



AND

North-Carolina State Gazette.

Quere are the plans of fair delightful peace,  
Unwar'd by party rage, to live like Brothers.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1809.

No. 449.

Vol. X.

Mr. Canning and Mr. Pinkney.

From the National Intelligencer.

The following letter, represented to be from Mr. Canning to Mr. Pinkney, has made its appearance in the New-York Gazette, with these introductory remarks:

"This letter establishes two IMPORTANT FACTS, which ought never to be forgotten."

"The first is, that the offer of Mr. Jefferson to raise the embargo on the rescinding the Orders in Council, was only communicated to Mr. Canning by Mr. Pinkney in his INDIVIDUAL capacity, in a verbal communication, and with an expression of a belief only, that his government would raise the embargo IF the British government would FIRST remove their obnoxious Orders in Council."

"The second Fact is, that Mr. Pinkney, (in reply to Mr. Canning's request for the information) states unreservedly, that when the President recommended the embargo, he had no information of the passage of the British Orders in Council now complained of."

We are even more astonished at the profligate falsehood of these assertions, ostensibly penned by an American, than at the hardness of the British Minister, whom we had during the course of the last summer occasion to detect in the most disingenuous misrepresentation and distortion of facts. The coincidence of misrepresentation can only be accounted for by the ascription of the letter, as well as the comment to the same foreign feelings.

The falsehood of the first allegation will abundantly appear from a reference to the documents recently published, from which the following extract will suffice.

Mr. Pinkney, in his note to Mr. Canning, bearing date the 23rd of August, precisely a month anterior to the date of Mr. C.'s extraordinary letter, says—

"I had the honor to state to you, sir, that it was the intention of the President, in case G. Britain repealed her orders, as regarded the United States, to exercise the power vested in him by the act of the last session of Congress, entitled 'An act to authorize the President of the United States, under certain conditions, to suspend the operation of the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the U. S. and the several supplementary acts thereto,' by suspending the embargo law and its supplements, as regards G. Britain."

"I am authorized to give you this assurance in the most formal manner; and I trust that upon impartial enquiry it will be found to have no inducement to perseverance in the British orders, while it creates the most powerful inducements of equity and policy to abandon them."

If Mr. Pinkney is to be credited, Mr. Canning has most egregiously misrepresented him on this point. And if on this point, there is equal reason to infer that he has equally misrepresented him on the other;—nay, stronger. For in this last instance, however unimportant the fact in dispute, let it be recollected that the opposition in this country had taken the ground contended for by Mr. C. who in this part, as in every other of the controversy between the two governments, appears most wonderfully to have co-operated with the American malcontents. Whether the government of the U. S. had a perfect knowledge of the orders of November 11th, previous to the imposition of the embargo, is of no importance; but it is certain that they were in existence a time enough to have reached this country before that event, and that the government, as well as the people, knew of their existence, and enough of their contents to justify, with other causes, the embargo.

On the general tenor of Mr. Canning's letter, it will be but fair for the reader not to decide until Mr. Pinkney's answer shall appear. From the late date of Mr. C.'s note, it may be presumed that Mr. Pinkney's reply had not reached the U. S. when the documents were laid before Congress.

Mr. Canning to Mr. Pinkney, accompanying his letter of September 23, 1808.  
Foreign Office  
Sept. 23, 1808

Sir—In laying before the king your letter of the 23rd of August, and in communicating to you the accompanying answer, which I have received his majesty's commands to return to it: I confess I feel some little embarrassment from the repeated references which your letter contains, to what has passed between us in con-

versation. An embarrassment arising in no degree (as you are perfectly aware) from any feeling of distrust in you personally, but from a recollection of a misrepresentation which took place in America of former conferences between us. You gave me, on that account, the most satisfactory proof that such misrepresentation did not originate with you, by communicating to me that part of your dispatch, in which the conferences particularly referred to, were related correctly; but this very circumstance which establishes your personal claim to entire confidence proves, at the same time, that a faithful report of a conference on your part is not a security against its misrepresentation.

It was for that reason, principally, that after hearing, with the most respectful attention, all that you had to state to me, verbally, upon the subject of the present overture, I felt myself under the necessity of requiring, as "indispensable," a written communication upon the subject.

It is for that reason, also, that as in your written communication you refer me to our late conversations for the "bearings and details" of your proposal, I feel it necessary to recapitulate, as shortly as I can, what I conceive to have passed in these conversations beyond what I find recorded in your letter.

The principal points on which the suggestions brought forward by you in personal conference, appear to me to have differed in some degree from the proposal now stated by you in writing are two—the first, that in conversation the proposal itself was not distinctly stated as an overture authorised by your government, the second, that the beneficial consequences likely to result to this country from the acceptance of that proposal were "pursued" through more ample "illustrations."

In the first of our conferences, I understood you to say little more on the authority of your government, than that you were instructed to remonstrate against the orders in council of the 7th of January, and 11th of November 1807, but to add, as from yourself, an expression of your own conviction, that if these orders were repealed, the President of the U. S. would suspend the embargo with respect to G. Britain.

Upon the consequences of such a suspension of the embargo while it would still continue to be enforced against France, you expatiated largely—still speaking, however, (as I understood) your own individual sentiments.

It was suggested by you, that America would, in this case, probably arm her merchant ships against the aggressions of France, an expedient, to which, you observed, it would be perfectly idle to resort against G. Britain. The collisions of armed vessels would probably produce war—and the United States would thus be brought into the very situation in which we must wish to place them, that of hostility to France, & virtual, if not formal alliance with G. Britain.

In our second conference, you repeated and enforced the arguments calculated to induce the British government to consent to the repeal of the orders in council, and in this conference, though not stating yourself to be authorised by your government formally to offer the suspension of the embargoes an immediate consequence of that repeal—yet you did profess (as I understood you) a readiness to take upon yourself to make that offer, provided that I should give you beforehand an unofficial assurance, that coupled with that offer so made, the demand of the repeal of the orders in council of January and November, 1807, would be probably rescinded.

I, of course, declined to give any such previous assurances—but as you appeared to attach great importance to this suggestion, and as I was led to think that a compliance with it might relieve you from a difficulty in executing the instructions of your government, I consented to take a few days to consider of it, and to reserve my definitive answer until I should see you again.

I never doubted in my own mind, as to the inexpediency and impor-

propriety of encouraging you to take an unauthorised step, by an unofficial promise that it should be well received—but in a matter of such delicacy I was desirous of either confirming or correcting my own opinion by the opinion of others.

The result was, that in a third interview, which took place shortly after the second, I had the honor to inform you, that after the most mature deliberation, I found it impossible to yield to your suggestion, and that it, therefore remained for you to frame your proposition according to the instructions of your government, as to your own unbiassed discretion.

My own share in these several conferences, beyond what was implied in the above statement was very small. I have (as you know) always wished to refer the argumentative discussion of the subject of the orders in council, to the official correspondence, which I have more than once been taught to expect you to open upon it, than to engage with you in a verbal controversy, which, if confined to ourselves, would be useless—if afterwards to be reduced into writing for the purpose of being communicated to our respective governments—superfluous.

But to the representations which you have repeatedly made against the orders in council of January and November, "as violating the rights of the United States, and affecting most destructively their best interests, upon grounds wholly inadmissible both in principle and fact"—I have uniformly maintained the unquestionable right of his majesty to resort to the fullest measures of retaliation, in consequence of the unparalleled aggressions of the enemy, and to retort upon that enemy the evils of his own injustice, & have uniformly contended that "if third parties suffer from those measures, the demand of reparation must be made to that power, which first violates the established usages of war and the rights of neutral states."

There was, indeed, one point, upon which I was particularly anxious to receive precise information, and upon which, from your candor and frankness, I was fortunate enough to obtain it. The connecting together, in your proposed overture, the suspension of the embargo and the repeal of the orders in council—as well those of November, as the preceding one of the 7th of January, might appear to imply that the embargo had been the immediate consequence of those orders, and I was, therefore, desirous to ascertain whether, in fact, the orders in council of November had been known to the government of the U. S. previous to the message of the President proposing the embargo—so as to be a moving consideration to that message. I had the satisfaction to learn from you, that such was not the fact—that rumors, indeed, might have reached America of some measure of further retaliation being in the contemplation of the British government, that, perhaps, (as I understood you) some more severe and sweeping measures might have been expected—but that the orders in council of the 11th of November, as having been issued, there was no knowledge of in America—at least, none in possession of the American government, at the time of proposing the embargo.—Such, sir, is, (according to the best of my recollection) correctly, the substance of what has passed between us, at our several interviews, previous to the presentation of your official letter; and such I have represented to have been the substance of what has passed on those several occasions in the reports of our conferences, which it has been my duty to make to the King.

If, in this recapitulation, there is anything mistaken, or any thing omitted, you will do me the justice to believe, the error unintentional, and you may rely on my readiness to put it right. I have the honor to be, &c.  
GEORGE CANNING.

From the succeeding Intelligencer. In our last we laid before our Readers the insidious letter of Mr. Canning, published by the emissaries of the British government (if not penned by Mr. Canning himself) to divide the people from their government by impressing upon their minds absolute untruths—to animate faction, & excite rebellion. We defy any man atten-

tively to examine the letter, and consider the place where it first appeared (Boston) and the season of its appearance (when the government was about rigorously to enforce the embargo) and to doubt the inference we have drawn. We have now the satisfaction of presenting an ANTI-DOTE, of whose complete efficacy we entertain no question. Like the factious attempt of Genet, this diplomatic artifice will recoil on its authors. The President yesterday laid before Congress the following important MESSAGE, which by a great exertion we are enabled to publish entire. A short but animated debate arose in the House of Representatives on the proposition to print the Message, not from any difference of opinion on this point, but from the universal indignation felt at this audacious foreign effort to interfere with our concerns. This feeling was not expressed only by the Republican, but likewise by several Federal Members of the House. Mr. KEY, in particular, did himself great honor by the manly terms in which he avowed his abhorrence of the attempt. Five thousand copies were ordered to be printed. The debate shall be given in our next.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the U. States.

I communicate to Congress certain letters which passed between the British Secretary of State, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Pinkney, our Minister Plenipotentiary at London. When the documents concerning the relations between the United States and Great-Britain were laid before Congress at the commencement of the session, the answer of Mr. Pinkney to the letter of Canning had not been received, and a communication of the latter alone would have accorded neither with propriety nor with the wishes of Mr. Pinkney. When that answer afterwards arrived, it was considered that as what had passed in conversation had been superceded by the written and formal correspondence on the subject, the variance in the statements of what had verbally passed was not of sufficient importance to be made the matter of a distinct and special communication. The letter of Mr. Canning, however, having lately appeared in print, unaccompanied by that of Mr. Pinkney in reply, and having a tendency to make impressions not warranted by the statements of Mr. Pinkney, it has become proper that the whole should be brought into public view.

TH: JEFFERSON.  
Jan. 17, 1809.

London, Sept. 24, 1808.

SIR—I am now enabled to transmit to you a copy of Mr. Canning's answer, received only last night, to my note of the 23d of August.

This answer was accompanied by a letter, of which also a copy is enclosed, recapitulating what Mr. Canning supposes to be "the substance of what has passed between us at our several interviews previous to the presentation of my official letter."

To the accompanying paper I think it indispensable that I should reply without delay—Supporting with politeness, but with firmness, the statements which I have already had the honor to make to you, of the conversations in question, and correcting some errors upon points, which Mr. Canning has thought fit to introduce into his letter, but which I had not supposed it necessary to mention in detail in my dispatches.

I shall not detain Mr. Atwater with a view to this reply; but will take care to forward a copy of it by an early conveyance. My official note and the answer to it being perfectly explicit, Mr. Canning's misapprehensions (for such they are) of previous verbal communications can scarcely be very important in a public view; but it is, nevertheless, of some consequence that, whatever may be the object of his statement, I should not make myself a party to its inaccuracies, by even a tacit admission of them.

I do not perceive that a formal reply to the more official paper can now be of any advantage; but I shall probably take occasion to combine with my reply to the one paper some observations upon the other.

I regret extremely that the views which I have been instructed to lay before this government, have not been met by it as I had at first been led to expect. The overture cannot fail, however, to place in a strong light the just and liberal sentiments by which our government is animated, and in other respects to be useful and honorable to our country.

I have the the honor to be, with the highest consideration, &c.

WM. PINKNEY.  
Hon. Jas. Madison, &c.

[Here follows the letter of Mr. Canning to Mr. Pinkney, published in our last—If, on examination, there should appear to be any variation between the original and the copy, we shall notice it in our next.]

Great Cumberland Place,  
Sept. 24, 1808.

SIR—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your answer to my official note of the 23d of last month, relative to the British orders in council of January and November 1807, together with a statement of "the substance of what has passed between us at our several interviews, previous to the presentation of that note."

I shall lose no time in transmitting to my government, copies of both these papers, upon the last of which I will take the liberty, in the course of a few days, to trouble you with some observations.

I have the honor to be with the highest consideration, &c.

WM. PINKNEY.  
Rt. Hon. Geo. Canning, &c.

London, Oct. 11, 1808.

SIR—I have the honor to transmit enclosed a copy of my reply to Mr. Canning's letter to me, of the 23d of the last month, accompanying his official answer of the same date to my note of the 23d August.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, &c.

WM. PINKNEY.  
Hon. Jas. Madison, &c.

TO MR. CANNING.

Great Cumberland Place,  
October 10, 1808.

SIR—If my reply to the letter, which you did me the honor to address to me on the 23d of last month, should be of greater length than the occasion may be thought to require, you will, I am sure, impute it to its real cause, an earnest desire on my part, arising from a feeling of sincere respect for you, that the statement which I am to give of facts, deemed by you to be important, should be full as well as accurate.

I will not fatigue you, sir, with assurances that no person could be less disposed than I am, to find fault with the object of your letter, which appears to be to guard against all misrepresentation of "what has passed in our last interviews, beyond what you find recorded in my note." You have told me, that I have, personally, no concern in that object, and I did not require to be told that my government has as little. I understand, indeed, that the circumstance which has suggested a peculiar motive for this proceeding, was one of those newspaper misrepresentations, which every day produces where the press is free, which had no credit & beget no consequence, and for which it is greatly to be feared your expedient will provide no remedy. Of my conduct, when that circumstance occurred, in giving you unsolicited proofs that I had transmitted to Mr. Secretary Madison, a faithful report of our conferences, mistaken by public rumor or private conjecture, it is not necessary for me to speak for you have yourself done justice to it.

The motive, to which I am indebted for the honor of your letter, appears to have been instrumental in producing another effect equally unexceptionable. But you will allow me to say, that, until the receipt of that letter, I had not been apprised, by the slightest intimation, that it was in any degree owing to such a cause that you declined, on the part of his Majesty's government, after two conferences, in which I had been suffered, if not encouraged, to unfold myself, individually as well as officially, at great length and with perfect frankness, to give an answer to my verbal overture.

At our first interview (on the 29th of June) verbal communication was not discontinued, but commended. For, after I had made myself understood as to the purpose, for which the interview had been requested, you asked me, if I thought of taking a more formal course, I immediately added that you presumed I did not; for that the course I had

(Continued in the last page.)