

# Foreign Intelligence.

## Late from England.

New-York, August 26.

On Saturday evening arrived at this port the ship Herald, capt. Price, having sailed from Liverpool on the 9th July, by which we have received a file of London papers to the 6th, and a Liverpool paper of the 8th of July.

It appears that capt. Bingham's letter which was received by the British Government, had not been published on the 6th, but was expected to appear in the Gazette the following day.

A special messenger (Mr. Proudman) left London on the 5th of July, on his way to America, with dispatches for Mr. Foster; and a sloop of war, was to sail about the same time for our coast, with pilots, who were acquainted with our harbors, and charts of all our line of Sea Coast.

It is also stated in the London papers, that Marshal Massena had left France for Spain and Portugal, to resume the command of his army.

The King of England remained as by the last advices.

The following is a copy of capt. Price's instructions, relative to his dispatches:

Amstcrdam Gazette, Liverpool, July 8.

"Sir—You have two dispatches for the Department of State No 1 and 2. In case of war, and you be brought to by a British cruiser, you will sink No. 1. Your most obedt. servt. JAMES MAURY

To Captain John Byce of the American ship Herald."

LONDON, JULY 1.

His Majesty's sloop Spy, of 16 guns, was to sail yesterday from Portsmouth for the coast of America, with charts of the different harbours, soundings, &c. on the shores of the United States. The Spy also brings out Pilots acquainted with the American harbors. We stated last week, that Rear Admiral Sir Joseph Yorke, is to proceed with a squadron for that quarter. This gallant Officer is expected at Portsmouth on Wednesday, to hoist his flag on board the Vengeur, of 74 guns. The ships which we understand, have received orders to put themselves under his command, are, Vengeur, 74; Denmark, 74; America, 74; Edinburgh, 74; Pyramus frigate, and Rover. This small squadron is large enough to blow the whole American navy out of the water. Its departure, however, will depend upon the conduct of the Government of the United States respecting the late affair between the Little Belt and the American frigate President.

JULY 4.

A Gentleman, who left St. Petersburg on the 13th ult. states, that although it was reported there that the differences between France and Russia had been amicably adjusted, yet troops of every description continued to be sent into Poland.

The Mutine, recently arrived from Rio Janeiro, has imported about two millions of dollars; and the China fleet, shortly expected, has on board from 10 to 12 millions.

JULY 6.

The 2d and 9th dragoons sailed from Plymouth on Thursday. Each man took a spare horse to remount such of our cavalry in Portugal as may be in want of horses. The drafts from the second battalion of the 32d and 40th regiments sailed from Cove last Saturday evening. The 59th regiment of foot sailed the next day.

Sir J. Yorke sailed yesterday for the coast of America, with the squadron under his command, consisting of three sail of the line, a frigate and a sloop.

The Members of the Queen's Council are summoned to meet at Windsor this day in order to receive the quarterly report of the King's physicians respecting his Majesty's health. This report will be laid before both Houses of Parliament on Friday next.

Yesterday at a quarter past twelve his Majesty came on the Terrace for his morning's exercise, and walked till near one, when he returned to the Castle to dinner.

The 26th and 27th regiments have sailed from Jersey for Portugal, and the 25d regiment from Guernsey.

A letter received yesterday from Holland by a commercial house in the city, states, that 10,000 French troops had marched towards Tonnaingen.

Private letters from Lisbon state, that Massena had met Bonaparte at Cherbun, where he concerted a new plan of the war in the Peninsula, and that he had returned to Spain, to resume his command.

Liverpool, July 6.

## AMERICA.

It is not only the general opinion in the circles of Government, that the United States are disposed to hostilities with this country, but a declaration to this effect has been made by one of the Members of the Cabinet in a private company. On the important subject of the President and the Little Belt we have to observe, that a gentleman in London who, previous to his departure from America, saw capt. Rogers, who declared that he and the whole of the officers of his crew would make oath that the Little Belt fired the first shot after having been killed twice.

## Very late from France.

New-York, August 27.

The last sailing schooner Purse, capt. Turner, arrived at this port yesterday in 32 days from Bordeaux, from whence she sailed on the 22d July. The affair between the President and Little Belt was known to the French government, and had produced the release, with permission to sail, of several American vessels. The news of the departure of Sir Joseph Yorke for the American station, had also been received.

Joseph Bonaparte had set out for Spain; and 80,000 troops were to follow him, as a reinforcement to the armies in Spain and Portugal.

Tranquillity prevailed between France and Russia, and no idea was entertained that it would be interrupted.

We do not learn that any material change had taken place in the relations between the United States and France. Hopes were however entertained by the French people, that on the arrival of Mr. Barlow our differences would be amicably adjusted. The enormous duties on American produce continued, but there was a prospect of their being speedily reduced.

Genl Turreau, late Minister to this country, had arrived in the brig Osmy, in 30 days from New-York.

The super-cargo of the Purse is the bearer of dispatches for government.

By the Purse has been received a file of French papers to the 17th July, which are very barren of news. They contain the affair of the President and Little Belt as published in the American newspapers.

Under the Paris head of July 9th, we find a dispatch from Gen. Count Suchet, dated the 29th of June, announcing the capture of Tarragona, after a siege of 2 months, during which time five successive assaults were made. The garrison consisted of 18,000 men of the best troops of Spain. 4000 men were killed in the city; from 10 to 12,000 attempted to save themselves by passing over the walls, 1000 of whom were sabred and drowned; and nearly 10,000, including 500 officers, are prisoners, and are on their march to France. About 1500 wounded men were in the hospitals. Among the prisoners are the Governor Don Juan de Conturas, 3 Field Marshals and 497 officers. Twenty standards, 40,000 bullets & bombs, & 500,000 lbs. of powder and ball are also taken.

Under the same head is a dispatch from Marshal Soult, dated before Badajoz, the 21st of June, announcing the raising of the siege of that place by the British, and of his having formed a junction with the army of the south, under Gen. Marmont, late Massena's army.

## Domestic.

### INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Vincennes (Indian Ter.) Aug. 3.

The council between the Governor and the Indian Chiefs closed on Wednesday evening. The celebrated Tecumseh (brother of the Prophet) was the principal speaker on the part of the Indians. His display of talents and oratory was by no means such as we had anticipated. In his first speech on Tuesday, he made an apology for seizing the alt, and it was so weak a one, he might as well have held his tongue. In his last speech he displayed indeed some art & ingenuity; but the veil under which he attempted to cover his designs, was so thin, as to be seen through by all those who were not wilfully blind. He gave indeed no satisfaction on any point. To the complaint of the Governor on the subject of the late murders and other depredations, and the demand of the two men who had murdered Capt. Cole and his party on the Missouri, he replied, that these ought to be forgiven; that he was about to set out to visit the southern Indians, for the purpose of inviting them to join the northern tribes, all of whom were now united under his control; that as soon as he effected the object of his journey, which he expected would take him till next spring, he would then return and he would then be willing to settle all differences with the white people; that he would send messages to all the different tribes under his control, to tell them what to do in his absence; but if any further murders were committed on our people, he hoped it would be overlooked until his return. To the question asked him by the Governor, whether it was the intention of the Indians to do any mischief to those who have or who shall settle in the new purchase? He replied, that the tract ought not to be settled until his return; because a considerable number of Indians would come to settle at his town this fall; that they intended to use that tract as a hunting ground, and that the white people would probably lose their cattle and hogs.

Strip of the thin disguise with which he attempted to cover his intentions, the plain English of what he said appeared to be this: "In obedience to my master, the British, I have now succeeded in uniting the northern tribes of Indians into a confederacy for the purpose of attacking the United States, and I am now on my way to stir up the southern Indians—I wish you however to remain perfectly quiet till I return. Do not attempt to obtain any satisfaction for the injuries you may sustain, or for such as

you have already received; I am not quite ready to resist you—when I return I shall be completely so, and then you may do as you please." We hope however the government will take immediate and effectual measures to break up this confederacy. The resolutions of the citizens of this county which we this day publish and the address to the President, which we also insert, will, we hope have the desired effect.

Knoxville, August 12.

Death of the Black Fox—This distinguished chief of the Cherokee nation of Indians, died on the 15th July. His death is an event of importance to the people of this section of the country. Many of the young men of the nation it is known have expressed themselves with jealous hostility of the whites, inasmuch that on several occasions misunderstandings, like to produce bloodshed, have frequently taken place. Notwithstanding detachments of U. S. troops have been employed in removing trespassers off the Indian lands, encroachments continue to be made and continue to furnish just grounds of complaint to this tribe of Indians. Circumstances of this kind afford to the restless and designing the means of sowing the seeds of hostility in the minds of many. On such occasions the influence of the Black Fox never failed in quieting the minds of his reflecting brethren—and when it is considered that a commercial intercourse with Mobile through the waters of the Coosa which rise in, and pass through a considerable part of the Cherokee country, is an object of particular interest to the people of this State, the death of a Chief whose information enabled him to estimate the advantages to his tribe from a measure of the kind, is much to be regretted.

## Political.

From the National Intelligencer.

### CONSIDERATIONS

#### ON ROBERT SMITH'S ADDRESS.

(Concluded.)

What are the three distinct facts adduced by Mr. Smith against Mr. Madison, from which Federalists attempt to substantiate, what the writer doubtless meant to imply, a subservience to France?

1. That he did not approve a letter to Gen. Turreau, on the subject of the restrictions on our trade with France.

It might be sufficient, on this head, to observe that this letter could not have been transmitted to Gen. Turreau unless approved by the President, and therefore there could be no other view in transplanting it into this address than of supplying the extreme paucity of materials for Mr. Madison's crimination by any thing upon which a plausible insinuation could be bottomed. But let us look at the object probably intended by the letter at the time it was drafted, which is further illustrated by the formal manner in which its history is introduced into his printed book. It was evidently with a design to confuse and embarrass the proceedings of Congress and to prevent the passage of the non-intercourse of the last session, which he knew to be necessary to enforce the law of May, 1810, that Mr. Smith blended questions of commercial regulations with that of a revocation of the decrees, in his letter to Gen. Turreau, proper in itself as directed to France, but very improper as related to England, whose ministry has not failed since to take advantage of it; and we much question whether the extent of the evil, to which it may have given birth, is yet realized. What has already come to our knowledge is enough to shew the wisdom of Mr. Madison in that particular respect, in causing to be inserted the clause intended to guard against such evils; the insertion of which clause, if we do not misapprehend Mr. Smith, is what particularly excited his disgust, and has made that act a prominent ingredient in his address. For our readers be it to judge, what object Mr. Smith had in view when his ire was excited by an amendment to his letter which the public good so essentially required.

2. That he did not approve an intended letter to Gen. Armstrong on the subject of the Rambouillet confiscations.

This letter, with which Mr. Smith was so much pleased as to insert it at full length in his address, was, it may be observed, only an argumentative one on a subject which certainly required no argument; for it was a matter of feeling more than reason. It contained not a word of the indignation felt by our government and people at those confiscations, nor any instruction to communicate those feelings to the French government. Nor was it particularly necessary that it should. Those feelings had already been communicated by Mr. Armstrong in his note of the 10th of March to the Duke of Cadore, as the following extract from it will shew:

"It is true, that the United States have, since the 20th of May last, forbidden the entry of French vessels into their harbors; and it is also true, that the penalty of confiscation attaches to the violation of this law. But, in what respect does this offend France? Will she refuse to us the right of regulating commerce within our own ports? Or, will she deny, that the law in question is a regulation merely municipal? Examine it, both as to object and means. What does it more than forbid American ships from going into the ports of France, and French ships from coming into those of the United States? And why this prohibition? To avoid injury and insult; to escape that lawlessness, which is declared to be a forced consequence of the decrees of the British council." If, then, its object be purely

defensive, what are its means? Simply a law previously and generally promulgated, operating solely within the territory of the United States, and punishing alike the infractors of it, whether citizens of the said states, or others. And what is this, but the exercise of a right, common to all nations, of excluding at their will, foreign commerce, and of enforcing that exclusion? Can this be deemed a wrong to France? Can this be regarded as a legitimate cause of reprisal, on the part of a power, who makes it the first duty of nations to defend their sovereignty, and who even denationalizes the ships of those who will not subscribe to the opinion?

"But it has been said, that 'the United States have nothing to complain of against France.' Was the capture and condemnation of a ship, driven on the shores of France, by stress of weather and the perils of the sea, nothing? Was the seizure and sequestration of many cargoes, brought to France, in ships violating no law, and admitted to regular entry at the imperial custom houses, nothing? Was the violation of our maritime rights, consecrated, as they have been, by the solemn forms of a public treaty, nothing? In a word, was it nothing, that our ships were burnt on the high seas, without other offence, than that of belonging to the United States, or other apology than was to be found in the enhanced safety of the perpetrators? Surely, if it be the duty of the United States to resent the theoretical usurpations of the British orders of November, 1807, it cannot be less their duty to complain of the daily and practical outrages on the part of France."

The tone of Mr. Smith's intended letter, and the ground it takes, are much weaker than those of Gen. Armstrong's note already in the hands of the French government. For this argumentative letter Mr. Madison substituted a communication to Mr. Armstrong of the high indignation felt at the outrage; and an approbation of the manner in which he had portrayed it in his note of the 10th March. Subjoined to the letter also was an instruction, which, had it been received in time, would in all probability have connected the restoration of the property confiscated under the Rambouillet decree with the revocation of the Berlin & Milan decrees, as conditions on which our non-intercourse should take place. Let any one judge which was strongest and most useful, the intended letter or Mr. Madison's substitution? Which was most energetic, an argument to prove what was self evident, or an approbation, and thereby the adoption of the vigorous remonstrance of our minister in France? And our readers will recollect that Gen. Armstrong, at the date of the Duke of Cadore's letter accepting the terms of our law (Aug. 5, 1810,) had not yet officially received the law of May 1, 1810; nor did he receive it until some time afterwards, and of course had only the naked law, as taken from a newspaper, without the instruction which accompanied it. The law itself did not require any such restoration of our property as the President was induced, by his sensibility to the rights of our injured citizens, to require to be connected with the revocation contemplated by law. But the connection of the two was an act discretionary with the Executive, and for which he took the responsibility on himself. Unfortunately, perhaps, for those whose property is in jeopardy, the French government acted upon the law, as taken from a newspaper, before it was officially received by Gen. Armstrong from the Department of State; and the law on the face of it did not contemplate a restoration of any sequestered property as a condition. Hence arose the impossibility of afterwards making it a condition precedent to the revival of the non-intercourse as to G. Britain, however desirable such a connection of cessation and reparation of injury would have been.

But Mr. Smith wishes to produce a conviction that Mr. Madison was unwilling to exhibit the conduct of France in an odious point of view. Why did he indigenously pass over the letter addressed to Gen. Armstrong with Mr. Madison's approbation, subsequently to the date of the letter substituted for that proposed by Mr. Smith? The letter to which we allude, dated July 5, our readers will perceive from its date was subsequent to the arrival of the John Adams, and to the preparation of the letter which Mr. S. accuses the President of an undue bias towards France for not sending. The following is the first paragraph:

"The arrival of the John Adams, brought your letters of the 1st, 4th, 7th and 16th April.

"From that of the 16th April, it appears, that the seizures of the American property, lately made, had been followed up by its actual sale, and that the proceeds had been deposited in the Emperor's *caisse privee*. You have presented, in such just colors, the enormity of this outrage, that I have only to signify to you, that the President entirely approves the step that has been taken by you, and that he does not doubt that it will be followed by you, or the person who may succeed you, with such further interpositions, as may be deemed advisable. He instructs you, particularly, to make the French government sensible of the deep impression made here, by so signal an aggression on the principles of justice and of good faith; and to demand every reparation of which the case is susceptible. If it be not the purpose of the French government to remove every idea of friendly adjustment with the United States, it would

From a newspaper. This fact is ascertained by the following passage in the Duke of Cadore's note of August 5, to Gen. Armstrong: "I have laid before his majesty the act of Congress of the 1st May, taken from the Gazette of the United States, which you have sent to me."

seem impossible but that a reconsideration of this violent proceeding must lead to a redress of it, as a preliminary to a general accommodation of the differences between the two countries."

After perusing this letter, actually sent, with what face can any man charge the President with a disposition to palliate the conduct of France? Could language be at once stronger and yet consistent with the decorum by which all state papers should be characterized? Nay, more, can any one shew us language of greater severity in any case used by our government in relation to the British government? We believe not; and yet there are those who would not fail to produce it if they could; because it would be joy to their hearts to exhibit the government as more partial to one than the other of the belligerents. The more we reflect on this subject, the more we are at a loss to perceive a reason for the insertion of this letter in Mr. Smith's address, unless to display the talent exhibited in the preparation of it.

III. That Mr. Madison did not approve the draft of a letter to Mr. Serrurier, the French minister to our government.

This letter, it pains us to say, was, as was the letter to Gen. Turreau, evidently designed to embarrass and confuse the proceedings of Congress. Mr. Smith had had a previous conversation with M. Serrurier, by means of an interpreter, and well knew that in answer to the letter which he framed, M. Serrurier would not be enabled to say any thing. Let it be remembered—for it is necessary to the due comprehension of this apparent manoeuvre—that M. Serrurier left France on the 1st of January; was detained in Bayonne long after he had received his instructions, and certainly had no instructions subsequent to the 2d of November. These facts being as well known to Mr. Madison as to Mr. Smith, he refused permission to catechise M. Serrurier on points on which Mr. Smith was absolutely informed. M. Serrurier was not instructed, and in answer to which he knew he could only have referred to previous communications from his government to ours or to the acts of his government. If there had been no other reason against sending this letter, it was sufficient that it must of necessity be useless, and being useless must be injurious, because belittling the government by such frivolous conduct.

These are the three facts on which the federal papers, the same papers which particularly laud Mr. Smith for his publication, rely for proof of French influence; these are the facts by which letters from Nova Scotia, published in federal papers in Baltimore, declare "President Madison is clearly proved to be a Frenchman." We appeal to every man of common understanding in the nation, whether such a charge, supported by such vouchers, be not superlatively ridiculous.

But it may be, that Mr. Smith sanctions the idea promulgated "through a certain medium," that no charge of subservience to France was intended. A re-perusal of the Address would have flashed conviction of the incorrectness of this assertion on its author's mind. "Sensible as I have been (says Mr. Smith) to the insults and injuries which the United States have received, again and again, from Great-Britain, [Mr. Smith] have at no time been blind to the reiterated outrages of France." Who said he had? Why introduce this phrase and the paragraph which follows it? Its insertion was not called for in self-justification. It must then have some other object; there needs no supernatural agency to disclose its meaning; and it harmonizes well with the evident design of the whole Address. As to Mr. Smith's opposition to the law of last March, on the ground of partiality to France, on which he evidently designs to leave it; nothing can more clearly illustrate its futility than a moment's reflection on the present state of our commercial relations to France, for doing us a certain justice, has received the distinction in her favor which was awarded by our law to the nation which should return to an observance of respect for neutral rights. Great-Britain had it in her power to have availed herself of the law long before France heard of its passage, but she did not think proper to do so. She now has it in her power, without resigning a single particle of her greatness, to entitle herself to the same privileges in our ports that France now enjoys, by revoking her orders in council as they respect the United States. We refuse to receive her goods so long as she refuses to permit ours to pass. And is this what Mr. Smith calls being "blind to the reiterated outrages of France?" The recent condemnations in British ports speak a different language; and the general voice would damn the public servants who did not by some act resist such outrage. If France were to have been placed in the same relation to us as Britain is now, there is no question but we should have been at war with her long ago.

We shall conclude these desultory reflections, all we have to make at this time on the subject of Mr. Smith's Address, by calling the attention of our readers more particularly to the effects which it may be expected to produce on our foreign relations. Independent of the unfavorable impression which will be produced by the spectacle of our great officers of State divulging the secrets of their Departments, the effects of this combination of fact and hypothesis on our relations with the two belligerents will, we are persuaded, be felt to an extent which cannot now be realized.

As to England, a few weeks we fear will too clearly indicate the operation of the deleterious political poison. Who is there that expects a repeal of her orders in council, when an Ex-Secretary of State declares by implication that his government has "identified" itself with France? Who so credulous as to calculate on restoration of the property confiscated under those orders, or any respect for our rights, when a person ejected from a high office proclaims from the house-top assertions from which the inference is clearly deducible, that his government has been "blind to the reiterated outrages of France?" The reality of the statements contained in this address enter not into the consideration of its effects abroad, which will precede their refutation with a speed not to be overestimated.

As to France—How degrading is the position in which we are placed as to her! A picture is held up to her view in which our Chief Magistrate is represented as bending to her will, as humbling the nation to her high behests! After this, who would be surprised, with the ignorance of our institutions and sentiments which generally prevails in Europe, that we should be greeted with language fit only to be addressed to vassals! When a Secretary of State professes "to draw the mysterious curtain" which veils our affairs, who but attaches credit to his statements? If some of our own honest people have those be affected who have so few opportunities of gaining a correct knowledge of our concerns!