

these grounds—but that the *only* point of importance, was the failure of any stipulation to keep in force our Non-Intercourse with France.

That it was perceived, when Mr. Erskine's agreement was rejected, that our law interdicting the intercourse with France was to expire in June, and there was no stipulation that it should be renewed—It seems then the *only objection* to that agreement was the neglect on our part to stipulate that we would enforce our Non-Intercourse with France, and that the two other articles of the conditions prescribed to Mr. Erskine were withdrawn.

What then can we say not only to the honor but the honesty of a Cabinet who were in possession of these positive declarations of the British minister long before Mr. Jackson's arrival, and would still persist that Great Britain *still insisted* on these offensive conditions which they had withdrawn before Mr. Jackson's mission, and which Mr. Jackson as positively disclaimed having any authority to urge? As to the *only condition*, on which they insisted, that we should resist the French decrees, it was the same which Mr. Jefferson says he explicitly authorized Mr. Pinkney to agree to, and which is perfectly reasonable in itself.

NOTE III.

IN Number VII. of our remarks we demonstrated the distinction between the conduct of President Washington in the case of Genet, and the unjustifiable proceedings of Mr. Madison in relation to Mr. Jackson—and we stated that it would appear that the *same* party who were now so ready to dismiss the British Minister, at that time, upheld the insolent Minister of France, and denied the *power of the President* to dismiss a Foreign Minister.

That this subject may be fully understood, I shall compare the cases of the conduct of *French Ministers*, the forbearance of former administrations, the defence of these Ministers by Mr. Madison's friends, with the pretended insult of Mr. Jackson, and the high metted sensibility of the present Administration—

In a case of a French privateer which the Government ordered to be stopped, Mr. Genet declared he would "*appeal* from the President to the people for their direct interference." This was certified by the Chief Justice of the United States, and one of our senators—These high officers of our own country were abused and vilified, and Mr. Genet, a foreign Minister, was declared by Mr. Madison's political friends to be more deserving of credit. The French Minister then addressed a letter to the *President* which was instantly published in the publick papers, by Genet himself, dated August 13, 1793, from which I make the following extract.

"To you alone have I declared that the *Federal Government*, far from manifesting any regard for our generous conduct toward this country, for the advantages which we were offering to her commerce, were *sacrificing* our interests to those of our enemies. To you have I represented that this conduct (of the American Government) did not appear to correspond with the *views of the People*."

Here was a direct appeal to the people, and an impudent distinction set up between the views of *that people* and of their rulers. But Mr. Madison's friends in the Chronicle of the same day thus excuse and justify this conduct; "every publick minister is entitled to decency and respect while he pursues a line of conduct consistent with the duties of his office—whether the Minister of France has experienced this generosity, let the publications decide," and alluding to this offensive letter it is added. "What proceeding could have been more *frank and proper* than for him (Mr. Genet) to apply to the President, whom he is said to have insulted, for a vindication of his conduct? The address of Mr. Genet, while it bespeaks the *frankness* of a Republican, carries in it a *decency* as it respects the honour and dignity of the Government of the United States."—Again speaking of the same act, "was it extraordinary that a minister of a foreign country should conduct himself *warmly* on such an occasion? But if Genet did say that he would appeal from the *President to the People*, what is there so *criminal* in it? The people would not suddenly *destroy* the President or injure his *official dignity*." See Chronicle Dec. 18, 1793.

This was the language of all Mr. Madison's party upon the occasion of Mr. Genet's outrageous insults, palpable, gross and unquestionable insults to Gen. Washington—These are the men who now call upon us to whet our resentments to the keenest edge against Mr. Jackson for pretended insinuations which no man can discover—These are the men who with *affected delicacy* after inflaming our passions urge us not to become *Cannibals*, and not to feast ourselves on the mangled limbs of the offending minister—

Dur
feron
such
our
entire
retain
authori
For
—Gen
cutiv
patron
that h
not cr
have b
our or
numb
in sup
ing it
had n
here
in thi

W
admi
made
const
Th
true,
of th
might
be sa
trine
clare
woul
woul
In sh
mak
the
W
will
limi
thor
the
was
wh
"I
late
act
right
so:
I
won
to
Mr
—
see
arr
wo