his proceeding the British govern-
ent has involved itself in manifest
inconsistency. It has maintained
y one act, that the French decrees
were in full force, and by another that
hey were repealed during the same
pace of time. It admits also, that
y no act of the French government
r its cruizers, had any violation of
he repeal announced by the decla-
ation of the French government of
he 5th August, 1810, been com-
mitted, or at least, that such violat-
ion had not had sufficient weight to
prevent the repeal of the orders in
council.

It was objected that the declarati-
on of the French government of the
5th of August, 1810 was not such
an act as the British government
ought to have regarded. The Se-
cretary of State is thoroughly satis-
fied that this objection is altogether
unfounded. It was communicated
by the Emperor through his higheſt
official organ, the Secretary of For-
eign affairs, to the minister plen-
potentiary of the United States at
Paris. It is impossible to conceive
an act more formal, authentic or ob-
ligatory on the French government
than that alluded to. Does one govern-
ment ever ask or expect from another,
to secure the performance of any duty
however important, more than its of-
ficial pledge, fairly and fully expres-
sed? Can better security be given
for its performance? Had there been
any doubt on this subject, the con-
duct of G. Britain herself, in simi-
lar cases, would have completely re-
moved it. The whole history of her
diplomatic intercourse with other
powers, on the subject of blockade,
is in accord with this proceeding of
the French government. We know
that when her government institutes
a blockade, the Secretary of Foreign
Affairs announces it to the ministers
of other powers in London; and
that the same form is observed when
they are revoked. Nor was the au-
thenticity of either act, thus an-
nounced, ever questioned.

Had a similar declaration been
made by the minister of France in
the United States to this government
by the order of his own, would it
not have been entitled to re-
spect and been respected? By
the usage of nations such res-
pect could not have been withheld.
The arrangement made with Mr.
Erskine is a full proof of the good
faith of this government and of its
impartiality, in its transactions with
both the belligerents. It was made
with that minister on the ground of
his public character and the confi-
dence due to it; on which basis the
non-intercourse was removed as to
England, and left in full force a-
gainst France. The failure of that
arrangement was imputable to the
British government alone, who, in
rejecting it took on itself a high re-
sponsibility, not simply in regard to
the consequences attending it, but
in disavowing and annulling the act
of its minister, without shewing
that he had exceeded his authori-
ty. In accepting the declaration of
the French minister of Foreign
Affairs, in proof of the French re-
peal, the U. States gave no proof of
improper credence to the govern-
ment of France. On a comparison
of both transactions, it will appear
that if a marked confidence and res-
pect was shewn to either govern-
ment, it was to that of Great Bri-
tain. In accepting the declaration
of the government of France in the
presence of the Emperor, the Uni-
ted States stood on more secure
ground, than in accepting that of a
British minister in this country.

To the demand made by the Uni-
ted States of the repeal of the Bri-
tish orders in council founded on the
basis of the French repeal, of Au-
gust 5, 1810, the British govern-
ment replied, by demanding a copy
of the orders issued by the French
government for carrying into effect
that repeal; a demand without ex-
ample in the intercourse between
nations. By this demand it ceased to
be a question whether the French
repeal was of sufficient extent, it
was founded on justifiable conditions.
The pledge of the French govern-
ment was doubted; a scrutiny was
to be instituted as to the manner in
which it was to be discharged, and
its faith preserved, not by the sub-
sequent conduct of its cruizers to-
wards the vessels of the U. States
but by a copy of the orders given to
its cruizers. Where would this end?
If the French government intended
a fraud, by its declaration of repeal
announced to the minister of the U.
States, and afterwards to this go-
vernment, might it not likewise com-
mit a fraud in any other communi-
cation which it might make? If cre-
dit was refused by the British go-
vernment to the act of the French

government, thus formally announ-
ced, is it probable that it would have
been given by it, to any document of
inferior character directed to its own
people? Although it was the policy
and might be the interest of the Bri-
tish government to engage the U-
nited States in such a controversy
with the French government it was
far from comporting with their in-
terest to do it. They considered
it their duty to accept the repeal al-
ready made by the French govern-
ment, of its decrees, and to look to
its conduct and to that of its cruizers
sanctioned by the government, for
the faithful performance or violati-
on of it. The U. S. having been in-
jured by both powers, were unwill-
ing in their exertion to obtain jus-
tice of either, to become the instru-
ment of the other. They were the
less inclined to it in the present in-
stance, from the consideration, that
the party making the pressure on
them maintained in full force its un-
lawful edicts against the American
commerce, while it could not deny
that a considerable advance, at least,
had been made by the other towards
a complete accommodation, it being
manifest to the world, not only that
the faith of the French government
stood pledged for the repeal of its de-
crees, but that the repeal did take
effect on the 1st of November, 1810,
in regard to the U. S. that several
American vessels taken under them
had been delivered up, and judicial
decisions suspended on all, by its or-
der, and that it also continued to
give the most positive assurances
that the repeal should be faithfully
observed.

It has also been urged that the
French repeal was conditional, and
for that reason could not be accepted.
This objection has already been ful-
ly answered. It merits attention,
however, that the acts of the Bri-
tish government relating to this sub-
ject, particularly the declaration of
the 21st April, 1812, and the repeal
of the 23d June of the same year,
are equally and in like manner condi-
tional. It is not a little surprising,
that the British government should
have objected to a measure in ano-
ther government, to which it has
self given a sanction by its own act.
It is proper, however, to remark,
that this objection has been complete-
ly waved and given up by the ac-
ceptance of the decree of the 28th
April, 1811.

The British government has urg-
ed also, that it could not confide in
the faithful performance by the French
government of any engagement it
might enter into relative to the re-
peal of its decrees. This objection
would be equally applicable to any
other compact to be entered into
with France. While maintained, it
would be a bar to any treaty, even
a treaty of peace, between them.
But it also has been admitted to be
unfounded by the acceptance of the
decree of the 28th April, 1811.

The Secretary of State presumes
that these facts and explanations,
supported as they are by authentic
documents, prove, first, that the
repeal of the British orders in coun-
cil was not to be ascribed to the
French decree bearing date on the
28th April, 1811; and secondly, that
in making that decree the basis of
their repeal, the British government
has conceded that it ought to have
repealed them on the ground of the
declaration of the French govern-
ment of the 5th August, 1810, so as
to take effect on the first November
following. To what cause the re-
peal of the British orders in council
was justly attributable, cannot now
remain a doubt with any, who have
marked with a just discernment the
course of events. It must afford
great consolation to the good people
of these states, to know that they
have not submitted to privations in
vain.

The discussion of other wrongs,
particularly that relating to impress-
ment, had been closed sometime be-
fore the period alluded to. It was
unworthy of the character of the
United States to pursue the discus-
sion on that difference, when it was
evident that no advantage could be de-
rived from it. The right was reserv-
ed, to be brought forward and urged
again, when it might be done with
effect. In the mean time the prac-
tice of impressment was persevered
in with vigour.

At the time when war was declar-
ed against G. Britain, no satisfacto-
ry arrangement was offered or likely
to be obtained, respecting impress-
ment, and nothing was more remote
from the expectation of this govern-
ment, than the repeal of the orders
in council. Every circumstance
which had occurred tending to illus-
trate the policy and views of the
British government rendered such
an event altogether improbable.—
From the commencement of that
system of hostility, which G. Bri-
tain had adopted against the United
States, her pretensions had grad-
ually increased, or at least became
more fully unfolded, according to
circumstances, until at the moment
when war was declared they had as-
sumed a character which dispelled
all prospect of accommodation. The
orders in council were said to have
been adopted on a principle of reta-
liation on France; although at the
time when the order of May, 1806,
was issued, no measure of France
had occurred on which it could be re-
taliatory, and at the date of the
next order, January 1807, it was
hardly possible that this government
should have even heard of the decree
of Berlin, to which it related. It
was stated at the time of their a-
doption, and for sometime afterwards,
that they should be revoked as soon
as France revoked her decrees, and
that the British government would
proceed with the government of
France *pari passu* in the revoca-
tion. After the revocation how-
ever, of the French government
of the 5th August, 1810, by which
the Berlin and Milan decrees were
declared to be repealed, the British
government changed its tone, and
continued to rise in its demands, to
the moment that war was declared.
It objected first that the French re-
peal was conditional, and not abso-
lute; although the only condition
attached to it was, that G. Britain
should follow the example, or the
U. States fulfil their pledge by exe-
cuting the non-importation act a-
gainst her. It was then demanded
that France should repeal her inter-
nal regulations, as a condition of the
repeal of the British orders in coun-
cil. Next, that the French repeal
should be extended to all neutral na-
tions, as well as to the U. States;
and lastly, that the ports of her ene-
mies, and all ports from which the
British flag was excluded, should be
opened to British manufactures in
American vessels; conditions so ex-
travagant as to satisfy all dispassi-
onate minds that they were demand-
ed, not in the expectation that they
would or could be complied with,
but to terminate the discussion.

On full consideration of all cir-
cumstances, it appeared that the
period had arrived, when it became
the duty of the U. S. to take that
attitude with G. Britain, which was
due to their violated rights, to the
security of their most important in-
terests, and to their character as an
independent nation. To have shrunk
from the crisis would have been to
abandon every thing valuable to a
free people. The surrender of our
seamen to British impressment, with
the destruction of our navigation
and commerce, would not have been
its only evils. The desolation of
property, however great and widely
spread, affects an interest which ad-
mits of repair. The wound is
incurable only, which fixes a stigma
on the national honor. While the
spirit of the people is unsubdued,
there will always be found in their
virtue a resource equal to the great-
est dangers and most trying emer-
gencies. It is in the nature of a free
government, to inspire in the body
of the people, generous and noble
sentiments, and it is the duty of the
constituted authorities to cherish
and appeal to those sentiments, and
rely on the patriotic support of their
constituents. Had they proved them-
selves unequal to the crisis, the most
fatal consequences would have re-
sulted from it. The proof of their
weakness would have been recorded,
but not to them alone would its bane-
ful effects have been visited. It
would have shaken the foundation
of the government itself, and even
of the sacred principles of the revo-
lution, on which all our political in-
stitutions depend. Yielding to the
pretentions of a foreign power, with-
out making a manly effort in defence
of our rights, without appealing to
the virtue of the people, or to the
strength of our Union, it would
have been charged and believed that
in these sources lay the hidden de-
fects. Where would the good peo-
ple of these states have been able
to make another stand? Where
would have been their rallying point?
The government of their choice hav-
ing been dishonored, its weakness,
and that of their institutions demon-
strated, the triumph of the enemy
would have been complete. It
would also have been durable.

The constituted authorities of
the U. S. neither dreaded or antici-
pated these evils. They had full
confidence in the strength of the
union, in the firmness and virtue of
the people, and were satisfied when
the appeal should be made, that am-
ple proof would be afforded, that their
confidence had not been misplaced.
Foreign pressure, it was not doubt-
ed, would soon dissipate foreign
partialities and prejudices, if such
existed, and unite us more closely
together as one people.

In declaring war against G. Britain
the U. S. have placed themselves in
a situation to retort the hostility
which they had so long suffered from
the British government. The main-
tenance of their rights was the ob-
ject of the war. Of the desire of
this government to terminate the
war on honourable conditions, am-
ple proof has been afforded by the
proposition made to the British go-
vernment immediately after the de-
claration of war, through the charge
d'affaires of the U. S. at London,
and by the promptitude and manner
of the acceptance of the mediation
of the emperor of Russia.

It was anticipated by some that a
declaration of war against G. Bri-
tain would force the U. S. into a
close connexion with her adversary,
much to their advantage. The se-
cretary of state thinks it proper to
remark that nothing is more remote
from the fact. The discrimination
in favour of France according to
law, in consequence of her accept-
ance of the proposition made equal-
ly to both powers, produced a dif-
ference between them in that special
case, but in that only. The war
with England was declared, without
any concert or communication with
the French government; it has pro-
duced no connexion between the U.
S. and France, or any understand-
ing as to its prosecution, continu-
ance, or termination. The ostensi-
ble relation between the two coun-
tries, is the true and only one.—
The United States have just claims
on France for spoliations on their
commerce on the high seas, and
in the ports of France, and
their late minister was, and their
present minister is, instructed to
demand reparation for these injuries,
and to press it with the energy due
to the justice of their claims and
the character of the U. S. The re-
sult of the negotiation will be com-
municated to congress in due time.
The papers marked I, contain co-
pies of two letters, addressed from
this department to Mr. Barlow, one
of the 11th June, 1812, just before
the declaration of war, the other of
the 14th July, following, which
shew distinctly the relation existing
between the U. S. and France at
that interesting period. No change
has since occurred in it.

All of which is respectfully sub-
mitted.

JAMES MONROE.

Department of State,
July 12, 1813.

The President of the U. S.

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

ANNAPOLIS, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1813.

FRIENDS OF PEACE.

At a numerous meeting of the Voters of the second election district of Anne-Arundel county, convened, in pursuance of public notice, at Mr. Rob't. Lusby's Old Fields, adjoining the farm of Brice J. Worthington, esq. on Saturday the 17th instant, the following gentlemen, to wit—John Worthington, Henry Maynadier, B. J. Worthington, Basil Brown, Thos. Snowden, Charles Watson, and Nicholas Watkins of Thos. were appointed a committee to draft Resolutions expressive of the sense of the majority of the meeting, on the present situation of public affairs; who having retired for the purpose, prepared and reported the following:

Resolved, That it is the unquestionable and constitutional right of the people, peaceably to assemble, and with becoming decorum, and manly firmness, freely to express their opinions on the measures of government, and to concert and use all proper and constitutional means to bring about a change of their rulers, and those measures which are deemed hostile to their political welfear.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, it is the true interest of the people of the United States of America to live in peace and concord with all the nations of the world; and that their interest and happiness were best promoted while they maintained a neutral position, and wisely determined not to be entangled in the intrigues and disputes of the nations of Europe, and to act with good faith towards the two belligerents. France and Great-Britain.

Resolved, That war is the greatest calamity that can be inflicted on a people, and that this meeting have viewed with real regret, and heart-felt concern, the acts and measures of the general government which have involved the United States in the present ruinous & destructive war, into which they have been, without due preparation, unnecessarily and unwisely precipitated.

Resolved, That the great and prominent cause of declaring war has been removed by the revocation of the British orders in council within a few days after the war was declared.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the revocation of the orders in council afforded the most favourable opportunity for our Rulers to suspend hostilities, and to commence a negotiation for peace, and thereby stop the further effusion of the blood of Americans, and arrest all the evils and calamities incident to war, conducted in such a way as to subject that portion of the people residing on the sea-board to the most indescribable distress, suffering & privations, without any attainable object.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, it is incompatible with the true interest, welfare and happiness, of the people of the United States, to form an alliance with any of the powers of Europe to establish the freedom of the seas on a basis different from that which is recognized and settled by the law of nations, and that a confederacy or co-operation with any foreign power to effect such purpose, will prolong the war and render the people on the sea-board wretched and miserable.

Resolved, That the people of Canada are an innocent unoffending people, and having no voice, participation in, or controul over, the measures of the rulers of Great-Britain, are not morally responsible for them; and that the prosecution of the war in that country, for the purpose of coercing Great-Britain into the relinquishment of the right of impressment, is not consonant to the benevolent precepts of christianity, nor does it accord with our notions of the immutable principles of justice.

Resolved, That the only pretext, or ostensible cause, for prosecuting the war at this time, is the right of impressment, as claimed by Great-Britain and resisted by the Rulers of America—Great-Britain claiming the right to impress native seamen, subjects of Great-Britain, on board neutral merchant vessels, and America resisting the claim wholly, or so far as respects those seamen who have become naturalized citizens of America—a right which is susceptible of adjustment or modification by negotiation only, and cannot be settled by war, as long as either party is able to carry it on, and while this trial by war is going on, thousands of Americans will be destroyed, and thousands of families on the sea board will be deprived of their homes and all the comforts of life—And for what is this sacrifice to be made? for the protection of a few British seamen who have deserted their own country, and voluntarily placed themselves in the predicament of being claimed as the subjects of the United States of America and of Great Britain.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, our Rulers in their great zeal and solicitude to invade Canada, and coerce Great Britain into a relinquishment of the right of impressment in favour of a few British seamen, have neglected or been unconcerned about the protection of thousands of families, native Americans, women and children, exposed to the ravages of the enemy.

Resolved, That this meeting, deprecating the evils and sufferings resulting from the prosecution of the war, and feeling the greatest solicitude to restore peace and commerce, with all their blessings, have determined to support, and will support by all lawful and proper means and ways, such candidates as will exert themselves to effect objects so desirable.

Resolved, That as the above resolutions, after being read to this meeting, were unanimously accepted, the same committee be appointed to correspond with any similar committees that may be appointed by the other election districts of this county, for the purpose of forming a general committee to nominate candidates to the next general assembly of this state, who will pledge themselves to exert all honourable and constitutional means of procuring an honourable peace and a restoration of the blessings of commerce.

The unanimous vote by which the resolutions above were adopted, is a propitious omen of what will be the language of Anne-Arundel county at the next election, notwithstanding those strenuous efforts which are daily making on the democratic side to rivet the people to their old opinions. The resolutions were passed without a dissenting voice, although many were present at the time who had heretofore been loud for the war, and in support of those men who have brought so many of our fellow-citizens to poverty and absolute ruin. The business of the meeting was begun and completed without any disturbance, although many could not avoid apprehending it when they saw a company of drafted militia, armed and equipped, marching from the city of Annapolis to the field, under the command of a Capt. Barnes. What could have been their intention is wholly unknown, yet every one is at liberty to conjecture. This company, however, retired before they had advanced to the ground previously selected for the meeting, by reason it is said of a remonstrance being made by some of the more cautious of their political brethren. That this was prudent, every one will admit, for nothing could have excited more indignation among the independent citizens of the state, than to see even the least attempt made by a body of armed men to silence the voice of deliberation. To prevent any result so dishonourable, as well as to shield themselves from expected insult, the freemen of the second election district adopted a plan that was sanctioned by wisdom, and which friends to order must approve. They commenced their business about 12 o'clock, and as they were unanimous, not an individual appearing to oppose them, it was soon accomplished, to the no small gratification of many who were present from different parts of the county. Whether any interruption was contemplated, it is difficult to ascertain, but we are sometimes authorised to judge from appearances. We will not pretend to charge any such design upon Capt. Barnes, but content ourselves by observing, that if any plan had been previously concerted, with a view of silencing the freedom of discussion, which many could not help believing, that it would show a degree of depravity in the advocates of administration that could scarcely have been expected. But as no attempt was made, we will not make any farther remarks on the subject. After the resolutions were passed, and the business of the meeting transacted, and that without any improper interference, an opportunity was offered to gentlemen of each political party to address the people. We wish not to draw any invidious comparisons between those who spoke on this occasion, but it would be doing injustice not to mention the lucid and eloquent speech of Mr. Maxcey. He addressed himself not only to the understandings, but the feelings of his audience, in a speech well calculated to exhibit the policy of our rulers in its true colours, and expose the futility of those schemes which have so often multiplied disgrace upon our country.

NOTICE.

The friends of Peace and Commerce of the 4th election district (Spurrier's) in Anne-Arundel county, are respectfully invited to attend a meeting at a spring on Mr. Thomas Worthington, junior's, farm, about four miles above Rummels's Tavern, on the last Friday in July, it being the 30th inst.

July 22, 1813.

NOTICE.

The friends of Peace, Commerce, order and good government, in the 3d election district of Anne-Arundel county, are invited to attend a meeting to take place on Thursday the 29th inst. at Charles Waters, Esquire's mill, on Magothy—The attendance of gentlemen from the other districts is requested.

July 22, 1813.

MISSION TO RUSSIA.

The Senate, we are informed, have refused to confirm the nomination of Albert Gallatin as one of the Embassadors from the U. S. to negotiate with G. Britain; they have confirmed the appointment of John Quincy Adams and James A. Bayard.

[*Fed. Gazette.*]

50 Dollars Reward.

Ran away from Salubria, near Hagar's-Town, Washington county, (Md.) on the 11th inst. a negro slave who calls himself BILL GUY, the property of the subscriber. Bill is about 5 feet six or 7 inches high, rather of a lighter complexion than the generality of blacks, extremely awkward and ungraceful in his address and particularly his walk, and has a wild and suspicious stare when accosted. He is between 18 and 21 years of age and was raised by Mr. Benjamin Harrison of West River, at which place he has a mother and other relations. The above reward will be given to any person who shall secure him in any gaol in the United States, if taken out of Washington county.

O. H. W. STULL.

Washington County,
July 13th, 1813. 4f.

A List of Letters

Remaining in the Post-Office, Annapolis, July 1, 1813.

John Brewer, Henry Beeding, Jos. Bartholomew, Jane Blackston, Robert Brockett, Peter A. Carnes, Nathaniel Cruise, John R. Campbell, Kitty Carroll, Mrs. Cross, Jesse Cole, Henry Drury, David Delouden (2), Ephraim Dutvall, Stephen B. Dorsey, Charles Fleming, James Fifty, West River, William S. Green (2), Clerk of A. A. County Court, Edward S. Gantt, Henry W. Hardy, George Hoffingle, Ann Kair, Polly King, William Kilty, John Lyttle, Fort Madison, Lieut. Caleb Mackbea, Samuel B. Parsons, Stephen Patter, William Patterson, Thomas Rieney (3), Nathan Randall, John Ross, William Reid, Lt. Ridgely, Peter Ross, David Ramsay, John Skinner, U. S. Agent, James Sears, Joseph Smith, John Smith near Annapolis, Hezekiah Saffield, George Stevens, William Thomas, William Taylor, Nathan Tuchston, Fort Madison, John Williams, James Wallace, Isaac Warnip, Tompson P. Williams, Charles A. Warfield, William Watkins, Charles Warfield of L. 12 miles from Annapolis, Jacob Whitwright, West River, Jane Younger, Elenor Young, Edward Young, Henry Yuckley.

JOHN MUNROE, P. M.