marked, first, that the number, though considerable, is probably less than may be supposed. Secondly, that what is wrong in itself cannot be made right by considerations of expediency or advantage. Thirdly, that it is proved by the fact that the number of real British subjects gained by the practice in question is of inconsiderable importance even in the scale of advantage. The annexed report to Congress on the subject of impressments, with the addition of such cases as may be in the hand of Mr. Erving, then our consul in London, will verify the remark in its application to the present war. The statement made by his predecessor during the last war, and which is also annexed, is in the same view still more conclusive. The statement comprehends not only all the applications made by him in the first instance, for the liberation of impressed seamen, between the month of June, 1797 and September 1801, but many also which had been made previous to this agency, by Mr. Pinckney and Mr. King, and which it was necessary for him to renew. These applications therefore may fairly be considered as embracing the greater part of the period of the war; and as applications are known to be pretty indiscriminately made, they may futher be considered as embracing if not the whole the far greater part of the impressments, those of British subjects as well as others. Yet the result exhibits 2,059 cases only, and of this number 102 seamen only, detained as being British subjects which is less than 1-20 of the number impressed, and 1,142 discharged or ordered to be so, as not being British subjects, which is more than half of the whole number, leaving 805 for further proof, with the strongest presumption, that the greater part, if not the whole, were Americans or other aliens, whose proof of citizenship had been lost or destroyed, or whose situation would account for the difficulties and delays in producing it. So that it is certain, that for all the British seamen gained by this violent proceeding, more than an equal number, who were not so, were the victims; it is highly probable that for every British seamen so gained, a number of others, less than 10 for one, must have been the victims and it is even possible that this number may have exceeded the proportion of twenty to one.

It cannot therefore be doubted, that the acquisition of British seamen, by these impressments, whatever may be its advantage, is lost in the wrong done to Americas ignorantly or willfully mistaken for British subjects, in the jealousy and ill-will excited among all maritime nations by an adherence to such a practice, and in the particular provocation to measures of redress on the part of the U. S. not less disagreeable to them, than embarrassing to Great Britain, and which may threaten the good understanding which ought to be faithfully cultivated by both. The copy of a bill brought into Congress under the influence of violations committed on our flag, gives force to this latter consideration. Whether it will pass into a law, and at the present session, is more than can yet be said. As there is every reason to believe that it has been proposed with reluctance, it will probably not be pursued into effect, if any hope can be supported of a remedy, by an amicable arrangement between the two nations.

There is a further consideration which ought to have weight in this question. Although the British seamen employed in carrying on American commerce, be in some respects lost to their own nation, yet such is the intimate & extensive connection of this commerce, direct and circuitous, with the commerce, the manufactures, the revenue and the general resources of the British nation; that in other respecst its mariners, on board American vessels, may truly be said to be rendering it the most valuable services. It would not be extravagant to make it a question, whether G. Britain would not suffer more by withdrawing her seamen from the merchant vessels of the U. S. than her enemies would suffer from the addition of them to the crews of her ships of war and cruisers.

Should any difficulty be started concerning seamen born within the British dominions, and naturalized by the U. S. since the treaty of 1783, you may remove it by observing: First, that very few, if any, such naturalizations can take place, the law here requiring a preparatory residence of five years, with notice of the intention to become a citizen entered of record two years before the last necessary formality, besides a regular proof of good and moral character, conditions little likely to be complied with by ordinary seafaring persons. Secondly, that a discontinuance of impressments on the high seas will preclude an actual collision between the interfering claims. Within the jurisdiction of each nation, and in their respective vessels on the high seas, each will enforce the allegiance which it claims. In other situations the individuals doubly claimed, will be within a jurisdiction independent of both nations.

Secondly. The British pretensions to domain over the narrow seas are so obsolete, and so indefensible, that they never would have occurred as a probable objection in this case, if they had not actually frustrated an arrangement settled by Mr. King with the British ministry on the subject of impressments from American vessels on the high seas. At the moment when the articles were expected to be signed, an exception of the "narrow seas" was urged and insisted on by lord St. Vincent; and being utterly inadmissible on our part, the negociation was abandoned.

The objection in itself has certainly not the slightest foundation. The time has been indeed when England not only claimed, but exercised pretensions scarcely inferior to full sovereignty over the seas surrounding the British isles, and even as far as cape Finistere to the south, and Van Staten, in Norway, to the north. It was a time, however, when reason had little share in determining the law, and the intercourse of nations, when power alone decided questions of right, and when the ignorance and want of concert among other maritime countries facilitated such an usurpation. The progress of civilization and information has produced a change in all those respects, and no principle in the code of public law, is at present better established, than the common freedom of the seas beyond a very limited distance from territories washed by them. This distance is not indeed fixed with absolute precision. It is varied in a small degree by written authorities, & perhaps it may be reasonably varied in some degree by local peculiarities. But the greatest distance which would now be listened to any where, would make a small proportion of the narrowest part of the narrowest seas in question.

What are, in fact, the prerogatives claimed and exercised by G. Britain over the seas? If they were really a part of her domain, her authority would be the same there as within her other domain. Foreign vessels would be subject to all the laws and regulations framed for them, as much as if they were within the harbors or rivers of the country. Nothing of this sort is pretended. Nothing of this sort will be tolerated. The only instances in which these seas are distinguished from other seas, or in which G. Britain enjoys within them, any distinction over other nations, are first, the compliment paid by other flags to hers. Secondly, the extension of her territorial jurisdiction in certain cases to the distance of four leagues from the coast. The first is a relic of ancient usurpation, which has thus long escaped the correction, which modern and more enlightened times have applied to other usurpations. The prerogative has been often contested, however, even at the expense of bloody wars, and is still borne with ill will and impatience by her neighbors. At the last treaty of peace at Amiens, the abolition of it was repeatedly and strongly pressed by France; and it is not improbable, that at no remote day it will follow the fate of the title of "King of France," so long worn by the British monarchs, and at length so properly sacrificed to the lessons of a magnanimous wisdom. As far as this homage to the British flag has any foundation at present, it rests merely on long usage and long acquiescence, which are construed, as in a few other cases of maritime claims, into the effect of a general tho' tacit convention. The second instance is the extension of the territorial jurisdiction to four leagues from the shore. This too, as far as the distance may exceed that which is generally allowed, rests on a like foundation, strengthened, perhaps, by the local facility of smuggling, and the peculiar interest which Great Britain has in preventing a practice affecting so deeply her whole system of revenue, commerce and manufactures: whilst the limitation itself to four leagues necessarily implies that beyond that distance no territorial jurisdiction is assumed.

But whatever may be the origin or value of these prerogatives over foreign flags in our case, and within a limited portion of these seas in another, it is obvious that neither of them will be violated by the exemption of American vessels from impressments, which are no wise connected with either; having never been made the pretext either of withholding the wonted homage to the British flag, or of smuggling in defiance of British laws.

The extension of the British law to four leagues from the shore is inferred from an act of parliament passed in the year 1736, (9 G 2. C. 35) the terms of which comprehended all vessels, foreign as well as British. It is possible, however, that the former are constructively excepted.—Should your inquiries ascertain this to be the case, you will find yourself on better ground, that the concession here made.

With respect to the compliment paid to the British flag, it is also possible that more is here conceded than you may find to be necessary. After the peace of 1783, this compliment was peremptorily withheld by France, in spite of the remonstrances of Great Britain; and it remains for your inquiry, whether it did not continue to be refused, notwithstanding the failure at Amiens, to obtain from Great Britain a formal renunciation of the claim.

From every view of the subject, it is reasonable to expect that the exception of the narrow seas, from the stipulation against impressments, will not be inflexibly maintained. Should it be so, your negociation will be at an end. The truth is, that so great a proportion of our trade direct and circuitous, passes through those channels, and such is its peculiar exposure in them, to the wrong practised, that with such an exception, any remedy would be very partial.—And we can never consent to purchase a partial remedy, by confirming a general evil, and by subjecting ourselves to our own reproaches, as well as to those of other nations.

Third. It appears, as well by a letter from Mr. Thornton, in answer to one from me, of both which copies are inclosed, as from conversations with Mr. Merry, that the facility which would be given, particularly in the British channel, by the immunity claimed for American vessels, to the escape of traitors, and the desertion of others whose services in time of war may be particularly important to an enemy, forms one of the pleas for the British practice of examining American crews, and will be one of the objections to a formal relinquishment of it.

This plea, like all the others, admits a solid and satisfactory reply. In the first place, if it could prevail at all against the neutral claim, it would authorize the seizure of the persons described only, and in vessels bound to a hostile country only; whereas the practise of impressing is applied to persons few, if any of whom are alleged to be of either description, and to vessels whithersoever bound, even to Great Britain herself. In the next place, it is not only a preference of a smaller object on one side to a greater object on the other; but a sacrifice of right on one side, to expediency on the other side.

Baltimore, July 11.

We have received a letter from Mr. Gassaway Pindell, covering another from his son, now on board a British ship of war, in Hampton Roads. This is a case which comes so directly home to the feelings of all Marylanders, that no fiery declamation need be resorted to, to impress on their minds a due sense of the extent of British insolence & hostility. What must have been the feelings of a fond parent, of an affectionate and loving sister and brother, on receiving such a letter, as at that time compelled the belief, that in a few days, and at their very doors, the kidnapped member of a beloved family was ordered to apply the match and deal destruction round among his countrymen! Truly has it been said, that the present is a case for *feeling*: Reason has no authority at such a crisis. But we will not attempt to increase the just indignation of an enraged people: here are the documents:

Extract of a letter from Mr. G. Pindell, to the editor of the Federal Gazette, dated Pig Point, (Ann Arundel county,) July 3.

SIR,

I have seen in your paper on the 30th June a copy of a letter signed by a number of Americans on board the British ship of war Bellona, to commodore Barron, late commander of the United States frigate Chesapeake, requesting his assistance to have them released. The name of Stephen Pindell is mispelled (Findell): he is my son: I enclose a letter from him, which, if you think proper, you may insert in your useful paper. He served his apprenticeship to capt. Tenant, of Fell's point, Baltimore.

"*Mr. Gassaway Pindell, Inspector, at Pig Point Warehouse, Maryland.*

"*On board the Bellona, June 15, 1807.*

"*Honored Father,*

"This is to inform you, that the schooner in which I shipped, at capt. Tenant's request, was captured a few hours after the pilot left her. The schooner was sent to Halifax, and all of her crew put on board the Melampus frigate; in about a month after which, we were sent on board the Bellona, 74, I despair of getting clear, unless you can come down. Dear Father! you must contrive to come to my relief: I cannot consent to remain in such a service. Pray come down; I would indeed sooner drown myself than continue where I am, and where I will not grieve much longer!

"I am,
"Your dutiful Son,
"STEPHEN PINDELL.

From the Norfolk Public Ledger.

The President's Proclamation, which we published yesterday, in an *extra* sheet, is again republished in this day's Ledger. This cannot fail at this interesting crisis, to be considered but as a document of the first importance. The measures which the executive proposed to pursue on this occasion, were looked for with a degree of anxiety proportioned to the magnitude of the interests which was to be involved. The powers of the executive are limited. He can call Congress, he can forbid the armed ships of Britain from entering the waters of the U. States, and he can seek reparation by negociation. The second he has done, and we may fairly infer that the last will also be adopted. Whatever may be the case, it is to be fairly inferred that the President does not believe that this particular act has been or will be sanctioned by the British government. With such impressions then, the President could pursue no other course. The state of our relations with Great Britain as well as with all other foreign powers, it is presumed, is best known to the executive.

There has been but one sentiment upon this occassion; the outrage is insulting to our national character beyond forbearance—Ample reparation must be made, but the *mode* of obtaining it ought to be left to the Executive, who is confident of the support of the *whole* nation, if satisfaction is not given. It is not to be expected that the same unanimity will be found as to the means, tho' all agree in the end.

Captain Maxwell, arrived here on Monday last in the schooner Dianna Talbot, in 9 days from Havanna. The day before he sailed a vessel arrived at that place in six day form New-Orleans, a passenger in which informed Captain M. that a duel had been fought between *governor Claiborne* and *Mr. Clarke*, the Representative in Congress for that district. The challenge was given by Governor Claiborne, and the duel fought about 75 miles within the Spanish territory. Governor C. was wounded dangerously immediately under the right hip. The informant saw Governor C. brought into New Orleans two days before he left that city; from the wound, and pain occasioned by travelling, serious apprehensions were entertained for the life of the governor.

Fredericksburg, July 3.

July 1st, 1807.

At a meeting of the citizens of Fredericksburg and its vicinity, convened at the Town Hall.

Wm. Smock, (Mayor) Chairman.

James Brown, from the committee appointed at the last meeting (of June 27th) to prepare an address to the President of the U. States, presented the following memorial:

To the President of the United States.

The memorial of the citizens of Fredericksburg and its vicinity,

Sheweth, That British injuries, long and unremittingly pursued, have filled the bosoms of your memorialists with sentiments of the strongest indignation—that, in these injuries, there has been nothing wanting of predatory outrage and national insult, to stamp them indelibly on the feelings and recollections of Americans—your memorialists are attached to peace—are warmly attached to fair and honorable peace. They have hitherto suppressed the emotions which British violence has kindled—they have warmly applauded that policy of our government which has sought redress of wrongs, through amicable and rational discussion—and have anxiously marked the progress of negociation, which, they fondly hoped, would restore to their country her rights redressed, and her name untarnished—but that negociation has been found to be the protraction of wrongs. Instead of ills redressed—outrage has become more daring. The vessels of America have been seized and plundered—her citizens have been impressed and murdered—her ports and harbors have been infested with British force—her sovereignty and independence have been flagrantly insulted and violated. And when justice has demanded from the government of Great Britain signal punishment on the violation of her flag, and of her territory, and on the murder of an American citizen—he has been discharged from the mockery of trial with triumphant acquittal.

The late unwarrantable and unprovoked attack of a British squadron upon the United States' frigate, the Chesapeake, fills up the measure of astonishment and of patience—it strips the American flag of its honors, and if submitted to, will leave this country without a name.

Your memorialists pronounce that the present is a crisis which is to fix the American character forever. It will either terminate the career of American glory, or will prolong it to the latest posterity. It must furnish the sad memorial of blighted honors, of withered strength, and of premature decay; or it will transmit to succeeding generations, the untarnished splendor of that name which is derived from the conquest of freedom, and the atchievement of the revolution.

At the present crisis, but one sentiment thrills through the nation. It warms, invigorates and connects the hearts of ALL in one firm, unanimous resolution to resist British violence and outrage. It renounces that *hostile* peace which presents the spectacle of unrelenting cruelty and warfare on the one side, and of forbearance to retaliate by force on the other.

These memorialists repose a confidence in the government of their country, to which its virtuous and upright administration pre-eminently entitles it. They rely upon its wisdom and its firmness to adopt the most prompt and efficient measures, to rescue their country's honor from disgrace and to secure her rights from violation. In the pursuit of such measures they pledge the government their warmest support, and their firm resolve to devote their fortunes and their lives to the preservation of the rights and the dignity of their nation.

These memorialists beg leave to offer their best wishes for the happiness and prosperity of the President of the U. S. and to tender him their friendship and high esteem.

Which memorial being read, was unanimously agreed to. And it was thereupon ordered, that the same be signed by the chairman of the meeting and transmitted, in the behalf of the citizens of Fredericksburg and its vicinity, to the President of the U. States.

On motion, ordered, That David C. Ker, John W. Green, Robert Standard, and John Tayloe Lomax, be a committee of correspondence to communicate with the committees of Norfolk, and other places.

Whereupon the meeting adjourned.

(Signed)

WM. SMOCK.

From the Boston Centinel of July 10.

"We have seen with pleasure the spirit of resentment, and the tokens of unanimity, which the late unparalleled and degrading attack on the American flag, has called forth in our country.—And we cordially unite in those public expressions, which demonstrate, that when any foreign power whatever shall dare to assail our sovereignty, or insult our national rights, that it will find, we shall dismiss local politics, rally round the standard of government, and, as we did in 1798, shew to the world, that we are Americans, and not a "divided people." This animation has been inspired by just feelings on the unwarrantable procedure of a foreign officer, in insisting on making search for, and to take from an U. States frigate, a part of her crew; and in consequence of a refusal to permit either, in commencing a hostile attack on that frigate, and in compelling by superior force the American captain to strike the flag of the nation. It is this transaction, which has called forth the unanimity of the nation; and the proffers of support to government. These expressions we do not think, have a tendency to War, but, on the contrary, to prevent an open rupture with Great Britain: As they will give weight to such demands of honorable reparation for the past, and security for the future as the nation, through its government, has a right to demand; and which we doubt not, the British government, when it sees we are united, will not hesitate to give.

"We had proceeded thus far, when we received a copy of the *President's Proclamation*, which we pronounce a temperate, and dignified state-paper, which all Americans are called upon to obey;—which they will cheerfully execute; and which renders further remarks on the transaction which occasioned it unnecessary.

From the Boston Democrat of July 8.

'PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

'This interesting paper must be read with avidity by that great portion of the community, who love their country. We are happy at last to find an uniform sentiment of execration against those British pirates and murderers who have so long infringed on the rights of humanity; and set at defiance every principle of justice. Americans feel of one mind and one soul with respect to this last unparalleled brutality; and will doubtless proffer their whole support to aid the government in whatever measures may be conceived most conducive to the public safety and protection.

New York, July 11.

The brig Comet, capt. Center, left Nantes on the 24th of May, and brings Paris papers to the 16th of that month. They contain no intelligence worth transcribing. No engagement had taken place between the French and the Russians.

An article, added ten days after its conclusion to the armistice between gen. Mortier and the Swedish general Essen, extends to a month the term before which the two powers of France and Sweden are to give each other notice of the recommencement of hostilities; and is mentioned in the Paris papers as a proof that the conduct of general Essen has been approved by his master.

His excellency Gov. TOMPKINS has received direction, by this morning's southern mail, to call out 12,000 of the New-York militia into the service of the United States. The orders to the major general, it is expected, will be issued this morning.

From the Aurora.

The Washington Federalist states in a postscript, that Mr. Erskine, the British Ambassador, had arrived at Washington city—declared the late murderous and perfidious aggressions unauthorised, and was about to forward an immediate dispatch to the British naval commander at Hampton.

On this we have only to observe—to wit:

1. When the British squadron attacked the Spanish frigates three years ago returning to Spain, unconscious of war, and sunk one and captured two others, that the English charge des affaires at Madrid, declared the act unauthorised. But the dollars in the captured frigate were nevertheless sent in triumph to the tower in London.

2. When in the year 1780, or thereabout, count Byland, with a Danish convoy, met an English fleet in the English channel, and was fired upon by them, it was said to be *unauthorised*—but the fleet was kept.

3. When the Dutch convoy in 1794, was fired upon in the North Sea, it was declared to be unauthorised.

4. When Pearce was killed, it was said to be unauthorised, but Whitby has been since promoted.

5. When Love, in the Driver, insulted the port of Charleston, it was said to be unauthorised.

Now acts of *aggression* such as these noted, are crimes against the law of nations—if so, they are crimes against the state whose officers commit them, and they are therefore punishable—if the culprits are not punished, do the governments not *authorise* what they overlook in so strange a manner.

New Orleans, June 10, 1807.

SIR,

A publication appeared some time since in one of the northern papers, stating that I had procured in Canada, a traitorous letter written by Mr. Jefferson to Benedict Arnold, after his desertion.

At that time I paid little attention to a story which I thought few would repeat, and was sure none could seriously believe. Lately, however, I have understood that the tale has been republished, and that my silence is cited either as an admission of the fact, or as

CC2