

The Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA,  
FRIDAY EVENING, MAY 19

To THOMAS JEFFERSON, Esquire, Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate.

SIR,

YOUR arrival at the seat of government immediately after the publication of a letter said to be written by you to your friend Mazzini in Italy, affords you a fair opportunity of doing away any bad impression respecting your character, which the falsely ascribing to you improper sentiments may hitherto have occasioned. For the honor of the American name, I must confess, that your silence upon the subject, and the conduct of that party with which you appear, at present, to act, leaves but little probability of its not having proceeded from your pen. If it is not your production, an explicit disavowal of it appears incumbent on you, for several reasons.

1. Because it implies a contradiction of those sentiments respecting our excellent constitution, which you have formerly held, before a disappointed ambition threw you into the hands of a desperate faction, by whose means you expected, no doubt, to have filled the first office of our government.

2. Because it is a direct libel on the character of those men, whom the choice of a free people called to the exercise of the executive and judiciary powers of our government.—And,

3. Because its publication in a country, from whose government and citizens we have met with every kind of injury and insult, has a tendency to encourage a continuance of such conduct in our allies, from a persuasion, that our internal situation would admit of its exercise with impunity.

You stated truly when you represented all our proprietors of land as friendly to republican principles, and if you had gone further and declared all our native citizens as faithful to the government they had formed, and disposed to defend their rights as an independent nation, from the insidious attacks of foreign foes, you would have run no risk of a contradiction. It is to be sure unfortunate for the ancient dominion of Virginia, that the names of the late secretary Randolph, Giles, Madison, Monroe & yourself are found in its rolls of citizens; but whilst she possesses the beloved Washington; and the memory of his great achievements and illustrious character is cherished by Americans, those names, like specks upon the sun's disk, will be but transiently observed, and detract but inconsiderably from her lustre. But it probably suited your purpose better to say, "Our political situation is prodigiously changed since you left us. Instead of that noble love of liberty, and that republican government, which carried us triumphantly through the dangers of the war, an anglo-monarchical aristocracy has arisen. Their avowed object is to impose on us the yoke, as they have already given us the form, of the British government. Nevertheless the principal body of our citizens retain faithful to republican principles. All our proprietors of lands are friendly to those principles, as also the mass of men of talents. We have against us (republicans) the executive power, the judiciary power (two of the three branches of our government) all the officers of government, all who are seeking offices, all timid men, who prefer the calm of despotism to the tempestuous sea of liberty, the British merchants, and the Americans who trade on British capitals, the speculators, persons interested in the banks and public funds (establishments invented with views of corruption and to assimilate us to the British model in all its corrupt parts.)"

Supposing for an instant, what I can by no means admit, that such is the present situation of our country, is it, sir, the part of a friend to his country—is it the part of a citizen, who had been frequently intrusted with the management of public concerns, thus to expose the failings of his brethren—the weak and vulnerable part of his native land, to a prattling foreigner, whose self-consequence and pride, abstracted from any other motive, might induce him to make an improper use of this, at least, very impudent confidence? We have not forgotten the fine theme, which the precious confessions of your countryman Randolph furnished to a former French minister, and we can readily conceive, that your letter, under the improving hand of an intriguing Italian, may prove the source of accumulating evils to the United States. Have we not repeatedly shewn our attachment to the cause of liberty and to France? Did we not exert every muscle—strain every nerve, to assist her in establishing her right to make her own form of government untrammelled by the will of other nations?—And that too, when those who now basely fawn by her side, and ignominiously lick the dust from her feet, were foremost in their opposition to the regeneration of a numerous people. Did we not, for a long time, patiently bear with the cringing insolence of Genet—the impertinent suggestions of Fauchet—and the dark and insidious manoeuvres of Adet, without shewing any intemperance of conduct at their behaviour, or ceasing our good offices to their nation, or their compatriots? True it is, sir, that the feeble attempts of a rising republic, without a navy or large standing army, could be of little service in battle, to either of the contending parties—of this, in the commencement of her struggle, France seemed fully sensible, and was aware of the advantage to be derived from our remaining neutral. And is it for this, we are charged by you with ingratitude and injustice, and are those men, whom you once thought *Solemn in council, and Sampsons in combat*, for this to be branded by you, with the name of *Apollates*?

But I am perhaps intruding upon your time, and taking up some moments which might be more profitably employed in attention to public affairs; I shall therefore close

this letter, with a wish, that if the writing ascribed to you is spurious it may be disowned. In doing this, you will render a justice due to yourself, and to a large number of your fellow-citizens, but no one more than  
A NATIVE AMERICAN.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Wednesday, May 18.

Mr. Coit moved that a Standing Committee of revision and unfinished business be appointed.

Mr. Hartley hoped such a committee would not be appointed, as, if all the unfinished business of last session were to be reported and acted upon, the session would be protracted to a length which he trusted was not the wish of the members of that house.

Mr. Coit observed, that the appointment of such a committee did not infer that the house would go into the consideration of all the unfinished business which might be reported; but there might be some subjects which would require attention, particularly any laws which might be about to expire.

Mr. Thatcher was opposed to the appointment of this committee; he was again attending to any private business; he wished only to attend to the important subject for which they had been called together. As to any laws being about to expire, he did not believe there were any, as all such were attended to last session.

Mr. Giles thought there was no necessity for this committee. He thought the question, however, of some importance, as the decision upon it would show whether the house intended to attend to ordinary business, or merely to that which would arise from the Speech of the President. For his part, he wished to get away as soon as possible, and, therefore, to confine their business to that subject upon which they were called to deliberate; and though the Speech contained a variety of important objects, he hoped they should soon be able to get through them. He hoped, therefore, no business would be taken up until that was disposed of.

Mr. Sitgreaves said, the opposition to the appointment of this committee was totally without object. It should be recollected, he said, that the appointment of this committee was a part of the standing rules of the House; unless it were appointed, therefore, there would be a contravention of a rule [Mr. S. read the rule]. For his own part, he was not prepared to say, with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Thatcher) that there were no laws which would expire before the next session of Congress. It was true, that there had been attended to last session; but it was also true, that laws which were passed for a limited time, were said to be for so long, "and until the end of the next session of Congress;" and this session, being an extraordinary one, might put a period to some of such laws. But, suppose these were not the case, what mischief, he asked, could the appointment of this committee effect? He could see none. It would, by reporting the unfinished business, and any expiring laws (if such there were) take the trouble of enquiry from the house; and, when the business was reported, any part of it might be taken up, or not, as the house should determine. It might, therefore, be of some advantage, but could be of no disadvantage to appoint this committee.

Mr. Coit said, his principal object in the motion he had made, was to attend to expiring laws. The gentleman from Massachusetts was mistaken, when he asserted no law would expire before the next meeting of Congress. One he recollected; there might be others. It was a law passed May 6, 1796, relative to Revenue Cutters, which was to remain in force for one year, and from thence to the end of the next session of Congress; of course it would expire, if no provision was made to prevent it, with this session.

Mr. Thatcher withdrew his objections to the motion.

Mr. Giles did not know that the appointment of this committee would protract the session; but if gentlemen attended to the duties of this committee, they would find, that if the house were to attend to all the subjects upon which they were to report, it would of necessity occupy a considerable length of time. [He read what there were.] If, indeed, it were understood, that this committee was only to extend to expiring laws, he should have no objection to its being appointed; but, should a general report be made, and the house act upon it, the session would be extended to a period beyond what any member contemplated.

Mr. Hartley hoped the committee would not be appointed, as he said there were from 50 to 100 private cases on the list of unfinished business, to consider which would make a long session. If it were intended merely to enquire what laws were expiring, he would agree to it; but not otherwise. The rules which were before them, he said, were intended only for their ordinary annual sessions, and not to govern an extraordinary meeting like the present. If this committee were appointed, they might proceed to the appointment of a committee of claims. He hoped they should not decide any thing, before they had disposed of the President's speech.

Mr. Nicholas hoped this business would be settled so as to meet the wishes of the House. He hoped a committee would be appointed and afterwards discharged from all other parts of their duty except what related to expiring laws.

The question being put it was carried, there being 51 votes in favor of it; and a committee of three were appointed accordingly.

Mr. Nicholas then moved that the committee be discharged from "examining and reporting from the journal of last session, all such matters as were then depending and undetermined, and also from revising the laws for the establishment of offices, and from reporting from time to time such provisions and expense attending them, as may appear to have become necessary."

Mr. Giles seconded the motion. The only objection which he had to this procedure was that it was rather awkward first to appoint a

committee, and then to discharge it from a great part of its duties; but having appointed the committee, he hoped this course would be taken, as gentlemen would recollect how easy it was to guide from one step of business to another, which was not at first intended, when so much lay before them.

Mr. Craik was not prepared to say that it would be improper to act upon any of the unfinished business of last session. He felt as strong a disposition to make the present session a short one as other gentlemen; but to enable them to do the business properly, he thought the best way would be to suffer this committee to take the whole of it before them, as it was not in the power of individual members to go over the journal of last session, and say what was necessary to be done into. Upon a view of the subjects, there might be measures which it would be essential to have acted upon; and, after the report was made, the House would not be obliged to take up any thing which it did not think necessary, and therefore no inconvenience could result from it.

Mr. Swanwick said, whatever might be the decision of the House upon this question, there was one case which he thought in some degree connected with the subject of the President's Speech, which he wished to be considered. It was the case of North & Veley of Charleston, merchants, who prayed for the refunding of certain duties. There were circumstances in this case, he believed, which were infringements of existing treaties.

Mr. Giles said, if they gave way to business of this sort they might expect to see all the summer, as every member had business entrusted to him which he thought of the first importance. He hoped they should attend only to the business upon which they were called.

Mr. Swanwick hoped, if the present motion were agreed to, an exception would be made in favor of the case he had mentioned.

The Speaker said the exception would not be in order.

Then, —Mr. Swanwick added,—He should vote against the motion. As he looked on this business as of the first importance, and that whilst we were attending to our own rights, we ought, in some degree, to respect those of other nations.

Mr. Macon said, it was of little consequence how the matter was determined, since, if the motion was carried, it would be in the power of any two members to bring forward any subject they pleased. He thought it would be best to determine to do no private business at all.

Mr. Hartley observed that if any private case were taken up, none deserved attention more than that of *Mrs. Carmichael*.

Mr. Nicholas knew that it was in the power of any two members to bring forward any private business, and, if they could persuade the house to do it, to have it decided; but he concluded, if this vote passed, all such attempts would be in vain.

The question was put and carried without a division.

Mr. Swanwick then wished the House to resolve itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the Union, in order to take up the President's speech.

Mr. Giles observed that this would be premature, since the President had promised the certain papers which were not received, and they had yet to determine upon an answer to his speech.

Mr. Williams said, perhaps the business would be best expedited by an adjournment, since it would allow the gentlemen on the committee appointed for the purpose, time to prepare an answer to the Speech, and report it the earlier.

He made a motion to that effect, which was carried.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE,  
RELATIVE TO THE AFFAIRS OF  
FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES.

The following correspondence, comprising the most important of the documents contained in the President's message to Congress of 19th January last, is perused with candor and attention, must satisfy every independent American of the sincere, active and unceasing efforts of our government to maintain inviolate the rights of France, resulting from the duties of neutrality, the law of nations and existing treaties, and most completely vindicates our nation from the unjust reproaches and complaints of the French Directory and its agents.

"A government which required only a knowledge of the truth to justify its measures, could not be anxious to hull this fully and frankly displayed."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, JAN. 19, '79.

Letter from Mr. Fauchet to Mr. Randolph.

(Continued from Wednesday's Gazette.)

I have gone over in detail the different points stated in our correspondence; let us return to that part of your letter which considers the neutrality of the United States.

I conceived, sir, that the respect and circumstance with which I had touched on this question, would have spared me the bitter reflections which your letter appears to contain on that matter. However great may be my desire to enter into details for my own defence, yet I shall waive them, from the same motives which dictated my first letter. But, sir, if these sentiments had not been with me so weighty, I could at least take off the veil which you seem willing to leave over the measures of the English, and refuse the application of the principle upon which you ground the silence of the government of the United States on the subject of these measures. I might make it doubtful whether the arbitrary proclamations of the English government and generals were but the ordinary ebullitions which neutral commerce is obliged to suffer in all wars. I might in like manner hesitate to admit that the federal government had not sufficient grounds to demand their revocation. But that would lead against my inclination into an examination of the cases in which a neutral power should actually acknowledge the legality of an interruption of its commerce, such as those of a place blockaded and contraband. I should also be obliged to examine whether the principles by which the English government endeavor to support itself are consecrated by the law of nations, or whether they are not rather established to serve on the present occasion;—whether in changing the language the cabinet of London has changed its measures;—whether the successive orders of the 8th June and 6th November 1793, and of the 8th January 1794, are not variations of the same system, to which the deprivations still exercised on your commerce, are the sequel;—whether in a word it is true that the United States are suffering with all neutral nations under the same insults, or particularly sacrificed to exclusive vexations. In enumerating

these things, I only remind you of what has already come to your knowledge, and trace facts against which I know you are not less indignant than France against whom they are specially directed. The history of your neutrality would perhaps prove my assertion, that it has been a prey to the arbitrary conduct of Great Britain, and would have served as a justification of what I might and should repeat on the subject.

In fact from the evidently precarious situation of the neutrality of America, and from the vexations to which she is subjected, could I not show that this neutrality is in a violent situation to which the United States cannot consent; from this violent situation would I not have reason to infer the necessity of an energetic and vigorous reaction and of a solemn reparation, which by giving to America what her honor requires would have manifested towards the French republic, the inclination and intentions of your government? I would have remarked that these reparations had been announced at a certain period, but that if public report were believed they appeared as far off as ever. From this contradiction between the promises and the performance of them, this consequence seems to arise, that the United States had not yet established their neutrality upon as a respectable footing as France desired and had instructed me to demand; I was going to conclude that your government had not done in this respect every thing in its power, and feared lest this backwardness should arise from a lukewarmness towards its ancient ally, who has not ceased, on the contrary, to testify to it how much he desired to see the bands which connect the two countries brought closer together. This idea suggests to me a reflection that the friendship professed by the United States towards our republic of which they have on several occasions repeated assurances, does not permit them to alter their situation towards our most mortal enemies, to our disadvantage and amidst hostilities, the origin of which undoubtedly take date from the independence of America.

These remarks which I have long revolved in my mind, led me, Sir, accidentally to speak to you of the treaty in my letter of the 2d of May; but feeling all the circumstances which the silence observed on that act prescribed, I only presented doubts to you, and did not even imagine that the manner in which I wrote to you would have given rise to a controversy between us. Besides, Sir, it would be superfluous for me at present to commence such a subject with you. I therefore close by appealing, specially to the attention of the federal government upon points which truly interest the French republic, to wit—the energetic and liberal execution of her treaties with the United States, and the support of their neutrality upon a respectable footing towards and against all. I conceive it my duty to point out a thing as infinitely desirable; which is that nothing definitively be concluded as to the treaty submitted for ratification of the Senate, until my successor who is momentarily expected shall have communicated to you the instructions which without doubt he has received upon that important subject. I conjure you, Sir, to submit this reflection immediately to the President.

I have but one word more to say, Sir, on the close of your letter, in which you recur to contrasts between the present and the past. I cannot believe that the President had me in view when you insinuate on his part that endeavors are still making to injure the harmony existing between the two nations. I do not think that any one has ever given greater evidence than myself of a sincere desire of cultivating it. Still less can I admit notwithstanding some of your expressions, that your object was to inspire me with fears as to the manner in which I have conducted. You know well, Sir, that a public man who from any personal consideration whatsoever should compound with his duty, would be unworthy the confidence of his country.

Accept, Sir, my esteem,  
J. FAUCHET.

Mr. Randolph, Secretary of State, to Mr. Fauchet, Minister Plenipotentiary of the French Republic.  
Department of State, June 13th, 1795.

SIR,

I HAVE not been able to acknowledge sooner your letter of the 8th instant, which I had the honour of receiving on the same day.

If the plan, pursued in mine of the 29th ultimo, be more extensive, than the one proposed in yours of the 2d, you will ascribe the enlargement of it to my solicitude to remove every dissatisfaction, felt by the minister of our ally. A part, however, of that plan being to collect with fidelity the facts, applicable to your various charges, and to comment upon them with candor, I shall not relinquish it, in now replying to the old or new matter of your last letter. But I must be pardoned, if I pass over without much stress, any general declarations, which are not susceptible of a precise argument. For how shall I defend our government against unadvised insinuations, like these: "That positive engagements, which give France a right to certain privileges, have been neglected or executed with indifference: that other rights, common to all, have become doubtful, for you by too much submission to the acts of other powers: that you could cite a great number of examples; that it will be easy, more at leisure to have a collection made of them in the different consulates: that almost all the prizes have been subjected to artifices; and that one of the most disagreeable parts of your functions has been to reply to the just complaints of your injured fellow citizens," &c.

Being unable to add any other vindication in regard to the Favourite; and not being informed of the vessel going to Guadaloupe, and said to have been arrested, and while it was transcribing, Mr. Adet was received as the minister plenipotentiary of the French republic, to whom in consequence it was sent.

Norfolk, on suspicion of infringing our neutrality; nor yet, how it supports the complaint, relative to the Favourite, I leave the subject here. But let the vessel destined to Guadaloupe, be in any predicament whatsoever, the countermanding of the orders given by the Governor of Virginia to the militia officers of Norfolk, to refuse comfort to British vessels, using our waters as a station; cannot be tortured into any connection with her. For the act of the President never authorized the State Executives to issue such an order: No other Executive mis understood it: The Executive of Virginia revoked it a week before the revocation was heard by the Federal Executive, and you may determine from my correspondence with Mr. Hammond, on this subject, what the President finally contemplated.

Upon this point a few words will be sufficient. Of the re-adjunction towards Great Britain and of the reparation towards ourselves, the United States are the only legitimate judges. They will adapt the one and the other to their climate of their own power, and interest. Being the defenders of their own honour and welfare, they will not be suspected of voluntarily abandoning either; and if they do not mount to the pitch, which the French republic would prefer, their good will and intentions towards it ought not to be doubted. What you call, sir, lukewarmth to our ancient ally, is an upright neutrality. The new arrangements against which you have expressed yourself, are a part of the great subject, which is now at the disposal of the Senate.

There are some miscellaneous matters, which remain to be touched briefly.

We agree to submit the construction of the 17th article of the treaty to explanations between the two governments. But in the mean time I must own, that I do not feel the importance of Mr. Hammond's acknowledgement to your reasoning. He had contended, that under our treaty with France, we could not expel the prizes made by the British cruisers. I had insisted upon our right to drive them off, and by way of argument reminded him of a construction, which we had adopted respecting the cruisers themselves, and which by his *literal* exposition would be defeated. You do not seem to be aware of the dilemma, to which this mode of reasoning exposes you. If Mr. Hammond be correct, then are your complaints against the admission of prizes, and our anxiety to prevent it, wholly unfounded; and our harbours may swarm with them. If he be incorrect the concession amounts to nothing. Between us it fairly is of no avail, whether a British minister reasons well or ill; though I do not recollect, that he has repeated this branch of his position, since he has been apprised of its tenet. Wherefore truth lies, it is our duty to follow; and I set our constitution upon this broad principle: That notwithstanding the letter of the treaty; its spirit, its context, and the rules of interpretation will uphold the regulations of our government.

In a procedure, like this, it will not be easy to find a leaning or subserviency to Great Britain. It is a leaning and subserviency to the character of our nation. Your letter strongly demonstrates the propriety of my remark, that a neutral nation, while it defends itself against charges from one of the warring powers, may seem to palliate the misdoings of another. But we surely ought to have been exempt from this reflection; as you are particularly desired not to infer from my justification of the executive that the validity of the proclamation of blockade is affected to; as you admit "That we are indignant at the injuries which Great Britain has done us;" and as we have employed no argument which is not derived from national law. Until you shall permit yourself to be more specific in your accusations, we cannot surrender the consciousness of our political purity.

It is with real regret, that I read in your last letter an idea, that we have not done justice to your proclamation, to your displeasure at the crew of the *Concorde*, and to your general conduct towards our government. How much more is that regret increased, when any of my expressions can be brought into an attempt to inspire you with fear, or to deter you by personal considerations from the discharge of your duty. A respect to ourselves, would forbid such an attempt; a respect for you, would forbid it; having no possible object, distant from the interest of the United States, we are incapable of it; being confident in our power to frustrate any incroachments, we can never intend to plant in your breast an unworthy motive. As you again disclaim an approbation of Mr. Genet's excesses; so am I not scrupulous to confess that I should not have resorted to them, had I not inferred from your letter an inclination to bring them up with some share of countenance to them.—But this being as you inform me, the moment of our official separation, I am compelled by candor to intimate to you, what, under other circumstances, would have been stated to you more formally and minutely. The citizens of the United States have a right, and will exercise the right, freely to investigate the measures of government. A foreign minister has a right to remonstrate with the Executive to whom he is accredited, upon any of those measures affecting his country. But it will ever be denied as a right of a foreign minister, that he should endeavor, by an address to the people, oral or written, to forestall a depending measure, or to defeat one, which has been decided. This remark is made now; because it cannot be erroneously wrested into a defence or outwork of the treaty with Great Britain;—and because it is an assertion of the sovereignty of the United States, consistent with what is past, and we trust not likely to be contradicted hereafter.

I cannot conclude this letter without offering to you my sincere wishes for your happiness, and a personal assurance of the greatest respect and esteem, with which I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,  
EDM. RANDOLPH.