

# NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

(VOL. 9.)

Saturday, June 14, 1794.

(No. 440.)

PHILADELPHIA, May 26.

The following very interesting Letters were read in the House of Representatives of the United States, on Wednesday and yesterday.

Philadelphia, May 20, 1794.

S I R,  
IT cannot be unknown to you, that a speech, said to be addressed, on the 10th of February, 1794, to several Indian nations, and ascribed to the governor general of his Britannic majesty at Quebec, has appeared in most of the public prints in the United States. With so many circumstances of authenticity, after remaining so long without contradiction, it might have justified us in inquiring from you, whether it was really delivered under British authority. Our forbearance thus to inquire is conformable with the moderation which has directed the conduct of our government towards Great-Britain; and indicates, at the same time, our hope, from the declarations of yours, that its views would prove ultimately pacific and that it would discountenance every measure of its officers having a contrary tendency.

Even now, Sir, while I entertain a firm persuasion, that in assuring this speech to be genuine, I cannot well err, I shall be ready to retract the comments which I am about to make, if you shall think proper to deny its authenticity.

At the very moment when the British ministry were forwarding assurances of good will, does lord Dorchester foster and encourage, in the Indians, hostile dispositions towards the United States. It it was a part of the American character to indulge suspicion, what might not be conjectured as to the influence by which our treaty was defeated in the last year, from the assembling of deputies from almost all the nations who were at the late general council on the Miami, and whose enmity against us cannot be doubted? How nearly would that suspicion approach to proof, were we to recollect, that so high an officer as himself would not rashly hazard this expression: "I should not be surprized, if we are at war with the United States, in the course of the present year; and if we are, a line must then be drawn by the warriors."

But this speech only forebodes hostility: the intelligence which has been received this morning is, if true, HOSTILITY ITSELF. The President of the United States has understood, through channels of real confidence, that governor Simcoe has gone to the foot of the rapids of the Miami, followed by three companies of a British regiment, in order to build a fort there.

Permit me then to ask, whether these things be so? It has been usual, for each party to a negotiation, to pay such a deference to the pretensions of the other, as to keep their affairs in the same posture, until the negotiation was concluded. On this principle, you complained, in your letter of the 5th of July 1792, of the jurisdiction attempted to be exercised, under the state of Vermont; within the district occupied by the troops of your king; and demanded, that our government should suppress it from respect to the discussion which was pending. On this principle, you were assured, that proper measures should be adopted. On the same principle, you renew on the 10th of March, 1794, a similar application, and are answered, that the measures of the government should correspond with its assurances. Accordingly, although the forts, garrisons and districts, to which your letters relate, are confessedly within the limits of the United States, yet have our citizens been forbidden to interrupt you in the occupancy of them. What return then have we a right to expect?

But you will not suppose that I put the impropriety of the present aggression upon

the pendency of the negotiation. I quote this only to shew the contrast between the temper observed on your part towards us and on our part towards you. This possession of our acknowledged territory, has not the pretext of *status quo* on its side; it has no pretext at all. It is an act, the hostility of which cannot be palliated by connection with that negotiation. It is calculated to support an enemy whom we are seeking to bring to peace.

A late mission of the United States to Great Britain, is an unequivocal proof, after all that has happened, of the sincere wish of our government to preserve peace, and a good understanding with your nation. But our honour and safety require that an invasion shall be repelled.

Let me therefore inform you, Sir, that I have it in charge from the President of the United States, to request and urge you to take immediate and effectual measures, as far as in you lies, to suppress these hostile movements; to call to mind, that the army of the United States, in their march against the enemy, will not be able to distinguish between them, and any other people, associated in the war; to compare these incroachments with the candour of our conduct, and the doctrines which you have maintained; and to admonish those who shall throw obstacles in the way of negotiation, and tranquility, that they will be responsible for all the unhappy consequences.

I have the honor to be,  
With respect,  
S I R,

Your most obedient servant.

(Signed) EDM. RANDOLPH.  
Mr. HAMMOND, Minister. }  
Plenipotentiary of his Britannic Majesty. }

Philadelphia, May 22d, 1794.

S I R,  
IN answer to your letter of the 20th current, which I did not receive until late in the afternoon of yesterday, it is necessary for me to premise that, whatever may be my personal opinion, with respect to the stile and manner in which you have thought it proper to address me, upon the present occasion, it is not my intention to offer any imputation upon them, but to proceed with temper and candour to the examination of the subjects of your letter.

Though I never can acknowledge the right of this government to require from me so categorically, as you have required it, an explanation of any measure emanating from the Governors of Canada, over whose actions, I have no controul, and for whose conduct I am not responsible; I am willing to admit the authenticity of the speech to certain Indian nations to which you have alluded, and which you have ascribed to the Governor General of his Majesty's possessions in North America. But in order to ascertain the precise sense of the only passage of that speech, to which you have referred, and of which you have given merely a partial citation, I shall quote the passage at length:

"Children,  
"Since my return, I find no appearance of a line remains, and from the manner in which the people of the States push on and act, and talk on this side, and from what I can learn of their conduct towards the sea, I shall not be surprized, if we are at war with them in the course of the present year, and if so, a line must then be drawn by the warriors." From the context of this whole passage, it is manifest that Lord Dorchester was persuaded, that the aggression which might eventually lead to a state of hostility, had proceeded from the United States; and so far as the state of Vermont, to which I presume his Lordship principally alluded, was implicated, I am convinced

that, that persuasion was not ill founded. For notwithstanding the positive assurances, which I received from your predecessor, on the 9th of July 1792, in answer to my letter of the 5th of the same month, of the determination of the general government to discourage and repress the encroachments, which the state and individuals of Vermont had committed, on the territory occupied by his Majesty's garrisons I assert with confidence, that not only these encroachments have never been in any manner repressed, but that recent infringements in that quarter and on the territory in its vicinity have been committed. Indeed if this assertion of mine could require any corroboration. I would remark, that though the space of fifty days elapsed between my letter of the 10th of March 1794, upon this subject, and your answer, of the 29th April 1794, you did not attempt to deny the facts which I then stated, and which I now explicitly repeat.

In regard to your declaration that "governor Simcoe has gone to the foot of the Miami, followed by three companies of a British regiment, in order to build a fort there." I have no intelligence that such an event has actually occurred. But even admitting your information to be accurate, much will depend on the place, in which you assert, that the fort is intended to be erected, and whether it be for the purpose, of protecting subjects of his majesty residing in districts depending on the fort of Detroit, or of preventing that fortress from being straitened by the approach of the American army; to either of which cases I imagine that the principle of the *status quo*, until the final arrangement of the points in discussion between the two countries shall be concluded, will strictly apply. In order however to correct any inaccurate information you may have received, or to avoid any ambiguity relative to this circumstance, I shall immediately transmit copies of your letter, and of this answer, as well to the governor general of his majesty's possessions in North-America, and the governor of Upper Canada, as to his Majesty's ministers in England, for their respective information.

Before I conclude this letter, I must be permitted to observe that I have confined to the unrepessed and continued aggressions of the state of Vermont, alone, the persuasion of Lord Dorchester, that they were indicative of an existing hostile disposition in the United States against Great Britain, and might ultimately produce an actual state of war on their part. If I had been desirous of recurring to other sources of disquietude, I might, from the allusion of his Lordship to the conduct of this government towards "the sea," have deduced other motives of apprehension, on which, from the solicitude you evince to establish a "contrast between the temper observed on your part towards us, and our part towards you," I might have conceived myself justified in dilating. I might have adverted to the privateers originally fitted out at Charleston, at the commencement of the present hostilities, and which were allowed to depart from that port not only with the consent, but under the express permission of the governor of South-Carolina.

I might have adverted to the prizes made by those privateers, of which the legality was in some measure admitted, by the refusal of this government to restore such as were made antecedently to the 5th of June 1793. I might have adverted to the permission granted by this government to the commanders of French ships of war, and of privateers, to dispose of their prizes by sale, in ports of the United States. I might have adverted to the two privateers le petit Democrat (now la Corroli) and le Carmagnol, both which were illegally fitted out in the river Delaware, and which in consequence of my remonstrances and of the assurances

81 = \$ 1200 750  
110 -