

December 5.

AUTHENTIC.

Mr. Randolph presents his compliments to Mr. Hammond, and informs him, that he considers it as the wish of Governor Simcoe, that his letter to Mr. Hammond should be published. If this be a correct idea, it shall be transcribed for the press, together with Mr. Hammond's.

November 29, 1794.

Mr. Hammond presents his compliments to Mr. Randolph, and has the honor of informing him, that as his letter of the 1st of September was printed by his direction, Mr. Hammond claims that Lieutenant Governor Simcoe would be justifiable in his observations upon it should obtain a similar degree of publicity.

1st December, 1794.

Philadelphia, 25th Nov. 1794.

SIR,

In conformity to the assurance contained in my letter to you of the 3d of September. I took an early opportunity of transmitting yours of the first of that month to Lieutenant Governor Simcoe; from whom I have received a letter, a copy of which I esteem it not altogether useless and improper to communicate to you; as it tends to throw considerable light upon transactions in Canada, to which you have at different periods adverted, as it evinces the anxiety of Lieutenant Governor Simcoe, to remove by the exposition of the motives of his conduct, the misapprehensions to which you, Sir, and the citizens of the United States in general may have been exposed by the misrepresentations of interested individuals. I have the honor to be, with great respect

SIR,
Your most obedient
Humble servant,
GEO. HAMMOND.

The Secretary of State.

[Copy.]

Upper Canada.

Navy Hall, Oct. 20th, 1794.

SIR,

I was, last night, honored with your Excellency's dispatch, enclosing the copy of a letter to you from Mr. Randolph Secretary of State, dated on the first of September, and your answer, which intimates the intention of transmitting it to me by the first opportunity.

It appears upon the perusal of Mr. Randolph's letter, that I am called upon by the respect due to his official situation, publicly, to state the misrepresentations of that gentleman; and on this consideration, not to pass them over in that silence, which would otherwise best become the language and manner which the Secretary of State permits himself to make use of, in his animadversions on my conduct.

My having executed the orders of his Majesty's Commander in Chief in North America, Lord Dorchester, in re-occupying a Post upon the Miamis River, within the limits of those maintained by the British forces, at the peace, in the year 1783, upon the principles of self-defence against the approaches of an army, which menaced the King's possessions, is what I presume Mr. Secretary Randolph terms "Governor Simcoe's Invasion."

The motives which led to this re-occupation furnish the true grounds for discussion, but the establishment of a military post, from its own nature, must have been so unquestionable, as not to have required from you, Sir, on the part of Mr. Randolph an avowal or a denial; nor does it appear to me, that he has introduced to public an event, as a matter of doubt in itself, but solely as a ground work for ushering into the world "opinions" transmitted to the executive government of the United States, which however respectable are but, "opinions" that "British officers" and "British Soldiers aided an attack" made by the Indians at Fort Recco "very." Such an insinuation Sir, introduced as subsidiary evidence of a fact, which required no proof, will undoubtedly, on the undiscerning impress a belief, that the British troops, instead of adhering to that principle of self-defence, on which a post at the Miamis was re-established, were united in arms with the Indians in an attack upon a post held by the United States. As if to promote such a belief, Mr.

Randolph proceeds to comment on the protest delivered to Mr. Williamson at the harbor of the Great Sodus; he terms this protest, which I transmitted in obedience to Lord Dorchester's orders "a mandate borne by Lieutenant Sheaffe, under a military escort, and "in its tone, corresponding with the "form of its delivery, being unequivocally of a military and hostile nature.

Mr. Randolph seems peculiarly anxious to consider every transaction of the King's government, in its mode, as well as in its substance, as hostility, otherwise he could not but have seen in the protest delivered by Lieutenant Sheaffe to Mr. Williamson, not a tone of hostility, but a spirit of conciliation, explanatory of the just principle, on which the settlement in question is termed an aggression; the inexecution of the Treaty on the part of the United States—Nor is it possible to conceive that less offensive language could be made use of, consistent with the formality necessary to substantiate a protest requiring the suspension of the exercise of a controverted claim.

Had Mr. Secretary Randolph made due enquiry he would have found that the military escort consisted of an officer, expressly sent to accompany Lieutenant Sheaffe, and seven persons to row the boat, soldiers most certainly, but unarmed, without military habiliments, and in the dress they wear for the purposes of fatigue. It also might be presumed from Lieutenant Sheaffe's letter that he was personally acquainted with Captain Williamson, and in truth this circumstance was of some weight in the appointment.

The general language and conduct of Mr. Williamson, particularly in the proposals of his speculation at the Sodus have, of late, manifested a disposition incompatible with those views of conciliation, which are the true interests of Great Britain and the United States, that it became proper to select such a person as Mr. Sheaffe for this duty; being a gentleman of great discretion, incapable of any intemperate or uncivil conduct, and certainly not disqualified by being a Lieutenant in his Majesty's service.

Such, Sir, are the circumstances of this transaction which Mr. Randolph is pleased to term my "hostile views."

The following paragraphs do not seem to require illustration—it can escape no person that what in the beginning of Mr. Randolph's letter to you he had stated as respectable "opinions" transmitted to the executive government is no longer confined to "opinions" but the Secretary of State asserts as matter of fact "that the Governor of Upper Canada associated British with Indian force to assault our Fort."

In respect to Mr. Randolph's assertion and his appeal to you, Sir, that "it is grown into a maxim that the "affairs of the Indians within the bounds of any nation exclusively belong to that nation" I cannot admit so general and so novel a principle, as applicable either to the territory or boundary under consideration—I do not recognize its birth, nor any state of its existence. It will be difficult for the Secretary of State to prove, that it has governed the conduct of the United States; it is not to be found in the express provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht; it was never assumed by the British nation prior to that compact; it is incompatible with the natural rights; and injurious to the acknowledged independence of the Indian Americans.

The British government has not involved itself in disputes with the Indians by acting in so vague and indeterminate a manner. It has ever done justice to their natural rights; nor has it violated the stipulations purposely made for their support and definition; in consequence of such an uniform conduct, Sir, the Indians are constantly solicitous for the presence of some of the King's Officers, or subjects at their public meetings and I have the most full persuasion, that had the United States concurred with the confederacy in their request, that the King would extend his good offices to the mediating between them in the present war, and that in consequence his Majesty had graciously permitted me, as requested, or with more obvious propriety yourself, to have been present at the late Treaty, in such a case, I am confident that peace would have been established on this Continent, to the satisfaction of the United States, and the comfort of the Indian Nations; and scarcely in a lesser degree to the benefit of his Majesty's subjects in this Province, who are materially interested that their neighbours should on all sides flourish in wealth peace and prosperity.

As the close of the Secretary of State's letter seems intended through you, Sir, "to apprise me of the consequences of self-defence should I not

"be restrained by remonstrances," the date of it cannot possibly escape my notice; it bears that of the first day of September and on the 22d of August, General Wayne advanced to the Post at the Miamis, laid waste the possessions of the King's subjects under it's protection and summoned it to surrender. It may here be proper to observe that so ill informed was that Officer of the very principles on which he made his invasion or "self-defence," that in his summons he requires "the garrison to move to the nearest Post occupied by his Britannic Majesty in 1783." Had this requisition been complied with, the Garrison must have advanced up the Miamis River into the Indian Country beyond the post, whose evacuation had been demanded as a recent aggression.

The discretion, good conduct and magnanimity of Major Campbell, the Commander of that Garrison prevented the commencement of War and all its dreadful consequences.

Upon the comparison of circumstances, the march of General Wayne, the date of Mr. Randolph's letter, its immediate publication, and the manner of it, I cannot but conjecture that it was written not to remonstrate against "my excesses" but to prepare the minds of men for whatever consequences might have arisen from the movement of General Wayne's army; and could the temperate forbearance of Major Campbell and the event of the enterprise have been foreseen (if I may be permitted to revert to the object of this letter) I cannot believe that I should have been spared the necessity of taking notice of Mr. Secretary Randolph's publication, or of controverting the assumptions of a gentleman for whom I have always entertained the most profound respect.

To all Sir who know my private sentiments, to yourself, Sir, who are acquainted with my public conduct, to his Majesty's Ministers, and the officer chief in command, who have approved of my strict adherence to their orders and the consequent impartiality which I have maintained between the United States and the Indian Americans, any justification or expostion of my sentiments is unnecessary; even Mr. Secretary Randolph has officially in his possession sufficient proofs of my good will to the government and people of the United States—They ought to have sheltered me from the imputations to which I have been exposed. I have ever shown the warmest inclination to cultivate the most perfect harmony between his Majesty's subjects and those of the United States, and have looked forward to an honorable termination of existing differences with the most anxious solicitude.

Signed I. G. SIMCOE.

His Excellency
George Hammond, &c. &c. &c.

Philadelphia, Nov. 30. 1794.

SIR,

Under any aspect of the affairs of the United States in relation to Great Britain, I should decline a discussion with the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada. The Minister of his Britannic Majesty is the proper correspondent for the Secretary of State, upon subjects affecting their two nations; and his communications will be always received with the attention, due to his character, and with a temper, flowing from a love of truth and of harmony.

But before I could enter, Sir, even with yourself, into any examination of the letter, which the Lieutenant Governor thought proper to address to you on the 20th ultimo, I should take the liberty of asking, whether it has been transmitted to me, as a paper, which I am free to elimate according to its merits, by waving a reply, without violating my respect for your functions; or whether it is adopted, as the sense of your government? This preliminary enquiry would be rendered absolutely necessary; since on a former occasion you disavowed a responsibility for the conduct of the British government in Canada; and in your letter of the 27th instant, enclosing that of the Lieutenant-Governor, you leave it too uncertain, how far you approve its doctrines, its assertions, and its statements.

If it is to be understood, that to all these your assent is given, and were it expedient now to revive our former controversy; I should request you to define precisely, what is meant by the apology for the Fort at the Rapids of the Miamis, as being the "re-occupying of a post" upon the Miamis river within the limits of those, maintained by the British forces, at the peace, in the year 1783; I should urge an explicit declaration, whether British officers and British soldiers did or did not aid the attack, made by the Indians on Fort-Recovery; and should at the same time detail the evidence, upon which we have been induced to believe it. I should

beg to be informed, how the nature and spirit of the mandate, borne by two British officers, and seven British soldiers were in fact, or on principle transformed into the garb of peace, by the absence of arms, and "military habiliments,"—the dress of fatigue, or the friendship of Lieutenant Sheaffe for Mr. Williamson. I should wish to know, whether Governor Simcoe derives from his instructions, or any other warrant of his Britannic Majesty, an authority to deny that it is inadmissible for one nation to intermeddle with the Indians within the territories of another. I should oppose the conclusion, that what may not be found in the treaty of Utrecht does not exist, under the sanction of the law of nations, and especially in regard to the usages of America. But, for reasons, which may be easily conceived, I would not, without the most clear necessity, recur to the circumstances, which prevented a treaty with the northern tribes of Indians, in the last year. Nor should I waste a moment in refuting the supposition, that my letter of the first of September, was "written to prepare the minds of men" for whatever consequences might have arisen from the movement of General "Wayne's army;" because on the 20th of May I complained of the erection of the Fort, and you were then informed, that the army of the United States in their march against the enemy, would not be able to distinguish between them and any other people associated in the war.

These, however, and many other striking features in the letter and conduct of Governor Simcoe will, I hope, at no distant day be consigned to oblivion by the reparation of our injuries, and the restitution of our rights. Until, therefore, I shall be disappointed in this hope, I shall not willingly open a new source of altercation.

I have the honor, Sir, to be

With great respect,

Your most obedient Servant,
EDM: RANDOLPH.

The Minister Plenipotentiary of his Britannic Majesty.

* The letter containing the complaint was addressed to Mr. Hammond, who on the 22d of May says in his reply, that he should immediately transmit a copy of that letter to the Governor of Upper Canada; and there can be no doubt of this having been done.

Philadelphia, 1st December, 1794.

4 o'clock, P. M.

SIR,

In answer to your letter of yesterday, which I have this moment received, it is expedient for me merely to remark—in addition to the motives that I have already assigned, as inducing me to transmit to you a copy of the letter, addressed to me by the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada—that, as in your letter of the 1st of September you considered me to be the proper medium of conveying to that officer the remonstrances of this government against his conduct, I am not sensible that I have been guilty of any impropriety, in communicating to you, in Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe's own language, his exposition of the principles by which he was actuated in the two transactions, on which you had especially animadverted.

Being equally unwilling with yourself, Sir, "now to revive our former controversy," or "to open new sources of altercation," and persevering in my resolution (from which I trust I have not deviated in this instance) not to esteem myself responsible for the conduct of his Majesty's officers, in Canada, or in any other of the King's possessions, it is totally unnecessary for me to express my personal approbation of, or dissent from, "the doctrines, assertions, and statements" contained in Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe's letter.

I have the honor to be,

With great respect,

SIR,

Your most obedient

Humble servant,

GEO. HAMMOND.

The Secretary of State.

Foreign Intelligence.

NATIONAL CONVENTION

Friday, September 19.

Delmas, in the name of the committee of public safety.—"The telegraphe informed you two days ago, that the army of the north had obtained a considerable advantage on the 28th Fructidor, (September 14). The committee of public safety has received a dispatch relative to that glorious day." Bellegarde and Lacombe, representatives of the people with the armies of the north, the Sambre, and the

Meuse, to the committee of public safety,

Head-quarters, at Boxtel, Sept. 6.

"Citizen Colleagues,

"We hasten to announce to you the signal advantage which the army of the north has just obtained over the allies commanded by the duke of York. According to your orders to attack the enemy, the army marched in the direction of Gorcum, where we must necessarily fall in with them. The two armies were soon within sight of one another and yesterday the last movement was made with as much boldness as good concert, Pichegru had resolved to encamp on this side of the river Dommel, where the enemy had their advanced posts, and to push his own advanced posts beyond the river—an operation which must give him a most advantageous position and in which he perfectly succeeded. The passage of the river was defended by the village of Boxtel, by entrenchments filled with cannon and 5000 cavalry and infantry. Nothing could stop the republican bravery.

The attack was brisk; but, after fighting for an hour and a half, the enemy fled. In their route we took 200 prisoners and 8 pieces of cannon, with their tumbrils. This morning a reconnoitring party of 800 men fell in with a corps of 5000 English, on their march to retake Boxtel; but, elated with their good fortune, and minding little the number of the enemy, our troops charged them with such impetuosity that terror and confusion soon pervaded their ranks, and made them abandon their object. After so much valor we shall not speak of the painful marches of our troops, in a country covered with heaths and brush-wood. The French are capable of every thing—we ought not, however, to pass over the distinguished conduct of the 8th regiment of hussars: thirty of them cleared a ditch which divided them from the two battalions of Hessians, and the Hessians laid down their arms. Next day a detachment of the same regiment gave a new proof of their courage: not being able to compel the prisoners, to point a piece of cannon they had taken, against the flying enemy, they dismounted and served it themselves. The cannon and 200 prisoners were the accidental conquest of a reconnoitring party in the morning. A remarkable instance of valor, among so many more, was displayed by the citizen Judge, second lieutenant of the 8th regiment of hussars, he had his wrist broken; we propose that he shall be promoted. This advantage, we hope is only the forerunner of events greater and more decisive. Health and fraternity.

BELGARDE, LACOMBE, of Tarn.

LONDON, October 1.

Extract of a letter from Torbay, Oct. 4.

"Yesterday Admiral Macbride with his squadron, arrived here from a cruise; he looked into Cherbourg, where he saw 5 frigates, a sloop of war, an armed brig, and two luggers; also a large camp on the adjoining hill of about 10,000 men. "After leaving Cherbourg, they flew our grand fleet a few leagues to southward of the Start."

Clerkenwell, Tuesday Oct. 6.

Of the Commissioners, the Lord Chief Baron attended by the Recorder, and went to Clerkenwell, and received a true bill found by the grand jury against John Martin, attorney.

Mr. Thomas Holcroft, of Newman street author of the Road to Ruin, &c. against whom a bill of indictment had been found on the day proceeding, but who had not yet been in custody, appeared in the court, and addressed the Lord Chief Baron in a speech of some length. The substance of it was, that in consequence of hearing he stood indicted of the crime of high treason, he thought it his duty to surrender to the laws. Convinced he said, of his innocence, he did not wish to screen his conduct from investigation; and his desire was, that the court would adopt the measures necessary to bring him to a trial.

The Lord Chief Baron, with the humanity we often admired as a strong and amiable feature of his character in the office of Attorney General, warned Mr. Holcroft of the consequences which probably would be the result of his confessing himself to be the Thomas Holcroft against whom a very respectable jury of the county had found a bill for the hideous and detestable crime of high treason. As there existed no legal proof before the court of his being the individual indicted, it was still in his own option to recall the confession he had just made, for similitude of name, the law would never infer identity.

Mr. Holcroft, persisting in what he said did on the motion of the Solicitor general find the Road to Newgate. After he was ordered into custody, he requested that Mr. Erskine and Mr. Gibbs should be assigned to be his counsel, which his Lordship freely granted.

Mr. Holcroft requested that his servants, who would be useful to him, he said, as amanuensis, might attend him in confinement. This however, he was informed, it was not in the power of the court to grant.

John Pierce, the Clerk of Martin, who as an attorney, asked permission to attend his master; this was objected to, as Pierce was liable to have a charge exhibited himself.

The court adjourned to Thursday, to which day the recorder also adjourned the Old Bailey Sessions. By that time it is expected that the grand jury will be able to