

BY publishing in your useful paper the letter from the secretary of State to the Spanish Minister, the people of the Western Country will see what miserable pretences are set up by the officers of the Spanish government...

LETTER from Mr. PICKERING, Secretary of State, to the Chevalier DE TRUFO, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of his Catholic Majesty to the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE. Philadelphia, August 8th, 1797.

I duly received your letter of the 11th of the last month, to which my other engagements have till this time prevented an answer.

My additional report to the President of the United States, on the 3d of July, in relation to Spanish affairs, has offended you, and is mentioned as the cause of your writing to me on the 11th. If, sir, I were now to make the just remarks and recriminations which your letter obviously suggests, I am afraid you would be still more offended.

In respect to your suspicions of an expedition preparing on the lakes by the British, for an attack upon Upper Louisiana, I have said that you never mentioned a single fact or reason on which your suspicions were founded. In contradiction to this assertion, you say that "In our conference on the 27th of February, you gave me information that a corps of 350 men had been raised at Montreal, and marched towards the lakes, where, after the evacuation of the American posts, there was no ostensible object for them."

But (you say) you never could have imagined that I would have given to the British minister a piece of advice, which might enable him to alter his plan, by letting him know that the former one was discovered. And what, sir, was the plan of the British to defeat which you desired the American government to interfere? Why, according to your suspicions, it was to MARCH AN ARMY THROUGH THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST UPPER LOUISIANA.

It was an act of still greater complaisance, when on the 21st of April you renewed the declaration of your suspicions, but still without assigning any reasons, for the

government to resolve on, and to communicate to you, what you are pleased to allow to be a "determinate disposition on this point."

In the next sentence (as in many others) you misrepresent my expressions and misunderstand my meaning. I do not say, that "from your not having given me detailed information respecting the expedition, and from the answer which I received from the British minister on the 10th of June, I believed the expedition to be groundless."

Another material circumstance I must notice—That troops of the United States were stationed at Niagara, on the Miami, at Detroit and Michilimackinack; and consequently in situations well calculated to protect our territory, as well as to discover and get information of, any warlike preparations so considerable as such an expedition would require; and the officers commanding on those stations could not have failed to communicate such discoveries or information to the Department of War: yet no such communications were made.

But it was also well known that they had not on the lakes a force adequate to the enterprise in question. I considered also the great difficulties that would attend the transportation of troops, equipage, provisions, cannon, and stores, by either of the routes suggested—if either could have been taken without violating the territory of the United States.

These were circumstances abundantly sufficient to discredit naked suspicion; and the declaration of Mr. Ligon, in the note of the 19th of June, was mentioned only as confirming the justness of the opinion which I had at first formed in March, and which I continued to entertain of your suspicions. I might add, that at that early period, Mr. Ligon assured me that he had no knowledge of such an expedition; and his inquiries of the governor-general of Canada and the British secretary of state, have enabled him positively to assert, in the above note, that no such expedition was ever intended. And this fact repels your suggestions that I had been "remiss" in not doing for two months, what, on my own principles, was proper to have been done.

But (you say) you never could have imagined that I would have given to the British minister a piece of advice, which might enable him to alter his plan, by letting him know that the former one was discovered. And what, sir, was the plan of the British to defeat which you desired the American government to interfere? Why, according to your suspicions, it was to MARCH AN ARMY THROUGH THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST UPPER LOUISIANA.

In your 5th paragraph you are pleased to mention what you consider as another omission of duty. That although on the 2d of March you wrote your suspicions, and three days before you mentioned them verbally, yet on the 9th, I had not laid the matter before the President. I will take the trouble to show with how little reason you have made this remark. The 2d of March was the day next preceding the dissolution of Congress; and at the close of a session the President is overwhelmed with business that cannot be postponed. On the 3d the then President's term of office expired. On the 4th the inauguration of the succeeding President was celebrated. The 5th of March was Sunday. The five following days were not unoccupied; and on the 11th of March the answer to your letter of the 2d was given. And although you attach so much importance to your suspicions, the details I have given prove that they were their debilitate of probability—that they were in fact unfounded; and consequently of no importance; that as such I then justly considered them; and therefore needed no

"very powerful" motive to remain silent five days.

I cannot but regret that my reasoning is so often not understood. When reciting my inquiry whether the posts occupied by the troops of Spain within the territory of the United States had been evacuated; and your answer, that not having for some months heard from the Baron Carondelet, you "were deprived of any information touching the steps taken for the execution of the treaty"—I put these last words between inverted commas, not as you say, "in order to draw attention"—but because they were an exact quotation from the translation of your letter. And when I added, in my report, "nevertheless he (the minister of his Catholic majesty) had previously informed the Baron de Carondelet of his suspicions of a projected expedition from Canada;" it was not to prove either that the Baron had received your letters, or that you had received his: but as that very information was assigned by the Baron as a reason for maintaining and reinforcing the posts, the obvious conclusion was that you wrote and transmitted to him the information with that view: and hence, that instead of disclaiming all knowledge on the subject, candour should have induced you to answer me, that although you had not received any late letters from the Baron, and therefore you could not say what steps had actually been taken for the evacuation of the posts, yet that on account of the suspected expedition from the lakes, of which you had informed the Baron, you presumed (or you advised, and probably you did advise) that he would still hold possession of them "to cover Louisiana." This "logic," sir, I hope is intelligible; and at any rate, not "extremely false."

I cannot omit noticing your observations on the 5th paragraph of my report. If, as you were obliging enough to promise, you had favored me with copies of the Baron de Carondelet's two letters (of which you undertook to give me an oral but literal translation) instead of their "substance," I might have been more correct in reciting his assertion—that Mr. Ellicott had not given him notice of his arrival at the Natchez as the commissioner of the United States for running the boundary line. Whether this was a complaint, or an "observation," as you choose to call it, every reader of your letter will see to be of no consequence. But whether the assertion was founded or unfounded, was material; seeing, in the same letter, Mr. Ellicott is charged with having "carried his zeal so far as to attempt to get possession of the Natchez by surprise;" and an assertion follows, that "Governor Gayoso says he has in his power documents which prove evidently the intention of this attempt." This accusation against Mr. Ellicott I considered as injurious, not to him only but to the government; for which in the character of commissioner he was appointed to act. If other circumstances induced me to doubt its correctness, the other complaint or "observation," which I knew to be unfounded, could not but increase my doubts. It was important, therefore, and my duty, to present them together to the President's notice. I have not "entirely mistaken" this matter. In my report to the President, I did not undertake to recite what you "mentioned," but what you translated from the Baron de Carondelet's letters: you repeated the charge in question; and it was not till then I handed you the copies of the Baron's and Mr. Ellicott's correspondence shewing the repugnance of fact to assertion; and it was then that you blushed; as I had before been astonished. And your remark, afterwards, was what I have stated in my report, "That you supposed the Baron did not consider Mr. Ellicott's letter as official." You then made no distinction between a complaint and an "observation," nor used the phrase "in the rigour," nor any other qualifying words; except those which are stated in my report.

Besides, the baron had no right to expect any other evidence of Mr. Ellicott's appointment than his letter, until they should meet for the purpose of commencing the business of their appointments; when of course they would mutually exhibit their commissions. And from the baron's answer of the 1st of March, it is plain that he expected no other notice: for he therein recognizes Mr. Ellicott as the commissioner of the United States.

In the last sentence of your paragraph on this subject you say, "That when after a mixed and desultory conversation upon various subjects, you had collected and methodized your ideas, and committed them to writing, my answer and observations ought to have been confined to the written communication."—This observation, sir, is inaccurate.

It may, however, be applied to a former part of your letter. You say that in our conference on the 27th of February, you mentioned to me the raising of 350 men at Montreal—that your informant saw them pass through Johnstown—and that you knew the British agents had treated with some of the Indian nations concerning an expedition preparing on the lakes. But in your letter of the 2d of March, in which you were "to collect and methodize your ideas" on the subject of your suspicions, you do not introduce one of those suspicions: of course, on your own principles, ought, if they ever had been mentioned, to have considered them as nullities.

In the 8th paragraph of your letter, you observe that my proof obtained from Mr. Ellicott's messengers, that he did not attempt to get possession of the Natchez fort by surprise, is merely negative. I offered it only as such. But the negative testimony of two men of good characters against a fact which they were likely to be acquainted with, if it existed, and whose existence other circumstances rendered improbable, and the assertion of which is mingled with assertions, by the same person, of other facts, of which some, or even one, is known to be unfounded, merits consideration. There is, however, further evidence applicable to this case.

In the letter dated at the Natchez the 5th of May, from lieutenant Pope to governor Gayoso, you will see that the governor had made the like accusation against the lieutenant. "A gentleman had informed him (the governor) that the lieutenant intended to attack the garrison at that place." Lieutenant Pope, justly hurt by the groundless assertion, desires the informer may be named, and required to acquit himself of his assertion, or be punished as a false accuser. The governor answers the next day,—speaks of the information as communicated to lieutenant Pope in familiar conversation; and adds, that the informer was to be despised. Yet, from the pointed manner in which lieutenant Pope made the demand, it is evident that the information was presented to him as a serious accusation. After this detail, will it not be conjectured, that the governor's "documents" respecting Mr. Ellicott's "attempt" are of a piece with his "familiar conversation" with lieutenant Pope concerning his "intended attack?"

PHILADELPHIA, FRIDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 13.

CITY HOSPITAL REPORT, From 12th to 13th Oct. in the morning.

Table with columns for Admitted, Discharged, Died, and Remained in Hospital, with sub-categories for Convalescent, Sick, and In-curred since last report.

Published by order of the Board, Wm. MONTGOMERY, Chairman pro tem.

The Inspectors of the Health-Office feel it their duty to advise their fellow-citizens, whose families are out of town, not to return to the city for a few days; for although at present there is a great appearance of the prevailing fever's subsiding, still as an unfavorable change may take place, those who are out of town, we conceive, had better not move in, particularly to the lower parts of the city and Southwark, until the disorder has more generally subsided; and in the mean time to employ proper persons to air and cleanse their houses.

Published by order of the Board, Wm. MONTGOMERY, Chairman pro tem.

October 13, 1797.

Married, last evening, JONATHAN WILLIAMS CONDY, Esq. to Miss ELIZA HOPKINSON, daughter of the Hon. Francis Hopkinson, deceased.

Died, on Wednesday last, of the present contagion, Mr. CHARLES DAVIES, of this city.

ELECTION. Chester County Return.

Table listing election results for Chester County, including names like Joseph McClellan, John Shoemaker, and Lindsay Coates.

ASSEMBLY. SENATOR. JAMES HANNUM, 1947.

Table listing assembly members and senators, including names like Cadwalader Evans, Benjamin Brooke, and Peter Muhlenberg.

By the eastern papers it appears that the malignant fever which has lately prevailed at Providence is entirely extinguished.—The students are invited to return to the college.

The frosts which have taken place since Tuesday will probably destroy the residue of the yellow fever in this city.—Ice of near 1-4 of an inch in thickness, was observed yesterday morning about four miles from town.

PRÆTATA In the Latin quotation from Diemerbroeck, in yesterday's Gazette.

In the case of Hermannus Thomas, in 10 line, for "far guinis unc: e fici" read, Sanguinis unc: 10, e Sinitire.—In the 2d extract, 2d line, for "reptatus" read, reptatus.

GAZETTE MARINE LIST. PORT OF PHILADELPHIA.

Arrived at the Fort. Ship Commerce, Chamberlain, Port-au-Prince. Schr. Ranger, Friar, Jacquemel. Sloop Barrett, Smith, Port-au-Prince. Driver, Brent, do.

New York, Oct. 12. Arrived. Schr. Active, Fraß Philadelphia. The 19th Sept. a fleet of ships arrived at Port au Prince, from Jamaica, with troops on board—their number unknown as they had not landed on the 20th, when our informant sailed—Left three Ship Yefon Capt. Pintard, of New-York. Names recollecting coming in the fleet from Port au Prince—Brig Rosanna, capt. Miner—Snow Nancy, Webb—Left in the keys—Schr. Thomas, for Philadelphia, sloop Driver, do. brig Nancy, do.

BOSTON, OCT. 8. Arrived, schr. Martin, Choate, Demarara, 49 days, via Portland, 10 days. Left there captains Gage, Smith, and Patterson, in brigs belonging here; several other American vessels, names not remembered.—Spoke nothing.

PIRACY AND CRUELTY. Same day, brig Peace and Plenty, Dunbar, St. Croix, 24 days. In lat. 23, N. long. 65, 35, W. was boarded by a French privateer brig, from Guadaloupe, under English colours. The particulars of the treatment which capt. D. received, is thus recorded by him. "The capt. of the privateer came on board, with five of his crew, and demanded my papers; after examination, ordered all my trunks and chests to be opened, and took from them all the money they contained, with the letters, which he opened; he took all our stock, and cabin stores, with all the spare running rigging, sails and blocks, and cut one studding-sail from the yard; he also took one cask of rum, belonging to the cargo, and a cask that belonged to capt. Haynes, who was to have come passenger, contents unknown. After plundering us of the above articles, he suffered his people to rob us of what they pleased; and so fully devoted were they to the business of thieving, that they took every article they could find, even to the knives, forks, spoons and tumblers, and in fact every article remaining in the cabin.—He then put two seamen on board, that were taken a few days before from the brig Favorite, Sisson, of Baltimore, master, and Mr. Taylor, supercargo, with a cargo of 50,000 dollars. The capt. of the privateer wished to put capt. Sisson and Mr. Taylor on board my vessel; but they insisted on staying aboard the privateer, and demanded to know the fate of their property, which spirited behaviour produced on the commander of the privateer, a conduct, unworthy a man, for on their refusal to quit the privateer, he inhumanly flogged them.—Besides capt. Sisson, there were several other American sailors and seamen on board the privateer, names except one, not to be ascertained, this individual's name was John Barnes, of Marblehead.—A few hours previous to our being boarded, the privateer took a sloop from Rhode-Island, captain Briggs, bound to Cape Francois, who he said was a good prize. To add insult to our misfortune, this inhuman pirate threatened to take me on board his vessel, and inflict an ignominious punishment on me; and fulfilled his brutal behaviour by dismissing me, with a curse on my country, and a declared determination to rob every American vessel he could not make a prize of."

Rum, at St. Croix, 15th ult. was from 80 a 85 cts. gall. Sugar, C. 9 dols.

Arrived in town late evening, capt. Cruft, late of the barque Pomona, and Dudley Colman, jun. late of the Telemachus, both taken and carried into Carthagen, property condemned.

By this day's Mail.

NEW-YORK, October 12.

Last Saturday evening a very sudden squall of wind and thunder came up from the S. W. the S. E. gale of which passed over this city, but did no great mischief. The heaviest part of this squall passed into Westchester county; and we learn, that the effects of it in North Salem were most terrible; the houses of Mr. Northrup, Mr. Titus, Mr. Shearman, Mr. Smith and several others, were unroofed; several hundred apple and other trees, torn up by the roots; a young daughter of Mr. Northrup carried several rods by a whirlwind, &c.

Difficulties having arisen within a few days respecting the value of FRENCH CROWNS we are authorized to publish, that crowns are received at the banks, for 110 cents, or eight billings and ten pence. [8/3, P. C.]

BALTIMORE, October 11.

BOARD OF HEALTH.

BURIALS.

In the west part of Baltimore, heretofore called the town, for the last 24 hours ending this morning at sun-rise.

2 Adults, 1 Child. Burials in the east part, called Fell's Point &c. including the Potter's Field.

3 Adults, 1 Child. (Signed) Joseph Townsend, clerks, October 10.

Arrived at the fort, ship Neptune, capt. Daniel Jaberdom, from Alicante—Captain Jaberdom put a number of masters of vessels ashore at Hampton roads, on his passage up.

A Meeting of the Select and Common Councils.

WILL be held, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon on Tuesday next, at the State-house, in the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of electing a MAYOR; and, as the election can be held on no other day, the attendance of all the Members is particularly requested.

By order, WILLIAM H. TOD, Clerk of the Select Council.

EDWARD J. COALE, Clerk of the Common Council.

October 13. The printers of the city are requested to publish the foregoing in their several gazettes.