[illegible] viewed by the ablest statesmen in England, who, to this conviction have added their belief that America would never submit to them.

Thus stood 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 than 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, and 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 especially under the feeling which could not but be excited by the more recent and more extensive outrages committed on our neutral rights, and would consequently reject the demand for a separation of the subjects. What right had *Britain*, in fact to demand such a separation? The right might have belonged to *us* to insist upon it, as we were the aggrieved party. *We* might have said, if we pleased, this is a transaction in itself of such 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 & reparation before we will proceed in the adjustment of that long catalogue of injuries which you have done us. But what right had Britain to insist upon 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 some 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 on 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 consultation 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 inconsistent with its honor, at once, apparently without a murmur, agreed 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 *aggrieved* 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 a *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 settlement of another & distinct question. Can inconsistency be more flagrant? And can even charity herself consider such anomalous conduct as evincive of those just, pacific and friendly sentiments, from the prevalence of which alone honorable reparation could rationably be expected?

It required no reflection, on the part of the Executive, to reject this demand; but, still true to its predominant 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 a 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 and their government. There is, besides, between the negociators of two governments a becoming forbearance which ought to restrain, and 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 government 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 let to the latter. The disavowal did not include the reparation; the reparation did include the disavowal. The one was a mockery, 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 its officers; they would, consequently, have acknowledged themselves 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 dishonored 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; and, 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 suily 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 this 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 government 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, there 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 their honor or receiving the least injury; while our government could not, consistently with the national honor or interests revoke it until the cause which produced it should be removed; was there not every obligation of honor and justice on her part, without delay, to make an honorable reparation; and was there not every obligation 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?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30.

The House went into a committe on the report of the select committee to whom was recommitted the bill for raising an additional military force.

The amendment reported by the select committee was, after a few objections by Mr. *Rhea*, agreed to, Ayes 66.

The bill being now open to amendment,

Mr. Rowan moved to amend the bill by striking out that part relating to cavalry. This motion was supported by himself, and opposed by Messrs. Tallmadge, Smilie, Durell, and Findley.

[Debate, excluded by other matter, in our next.]

A message was at this moment received from the President of the U. States.

Mr. Gardner said that possibly the message might throw some light on the subject now before the Committee. He therefore moved that the committee rise.

The committee rose, reported progress and obtained leave to sit again.

The Speaker having opened the President's message, declared it to be of a *confidential* nature. The galleries were cleared, and the doors remained closed till a few minutes past four, when the House immediately adjourned, the injunction of secrecy not having been taken off.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31.

On this day the resolution for an enquiry into the conduct of Harry Innes was taken up and passed.

The bill for raising an additional military force was ordered to a third reading to-day.

After which,

Mr. Randolph, said that according to the rules of the House, though the business was not to be sure very important, yet he had a report to make, which required that the galleries be cleared.

They were cleared accordingly, and so remained until four o'clock when the House immediately adjourned.

[Further detail of this day's proceedings in our next.]

Rumor says, that Mr. Canning, the prime secretary of England has resigned. If Mr. C. *has resigned*, a general change may be expected in the political concerns of Europe.

Oracle.

New-York, March 28.

By the fast sailing ship Oliver Ellsworth which arrived at this port on Saturday evening from Liverpool, the Editor of the Mercantile Advertiser has completed his files of London papers to the 22d February, inclusive, Liverpool papers to 24th. & Lloyd's lists and Price Currents to the 19th.

The papers are principally occupied with the debates in the Imperial Parliament of Great-Britain on the late Orders in Council against neutral commerce; the expedition to Copenhagen; the proposed mediation of Austria between England and France; the negociation with Portugal; the expedition to the Dardanels; and the improper use which his Majesty has made of the Droits of Admiralty, by granting the sum of 20,000l. sterling to several of his profligate children, at a time when the pressure of the public burthens became almost intolerable to the great mass of the nation.

For the late orders of council the ministry have had recourse to a bill of indemnity. In the House of Peers, when the subject of these orders was under consideration, Lord Erskine (late Chancellor) observed that they must lead to the most calamitous consequences. America, it was generally acknowledged, was the main source of British commercial prosperity, and these measures would inevitably dry it up and compel the people of the U. States to turn their thoughts to a navy and manufactures, contrary to the advice of the great and good Washington, and thereby fix permanently their attention on what may ultimately ruin England.

On a motion in the same House for an "Address to his majesty praying for the production of official information touching the execution of the French decree of blockade previous to the 11th November" the ministry were left in a minority of 9.

A bill was before Parliament at our last dates, for "more effectually carrying into execution certain orders in council made for the protection of the trade and navigation of G. Britain, and granting duties of customs on certain goods exported from G. Britain;" and a meeting had been called, by 22 of the most respectable houses in Liverpool to petition Parliament against its passing into a law until the objectionable parts of it should be expunged or modified. Among other articles of taxation, the bill proposes an export duty of 2s. 6d. sterling per bushel on Salt, which is considered as a staple branch of the export trade of Liverpool. This port, it is computed, carries on three fourths of the trade between the U. S. and G. Britain; and some idea of its importance may be collected from the fact that the annual export of British manufactures to the U. S. exceeds ten millions sterling, and the demand constantly and rapidly increasing. In the port of Liverpool alone, during the year 1807, entered 489 American vessels, averaging 252 tons, and paying a tonnage duty of 36,968l. In addition to which, the amount paid in dock duties, port charges, and disbursements among the tradesmen of Liverpool, is estimated at 149,360l. exclusive of any charge, or expence on the cargoes.

A Gottenburg article of February 12 states the declaration of war by Russia against Sweden, and that the Russians had entered Swedish Finland.

Philadelphia, March 28.

It appears that the Rochefort squadron has completely eluded the vigilance of the British look-out fleets. It was spoken off the Isle of Tormentara. This isle is situated in the Mediterranean a few leagues to the southward of Ivica, and is deserted, in consequence of the number of serpents that infest it.

New-Orleans, Feb. 16. 1808.

We learn that the governor has just received a letter from the Balize, informing him that an English armed vessel requested permission to enter, in order to take in a supply of provisions intending to sail immediately after for Jamaica. She has a pilot on board, and being refused permission to enter (which refusal the captain was informed was founded on the President's Proclamation) she put to sea. The person who conveyed to the English captain the letter mentioning the President's proclamation, had not returned before the departure of the letter written to the governor.

The letter written to the English captain requests him to send back the American Pilot whom he has on board. This vessel is thought to be the brig Soilar.

Persons from the Balize, with whom we have spoken, report that for these six days past there have been several English vessels at the entrance of the pass, that a frigate is at anchor there, and that two others are cruising off it.

LONDON, FEB. 13.

All accounts from Yorkshire and Lancashire are full of dreadful complaints on the state of trade, the woollen and cotton manufactures are said to be nearly at a stand; several people which houses in Yorkshire have had letters from their friends in America, desiring them not to purchase any more wool on any account, and many both woollen and cotton manufacturers have been under the necessity of discharging their work people, and of shutting up their manufactories till the return of a better trade.

LONDON, FEB. 18.

Another Gottenburgh mail, the sixth, arrived last night. It brings a confirmation of the intelligence previously received respecting the melancholy state of Portugal; commerce totally destroyed, and famine approaching. Some particulars of the insurrection, soon after the French entered Lisbon, are given.

FEB. 19.

A Circumstance rather remarkable, happened yesterday in the House of Lords, where a motion of Lord Grenville, for papers connected with the order of council was carried against the administration, by a majority of 9: but it appears that in this instance ministers were taken by surprize; and lord Sidmouth's motion for restoring the Danish fleet, was afterwards negatived, on a division of 103 to 51. The division in which the opposition were successful, was alluded to in the House of Commons by Lord Henry Petty who mentioned it in terms of exultation. The following is a list of the majority: Gloucester, Norfolk, Somerset, Bedford, Essex, Carlisle, Albemarle, Jersey, Spencer, Cholmondely, Cowper, St. Vincent, Grey, Sidmouth, St. John, Darnley, King, Somers, Holland, Grenville, Aukland, Erskine, Moira, Hutchinson, Ellenborough, Lauderdale, Selkirk.—*Proxies*—Bute, Hereford, Thanet, Bulkeley, Lucan, Ossary, Carnarvon, Shaftesbury, Blandford, Rosslyn, Guildford, Buckinghamshire, Stawell, Mennip, Braybrooke, Derby, Carysfort, Fife, Southampton, Foley.

FEBRUARY 22.

A report has been in circulation since Saturday, that Mr. Canning, disgusted with his colleagues, and indignant at the insults he has received, means to take ample vengeance for his wrongs by immediately resigning. Strong hopes, however, are still entertained, that this catastrophe, *so pregnant with national mischief*, may be averted; and that the wrath of our secretary, like a storm in in spring, will, after an evanescent bluster, give place to sunshine and tranquility. For our own part we have no hesitation to confess that such is our decided opinion, for although we have no doubt that Mr. Canning would have great satisfaction in mortifying or injuring his colleagues, even to the violence of every patriotic feeling, we are well convinced that he is by no means inclined to *quarrel with his bread and butter*. And the latter, we are enabled to assure our readers, would, as affairs are at present situated, be the inevitable consequence of the former.

FEB. 22.

Ministers we understand, intend to muster all their forces in the House of Lords on a motion for rescinding the resolution passed on Thursday night contrary to their wishes. The grounds on which they mean to justify this proceeding is, *the non-existence of that information which they have asserted, in the preamble to the Orders of Council, to be in possession of*; and which the vote of their Lordships calls upon them to produce.

WASHINGTON THEATRE.

BY AUTHORITY.

On Monday Evening, April 4th, will be presented a choice
SELECTION FROM THE DRAMA.
(Particulars in hand-bills.)

Mr. & Mrs. Ormsby respectfully inform Ladies and Gentlemen that, from the very flattering reception their first performance met with, they are induced to make every addition in their power to the Theatrical Entertainments. Several necessary improvements will be made, and no assistance shall be wanting that can be procured, in order to render the Theatre worthy the attention of the lovers of the Drama.

April 1—2p