WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12.

☞ THE "*Baltimore Baptist Association,*" composed of all the Baptist Churches on the Western Shore of Maryland and several in Pennsylvania, will meet in this CITY on Friday next the 14th inst. A SERMON will be delivered in the *Baptist Meeting House* at 7 o'clock in the evening of that day; and a number of Sermons will be preached during the sitting of the Association, of which notice will be given from the Pulpit, as to time and place, so soon as the arrangement shall be made.

Washington City, Oct. 12, 1808.

The following is another most important and powerful attestation to the wisdom of the Embargo, and forcibly manifests the light in which that measure is viewed by the most respectable and best informed men at a distance from the political passions which here discolor every thing. Mr. Murdock is a native of the state of Maryland, where he was educated, and spent a considerable portion of his life in the esteem of his fellow-citizens. During the war he served with high reputation in our army; and has since established himself in mercantile life in London, where he ranks among the most opulent and respectable merchants. We add, that his politics, when he resided in the U. States, were liberal.

Extract of a letter from WILLIAM MURDOCH, Esquire, merchant, London.

LONDON, 24th July, 1808.

"With regard to your Embargo, I think it a wise measure, and if it should be persevered in, it will be the means of preserving peace and saving America from ruin; whereas, if it should be taken off before the orders in council and French decrees are annulled, America will suffer, and in the end be ruined, and will furnish an example ever after for any foreign nation to lay any restriction they please on your commerce. If it is right and lawful for this country to compel by her orders in council, all your produce to come here to perish for want of a market, and moreover to tax one of your principal articles 9*d.* per lb. before it can be re-exported—I mean Cotton. If this is to be submitted to, it would be far better for you to become colonists again. I ask any one on your side who is opposed to the Embargo, to point out to me the difference between a foreign nation compelling all your produce to come to our market, there to tax it before it can be re-exported, or to go over to America and collect the tax before it can be exported? There is a difference in the mode, but none in the principle. If one article is liable to be taxed, every other, by the same rule, is equally so.

"It cannot be denied that every country has a right to regulate her own commerce, and lay what duties she chooses: but she has no right to order the produce of another country into her own ports, and then to tax it before it can go to a foreign market. The French decrees are equally pernicious and objectionable in principle as the orders in council, and both ought to be resisted with great firmness."

What will the apologists of the British government now say to the dispatches brought by the St. Michael, since that government has deprived them of its only ground of justification? We say, the *apologists of the British government,* for there is no apology made, or attempted to be made by the friends of the administration for the measures of France. *They,* true to the interests of their own country, condemn the measures of both governments. The Embargo, which is their measure, impartially operates on both. Indeed according to the admission of British partisans on both sides of the water, its rigor is most felt by France.

What, then, we repeat, will the apologists of the British government now say?

They have justified the British orders *solely on the ground of retaliation.* Not, from any dread of the power of France, to enforce her blockading decrees; but from the alleged acquiescence of our government; that is, because our government omitted to take any measure of resistance. What measure of resistance? Immediate war against France? No one has been hardy enough to contend for that. Commercial regulations that refused all commercial intercourse with her while her unjust decrees remained in force? This is the very measure offered by our government to Britain, to be taken in case she rescinds her orders. Rescind your orders, and we will remove the embargo so far as it regards you, while we will continue it so far as it regards France, until she revokes her decrees. If France still persists in her decrees we will have no trade with her; and if she rescinds them, our whole trade will be restored to its wonted freedom, and every ground on your part for your orders will be taken away. Can any thing be clearer?

But the British government has refused to accept our proffer. We say *refused,* for a delay of justice is a denial of it. She knows how keenly we feel the condition in which her iniquitous orders and those of France have placed us. She knows the indignation with which her scheme of tribute has been received by us? She knows that a pacific temper cannot, amidst accumulating wrongs, endure forever? She knows that America has a spirit, which *she* has once calamitously felt, and may woefully feel again. What then can she mean by thus rejecting the fair proposition tendered her? Can she mean any thing else than one of two things; to drive us into war, or to force us into an abject submission to her tribute? If her object were to do us justice, and to allow the harmony of the two nations to be restored without a violation of the most essential attribute of sovereignty, the exclusive right of taxing ourselves, would she not be contented with an entire removal of all the unjust restrictions imposed upon our commerce, thereby taking away every pretext for retaliation, or with nearly the whole of our trade, pursued on a footing of fair reciprocity, provided France persisted in her decrees?

As things at present stand, even charity herself must admit, that the pretext of Britain that her orders were retaliatory, insufficient as it was, is taken from her; that her object in enacting them was to make our trade tributary to her wants; that she fears that France, by following her example in rescinding her orders, would deprive her of this resource; and that, consequently, pursuing an unjust and imaginary policy at the expence of our rights, she in fact aims at nothing short of a monopoly of the trade of the world.

At any rate, we fear that she will remain inexorable until events shall have convinced her of the immovable fortitude and patriotism of the American people; until she shall be furnished with an unerring demonstration that the people are uncorrupted and incorruptible; until she shall see a Chief Magistrate chosen for four years, seated in the affections of a vast majority of his countrymen, too stern to bend to the injustice of any foreign potentate, to the leviathan of the deep, or the mammoth of the land, a Chief Magistrate, supported by the nation and its representatives elected for two years. Then, indeed, we may hope that the film will drop from her eyes, and that she will cease to credit the profligate falsehoods with which the opposition prints abound. Then the golden dream of uniting us in the indissoluble bonds of interest and even existence with herself, or of bringing us back to a state of colonial vassalage, may vanish into thin air.

Under these circumstances, it is in the highest degree fortunate for us that our course is as plain and as straight as a sun-beam. Let us unite as one man, not only in our support of measures, but likewise of men; for it is the latter circumstance that is now viewed abroad as most important. Let us hush up all the little divisions that exist among us. Let us give our undivided support to Madison, who will unquestionably be President; when we say our whole support, we mean *republican* support. Let us shew republicanism, in a crisis like this, in its full strength. Let us shew, that when the great interests of the country are at stake, it is one and indivisible.

Our readers may recollect that Mr. Madison, in his papers on the outrage on the Chesapeake, alludes to the case of Falkland's Islands. He states the case as follows:

"The case which will be noted last, though of a date prior to the case of Nootka Sound, is that of Falkland's Islands. These islands lie about one hundred leagues eastward of the streights of Magellan. The title to them had been a subject of controversy among several of the maritime nations of Europe. From the position of the islands and other circumstances, the pretension of Spain bore an advantageous comparison with those of her competitors. In the year 1770, the British took possession of Port Egmont in one of the islands, the Spaniards being at the time in possession of another part, and protesting against a settlement by the British. The protest being without effect, ships and troops were sent from Buenos-Ayres by the governor of that place, which forcibly dispossessed and drove off the British settlers.

"The British government looking entirely to the dispossession by force, demanded as a specific condition of preserving harmony between the two courts, not only the disavowal of the Spanish proceedings, but that the affairs of that settlement should be immediately restored to the precise state in which they were previous to the act of dispossession. The Spanish government made some difficulties; requiring particularly a disavowal, on the part of Great-Britain, of the conduct of her officer at Falkland's Islands, which, it was alleged, gave occasion to the steps taken by the Spanish governor; and proposing an adjustment by mutual stipulation in the ordinary form.

"The reply was, that the moderation of his Britannic majesty having limited his demand to the smallest reparation he could accept for the injury done, nothing was left for discussion but the mode of carrying the disavowal and restitution into execution; *reparation losing its value if it be conditional,* and to be obtained by any stipulation whatever from the party injured.

"The Spanish government yielded. The violent proceedings of its officers were disavowed. The fort, the port, and every thing else were agreed to be immediately restored to the precise situation which had been disturbed; and duplicates of orders issued for the purpose to the Spanish officers, were delivered into the hands of one of the British principal secretaries of state. Here again it is to be remarked, that satisfaction having been made for the forcible dispossession, the islands lost their importance in the eyes of the British government, were in a short time evacuated, and port Egmont remains with every other part of them in the hands of Spain."

This statement furnishes us with the *result* in this memorable case, which fully bears Mr. Madison out in his argument.

There were, however, certain intermediate stages of the negociation which shed additional and valuable light on the subject, and prove, with uncommon precision, the nature of the reparation required in that case by England, and which, consequently, she ought in justice herself to make in like cases.

In a debate in the House of Lords in the year 1770, alluding to this affair, the great *Lord Chatham* says,

"But, my Lords, I object to our negociating at all, in our present circumstances. We are not in that situation, in which a great and powerful nation is permitted to negociate.—A foreign power has forcibly robbed his majesty of a part of his dominions. Is the island restored? Are you replaced in *statu quo? If that had been done,* it might then perhaps have been justifiable to treat with the aggressor upon the satisfaction he ought to make for the insult offered to the crown of England. But will you descend so low? Will you so shamefully betray the king's honor, as to make it matter of negociation whether his majesty's possessions shall be restored to him or not? I doubt not, my Lords, that there are some important mysteries in the conduct of this affair, which, whenever they are explained, will account for the profound silence now observed by the king's servants. The time will come, my Lords, when they shall be dragged from their concealments. There are some questions, which, sooner or later, must be answered. The ministry, I find, without declaring themselves explicitly, have taken pains to possess the public with an opinion, that the Spanish Court have constantly *disavowed* the proceedings of their governor; and some persons, I see, have been shameless and daring enough to advise his Majesty to support and countenance this opinion in his speech from the throne. Certainly, my Lords, there never was a more odious, a more infamous falsehood imposed on a great nation.—It degrades the king's honor.—It is an insult to Parliament.—His Majesty has been advised to confirm and give currency to an *absolute falsehood.* I beg your Lordship's attention, and I hope I shall be understood, when I repeat, that the Court of Spain's having disavowed the act of their governor is an *absolute, a palpable falsehood.* Let me ask, my Lords, when the first communication was made by the Court of Madrid, of their being apprised of their taking of Falkland's Islands, *was it accompanied with an offer of instant restitution, of immediate satisfaction, and the punishment of the Spanish governor? If it was not, they have adopted the act as their own, and the very mention of a disavowal is an impudent insult offered to the King's dignity.* The King of Spain disowns the thief, while he leaves him unpunished, and profits by the theft; in vulgar English, he is the receiver of stolen goods, and ought to be treated accordingly."

Had Lord Chatham had the case of the Chesapeake in his eye, he could not have painted it in truer colors. At this time the island was not restored; but there had been a disavowal of the act by the Spanish court, as in the case of the Chesapeake there was a disavowal to us (at least of a qualified nature); but how indignantly is such a mere profession, unconnected with the acts called for by the nature of the case, scouted. "Was it accompanied with an offer of instant restitution, of immediate satisfaction, and the punishment of the Spanish governor? *If it was not, they have adopted the act as their own,* and the very mention of a disavowal is an impudent insult offered to the king's dignity."

In the case of the Chesapeake neither of these offers have been made—the men, torn by violence from her, have not been restored, nor has the officer that committed the outrage been punished. In the emphatic words then of Lord Chatham, the English government "*have adopted the act as their own.*"

An Eastern federal print asserts, that our minister, Mr. Pinkney, declined attending the dinner lately given in London to the Spanish deputies, from ill-will to the cause of the Spanish Patriots. *We assert,* on the authority of a gentleman just from England, that this representation is false. Mr. Pinkney did not attend that dinner, because he was in very ill health, and had assigned that very day for leaving London, where he had been only for a few days on special business, for his country residence. The profligate manner in which the characters of public men are lacerated is most scandalous.

Vermont. Nothing conclusive is yet received, but there still continues good reason to believe that the legislature is republican.

The following is the official statement of the votes given in one district for a member of Congress in the room of Mr. Witherell resigned:

Legal—For	Samuel Shaw,	3202
	Nathan Robinson,	1169
	Chauncy Langdon,	1073
	Jonas Galusha,	136
	Scattering	63
Illegal—Mountholly.		
For	Samuel Shaw,	62
	Chauncy Langdon,	3

Maryland.—The American assures the public that three delegates for Caroline are republican, and that the contrary statement arose altogether from mistake.

Two districts in Alleghany have been heard from, in which the federal ticket has a majority of about 100; three districts, of a more democratic complexion, remain to be heard from.

In Worcester the federal majority is 656, and in Somerset 383. Each of these counties has returned four federal delegates.

From the returns received, it appears that the republicans have 40 delegates, and the federalists 36.

Even, should Alleghany send federal delegates, exactly half the legislature will be republican.

Connecticut. Epaphroditus Champion, Samuel W. Dana, John Davenport, Jonathan O. Moseley, Timothy Pitkin, jr. Lewis B. Sturges and Benjamin Talmadge, all federal, are elected without opposition, representatives in the next Congress.

Delaware. The democratic ticket carried in New-Castle county by a majority of 694; in Kent the federal ticket had a majority of 420; in Sussex Mr. Van Dyke outran the general ticket—his majority in that county was 435; the highest in vote on the general ticket, we understand, did not exceed 300. Each county sends 7 representatives and 3 senators to the state legislature, and as both of the lower counties are federal, it follows that there will be a federal majority of one third of the representation of the state—that is, seven representatives and three senators. The aggregate majority in favor of Mr. Van Dyke is not half so great as it was last year. *Museum.*

Dr. *Samuel Miller* has been chosen Principal of Dickenson College in the room of the late Dr. Nisbitt.

The duke of Berg has been proclaimed king of Naples and Sicily by the name of Joachim Napolean, in the place of Joseph.

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

The Constitutionality of the Embargo—Concluded—In our last number we had endeavored to show that circumstances might exist, in which a suspension of the commerce of the United States might be for the general defence and welfare—that of the existence of these circumstances Congress was the sole judge, and that when in their opinion they did exist, they had a constitutional right to order an Embargo.

In considering the question, whether the Embargo act must contain a limitation of its existence, we had denied that any provision of that nature was to be found in the constitution. By what principle then of common sense or sound reason is it affirmed to be necessary? Circumstances may arise when the term of suspension of intercourse being known, the object would be defeated. If, for instance, the revocation of the orders in council or the Berlin or Bayonne decrees had been the limitation of the existence of the present Embargo, to how many thousand inconveniences would such a limitation be liable? It would have thrown the control of our commerce into foreign hands, it would have pledged to the government to continue the suspension of intercourse at every hazard till its object was obtained, and it might have been equivalent to an unlimited duration, as being to expire with the commencement of an event that never could occur. Would you limit the duration to any number of days? The party who might otherwise be coerced by the measure, knowing the extent of the privation would be able to estimate its pressure and the power necessary for resistance; and would contrast the disadvantages resulting from it, with the benefits of afterwards exercising an unimpeachable control. From these considerations it is easy to conceive that the general welfare of the country, when it requires the laying of an Embargo, may also require that the precise time of its continuance should remain unknown; and Congress, who clearly have the right of laying an embargo, would be most ridiculously placed, if deprived of the means of enforcing it in the best possible form.

The magnitude and importance of the commerce of the union have, during the continuance of the present Embargo, been most splendidly exhibited by the opponents of the measure. It has been stated that at the moment of its imposition the exports of the U. States equalled those of G. Britain in the year 1795, and that the spirit and enterprise of our countrymen had caused the flag of the union to wave in every port, and her sails to swell on every sea. The advocates of the Embargo allow this; with pleasure, with the pride of American patriots they confess and exult at the fact. A commerce so extensive, connecting itself with the necessities and convenience of every civilised country, is a weapon of Herculean force, and more efficacious & commanding than the boasted fleets of the "Leviathan of the Ocean" or all the armies of the "Mammoth of the Land." A non-intercourse, an entire suspension of commerce must produce effects on the commercial world, as great and tremendous as would be those on the natural, if the earth should suddenly become stationary in her course and the planets forget to revolve in their spheres. It is easy to perceive however that the effects of this suspension must nearly altogether depend on the uncertainty of its duration; and hence most forcibly results the conclusion that the term of its continuance is an unnecessary and sometimes dangerous addition to the act by which an embargo is enforced.

The argument derives new strength from the certainty that there is no provision of constitutional law which could by any implication fix the *term of limitation.* Unless some short time is provided it is apparent that the whole dispute is a mere controversy about words. An act laying an Embargo for a term not exceeding twenty years would certainly be an act with a limitation as much as the act incorporating the Bank of the U. S. and which unless renewed would permit free commerce again at that time. But who is there, who perceives any thing but a ceremonious farce, a futile and ridiculous affectation of respect, a mere covering without use or ornament in this mockery of form? Who is there, if for a moment he will cease to be a partizan, but must know, that a suspension of commercial intercourse could by no set of men be enforced beyond the causes which produced it? And that these causes, in the ever changing arrangements of commercial and belligerent power would long before that time, be contravened. To pretend that an embargo act without any time affixed for its termination is a perpetual interdiction of commerce, and unconstitutional, while an act enforcing an embargo for twenty, forty, or sixty years is more limited and constitutional, is a farcical perversion of common sense, which if connected with a subject less important than the present would provoke ridicule instead of argument, and contempt rather than conviction.

But does the embargo depend for its contitutionality only on the clause of the constitution giving power to