

applied to Mr. Talleyrand to know what the United States must expect from France, should they go to war with Spain. The General wrote to the President (and the President *incautiously* suffered this to go to congress in the mass of confidential documents)—Mr. Talleyrand was instantaneous, prompt, unequivocal, in his reply. *IF YOU GO TO WAR WITH SPAIN, FRANCE CAN NEITHER DOUBT NOR HESITATE! SHE MUST TAKE PART WITH SPAIN!*!

Thus early was the criminal man, who then pretended to administer the Executive department of the Government of the U. States, informed officially by his own confidential agent of the inflexible determination of the Emperor Napoleon to control the conduct of the United States in its foreign relations and thus early, as we shall soon abundantly prove, did he submit to such control. These facts, infinitely momentous beyond any thing in our recent history, have been concealed from the good people of the United States, from 1803 to 1810.

The confidential message so often alluded to—the confidential documents which accompanied it—the attempt of Mr. Jefferson to make Mr. Randolph, as chairman of the committee to whom the private message was referred (the independent and honest MACON being then the man who named committee) the tool of the executive to bring forward in concilie, a proposition to appropriate Two Millions of Dollars, with a view to supercede the measures which it seemed must naturally grow out of the message, as it contained not a hint about money, and did contain many hints about war—the conversation between Jefferson and Randolph, involving the indignant refusal of the latter to act the dishonorable part assigned him—the substance of conversations between the same gentleman and Mr. Madison and Mr. Gallatin, on the same subject—the (sort of) commission issued to Mr. Bidwell and Gen. Varnum, as managers of the House of Representatives, and Knights of the Back Stairs, when it was ascertained that Mr. Randolph would oppose the administration—the subterfuges, & other manœuvres of the “new leaders”—with the result—will be reviewed in succession. For the present, with the leave of the Public, we will take a little time to PAUSE AND REFLECT.

Foreign Intelligence.

BOUILLET DECREE.
The following is a copy of the French Decree, noticed in London papers.
The last number of the *Bulletin des Lois* contains an Imperial Decree, dated at Rambouillet, the 23d of March 1810—(taking into consideration that the government of the United States has by an act of the 1st March 1809, ordered, I. That from the 20th of May next ensuing, vessels arriving in the U. States, under the French flag, shall be seized and confiscated together with their cargoes. II. That from the same period, no merchandise nor produce of the soil, or manufactures of France or her colonies can be imported into the ports of the United States, from any foreign port whatsoever, under pain of seizure, confiscation and penalty of three times the value of the goods. III. That it shall not be lawful for American vessels to proceed for any port in France, her colonies or dependencies)—Decree as follows:

“All vessels sailing under the American flag, and owned in whole or in part by any citizen or subject of that power, that reckoning from the 20th of May, 1809, that may have already entered, or that shall subsequently enter the ports of France, her colonies, or the territories occupied by the French armies, shall be seized and sold, and the produce of the sale shall be deposited in the Caisse D’Amortisation. From this provision are alone excepted such vessels as may be charged with dispatches or commissions from the government of the United States, and have no lading or merchandise on board.”

Under capture of Napolitan Privateers.
Brig. Victory, Felt, Salem, colonial produce, also tea; brig. O’Conor, Baltimore, do, do; s.s. Osdenack, Sheffield, Boston, cod fish—cases not yet decided upon.

Arrived and sequestered at Gallipoli.
Brig. B-t-s-y and Sukey, Tibaucomb, Salem, assorted cargo.

Under sequestration at Grotta Vecchia.
Brig. P. Reservoir, Foster, Boston, 200 bales cotton, 15,000 p. Nankeens, and colonial produce, assorted; s.s. Morning Star, Atkins, Boston, codfish; Two Friends, Lee, Beverly, do; Mary, Larkham, Beverly, with colonial produce, captured by Napolitan gun-boats and sold vessel and cargo.

Arrived at Naples, since the above.

Sch’s Amherst, Bradford, Duxbury, with salts; brig Ruth & Nancy Gordon, Philadelphia and Lyon, with coffee; sch’s William, Turner, Dawson, sugar and pepper; Fortune, Martin, Boston, tobacco, cotton, &c.; Nancy, Holman, Lynn, codfish; brig Nancy Ann, Brown, Boston and Cadiz, codfish, all the above captured on entering the Harbour.

Sequestered, and cargoes selling by Government.
Ship Hercules, West. Salem, cotton, tea, 25,000 p. Nankeens; Trent, Cavendish, Boston, colonial produce, assorted; s.s. Haskel, Salem, 55,000 lb. pepper; s.s. Two Bells, Gardner, Beverly, colonial produce, assorted; Romp, Lawder, Salem Nankeens; Emily, Waterman, New York, colonial produce; Phoenix, —, Sera, in ballast; sch’s Kite, Thomson, Blimont, colonial produce; Syren, —, Newport, codfish; Peace, Graver, do, do; Hound, Warner, Baltimore, colonial produce; Dore, Thomas, Beverly, cod fish; Maria, Cleveland, Boston, beeswax, tobacco; Urania, Beck, N. York, colonial produce.

Besides the cargoes of the following vessels, which sailed on giving bonds for their value.

Ship Augustus, Moore, Baltimore, 55,000 lb. coco, 5,000 coffee; brig Sophie, Carman, do, principally coffee; sch’s Zephyr, Murphy, New York, Java Coffee.

The following are under capture of French Privateers.

Ship Margaret, Fairfield, Salem; bri. Caroline, Dew, Boston; sch’s Shadow, Philadelphia—assorted cargoes, comprised and sold by the French consul—vessel expected to sail.

From the London Gazette.

At the Court at the Queen’s Palace, the 2d of May 1810—present, the King’s most Excellent Majesty in Council.

His Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order and it is hereby ordered, that all vessels which shall have cleared out from any port, so far under the control of France or her allies as that British vessels may not freely trade therat and which are employed at the Whale Fishery, or other Fishery of any description, save as hereinafter excepted, and are returning, or destined to return, either to the port from whence the cleared, or to any other port or place, a which the British flag may not freely trad, shall be captured and condemned, together with their stores and cargo, as prizes to the captors.

But his Majesty is pleased to except from this order, vessels employed in conveying Fish fresh to market, such vessels not being fitted or provided for securing of fish.

And it is further ordered, that all vessels subject to the provision of this order as aforesaid, which shall have sailed on their present voyage previous to notice of this order, or reasonable time for notice, their own port without molestation on account of any thing contained in this order; provided they shall not have continued on their fishery more than twenty-one days (which are hereby allowed to such vessels) after due warning of this order received at sea. And the right hon. the lords commissioners of his Majesty’s treasury, his Majesty’s principal secretaries of state, the lords commissioners of the admiralty, and the judge of the high court of admiralty, and judges of the courts of vice-admiralty, are to take the necessary measures herein, as to them may respectively appertain.

W. FAWKENER.

New-York, July 11.

LATEST FROM CADIZ, &c.
We learn by the schr. Weymouth Capt. Howland, in 30 days from Teneriffe, that a few days before her departure, two Spanish and one English 74, with a transport ship having on board 800 French prisoners arrived at Santa Cruz from Cadiz, which place they left about the 1st of June. They stated that the Marquis de la Romana, with 10,000 troops were on their march in the rear of the French army towards Cadiz; and that the inhabitants of that place were in high spirits, and under no apprehensions of being obliged to surrender to the French.

We further learn, that the Seven Canary Islands were immediately to be placed under the Vice Royalty of the Duke del Parque, who, with a number of troops, were hourly expected at Santa Cruz.

It is further added by our informant, that so much were the inhabitants incensed against the French prisoners at Port Oratava, and the upper town, that they had embodied and threatened to massacre all they could find; and that two respectable French inhabitants of the place had been put to death by the populace. About 100 of the regular troops came over from St. Cruz and quelled the rioters.

PHILADELPHIA, July 12.

Yesterday arrived brig Saunders, Quail, from Cadiz, which he left the 29th May, and informs that the French are erecting batteries and advancing their works at Matagorda; but had not opened them when he sailed, neither had there been any encounter or sally on either side for some time previous to his sailing. On the 17th and 25th of May, two of the prison ships ran ashore in gales of wind, by which 6 or 700 French prisoners were released, the boats of the British men of war attempted to board them, while firing, and take out the prisoners, but the Frenchmen having got arms in their hands, kept them off and killed 16 or 17 of the English; from which it is supposed that those on the 25th, having 4 or 500 prisoners, taking the advantage of the gale, had rose on

their guards, seized their arms, cut the cables, and let her drift on shore—the Frenchmen defended her till they were all landed, when the British set her fire.

Capt. Quail informs, that on the 20th of May, the Spanish mountaineers, armed only with knives, daggers and cutlasses, poured down on the town of Chiru (about 16 miles from the Isle of Leon,) garrisoned by a body of French, whom they routed and cut to pieces, hardly leaving a man to tell their misfortunes.

Capt. Q. heard nothing of the battle in Portugal, or the evacuation of Madrid, as reported yesterday via Charleston.

LONDON. HOUSE OF COMMONS—MAY 15. AMERICAN DISPUTE.

Mr. Whitebread rose and said, that having read and considered certain papers laid before the House respecting the negotiation which was carried on between Mr. Erskine and the American government, he was now perfectly prepared to state his opinion upon them. The right hon. gentleman, his majesty’s secretary for foreign affairs, (Mr. Canning) had publicly charged Mr. Erskine with having departed widely from both letter and spirit of his instructions. Mr. Erskine denied the fact; and the question at issue in the face of Europe was, whether or not the right honorable gentleman had deviated from the truth. He for his own part was persuaded no such imputation could be founded against the right hon. gentleman. But—

[Here the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose and deprecated the progress of the honorable gentleman in a speech which might lead to an irregular debate, there being no question before the house.]

Mr. Whitebread did not mean to bring forward any motion on the subject; he wished to save the house the trouble of a discussion. The question was at issue, as between the right hon. gentleman, Mr. Erskine and himself. What he wished to say then was, that all that was wanting to the vindication of Mr. Erskine, was the publication of that letter now before the world, and from an attentive perusal of that letter, he thought the vindication complete; but that these instructions were not drawn up with the accuracy they ought to have been, nor with due attention to a law which had recently passed in America. Understanding, however, that an intercourse was now in negotiation with America, he did not wish to urge any thing further on the subject.

Mr. Canning expressed his surprise at the course pursued by the honorable gentleman, and thought he had “done a very foolish thing, when for so long a time he had appeared so anxious to bring forward.” For his own part, he had always courted it, as the only way in which he could shew to the world, that what he had done in his official character with respect to Mr. Erskine, would bear the strictest and most minute investigation. There was nothing for which he was more anxious than that the investigation of this subject should be entered into in the fullest manner.

He had never said any thing tending to discredite the character of Mr. Erskine. He had affirmed and re-affirmed, that Mr. Erskine had acted contrary to his instructions, not only as to the letter, but the spirit of them; and he was ready to make it appear in argument, whenever the honorable gentleman, or any other of Mr. Erskine’s friends, should chuse to bring it forward. He thought the hon. gentleman did not treat him fairly, when after he had stated, that if certain documents were brought forward, it would appear that his (Mr. Canning’s) conduct would be found faulty and reprehensible; and now those very documents were brought forward, the honorable gentleman deserted his former ground, and he was left without any opportunity of defending his official character from the charges which had at different times been made against him.

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT.

From our files of London papers to the 22d May, we have occasionally published several articles relative to the question which agitates the capital of the British empire. We say *cautiously*—for we are assured, verbally and by their newspapers, that the metropolitan district only appears to side with Burdett—and that but partially. A gentleman, himself a stickler for reform, informs us that he was in London when Sir Francis was arrested; that he afterwards crossed the kingdom; that the people out of Middlesex were uniformly against violence. We published last week the protest signed by 80 Livermen, against the Common Hall [and Burdett].—The “Morning Chronicle” of May 15, now before us, contains (including the above) upwards of 1600 signatures to that protest, all Livermen of London. Sir James Shaw asserted in the house of commons on the 8th May, that 1500 signed in one day.—Alderman Combe replied that the Livermen consisted of at least 12,000. The paper is open for additional signatures; so that at least a powerful minority of the capital are against Burdett, and he is supported nowhere in the country. Indeed those whom the ministerial papers term the most shameless libellers in the city, seem to acknowledge that they have overacted their part; all who think with horror of the French revolution are ready to oppose the violence which at such a period would overwhelm the *ins* and *outs*, the property, the liberty and the independence of their country. Take as an

instance, the following from the “London Times,” of May 26, an opposition paper, which hesitates not to charge the government with corruption. [See *Gazette*.]

“We have never run into the extravagance of even palliating the recent disturbance and tempestuous conduct of those who are seeking for ‘reformation’ with so much zeal—We gave it as our opinion, at the very commencement of the agitation in question, that it was a thing most desirable to the perpetrators of public wrongs; that it would tend to screen them, and that much evil would in consequence result from it; and every day convinces us more strongly of the truth of our prediction. In fact it will be seen, that many of the temperate and respectable part of the community keep aloof from both sides of the question, from the resolutionists and the counter resolutionists; from the former on account of their violence; and from the latter on account of the corrupt practices of government which they are evidently endeavoring to maintain.”

Lords Grenville and Grey stand up against the resolutionists. The following was delivered in the House of Lords May 7.

Lord Grenville entirely concurred with his noble friend (earl Grey) and expressed his deep regret that any person should have been so deluded as to attack the powers and privileges of parliament, upon which depended the very existence of the constitution, and the welfare and prosperity of the country. To parliament the people were indebted for their liberties, for their prosperity, and for all the advantages they had hitherto enjoyed. Take away the powers of parliament, and those educated persons who now clamored against them would soon find that the liberty & prosperity of the people would cease to exist. It was through the means of Parliament that the liberty of the people was first established: it was by parliament that liberty had, by wise and wholesome laws, been placed upon a firm and secure basis, and like their ancestors they ought to rally round parliament, to preserve its authority inviolate; for were it to be deprived of those privileges upon which depended its power and dignity, to what source could the people look for the maintenance of their own privileges and their own liberties? They could indeed hope to derive little aid from the Crown, if once the privileges of Parliament were gone. The noble secretary of state might attempt a defence of ministers, but it was to their misconduct that much of the evil that had arisen was to be attributed. They had violated their first entrance into office, and had ever since been acting in contradiction to the best interests of the country.

From the Virginia Patriot.

“The blockade of the coast of France from the Elbe to Brest has been uniformly and triumphantly cited by all those who are solicitous to palliate the Berlin decree. It is the particular measure on which the advocates of French aggression found their accusations of England; and it has been generally represented as an absolute and unqualified blockade, not defended as a measure of retaliation, but containing an assertion of the naked principle, that a mere paper blockade is legitimate. It is therefore entitled to more particular consideration.

This measure was adopted by the Fox administration, an administration noted for its respect for neutral rights, and for its avowed partiality to the U. States. This is not mentioned as justifying a proceeding in itself censurable, but as furnishing an additional inducement for enquiring into the real character of the measure, and into the motives assigned for its adoption.

In his letter of the 16th of May, 1806, Mr. Fox notifies to Col Monroe the “blockade of the coast, rivers and ports from the river Elbe to the port of Brest, both inclusive.” But the letter adds, “his majesty is pleased to declare that such a blockade shall not extend to prevent neutral ships and vessels laden with goods not being the property of his Majesty’s enemies and not being contraband of war, from approaching the said coasts and entering into any port from the said river and ports, provided the said ships and vessels so approaching and entering, shall not have been laden at any port belonging to or in the possession of any of his Majesty’s enemies, nor have previously broken the blockade.”

This order left unmolested the trade of neutrals, not only in articles of the growth or manufacture of neutral countries, but even in those of the growth or manufacture of the enemy, provided they ceased to be the property of the enemy, and were not contraband of war. Its sole operation was to inhibit the direct trade from one of the enemy’s ports to another: that is in fact, to inhibit the coasting trade and the direct colonial trade.

The National Intelligencer, however, does not deem it advisable to give to this measure its true character, nor does it answer his purpose to hint at the motives which produced it.

This is not an original measure, resting for its justification on its intrinsic propriety. It is a measure of retaliation, induced by previous violations of the usages of war on the part of France.

Mr. Fox introduces his communication to Col. Monroe by stating that “the king, taking into consideration the new and extraordinary means resorted to by the enemy, for the purpose of distressing the commerce of his subjects, has thought fit to direct,” &c.

These new and extraordinary means resorted to by the enemy, consisted in the attempt to prohibit all trade to the continent in British manufactures, though they had