country included. Once more, however, I express my disapprobation, & even my abhorrence of that demolition; which was the less excusable, as the assailants had freedom, *real* freedom of the press, to answer any thing which the bribed printer might publish, and even to publish an account of his bribery. Such, however, appears to have been the popular feeling *in favor of the war*, that no consideration was of sufficient weight to restrain the resentment of the people against a man who was daily declaiming against that measure.

If we conclude, as I think we must, that the people of America were in favor of the war at the time when it was declared, the next thing to be considered is, what effect the intelligence of the repeal of our Orders in Council will have in America. The question is, in short, whether the intelligence will make such a change in the sentiments of the people of America *as to produce peace.*—I think it will not. There are some persons in England who seem to believe that the receipt of that intelligence will at once put an end to the war; for they do not appear to consider any *treaty* necessary to the restoration of peace with America.

Not only must there be a *negociation* and a *treaty* or *convention*, before there can peace, or even a suspension of arms; but, I am of opinion, that no such treaty or convention will be made without more being done by us than *merely the repeal of the Orders in Council*, which removes but a part, & not by any means the greatest part, of the grievances of which the Americans complain. So long ago as the month of February last, as will be seen by my motto, I expressed to your royal highness my opinion, that the mere repeal of the Orders in Council would not satisfy the people of America. It was therefore with no small degree of surprise, that I saw (from the reports in the news papers) that Mr. Brougham *had pledged himself to support the ministers in a war against America, if she should not be satisfied with their measures of repeal.* I was surprised at this, because Mr Brougham must have seen, that she complained of the *impressment of her seamen*, and of divers other things, which she deemed to be injuries. Besides, did Mr Brougham imagine, that our two years, nearly, of refusal to repeal were to go off without any thing done by us in the way of compensation?—The history of the transaction is this: The American President announces in 1810, that unless we repeal our Orders by a certain day, in the same way that France had done, a certain law shall go into force against us. We do not comply; we continue in what he calls a violation of his country's rights for a year and a half after the time appointed for repealing; at the end of that time an enquiry takes place in parliament, and two volumes are published containing evidence of the ruinous consequences *to us* of the measures which America has adopted. *Thereupon* we repeal. But, sir, Mr. Brougham can hardly want to be told that America has made *no promise to be satisfied* with any repeal which should take place *after* her act should go into effect. Indeed she has never made any such promise; nor was it to be supposed that when she saw that her measures of exclusion was ruining us, she would be content with our merely doing that which was calculated to *save ourselves.* This, in fact, is our language to her; we refused to repeal our Orders till we found that the not repealing of them was injurious *to ourselves*, and therefore we now repeal them, and in consequence call upon you *to act as if we had never refused.*

This, sir, is what no nation can be expected to listen to. We do what America deems an injury; we do what she says is sufficient to justify her in declaring war against us. And after a while we desist; but notoriously because proof has been produced that perseverance *is injurious to ourselves* in the meanwhile she declares war to compel us to do that which we have done before we hear of her declaration. And under these circumstances, can we expect her to disarm, until she has obtained something like *indemnification* for the injuries which she alleges she has sustained? If there were in existence no ground of dispute other than that of the Orders in Council, it appears to me, that America could (especially with our parliamentary evidence before her) never think of peace without a *compensation for the vessels seized* illegally, as she says, under the Orders in Council. Otherwise she tells the world, that she may be always injured with impunity; because, the utmost that any nation has to apprehend from her hostility is to be compelled to *cease* to violate her rights. Upon this principle she may be exposed to a like attack the next day after she has made peace. Either, therefore, she complains without cause; or, the mere repeal of our Orders in Council ought not to satisfy her.

Besides, sir, it appears to me, that, even supposing that there were no other ground for the war on her part, than the existence of our orders in council, she is bound, in fairness towards the emperor Napoleon, to obtain some kind of compensation for what she has suffered from the execution of our orders in council after the time that he repealed his decrees. If she make peace with us, and place us upon the same footing with France, without obtaining such compensation, he will assuredly allege partiality against her, since she will have suffered us to continue to do with impunity, for a year and a half, that which she has made him cease to do. It was, therefore, I repeat it, matter of great surprize with me, that Mr. Brougham should have given the pledge above mentioned; though I hope your royal highness will be advised better than to pursue measures that shall put them to the test.

Compensation for the property seized under the orders in council will, I think, be demanded—and if the orders be recognized as a violation of the rights of America, I do not see upon what ground such compensation could be objected to; but, sir, as far as relates to ourselves I trust, that the means of making such compensation would not be demanded of *the people*, but would be taken from those who have received the amount of the property seized. With this, however, America has nothing to do—she can only demand compensation—but she may extend that demand to the amount of her fitting out ships of war, and in sending forth an army. "*Indemnity for the past and security for the future*" is, sir, a phrase not unknown to those who adorn, and have adorned your royal sire's court—and I do not know of any maxim in public law or in diplomacy, that forbids a republic any more than a monarchy to make such a demand. If we do allow that America has just cause of complaint, we do wrong, we act a base and cowardly part, if we desist not from doing that which she complains of.

Upon what ground it is, then, that Mr. Brougham expects an immediate cessation of hostilities on the part of America, I am at a loss to discover. I am at a loss to discover upon what ground it is that he has made his pledge, or at least the pledge which has been attributed to him. Either he must look upon the orders in council as the sole ground of the American declaration of war, or he must suppose there to be other grounds. If he looks upon them as the sole ground, he must, I think, suppose that America will lay down her arms without obtaining indemnity for such heavy losses as those orders have occasioned her—and if he looks upon the declaration as having been partly produced by other subjects of complaint, he must reasonably suppose, that an adjustment as to those grounds of complaint must precede a cessation of hostilities.

Whatever pledges may have been given by any persons, it is for your royal highness to lend an ear to the voice of reason; and, I am greatly deceived, if that voice will not recommend to you an expression, as speedily as possible, of your readiness to cause the officers of the fleet to cease to impress any person out of American ships. This, as I have before had the honour to assure your Royal Highness, is the complaint which has, at last, in reality, produced the war between us and our American brethren. There have been many subjects of difference, many grounds of quarrel, but this is what finds its way to the heart of American people. They would, I verily believe, have endured all but this: this, however, I knew they would not endure, and I told your ministers and the public so long ago. If I am asked, whether I think, that the ceasing to impress people on board the American ships would cause many of our sailors to desert, I answer, that *I do not know*—but, that I do not see *why it should?* I do not see why Englishmen should like the American service better than our own. And really, I must say, sir, that I think, that to entertain any such apprehension squares not well with the tenor of our national songs about the valor and patriotism of our "*tars.*" I think it exceeding humiliating to us to suffer it to be said, or to act as if we said, that we must retain the power of impressment, or personal seizure, on board American ships out at sea, for fear the giving up that power should cause our fleet to be deserted. Sir, I am one of those who love to believe, that English seamen do not want *force* to induce them to fight for their country. It is, in my eyes, a most mortifying thing to proclaim to the world, that we are likely to have a war with America, and that we appear to prefer war with America to the giving up of the means of detecting and seizing English sailors, deserters from the King's service. This so badly comports with all our assertions respecting the *freedom* we enjoy, and also respecting our devotion to our King, and our glorious constitution; for, it appears to me, that if the world believed in *the necessity* of this power of impressment, it must think either that our boastings of our blessed state are untrue, or that our sailors are not the most wise or the most loyal set of men. I am for wiping off the stigma—and without crying or fainting away as Sir Vicary Gibbs is reported to have done at Horsemonger lane—I am for shewing the Yankees and the whole world, that we want no terror, to keep our seamen to their duty—that we are not afraid of their sculking from our fleet to take refuge in American ships—that we entertain not the disgraceful apprehension, that those who have once had the honor to sail under the *royal* flag of the House of Hanover, will ever prefer that of the American or any other *republic.*

Honor, sir, as well as policy, seem to me to dictate the giving up of this power; and, as the giving of it up might, and, as I think, would, cause the restoration of peace between England and America, I will not be persuaded that such a measure does not accord with the wishes of your royal highness.

As to "*the exhausting the resources of America,*" which now begins to be talked of by that most corrupt of newspapers, the TIMES, I do most earnestly beseech your royal highness to bear in mind how long the late PITT promised this deluded nation that he would *exhaust the resources of republican France!* Sir, Mr. Madison, though a very plain dressed, sleek-headed man; tho' he wears neither tails, nor bags, nor big wigs, nor robes; though he dresses in a pepper & salt coat and a nice dimity waistcoat, knows a great deal more of our real situation than I believe many of your ministers know of it; and, I should not wonder if he knew almost as much of it as your Royal Highness's self does. He is a man, sir, who is not to be led by your hireling prints, he sees our gold at above *five pounds an ounce*; he has seen acts passed, which, in effect, force the circulation of our bank notes; and, seeing this, he does not want any body to tell him what is coming; seeing this, he will laugh at the idea of our exhausting the resources of America, the capitol of whose whole debt does not amount to a tenth part of one half years interest upon our debt. This ground of hope is, sir, more visionary than any other.—Indeed, they are equally visionary. There is no hope of any thing but loss and injury to us by a war with America.

I have now done all that I am able to prevent this calamity. If the war proceeds, I shall say as little about it as circumstances will permit. I have lost no occasion of endeavoring to put aside this evil; and when the result of the contest shall be lamented—when those who now rejoice at the idea of doing mischief to freemen, shall be weeping over their folly, I trust that your Royal Highness will have the justice to remember that this war had a decided opponent in your faithful servant,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 15th Sept. 1812.

CONGRESS.

IN SENATE.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19.

The bill further to prolong the continuance of the mint at Philadelphia was read a third time and passed.

The bill supplementary to the acts relative to the military establishment of the United States, reported by Mr. Campbell, of Ten from the Committee of Foreign Affairs, was read the second time.

Friday, November 20.

The bill, supplementary to the acts relative to the military establishment, was further considered and postponed to Monday.

Monday, November 23.

Mr. Tait presented the petition of sundry merchants of Savannah, praying for a remission of penalties incurred by the importation of British goods—twice read and committed.

The bill from the house, respecting the pay of the army, &c. was read and passed to a second reading.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, November 19.

Mr. Williams, from the committee appointed on that part of the President's Message relating to the subject of his report, reported in part a bill concerning the pay of the non-commissioned officers, musicians and privates and others of the army of the U. S. which was twice read and committed.

PRIZE LAW.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Breckenridge in the chair, on the bill in addition to the act concerning prizes and prize goods.

Friday, November 20.

Mr Poindexter reported a bill to compel the territorial judges to reside in their respective districts; which was twice read and committed.

INCREASE OF ARMY PAY.

On motion of Mr. Williams, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Nelson in the chair, on the bill concerning the pay of non-commissioned officers, musicians, privates, and others of the army, and for other purposes.

Saturday, November 21.

Mr Seybert presented a petition of White and Hazard, praying that additional duties may be laid on wire imported into the U. S.—Referred.

Mr Troup presented a petition of sundry merchants of Savannah, praying to be released from penalties incurred by them by late importations on their accounts of British manufactures into the U S—Referred.

Mr Williams reported a bill making provision for an additional number of general officers—Twice read and committed

PAY OF ARMY, &c.

The engrossed bill "concerning the pay of the non commissioned officers, privates, and others of the army, and for other purposes," was read a third time.

A motion was made by Mr Macon to recommit the bill to a committee of the whole for the purpose of amendment.

For recommitment	42
Against it	62

The bill was then passed, after a warm debate—

Ayes	64
Nays	37

And the House adjourned.

Monday, November 23.

Mr. Seaver presented the petition of Associates of the Newton Wire Factory in the state of Massachusetts, praying that additional duties may be laid on wire imported into the United States—Referred to the committee of commerce and manufactures.

Mr. Newton reported a bill to prohibit the use of licenses or passes issued under the authority of any foreign government.—The bill was twice read and committed.

PROPOSED NEW STATE.

On motion of Mr. Poindexter,

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Lewis in the chair, on the bill to authorise the people of Mississippi territory to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of the same into the Union.

Mr Richardson moved to strike out the first section of the bill

This motion was supported by Mr. Pitkin, and opposed by Mr Poindexter.

The motion to strike out the the first section was negatived, ayes 24.

After some amendment to the bill, the committee rose and reported it to the house.

Mr. Pitkin renewed the motion to strike out the first section of the bill; which was negatived by a large majority

The bill was then ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

Legislature of Maryland.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

Wednesday, November 18.

The clerk of the senate delivers a bill annulling the marriage of Jerome Buonaparte King of Westphalia, and Elizabeth Buonaparte, of the City of Baltimore, endorsed, "will pass."

The bill making an uniform provision for the surviving officers and soldiers of the late Maryland line in the revolutionary war, was read the second time and passed.

Mr. Claude delivers a petition from Thomas S. Brewer, of the city of Annapolis, a revolutionary soldier, praying relief. Read. Adjourned.

Thursday, Nov. 19.

Mr. Lecompte delivers a petition from Thomas Colston, of Dorchester county, praying that a law may pass to confirm his title to certain lands therein mentioned. Read and referred.

The bill making an uniform provision for the surviving officers and soldiers of the late Maryland line in the revolutionary war was sent to the Senate.

On motion by Mr. Stonestreet, Ordered, That the bill to repeal all such parts of the acts of Assembly of this state as require the payment of 25 shillings for a marriage license, be made the order of the day for Tuesday the 24th inst.

Mr. Lecompte delivers a petition from sundry inhabitants of Dorchester county, praying that the county courts may be invested with unlimited chancery jurisdiction. Read.

Mr. Hugg delivers a bill to change the place of holding the election in the third election district in Cæcil county & for other purposes. Read.

The Speaker laid before the house the report of the Examiner General, relative to his fees for the last year, which was read and ordered to lie on the table. Adjourned.

Friday, November 20.

Ordered, That the committee of claims place John Seth, esq. a delegate from Talbot county, on the diary, from the commencement of the session.

Mr. Potter delivers a bill for the benefit of Airy, Joshua, Elijah and Shelby Jump, of Caroline county.

Mr. Donaldson delivers a further additional supplement to the act for the relief of sundry insolvent debtors. Read. Adjourned.

Saturday, Nov. 21.

Mr. Sanders delivers a petition from Thomas M. Forman of Cæcil county, praying that a law may pass to confirm his title to certain lands therein mentioned. Read and referred.

Mr. Lecompte delivers a bill for the benefit of Thomas Colston of Dorchester county. Read.

Mr. Stevens a bill annulling the marriage of Robert Offley, and Sarah his wife of Queen-Anne's county. Read. Adjourned.

Monday, Nov. 23.

The bill for the benefit of Airy Jump, Joshua Jump, Elijah Jump and Shelby Jump, of Caroline county, was read the second time, passed, and sent to the senate.

Mr. Sanders delivers a bill to make valid a deed from Thomas W. Caulk to Lambert Veazy for a tract of land called Wheeler's Point, lying in Cæcil county, and to confirm to Thomas Marsh Forman his title to said land. Read.

Mr. Duvall delivers a memorial from Jehu Chandler, claiming a further compensation for his services in printing the Laws and Votes and Proceedings. Mr.