FEDERAL GAZETTE,
AND
BALTIMORE DAILY ADVERTISER.

APRIL 4, 1808.

PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY J. HEWES,
Opposite the Post-office, St Paul's lane, Baltimore

Daily paper $7, *Country paper* $5 *a year.*
All advertisements appear in both papers.

☞ SUPPOSED OFFICIAL.

From the National Intelligencer.

Some of the federal prints have already commenced an attack on the administration for the ground taken in the case of the Chesapeake. As it is impossible to foresee the consequences to which the suspension of the negociations may lead, it is very desirable that the public should fully understand the merits of this case.

Of the enormity of the outrage it is unnecessary to say any thing. The voice of America, the award of the world, that even of England herself has determined its character. On all hands it is admitted, that, if equalled, it has never been surpassed by any aggression committed on an independent nation, and that consequently the repa ration such a nation has a right to claim ought to be neither nominal nor trivial.

At the commission of this outrage there was throughout the United States one burst of indignation, one call for vengeance. Men of all parties denounced it as an act that called for an exertion of the full energies of the government. Meetings of the most respectable citizens were held in every part of the nation, which called upon the executive to exert these energies, pledging their lives and fortunes to support the measures which he should pursue. The ordinary distinctions of parties were lost and national feeling was unchecked The lightening of its vengeance was ready to fall wherever the government directed it.

The president convened his cabinet, the members of which were in some measure dispersed; they *deliberated* on the momentous object confided to them, with calmness, and without precipitation. Impatient as the nation was for their measures, they regarded their trust too deeply to take them before they had passed the ordeal of a mature judgment.

These counsels issued in the promulgation of the proclamation. Is there any man among us who forgets the feelings with which that proclamation was received? The republican part of the community, confiding in the wisdom and integrity of the executive, declared themselves satisfied with it, although many of them viewed it as much below what the case required; the federal part of the community were the loudest in its praise. Its wisdom, its forbearance, its moderation, its dignity, its calmness, surpassed their expectations, and even gratified their wishes. A solitary and disregarded murmur ran among the Essex junto, for which they were denounced by the federalists of the south.

This proclamation expressly declares the interdiction of our ports to British armed vessels to have been taken in consequence of the *numerous* outrages, *concluding* with the attack on the Chesapeake committed on our rights as a neutral and independent nation.

"Hospitality, it says, under such circumstances, ceases to be a duty; and a continuance of it, with such uncontroulable abuses, would tend only by multiplying injuries and irritations, to bring on a rupture between the two nations. This extreme resort is equally opposed to the interests of both, as it is to assurances of the most friendly dispositions on the part of the British government, in the midst of which this outrage has been committed. In this light the subject cannot but present itself to that government, and strengthen the motives to an *honorable reparation* of the wrong which has been done, and to that *effectual controul* of its naval commanders *which alone can justify the government of the United States in the exercise of those hospitalities it is now constrained to discontinue.*"

"No sooner was this instrument, going to provide, as far as the executive could provide, for the preservation of peace among ourselves, issued, than *honorable reparation*, and an *effectual controul* of her naval commanders were demanded of Great Britain. It was thought by our government that the former object was likely to be more successfully effected by its union with the latter, than by its standing alone. The reasons for this opinion are to be seen in Mr. Madison's able paper to Mr. Monroe. They are such as ought to have prevailed with the British government, and such as might have prevailed but for the secret purpose entertained, it is to be feared, by that government, to refuse, under some pretext or other, the honorable pretext claimed. Before the instructions of the government reached Mr. Monroe, he had, with commendable promptitude, remonstrated to Mr. Canning on this outrage. Mr. Canning declared it to be unauthorised, and professed his readiness to treat on the subject of reparation. Mr. Monroe, a short time after, received instructions not to separate the subject of the Chesapeake from the general subject of impressments. Mr. Canning required their separation. In consequence of this disagreement, the British government resolved on a special mission, and Mr. Rose was sent to this country.

On the eve of his departure, an order of council was issued disclaiming the right of search of national ships, but coupled with the assertion of rights relative to seamen born in Britain, and found on board of neutral private vessels, previously unasserted by Britain herself, unknown to the other nations of Europe, and constantly and strenuously resisted by us.

Mr. Rose left England either the end of October or the beginning of November, about which time were issued the celebrated orders which, with the French decrees, compelled us to adopt the severe measure of an embargo on our ships and goods. These orders bear date 11th day of November, & must have been determined upon some time before. Of them Mr. Rose and our ministers were studiously kept ignorant. These orders our government had a right to consider as cause of war. In this light we find them viewed by the ablest statesmen in England, who, to this conviction have added their belief that America would never submit to them.

Thus atood the relations between the two nations on Mr. Rose's arrival in this country. The British government had *nominally disavowed* the outrage, unmixed with any act of reparation, nearly at the same time that they had issued a succession of orders exposing our seamen to greater vexations and oppressions then they had ever before experienced, and our commerce to total annihilation.

Under this state of things our government might (as we believe the British government would, had it been placed in our situation) have demanded the revocation of the obnoxious parts of these orders before it received Mr. Rose. It might have said, what subsequent events but too strongly justify, at the very moment when you are professing a disposition to redress a particular wrong and avowing your readiness to arrange the terms, you have inflicted wrongs of a more general and hostile character.—Can we confide in the sincerity of a government that at the very instant that it disavows one outrage commits another of a deeper dye. But our government, anxious to preserve the peace of the country, and above all solicitous that we should have undisputed justice on our side, in case of an appeal to force, opposed no such obstacles to the offer of Britain. It took her professions in the fullest latitude in which they were made; and without hesitation received Mr. Rose with every demonstration of respect and attention.

We shall pass over the unpleasant altercations at Norfolk, which detained Mr. Rose near a fortnight, with the single remark that they manifested any thing else than an anxious desire to restore the amicable relations of the two countries. Mr. Rose at length reached Washington; his *first requisition* was that the affair of the Chesapeake should be separated from all other subjects. The reader is desired to mark this. His *first* demand was, not that the proclamation should be revoked before the negociation was entered upon; but that the subjects should be treated separately. Why was this made the *first* step, when it was intended also, if this were conceded, to take the other? Consistency would have dictated a different arrangement. The question, whether the affair of the Chesapeake should be distinctly considered, was of itself a subject of discussion appurtenant to & forming a part of the negociation, and ought therefore, to have followed, instead of preceding, the demand for the revocation of the proclamation; for if the president had refused to revoke his proclamation, according to Mr. Rose's instructions there was an end to the business. But the true cause of this transposition was the ground already taken by our government, the instruction given to Mr. Monroe not to separate the subjects, but to insist upon security for the future, as well as redress for the past. It comported with the feelings and views of the British administration to present the shew of amity and reparation. So far they were willing to go, and hence the embassy of Mr. Rose. But were they willing to do more? Were they ready to make honorable reparation? We will not affirm that they were not; but surely if it was their secret purpose not to make such reparation, they could not have pursued a course more likely to answer their end. There must have been on their minds the impression at least of probability that our government, in a case of such manifest injustice, would adhere to the ground it had taken more espccially under the feeling which could not but be excited by the more recent and more extensive outrage committed on our neutral rights, and would consequently reject the demand for a separation of the subjects. What right had Britain to demand any such separation? The right might have belonged to us to insist upon it as we were the agrieved party. We might have said if we pleased, this is a transaction in itself of snch magnitude, it has so deeply wounded the sensibility of our citizens, and cast so dark a reproach upon our national character, that we are compelled to demand instantaneous disavowal and reparation before we will proceed in the adjustment of that long catalogue of injuries which you have done us. But what right has Britain to insist upon such a course? It was our honor, not hers, our rights, not hers, that were wounded and violated. The demand, therefore, if made at all, should have come from us not her; and if we preferred a settlement of all subsisting differences, in which the affair of the Chesapeake should be merged, although connected with the same delay, to the instant reparation of a solitary wrong, what reason had she for complaint? She had none.—She could have none; for if her nice sensibility to honor prompted her to the immediate pursuit of means, calculated to wipe away the indelible stain fixed upon her character by the outrage upon the Chesapeake, she might have proceeded formally to disavow it; she might have punished those who committed it; she might have delivered up the men taken from the Chesapeake; without any consulation or negociation with our government: The moral obligation to make this atonement could be neither increased by the demand to make it; or impaired by an omission to make it. It is impossible, therefore to perceive in this first requisition any thing like a solicitude to pave the way towards making the honorable reparation due to this country.

Notwithstanding, however, these indications of an intention on the part of the British government only to *profess* but not to *make* reparation, the magnanimity, and moderation of our government, anxiously regarding the great end to be accomplished, and desirous to do every thing towards its accomplishment not inconsistant with its honor, at once apparently without a murmur, agree to separate the subjects. By thus abandoning that ground which it had deliberately taken, and which it had a right to maintain, it manifested a disposition forbearing and friendly, ready to make every sacrifice, even the pride of opinion, and in a case wherein it was the injured party, not incompatible with honor and justice.

But no sooner is this concession made than another is demanded. The *injuring* dexterously converts itself into the *aggreived* party, and requires the rescinding of an uncontestible act of sovereignty, before it will make any offer of reparation in a case in which it had solemnly admitted itself to have been the aggressor. Having claimed as *sine qua non*, the separation of the outrage on the Chesapeake from all other acts of either government, the moment this claim is acceded to, it demands the previous setlement of another & distinct question. Can inconsistency be more flagrant? And can even charity her self consider such anomolous conduct as evincive of those just, pacific and friendly sentiments, from the prevalence of which alone honorable reparation could rationally be expected.

It required no reflection on the part of the Executive, to reject this demand; but still true to its pre-eminent wish to restore the amicable relations of the two nations, the offer is made to make the revocation of the proclamation bear the same date with the acceptance of the reparation offered. But even this proposition is rejected.

We shall not attempt to go at any length into a discussion of the difficulty, thus unexpectedly and unfortunately raised by the British government. So far as it is made a subject of argument it may be confidently suffered to rest on the incontrovertible reasons assigned by Mr. Madison, and so far as it is matter of feeling it may be permitted to repose, with equal safety, on the universal sentiment of America.

There are, however, perhaps, some views which it did not behove Mr. Madison in the relation in which he stood to take, which may be very properly offered when the question becomes one between the American people & their government. There is, besides, between the negociators of two governments a becoming forbearance which ought to restrain, & in this instance appears eminently to have restrained, an expression of some truths which might have had an irritating rather than an emollient effect upon the general relations of the two nations.

Mr. Rose required the absolute revocation of the proclamation before any specific tender of reparation; our governmet offered to consider any tender which should be made, and, if acceptable, to revoke the proclamation at the same time that such tender was accepted. Let us test the character of these opposite courses by considering their relative effects, had they been pursued, on the *character* and *interests* of the two nations?

The American had at least an equal right with the British government to prescribe the course to be pursued. It was her honor that was to be healed, and her rights that were to be redressed. Of the reparation she was to be the judge. She had claimed not merely a naked disavowal, but a positive reparation, and G. Britain had herself acknowledged the justice of the demand. The former was only important as it led to the letter. The disavowal did not include the reparation; the reparation did include the disavowal. The one was a mockerry, and, persisted in, would be an insult without the latter. The disavowal, moreover, was no evidence that the reparation would follow. There existed strong reasons to justify the suspicion that an honorable reparation was not meant. The officer who committed the outrage was not disgraced, the men taken were still retained and, above all, the discontinuance of the British armed vessels to infest our waters did not follow, as it immediately should have followed, the disavowal in England. They continued, notwithstanding, for months, to violate our territory and infringe our laws.

Had our government, under these circumstances, rescinded the proclamation, as a preliminary to the negociation for reparation, they would have abandoned the deliberate ground taken in that instrument which imposed the interdiction until an honorable reparation was made, and a disposition manifested by the British government in future to control the excesses of it officer; they would, consequently, have acknowledged themselaes to have done a wrong, even in the exercise of an incontestible attribute of sovereignty, and have *given*, instead of themselves *receiving*, the first measure of atonement; they would have been dishonorad in their own eyes and disgraced in that of their country; and they would have shamefully compromitted the American character—for the world would have stigmatised the act as mean and pusyllanimous. It is true, that the revocation of the proclamation might have been followed by the tender of an honorable reparation; but it is equally true that it might not; & if this had eventually been the case, what time might not have elapsed before its final arrangement? During all this period, we should have remained exposed to the same indignities and outrages so uninterruptedly received, the temper of our people would have been lowered, perhaps humbled by the humiliating conduct of their government; we should have afforded to the British nation and to Europe the spectacle of a bully full of words, but ready, at the least appearance of danger, to shrink from the most *moderate course* that could have been pursued. For such, as we have already shewn, was the universal opinion of the proclamation when issued, even by the systematic opponents of the administration; and that proclamation, we repeat it, made the continuance of its restrictions coeval with the refusal to grant reparation and to control excesses.

Such would have been the effect of this concession on us. What would have been the effect on the British government, had it acceded to the proposition made by our government?

The outrage committed on the Chesapeake had been acknowledged by her to be unauthorised, and to require reparation. She had consequently declared herself under a moral obligation to make reparation. In this point the two governments are agreed. In granting this reparation then, the British government could only perform a solemn undisputed duty. She could not disgrace herself in her own eyes, she could not sully her honor in the eyes of the world. Instead however, of rendering this reparation she requires that the proclamation should be previously revoked, because it is alledged to have been, when issued, wrong in itself; and secondly, because the disavowal and the promise to make reparation, ought to induce our government to revoke it. It is contended to have been wrong in itself, as taking into our own hands the means of reparation, while we are claiming reparation from the British government, but this argument, even allowing, for argument sake, the fact to be correctly stated, is unsound, inasmuch as it leads to the monstrous conclusion, that the obligation to repair an acknowledged and flagrant injury is cancelled by receiving a doubtful and minor one, resulting from the original injury done. Justice, common sense, and feeling all require that he who commits the first wrong should repair the injury before he can sustain a claim for reparation for a minor injury growing out of the original wrong.

The last argument has been already sufficiently noticed, and it has been made manifestly to appear, that taking the whole conduct of the British governmennt into consideration, considering the enormity of the original outrage, the persistence of those who committed it, even after the disavowal, to infringe the proclamation, the nakedness of the disavowal itself, the entire omission so far to make reparation as it is in the power of Britain herself to make it without consulting us by punishing her officers and giving up the men taken from the Chesapeake, the total silence as to the nature of the reparation meant to be offered and the cotemporaneous issue of orders every feature of which is marked with hostility, their exists not a shadow of right on her part to require from us an act not of justice but of weakness, so far as it related to ourselves, and of generosity, perhaps credulity, so far as it related to her.

If then the British government not only could, but ought to have made an honorable reparation, notwithstanding the existence of the proclamation, without violating her honor or receiving the least injury; while our government could not, consistently with the national honor or interest revoke it until the cause which produced it should be removed; was their not every obligation of honor and justice on her part, without delay to make an honorable reparation; and was their not every obligaton of the like kind on the part of our government, while they went as far as they possibly could go with honor, to shrink from the precipice to which another step would have brought them, a precipice which presented nothing but humiliation and disgrace?

NEW-YORK, April 1.

ARRIVED.

Brig Sally-Tracy, Haile,	Passage in Spain	42
Schr Antelope, Weaver,	Havanna	11
Fletcher and Riley, Riley,	Alexandria	16
Sloop Rover, Rockman,	Baltimore	6
Lydia, Foster	Washington	10

CLEARED,

Thetis, M'Donald, New-Orleans; schr. Ann, Travers, Richmond; Sarah-Ann, Travers, Richmond; Sally, Travers, Richmond; Unity, Philips, Fredericksburgh; sloop Catharine Ann, Cole, Norfolk; Two-Sisters, Williams, Great Egg Harbour.

Brig Sally-Tracy, Haile, 42 days from Passage in Spain, in ballast. Left there brig Vengeance, Shipman, of Salem, bound from Norfolk to Bilboa, with tobacco, captured by a French launch 8 leagues from Bilboa; brig George from Newbury captain dead bound from Labrador to Bilboa with Fish, carried in 12th Jan. and ship Mars of New-York, bound from Savannah to London, captured by a French lugger.

April 2.

ARRIVED,

Brig Ann, Rowley,	St. Johns	16
Warren, Morris,	St. Sebastians	45
Schr Eliza, Wilber,	Newbern	4

CLEARED,

Schr Rising States, Gilbert, Norfolk; Polly Muckey, Etheredge, Edenton; Judith, Smith, do. Jane, Wood, Fredericksburgh.

Brig Warren, Morris, 45 days from St. Sebastians, in ballast. Left there, February 14th, brig Frederick, Hulin, of Boston, to sail in a few days; brig George, Bray (former captain dead) of Newburyport, prize to a French launch, expected to be condemned.—Left at Bayonne, schr Mary-Windsor, Howland, of Duxbury; ready for sea, and expected to sail the first fair wind; brig Hepsa and Jane, Motley, of Salem, seized for having his register indorsed; and schr. Augusta-Danvers, Stickney, seized for want of a certificare of origin of some pepper. Feb. 27, lat. 45 47, long. 10 30. was boarded by an English frigate, and treated with the utmost politeness. 28, in lat. 40 35, long. 33 41, was boarded by an English privateer cutter, and treated politely. March 13, in lat. 29 46, long 50 20, spoke ship Bath, Tuff, of Portland, 29 days from Liverpool, for Charleston.

IMPORTANT DECISION.

Letters have lately been received in the town of Providence (R. I.) from London, informing that the court of appeals in prize causes, in England, have reversed the sentence of the vice admiralty court of Bermuda, which condemned the valuable ship John Jay and her cargo, in the month of April, 1806. That ship, on her passage to Providence from Batavia, was detained by the British sloop of war Driver, and sent into Bermuda, in January, 1806. After her condemnation, an appeal was interposed, and the ship and cargo were delivered to the claimants on bonds, and under an agreement to place the estimate value in the hands of truestees in London, to wait the result of the appeal. This was accordingly done, and the property is now ordered to the American proprietors. On the trial in London, the king's advocate relied on the following points chiefly:

1. A false destination, thence inferring fraud; the ship being cleared for Sumatra and China, when it was clear that she was not to go thither.
2. The voyage being from Amsterdam.
3. Continuity of voyage; cargo the preceding voyage being from Batavia, not having been landed in the United States.
4. Illegal trade, not being permitted by the Dutch in peaceable times.

The principle adopted by the high court in this decision is favorable to many American claimants, as a large amount of property has been condemned in the vice admiralty courts, which must be restored.

Extract of a letter received by a gentleman in this city, from his correspondent at St. Sebastians, dated Feb. 22.

"At the present moment great consternation prevails in this province from the circumstance of the French having taken possession of the fortifications of Figuera, a principal key to Spain and to the citadel of Pampelune. Here the Spaniards cry aloud for Vengeance.

"The Courier of this morning brings the news that the king of Spain has consented to their taking possession of the citadel of Pampelune; and it is said also that the French troops are at Barcelona"

PHILADELPHIA, April 2.

ARRIVED, days

Ships Arabella, Little,	Charleston	12
John & Alice, Taylor,	Liverpool	35
	dry goods,	
Brig South Carolina, Serrill,	Charleston	7
Sch'r Regulator, Blanchard,	Passamaquoddy	12.

Ship Dorothea, Dougherty from Canton, arrived at New-Castle, yesterday morning.

Below, ship Henry, Russell, Havana.

☞ OFFICIAL DOCUMENT,

Communicated for the Federal Gazette.

Letters from the secretary of state to Mr. Monroe, on the subject of impressment, &c. also. extracts from, and enclosure in, the letters of Mr. Monroe to the secretary of state, prior to the joint mission of him and Mr. Pinkney.

PART II.

Mr. Madison to Mr. Monroe.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
January 5, 1804.

SIR,

The information and observation which you have as yet received from me since your arrival in London, on the impressment of our seamen and other violations of our rights, have been in private letters only. The delay in making these injuries the subject of official communications, proceeded, first from an expectation that the British government would have notified formally to the United States as a neutral power, the state of war between Great-Britain and France, which would have been an apt occasion, for combining with assurances of the fairness with which our neutral obligations would be fulfilled, our just claims on a correspondent respect for our neutral rights, and particularly of those which had been least respected during the last war: secondly, from the expected arrival of Mr. Merry, which, if he should not be charged with such a notification, might be a favorable opportunity for commencing the explanations and discussions which must precede a thorough correction of the wrongs which we experience.

Since the arrival of Mr. Merry, accordingly, no time has been lost in calling his attention to the subject; and in preparing both it and him, for the negotiation which is now to be committed to you. If appearances are to be trusted, his impressions and representations will be friendly to it. In my conversations with him, which have been free and full, he has expressed the best dispositions, has listened with candor to the appeals made, as well to the considerations of justice, as of the solid interest of his nation; and although he suggests serious difficulties on certain points, he will, I believe, sincerely co-operate in lessening them, and in bringing about an arrangement which will be acceptable to this country. The only topic on which any thing has passed in writing between the department of state and him, is that of the pretended blockade of St. Domingo. Copies of my letter to him & of his answer, are herewith inclosed; as also of the letter written to Mr. Thornton, some time before, & referred to in that to Mr. Merry, in relation to a like blockade of Martinique and Guadaloupe.

Although there are many important objects which may be thought to invite conventional regulations between the United States and Great-Britain, it is evidently proper to leave for subsequent consideration,