

The Edenton Gazette,

A N D

NORTH CAROLINA ADVERTISER.

EDENTON: Printed by JAMES WILLS, at 25c. per Annum, if paid within the year; if not, 30c. Distant Subscribers must pay in Advance. ADVERTISEMENTS of no more length than breadth inserted the first week for 5c. and 2c. 6d. for each continuance; larger ones in proportion. No Subscriber can discontinue his paper until he has paid up his arrears.

VOL. III.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1809.

NUM. 155.

MR. PINCKNEY'S LETTER. (CONCLUDED.)

At the third interview, after speaking of a transaction upon the Lakes, of which your traders complained, & of another occurrence in the Bay of Passamaquoddy, you observed, that you had thought long and anxiously upon what I had suggested to you; that the subject had at first struck you as being much more simple than upon careful examination it had been found to be; that, in the actual state of the world, it behoved both you and me to move in this affair with every possible degree of circumspection; that, without some explicit proposal on my part in writing, upon which the British government could deliberate and act, nothing could be done; and finally, that you must leave me to consult my own discretion whether I would make such a proposal.

It appeared to me, that if this determination should be persisted in, my overture was not likely to be successful, and I urged, accordingly, the propriety of going on in a course which would lead us to a better issue. That course was, that we should understand one another as to our respective views, and that a concise note, which I had in fact prepared since the last meeting, should then be presented and acted upon. You informed me that my wish in this particular could not be acceded to; that, if I presented a note, you must be left at perfect liberty to decide upon what I proposed; that you could not give me even an intimation of the probable consequences of it; and, in a word, that you would neither invite nor discourage such a proceeding. You added that there were some points belonging to the subject, which it would be proper to discuss in writing; one of which was the connection between our Embargo and your orders of November, supposed to be implied by my proposal. I remarked that, with an actual result in view, and with a wish to arrive at that result without delay, it could not be advisable to entangle ourselves in a written correspondence, undefined as to its scope and duration, upon topics on which we were not likely to agree; and that, if I were to frame my note, with a knowledge that it was to provoke argument, instead of leading at this crisis to a salutary change in the state of the world, you must be conscious that I too must argue. And where would this end? To what wholesome consequence would it conduct us? At the close of the interview, I observed that, as the footing upon which the subject was now placed, made delay of no importance, I should take time to prepare such further proceeding as the occasion required.

On the 26th of August I had the honor to see you again; and after entering more at large than I had before believed to be proper, into a consideration of the effect of my proposal, on the equity of adhering to your Orders in Council, and, after reading to you parts of my instructions, I delivered an official note, in which the proposal was made in the form required.

Something was said at this interview, of the affair of the Chesapeake, and the President's proclamation, which it is not, I presume, necessary to repeat. It will be sufficient to state, that you asked me what was to be done with these subjects; and that my reply was, that they had no connection with the present; but that I could say, with confidence, that my government had every disposition to attend to them, with a view to such adjust-

ment as would be honorable to both parties. I did not suppose that it was expected (for you did not intimate such an expectation) that renewed negotiation upon these points should, as well as the repeal, upon terms, of your Orders in Council, be invited by a formal overture from the government of America.

I will not trouble you with many observations more.

You state in your letter that "there was one point upon which you were particularly anxious to receive precise information, and upon which, from my candor and frankness, you were fortunate enough to obtain it." This was "whether in fact the Orders in Council of Nov. had been known to the government of the United States previous to the message of the President proposing the Embargo, so as to be a moving consideration to that message." I quote this passage, principally, that I may recall to your recollection, that my suggestions, upon the subject of it, were not made officially, or as being authorised, or furnished, by any communication from my government, or in answer to any direct enquiries on your part. They were very briefly made, near the close, as I think, of our third interview, in consequence of your intimation, intended perhaps to amount to an enquiry, that my proposal implied, that the Embargo had been produced by the Orders of November; to which you added, that this could not be admitted (as I comprehended what you said) that it even required to be made the subject of some notice or discussion in writing as intimately connected with my proposal, if it should be brought forward in that shape; and I understood you to assign this as one of the reasons why a written overture was indispensable. In replying to that intimation, and the remarks which followed it, I professed to speak, as I did in fact speak from general information only, and disclaimed, as it was my duty to do, all authority to say more, upon the nature and origin of the Embargo, than I had some time before communicated to you, in obedience to the orders of the President. The purpose of my observations was chiefly to shew, that there was no inducement for embarking in formal discussions upon this point; and I assured you that it was not in my power, either as it respected instructions from my government, or knowledge of facts, to do so. My opinion was, and I spoke accordingly, that it was one of those questions which might be left completely at rest, without the least injury to the wisdom or the justice of our conclusions, upon the great object of our conferences. There could be no objection however, to my giving you on this head such conjectural information as I was able. On the contrary, by fully disclosing to you my own materials for forming an opinion upon it, you would be enabled more distinctly to see that I could take no part in any discussion which you might propose to apply to it; and I could not but be assured, that any anxiety you might feel to obtain a knowledge of the facts in question, sprung from considerations which had every claim to my respect; for I knew that your mind was far above the reach of prejudices which would ascribe to the American Embargo participation in the councils or views of your adversary, or of any foreign power whatsoever.

My suggestions were to the following effect; that I believed that no copy of your orders of November had arrived in the United States at the date of the President's message; that

a recent change in the conduct of France to our prejudice did appear to be known; that intelligence had been received, and a belief entertained, of your intent to adopt some further measure, as a measure of retaliation against France, by which our commerce and our rights would be affected; that there was reason to conclude that you had actually adopted such a measure; that (as I had collected from American newspapers) this had appeared from private letters and the newspapers of this country received in the United States some days before the message of the President, and probably known to the government; that, in a word, various information concurred to shew that our trade was likely to be assailed by the combined efforts of both the belligerent parties; and that the Embargo was a measure of wise and peaceful precaution, adopted under this view of reasonably anticipated peril.

You observe in another part of your letter, "that you have always rather wished to refer the argumentative discussion of the subject of the Orders in Council to the official correspondence which you have more than once been taught to expect me to open upon it."—If I should object to any part of this statement, of which the substance is undoubtedly correct, it would be to the words "more than once." Your wish has always appeared to be such as you now represent it, and you had reason to expect that I would commence a written discussion of the orders of November, soon after their publication. I had told you that I should do so, and you had said that there could be no objection to it. But you were afterwards informed, that upon reflection, I had determined to leave the subject where it was until I should know the pleasure of my government.

The orders had been officially communicated, not to me, but to Mr. Madison, through the British minister at Washington. It seemed therefore to be proper, unless my instructions should make it otherwise, that the view which the government of the United States took of them, should find its way to you through the same channel, and accordingly the letters of Mr. Madison to which I have referred in my note of the 23d of August, did open, at great length, a discussion, which I could have no inducement to shun, although I did continue to think myself authorised to commence it.

It only remains to add, that your share in our several conversations was, what you represent it to have been, not considerable, and that your manner, although reserved, was, as it always is, perfectly friendly.

I need not say that, if in this letter, written under the influence of sincere concern that the proposal I had the honor to lay before you has been unsuccessful, any thing is to be found which you could wish to be otherwise than it is, I shall be the first to regret, that I have not been able to do justice to my own feelings and intentions.

I have the honor to be,
With the highest consideration,
Sir, your most obedient,
Humble servant,
W. PINCKNEY.

Congress of the United States.

THURSDAY, January 19.
The house, according to the order of the day, resolved itself into a committee of the whole house, on the bill to alter the time for the next meeting of Congress, Mr. Pittin in the chair.

Several motions were made to strike out of the bill the words "fourth Monday in May," but the committee finally rose and reported it without amendment.

After the Speaker resumed the chair, Mr. D. R. Williams renewed the motion to strike out "fourth Monday in May."

—This produced considerable discussion. From observations which fell from gentlemen on the subject, it appeared that there were three views taken of the question.—Messrs. Macon and D. R. Williams were against an extra session of Congress, conceiving that the Embargo would eventually be effectual, and that no measures ought to be taken to weaken the opinion that the policy would be adhered to. Messrs. Smilie, J. G. Jackson, Bacon, Nicholas, Burwell, G. W. Campbell, and others, were in favor of an extra session, on the grounds that if the European belligerents did not come to terms previously to the period designated in the bill, that it would be proper for Congress to meet and consult upon the propriety of repealing the Embargo, and of adopting more energetic means of resistance. Mr. Quincy contended that there was no real intention to repeal the Embargo; that from the first, there was an intention of persevering in the Embargo, as long as the people could be induced to bear it. That the original reason assigned for laying the Embargo was precaution; that, nevertheless, it had been argued from as a measure of coercion; that Great-Britain understanding it as a measure of coercion, would never acquiesce—that precaution had been the veil, through which coercion, like a sword, was to be thrust up to the hilt, into the vitals of Great-Britain; that the administration had no intention of going to war, which was manifested by several circumstances; that is to say, the appointment of officers in the new army, which had been made upon a rule excluding gentlemen of the opposition from holding commissions; the house had refused to fit out ships of war; the treasury was in an exhausted state; and he could not conceive if war was intended, that a party army would have been organized; that the navy would have been refused to be equipped; and that the treasury would not have been supplied by some means or other.—From these considerations he drew the inference that the Embargo was not to be repealed; that the extra session was merely calculated to keep the people quiet for the present, and that when Congress meet here in May, the citizens of the United States would be told, that they must bear it a little longer, and that thus the Embargo would be continued till next September or till next May twelve-month. To these criminations of Mr. Quincy, Mr. Eppes rejoined, as did Mr. J. G. Jackson, vindicating the friends of the Embargo from his imputations of insincerity in their professions of a disposition to raise the Embargo at an early day, and retorted upon Mr. Q. his charge of deluding the people, enquiring for what purpose Mr. Quincy had made the speech he had just uttered? Whether that was not intended to influence the minds of the citizens at the East?—A speech, said Mr. Eppes, (in substance) which appears to be a very polished composition, and very well cut and dried for the purpose intended.

The house adjourned at a late hour, without coming to any decision.

FRIDAY, January 20.

The house resumed the consideration of the bill, to alter the time for the next meeting of Congress—whereupon,