NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VII. | WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. | No. 1052.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM | WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 1807. | PAID IN ADVANCE.

Fifty Dollars Reward.

RAN away from the subscriber, on Monday the 11th of this month

Negro JOHN,

who calls himself John WHITE, but as he is an artful and intelligent fellow, may probable change his name, and attempt to pass for a freeman. John is about 35 years old, his complexion black, has a pleasant countenance, a high round fore-head and about 5 feet 9 or 10 inches high, square and well set. He is a blacksmith by trade, and a tolerable good house carpenter, and will probable offer his services in one or the other of the above trades.

Had on, when he absconded, a black fur hat a good deal worn, a round jacket of striped country made cotten, oznaburgs shirt, and a pair of olive colored negro cotten trowsers, but as he has a variety of clothing, will no doubt change his dress. He is given to drink and apt to get intoxicated.

The above reward and all reasonable charges will be paid for apprehending the said Runaway and lodging him in any jail so that I get him again, if out of the state, or fifty miles from home—but if within the state or the above distance from home 20 dollars & all reasonable charges.

CLEMENT BROOKE.
Near Upper Marlborough.
Prince George's County.

May 25.—w6t.

Treasury Department, United States, April 28, 1807.

WHEREAS the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund at a meeting held on the 23d day of March 1807, did among other things resolve, that the Eight per cent. Stock, created in pursuance of the several acts of Congress passed on the 16th day of July 1798, and 7th day of May 1800, should be reimbursed on the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and nine.

This is therefore to give notice that the principal of the said Eight per cent. stock will, on surrender of the certificates, be paid on the first day of January 1809, to the respective Stockholders or their lawful representatives or attornies duly constituted and authorised, either at the Treasury or at the Loan Office, as the case may be, where credits have been given for the amount of Stock respectively held by them.

It is further made known for the information of the parties concerned, that no transfers of the said Eight per Cent Stock either from or to the books of the Treasury, or from or to the books of a Commissioner of Loans will be allowed after the first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eight. And the interest on all certificates of said Stock, which shall not have been surrendered in pursuance of this notification, will cease and determine on the day preceding the day hereby fixed for the reimbursement thereof.

And whereas the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund at their meeting held on the 23d day of March as aforesaid, did also resolve, that the sum which after making the current payments for the years 1807 and 1808, and after reimbursing the Four and a half per Cent Stock, might remain to complete the annual appropriation of Eight Millions of dollars, for those two years' should, among other purposes, be applied to the purchase of the Eight per Cent Stock at private sale, and that such of the Cashiers of the Bank of the United States, and of its office of Discount and Deposit as the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate, be the agents under his superintendance for making the said purchases: Notice is hereby accordingly given, that James Davidson, jun Cashier of the office of Discount and Deposit at Washington, has been appointed agent for that purpose in Washington, to whom such of the proprietors of Eight per Cent Stock as may be willing to sell the same within the prices limited by law, are requested to apply.

ALBERT GALLATIN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

w.

Treasury Department of the United States, April 2d, 1807.

Whereas the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, at a meeting held on the 23d day of March 1807, did resolve, that the sum remaining to complete the expenditure of the annual appropriation of eight millions of dollars, should among other purposes be applied to the reimbursement of the FOUR AND HALF PER CENT. STOCK, created in pursuance of an act of Congress, passed on the 3rd day of March 1795

This is therefore to give notice, that the principal of the said Four and half per cent. stock, will on surrender of the certificates be paid on the 1st day of October next ensuing the date hereof to the respective Stockholders or their lawful Representatives or Attornies duly constituted and authorised, either at the Treasury or at the Loan Office as the case may be, where credits have been given for the amount of stock respectively held by them, & that the interest which may then be due on said stock, will also be paid to the respective Stockholders or their lawful Representatives or Attornies duly constituted and authorised

It is further made known for the information of the parties concerned, that no transfers of the said Four and half per cent. Stock, either from, or to the books of the Treasury, or from or to the books of a Commissioner of Loans, will be allowed after the first day of September ensuing. And the interest on all certificates of said stock, which shall not have been surrendered in pursuance of this Notification will cease and determine on the day preceding the day, hereby fixed for the reimbursement thereof.

ALBERT GALLATIN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

april 6—wt83o

Treasury Department, Register's Office, June 5th, 1807.

Notice is hereby given,

THAT, in conformity with the provisions of the act supplementary to the act, entituled "An act making provision for the redemption of the whole of the public debt of the United States," books will be, opened at the Treasury on the first day of July next, to continue open until the seventeenth day of March, 1808, inclusively, the fourteen last days of each quarter excepted, for the purpose of receiving subscriptions for such parts of the old six per cent. deferred six per cent. and three per cent. stocks, as may, on the day of subscription stand on the books of the treasury.

Those proprietors of the old six per cent. and deferred stocks, who may subscribe, will receive in lieu thereof a new six per cent. stock, equal to the unredeemed amount of the stock surrendered, redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, under a proviso however, that no reimbursement shall be made except for the whole amount of any such new certificate of stock, nor till after six months previous notice; and the proprietors of the three per cent. stock who may subscribe, will receive in lieu thereof, a six per cent stock, equal to sixty-five per cent. of the amount of three per cent surrendered, redeemable in the same manner as the new six per cent. abovementioned, but not reimbursable however, without the assent of the holders, until after the whole of the new six per cent. (given in exchange for old six or deferred as abovementioned,) as well as the whole of the eight per cent. stock of the United States, shall have been reimbursed. It is also provided that in every reimbursement which may take place, a preference will be given to those creditors who may notify their wish to be reimbursed; and that if the applications to that effect shall at any time either exceed or fall short of the sum then applicable to that purpose, the priority of payment shall, so far as may be necessary, be determined by lot.

The present stockholders who reside in any part of Europe and may assent to that modification, may, at their option, receive the interest accruing on the new stock, either in the United States as heretofore, or in London, or Amsterdam, at par: in which last case, the interest will be paid there by the bankers of the United States, six months subsequent to the day on which the same would be payable in the United States and subject to no variation; nor to any other deduction than a commission to the bankers, of one half per cent. on the interest thus paid.

JOSEPH NOURSE, Reg. of the Treasury.

NOTE—Proprietors of 1000 dollars nominal six per cent. stock, subscribed before the 1st October, 1807, will be entitled to receive,

(Proprietors of 1000 dollars nominal six per cent. stock, subscribed before the 1st October, 1807, will be entitled to receive,)	649 62	of new six.
If subscribed between the 1st Oct. and 31st Dec. 1807,	644 37	——
Between the 1st Jan. and 17th March 1808	619 03	——
Proprietors of 1000 dollars nominal deferred, subscribed before the 1st Oct. 1807, will be entitled to receive,	855 78	——
If subscribed between the 1st Oct. and 31st Dec. 1807,	853 62	——
Between the 1st Jan. and 17th March 1808,	831 42	——

Being the unredeemed amount of the old stock on the 1st July, and October 1807, and 1st January 1808, respectively.

Proprietors of 1000 dollars three per cent. stock, will be entitled to receive 650 dollars of new six.

June 8—wem

FOR SALE,

A VALUABLE tract of LAND containing 217 acres, situated in Montgomery county and state of Maryland, about 7 miles above Georgetown, on the river road, and within a mile of the navigation of Potomac river.—This land is very valuable, not only on account of its eligible situation, but also for the quantity of meadow land, and timber thereon. A great bargain may be had in this property, and a credit given till the 20th of November next for two thirds of the purchase money, and a very long credit for the residue, the payments being properly secured, and upon the first payment's being made an unexceptionable title will be given, agreeably to the decision of the Chancellor of Maryland.

Also for Sale,

A LOT with the improvements thereon in Washington city, fronting on F. street a few doors east of the Branch Bank—on this lot are two comfortable framed buildings, one two stories high, with a piazza to each story, the other a single story. This property will be sold either for cash or on a credit, as may best suit the purchaser,

JAMES H. BLAKE.

Alexandria, June 19—w6t

RUN-AWAY NEGRO.

WAS committed to the jail of Washington county, in the state of Md as a run-away, on the 15th inst a negro man who calls himself GEORGE PACKET, says he is free, and that he lately wrought on the road, near Ellicott's mills, in Baltimore county. He is black and spare made, about 40 years of age, 5 feet 5 or 6 inches high; his cloathing is an old mixed coating round about, one blue cloth do lined with green baize, a striped swansdown waistcoat, one yellow striped silk and worsted do. nankeen pantaloons, a coarse linen shirt, good calf-skin shoes with hob nails in the heels, and an old fur hat. His owner (if any) is desired to release him, or he will be sold agreeably to law.

ISAAC S. WHITE, sheriff.

June 26—w3t

We invite the attention of the public to the following important state paper, on a subject with which every American citizen ought to be conversant. It is the clearest and ablest defence of the rights for which we contend, and for the maintenance of which the sword is probably about to be drawn, that has appeared in print. It has been already inserted in this paper; but the crisis renders its republication very seasonable at this time. We now derive it from a pamphlet, printed and circulated at Philadelphia on the 4th of July, which commences with the following title and prefatory remarks.

—

ALL IMPRESSMENTS UNLAWFUL AND INADMISSIBLE.

—

An important and luminous communication on the subject of the impressment of American and foreign seamen and other persons.

IT has become manifest to every attentive observer, that the early and continued aggressions of Great Britain on our *persons*, our property, and our *rights*, imperiously demand a firm stand—an *effectual*, though calm system of measures of arrestation. For this purpose, it is our duty to make ourselves completely masters of the great truths and arguments by which our rights have been elucidated, supported and maintained.

On the 17th of January, 1806, the President of the United States communicated to Congress an extract from a dispatch of James Madison, Esq. our secretary of state, to James Monroe, Esq. our minister in London, which contains many facts highly important, and observations and arguments perfectly satisfactory and *conclusive* against "*impressments* of seamen and passengers, whether foreign or American, on board of our vessels." The re-publication of that document at this crisis will at once display some of the reasons on which the government has probably declined to sanction the recent draught of a treaty with Great Britain, and will elucidate the ground on which the question of *the impressment of persons*, both native and alien, has been rested by our administration.

—

Extract of a letter from the Secretary of State to James Monroe, Esq. dated 5th January, 1804.

We consider a neutral flag on the high seas, as a safeguard to those sailing under it. Great Britain, on the contrary, asserts a right to search for, and seize her own subjects; and under that cover, as cannot but happen, are often seized and taken off, citizens of the United States, and citizens or subjects of other neutral countries, navigating the high seas, under the protection of the American flag.

Were the right of Great Britain, in this case, not denied, the abuses flowing from it, would justify the U. S. in claiming and expecting a discontinuance of its exercise. But the right is denied, and on the best grounds.

Although Great Britain has not yet adopted, in the same latitude with most other nations, the immunities of a neutral flag, she will not deny the general freedom of the high seas, and of neutral vessels navigating them, with such exceptions only as are annexed to it by the law of nations. She must produce then such an exception in the law of nations, in favor of the right she contends for. But in what written and received authority will she find it? In what usage except her own, will it be found? She will find in both, that a neutral vessel does not protect certain objects denominated contraband of war, including enemies serving in the war, nor articles going into a blockaded port, nor as she has maintained, and as we have not contested, enemies property of any kind. But no where will she find an exception to this freedom of the seas, and of neutral flags, which justifies the taking away of any person, not *an enemy in military service*, found on board a neutral vessel.

If treaties, British as well as others, are to be consulted on this subject, it will equally appear, that no countenance to the practice can be found in them. Whilst they admit a contraband of war, by enumerating its articles, and the effect of a real blockade, by defining it, *in no instance* do they affirm or imply a *right in any sovereign to inforce his claims to the allegiance of his subjects, on board neutral vessels on the high seas.* On the contrary, whenever a belligerent claim against persons on board a neutral vessel, is referred to in treaties, enemies in military service *alone* are excepted from the general immunity of persons in that situation; and this exception confirms the immunity of those who are not included in it.

It is not then from the law or the usage of nations, nor from the tenor of the treaties, that any sanction can be derived for the practice in question. And surely it will not be pretended that the sovereignty of any nation, extends in any case whatever, *beyond its own dominions*, and *its own vessels on the high seas.* Such a doctrine would give just alarm to all nations, and more than any thing would countenance the imputation of aspiring to an universal empire of the seas. It would be the less admissible too, as it would be applicable to times of peace, as well as to times of war, and to property as well as to persons. If the law of allegiance, which is a municipal law, be in force at all on the high seas, on board foreign vessels, it must be so at all times there, as it is within its acknowledged sphere. If the reason alleged for it be good in time of war, namely, that the sovereign has then a right to the service of all his subjects, it must be good at all times, because at all times he has the same right to their service. War is not the only occasion for which he may want their services, nor is external danger the only danger against which their services may be required, for his security. Again—if the authority of a municipal law can operate on persons in foreign vessels on the high seas, because within the dominion of their sovereign they would be subject to that law, and are violating that law by being in that situation, how reject the inference that the authority of a municipal law may equally be enforced, on board foreign vessels, on the high seas, against articles of property exported in violation of such a law, or belonging to the country from which it was exported? And thus every commercial regulation, in time of peace too, as well as of war, would be made obligatory on foreigners and their vessels, not only whilst within the dominion of the sovereign making the regulation, but in every sea, and at every distance where an armed vessel might meet with them. Another inference deserves attention. If the subjects of one sovereign may be taken by force from the vessels of another, on the high seas, the right of taking them when found, implies the right of searching for them, a vexation of commerce, especially in the time of peace, which has not yet been attempted, and which for that as well as other reasons, may be regarded as contradicting the principle, from which it would flow.

Taking reason and justice for the tests of this practice, it is peculiarly indefensible; because it deprives *the dearest rights* of a regular trial, to which the most inconsiderable article of property captured on the high seas, is entitled; and leaves their destiny to the will of an officer, sometimes cruel, often ignorant, and generally interested by his want of mariners, in his own decisions. Whenever property found in a neutral vessel, is supposed to be liable, on any grounds to capture and condemnation, the rule in all cases is that the question shall not be decided by the captor, but be carried before a legal tribunal, where a regular trial may be had, and where the captor himself is liable to damages, for an abuse of his power. Can it be reasonable then, or just, that a belligerent commander, who is thus restricted, and thus responsible in a case of mere property of trivial amount, should be permitted, without recurring to any tribunal whatever, to examine the crew of a neutral vessel, to decide the important question of their respective allegiances, and to carry that decision into instant execution, by forcing every individual he may chuse, into a service abhorrent to his feelings, cutting him off from his most tender connexions, exposing his mind and his person to the most humiliating discipline, and his life itself to the greatest dangers? Reason, justice and humanity unite in protesting against so extravagant a proceeding. And what is the pretext for it? It is that the similarity of language and of features between American citizens and British subjects, are such as not easily to be distinguished; and that without this arbitrary and summary authority to make the distinction, British subjects would escape, under the name of American citizens, from the duty which they owe to their sovereign. Is then the difficulty of distinguishing a mariner of one country from the mariner of the other, and the importance of his services, a good plea for referring the question whether he belongs to the one or to the other, to an arbitrary decision on the spot, by an interested and unresponsible officer? In all other cases, the difficulty and the importance of questions are considered as reasons for requiring greater care and formality in investigating them, and greater security for a right decision on them. To say that precautions of this sort are incompatible with the object is to admit the object is unjustifiable; since the only means by which it can be pursued are such as cannot be justified.

The evil takes a deeper die, when viewed in its practice as well as its principles. Were it allowable that British subjects should be taken out of American vessels on the high seas, it might at least be required that the proof of their allegiance should lie on the British side. This obvious and just rule is, however, reversed; and every seaman on board, though going from an American port, and sailing under the American flag, & sometimes even speaking an idiom proving him not to be a British subject, is presumed to be such, unless shewn to be an American citizen. It may safely be affirmed that this is an outrage and an indignity which has no precedent, & which G. Britain would be among the last nations in the world to suffer, if offered to her own subjects and her own flag. Nor is it always against the right presumption alone, which is in favor of the citizenship corresponding with the flag, that the violence is committed.—Not unfrequently it takes place in defiance of the most positive proof, certified in due form by an American officer. Let it not be said, that in granting to American seamen this protection for their rights as such, the point is yielded that the proof lies on the American side, and that the want of it in the prescribed form justifies the inference that the seamen is not of American allegiance. It is distinctly to be understood, that the certificate usually called a protection to American seamen, is not meant to protect them *under their own, or even any other neutral flag* on the high seas. We can never admit, that in such a situation, any other protection is required for them, than the *neutral flag itself* on the high seas. The document is given to prove their real character, in situations to which neither the law of nations nor the law of their own country are applicable; in other words, to protect them within the jurisdiction of the British laws, and to secure to them, within every other jurisdiction, the rights and immunities due to them. If, in the course of their navigation even on the high seas, the document should have the effect of repelling wrongs of any sort, it is an incidental advantage only, of which they avail themselves, and is by no means to be misconstrued into a right to exact such a proof, or to make any disadvantageous inference from the want of it.

Were it even admitted, that certificates for protection might be justly required in time of war, from American seamen, they could only be required in cases where the lapse of time from its commencement, had given an opportunity for the American seamen to provide themselves with such a document. Yet it is certain, that in a variety of instances, seamen have been impressed from American vessels, on the plea that they had not this proof of citizenship when the dates and places of the impressments demonstrated the impossibility of their knowing in time to provide the proof, that a state of war had rendered, it necessary.

Whether, therefore, we consult the law of nations, the tenor of treaties, or the dictates of reason and justice, *no warrant no pretext can be found for the British practice of making impressments from American vessels on the high seas.*

Great Britain has the less to say in excuse for this practice, as it is in direct contradiction to the principles, on which she proceeds in other cases.—Whilst she claims and seizes on the high seas her own subjects, voluntarily serving in American vessels, she has constantly given, when she could give, as reason for not discharging from her service American citizens, that they had voluntarily engaged in it. Nay more, whilst she impresses her own subjects from the American service, altho' they may have been settled or married, and even naturalized in the U. States, she constantly refuses to release from hers, American citizens impressed into it, whenever she can give for reason, that they were either settled or married within her dominions. Thus, when the voluntary consent of the individual favors her pretensions, she pleads the validity of that consent. When the voluntary consent of the individuals, stands in the way of her pretensions, *it goes for nothing!* When marriage or residence can be pleaded in her favor, she avails herself of the plea.—When marriage and residence and even naturalization are against her, no respect whatever is paid to either! She takes, by force, her own subjects voluntarily serving in our vessels. She keeps by force American citizens involuntarily serving in hers. More flagrant inconsistencies cannot be imagined.

Notwithstanding the powerful motives, which ought to be felt by the British government to relinquish a practice which exposes it to so many reproaches, it is foreseen, that objections of different sorts will be pressed on you. You will be told first, of the great number of British seamen in the American trade, and of the necessity for their services in time of war and danger. Secondly, of the right & the prejudice of the British nation with respect to what are called the British or narrow seas, where its domain would be abandoned by the general stipulation required. Thirdly, of the use which would be made of such a sanctuary as that of American vessels, for desertions, and traitorous communications to her enemies especially across the channel to France.

1st. With respect to the British seamen serving in our trade, it may be re-