Eastern Shore REPUBLICAN STAR OR General Advertiser.

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, Printer of the LAWS of the UNITED STATES.

[VOL. 8....11.] TUESDAY MORNING, JANUARY 2, 1810. [NO. 18....538.]

Terms of the Star

ARE TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, payable half yearly IN ADVANCE: No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.—

ADVERTISEMENTS,

ARE inserted *three weeks* for *ONE DOLLAR*, and continued *weekly*, for *TWENTY-FIVE CENTS* per square.

PUBLIC SALE.

ON THURSDAY, the 4th day of January, 1810, will be sold at public vendue, all the household and kitchen furniture of the late Col. *Henry Johnson*, deceased, at his late dwelling on King's Creek: Also, Horses, Cattle, Sheep and Hogs—some very well sorted long Corn, the quantity not accurately ascertained: Corn Blades, Tops, Husks, Straw, and some Hay: Carts, Ploughs, Harrows—in a word, Farming Utensils in general, and a second hand Carriage. A credit of twelve months will be given, on all sums above ten dollars, under which sum the cash will be required; the purchaser giving bond with approved security, bearing interest from the date, before the property is taken away.

S. T. JOHNSON,
Executor of Henry Johnson, dec'd.
December 26, 1809. 2

N. B. Amongst the Stock, there is a pen of very well fatted Hogs, two Steers, corn fed for some time past, perhaps during the fall, and four wethers on a good clover lot, that have also been corn fed.

REMOVAL.

THE Subscriber begs leave to inform his friends and the public in general, that he has removed his

Boot and Shoe-making Shop,

to the front of his dwelling house opposite the Bank, on Washington street, and that he has just received a large assortment of LEATHER, for Boots and Shoes, where he will be able to supply the demands he may be favoured with, at the shortest notice, and on the most reasonable terms.

SAMUEL SHERWOOD.
Easton December 26, 1809. 3

N. B. A general assortment of GROCERIES, are on sale at the above shop.
S. SHERWOOD.

NEW GROCERY STORE.

WM. M. MAYNADIER,

HAVING taken the business carried on by Mr. JAMES BOWIE, has opened in Mr. THOMAS P. SMITH'S *NEW-BUILDINGS*, a general assortment of

GROCERIES—

CONSISTING OF

BROWN SUGAR, 1st & 2d quality.
Family, loaf & lump do.
Coffee, West-India.
Ditto, Moco.
Chocolate, first and second quality.
Candles, spermaceti, moul'd and dipt.
Soap.
Teas, of the william Bingham's cargo.
Raisins, muskatel & keg.
Currants.
Almonds.
Filberts.
Oranges.
Lemmons.
Cocoa nuts.
Cordials, Noyeau,
Figs.
Grapes in jars.
Rice.
Segars, Spanish.
Cheese, Goshen.
Olives, Capers.
Tammarinds.
Basket salt, Mustard
Crackers and pilot Bread.
Powder and shot.
Window glass.
Putty.
Chalk.
Patent lamps.
Spermaceti & lamp oil.
Molasses.
Whiskey.
Apple brandy.
New-England Rum.
Antigua do—old.
French Brandy.
Jamaica spirits.
Holland gin.
Madeira, Sherry, Port, Malaga and Lisbon Wines.
Vinegar.
Chewing tobacco, 1st and 2d quality.
Smoking do. and pipes.
Snuff.
Firkin butter, first quality.
Buckwheat flour, do.
Sweet oil.
Pepper. Allspice.
Cinnamon, Cloves.
Mace, Nutmegs.
Starch. Fig-Blue.
Salt-Petre, Copperas, Ginger.
Allum, Madder.
Brimstone, Rosin, Glue.
Lampblack, Sifters.
Leading lines, bed cords.
Traces, Demijohns.
Nails assorted.
Queen's-Ware assorted.

All of which he will sell on the lowest terms.—Easton, December 5, 1809. m

BARR-IRON.

THE Subscriber has just received a large quantity of Barr-Iron, Crowley Steel, and Carriage Tyre, of the first quality, which he will sell on reasonable terms, at his shop on Dover street. He intends keeping a constant supply of the above articles, where country smith's and others, can be supplied to any amount.

WILLIAM BARTON.
Easton, December 12, 1809. m

N. B. His customers and others can be supplied as usual with their smith's work, where the business will be carried on extensively. W. B.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

EXPOSITION

Of the conduct of the honorable FRANCIS JAMES JACKSON, *in his correspondence with* ROBERT SMITH, Esq. *Secretary of State.*

(CONCLUDED.)

Mr. Smith, in his letter to Mr. Pinkney of November the 23d, has placed the subject of the disavowal of Mr. Erskine's arrangement in so fair a light, and expressed so completely the frivolity of the pretences upon which it was disavowed, that but very few additional strictures, in that particular, will be introduced into this exposition; and these will be confined to the tenor of the dispatch of the 23d January, which Mr. Erskine is said to have violated.—One of the conditions prescribed in that dispatch, was in the following words:

"3d. Great Britain, for the purpose of *securing* the operation of the embargo, and of the *bona fide* intention of America to prevent her citizens from trading with France, and the powers adopting and acting under the French decrees, is to be considered at liberty to capture all such American vessels as may be found attempting to trade with the ports of any of these powers; without which security for the observance of the embargo, the raising it nominally, with respect to Great Britain alone, would, in fact, raise it with respect to all the world."

"In urging" this condition, Mr. Smith very properly remarks, "Mr. Canning has taken a ground forbidden by those principles of decorum which regulate and mark the proceedings of governments towards each other." It was not only to obtain a *pledge* against the *bad faith* of the intention of the American government, as the secretary of state says; but the *liberty to capture* which the condition requires, plainly implies, that even if the intention of the American *government* be an intention of *good faith* yet there would be no *security* to Great Britain for the fulfilment of it by the citizens of the U. States, unless the British navy were at liberty to make prize of the vessels and goods of those citizens, who are by the condition supposed to be so profligate as not to obey the laws of their country, and the constituted authorities so imbecile as not to be able to compel them to respect the acts of congress. In effect, that the *people* of the United States are knaves and law breakers, and their congress and president a mere cypher. The navy of Great Britain was to strengthen the latter and make the former virtuous. And this condition, and the whole despatch was to be communicated *in extenso* (in all its parts) to the chief magistrate of the nation!

It seems to be of some importance to the merits of the case in question, to discriminate clearly between the act of a minister concluding an agreement in virtue of a *full power* in relation to the terms of the agreement, and the act of a minister concluding such agreement by the authority of a *general power* (or letter of credence) to act for his sovereign in any matter respecting which he should be instructed. In the first instance, the minister would have to produce his *full power* to the government with which he was about to negociate; in the second, the minister being resident near the government, and his *general letter of credence* being in the possession of the government, he would not be under the necessity of presenting any *new* power, nor be compelled to shew his instructions. but, acting on his usual *envoyal* and *plenipotential* character, full faith and credit would be given to him in that shape by the government with which he treated. Mr. Erskine appears to have acted in the latter way. He made the arrangement in virtue of his *general letter of credence*, and kept his "*several*" letters of instruction out of view, "*subject to his own discretion.*" But if a *full power* had been necessary to enable Mr. Erskine to conclude the arrrangement, Mr. Jackson acknowledges that he *had* that full power in his possession, for, says he, in his letter of the 4th of November, "the INSTRUCTIONS in this (Mr. Erskine's) case *took the place of a* FULL POWER." And, if a *full power* had *not* been requisite, Mr. Jackson gives a very substantial reason why it was not necessary: "No full power (he observes in his letter of November 4th) was given in the present [Mr. Erskne's] case, because it was not a treaty, but the materials for forming a treaty, that was in contemplation. Thus, in any view of the subject, Mr. Erskine's mode of proceeding and the authority by which he acted, are pronounced by Mr. Jackson to have been correct and sufficient.

The dispatch from Mr. Canning to Mr. Erskine, of the 23d of January, affords the most conclusive proof that the arrangement which he was authorised to conclude with the American executive, was not to be subject to any subsequent act of ratification in London previously to its going into operation; for Mr. Canning says in that dispatch, "his majesty will be prepared on the faith of such engagement [as Mr. Erskine might make] either immediately (if the repeal shall have been immediate in America,) or on any day specified by the American government for that repeal reciprocally to recal the orders in council, without waiting for the conclusion of the treaty; and, *you are authorised*, in the circumstances herein described, *to make such reciprocal engagement on his majesty's behalf.*" Here is a clear power to conclude and give instaneous effect to the agreement the moment it was entered into; there is no reservation for the king's consent after the arrangement was made; his majesty's approbation preceded the fact, and Mr. Erskine was acting on this point at least, by the absolute command of his sovereign, nor is the case at all singular; other British ministers, resident at foreign courts, have been clothed with the same power.

Alleyne Fitzherbert concluded a preliminary arrangement with the court of Spain, (which was signed at Madrid the 24th of July, 1790, by himself and the the count Florida Blanca, respecting the capture of certain British vessels in the bay of Nootka,) in virtue of his general letter of credence as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Catholic king; and this arrangement was held sacred and binding on the British government, and was followed by a convention between Great Britain and Spain on the 28th of October of the same year. These state papers may be found in the London Annual Register for 1790, pages 300, 301 and 303. It is, therefore, a flimsy pretence for disavowing the arrangement of the 19th of April, to say that it was subject to ratification in England, seeing the authority is explicit to the contrary, and supported by a parallel case in English history. And Mr. Jackson is truly unfortunate in his allusion to the rejected treaty assented to by col. Monroe, because col. Monroe informed the British commissioners that he was acting contrary to his instructions, and the treaty contained, moreover, a special provision that it should not go into effect before it was ratified by the American and British governments respectively; which circumstance precluded the possibility of all imposture in the case, that might arise from the treachery of either party.

If it be even allowed that the arrangement was loosely framed on the part of Mr. Erskine, yet still, as the terms of it were manifested just in respect to the United States, it was to be expected that the British government would provide against every contingent loss that might accrue from the violation of it. Mr. Jackson himself appears to be perfectly aware of the propriety of such a provision, and lays no trifling emphasis upon that "frankness, promptitude, and most scrupulous regard to national honor," with which "his majesty's government gave notice to the American minister in London of the disavowal, of the motives of it & of the precautions spontaneously taken by his majesty to prevent *any* loss or injury accruing to the citizens of the United States." But, when pressed upon the subject, when certain important omissions were indicated to him, and it was shewn that his majesty had not been quite so scrupulous to honor as he ought to have been in his spontaneous precautions "to prevent *any* loss," Mr. Jackson very gravely replied, that "it *was not* and *could not* be *intended* to obviate *all* possible inconvenience." And as a reason why the non-intention "to obviate all inconvenience" was correct, he supposes a case where no previous contract exists, entirely disregarding the fact that the guarantee against all possible loss was due from the king of Great Britain to the U. States not as a *favour* but as a *right*, not a recompence for the common depredations of British cruisers, but as an act necessary to skreen him from the imputation of violating the faith of Great Britain for the purpose of decoying, like the crying crocodile, the property of American citizens within the grasp of his naval force. And why does Mr. Jackson remind the secretary of state of the "*usual* liberality of British tribunals?"—As well might Ulysses have consoled his unhappy companions by referring them to the merciful disposition of the Cyclops, who devoured one of their number each revolving day?

That there either is a British party in America, or that Mr. Jackson *thinks so*, is too manifest in the style of some parts of his correspondence. He says, that the conduct of Great Britain to America arises out of "A great system of policy, *deliberately adopted and acted on*," and that it is a strong and solid reason for adhering to it, because it enables his Britannic majesty to oppose a barrier to the entire submission of Europe to the power of the emperor of the French. It is to illustrate this idea that the allusion is made to Augereau's proclamation to the Catalonians; an allusion which might do very well if addressed to one of the petty belligerent nations of Europe, but which is totally irrelative and altogether ludicrous, when applied to such a neutral power as the United States. This "*great system of policy*," "*so deliberately adopted and acted on*," is to prevent the subjugation of Europe; that is of G. Britain, for nearly all the rest of Europe is subjugated, or new modelled. And what is this boasted system? It consists in the difference of price on coffee and sugar, occasioned by the conveyance of those articles into France thro' Hamburg and Tonningen, instead of their being landed in the ports of Holland. This difference may be two or three cents on the pound: and these two or three cents are to be the salvation of Europe; they are the result of the "*great* system of policy" pursued by the British, they are the "*strong* and *solid* reasons," worthy (as Mr. Jackson proclaims) to govern the councils of a *great* and *powerful* monarch," in a formal departure from the common maxims of justice, in the violation of neutral rights, and sufficient to induce those councils to refrain from any attempt to "*propitiate* America!" The expeditions of Sir John Moore and Lord Wellington, and that the magnificent to the Scheldt, might be *diversions* in behalf of suffering Spain and Portugal, and bleeding Austria; but the two or three cents difference in price upon sugar and coffee, is the stroke of death to Napoleon. It is the mortal blow, which is to destroy his powar forever?

There is however, a circumstance connected with this "*great* system of policy," which the secretary of state justly denominates a "phenominon," and which renders very questionable the vaunted magnanimity of the "councils of this *great* and *powerful* monarch." It is, that whilst "a *total* and *unqualified* interdiction of *all trade* with the enemies of Great Britain is enforced against the United States, British merchants, with the tacit permission of those "councils," supply, through the ports of Holland and elsewhere, the continent of Europe with those very articles of colonial produce,* the privation of which, Mr. Jackson exulting avows, is to preserve the world from universal domination! Does coffee or does sugar change its nature, by passing into the European markets thro' the hands of Englishmen and smugglers, instead of being conveyed thither in vessels of the United States navigated by American seamen? Or will Mr. Jackson admit, (what is most probable) that this "*great system of policy*", so "worthy to govern the councils of a *great* and *powerful* monarch," instead of having for its object resistance to Bonaparte, in vindication of the rights of nations, is to paralyse the commerce of the citizens of the United States with France, Holland, Italy, and their dependencies, in order that the shopkeepers of London and of Liverpool may enjoy the whole profits accruing from the supply of the enemies of G. Britain with the productions of the West India islands, and even of the continent of America? In this latter case, the chivalric spirit, which the new envoy assures us is "to be found in the hearts of the British monarch and his subjects," migrates into paltry pounds, shillings and pence; and instead of valiantly freeing the world from bondage, lies meekly snug in the pockets or the coffers of the English merchants until called forth by the ministry, to supply the means of some new project for infringing the law of nations, and outraging the jurisdiction and rights of neutral states.

It is sufficient to observe, in relation to Mr. Jackson's declaration that he had a *full power*, to negociate, independent of his general letter of credence, that as he has never presented that full power to the President, it was impossible, on his own principles, to treat further with him until he did present it. His offer therefore, "to exchange his full power against that with which Mr. Smith should be provided," is an evasion; the President could not, according to usage, furnish the secretary of state with a full power before Mr. Jackson had produced one; and for this very plain reason because the President could not tell without having *seen* Mr. Jackson's full power, what the new envoy was authorised to negociate about; particularly after he had officially announced that he was only empowered "to *receive* and *discuss* propositions."

The able manner in which the secretary of state has exposed the singular proposition relative to the reparation for the attack on the frigate Chesapeake, almost obviates the necessity of further elucidation. The *manner* in which the paper of *memoranda* was presented, however, deserves some notice. The affair of the Chesapeake, up to the 23d of October, has been embraced in the general correspondence between Mr. Smith and Mr. Jackson. The latter, in his letter of that date, omits the subject altogether; but, in a note of the 27th of October, he *slipped in* a seperate proposition, which he doubtless thought would, like the artful *pass* of a fencing-master, effect a *palpable* HIT. There was something so extremely ridiculous in this trick, that it could excite nothing but a sarcastic smile, at the awkward effort at dexterity in Mr. Erskine's successor.—He was placed in the posture of a wandering and pretended conjuror, who, being a novice in deception, hugs himself in the conceit that he is deceiving his audience, whilst the audience perceives the whole cheat, and laugh at the conjuror's clumsiness.

But what was this paper of *memoranda?* Surely not a *tender* nor an *act* of reparation. It was a *demand* on the American government to *legalize*, by acknowledging, the correctness of the principle upon which the frigate was attacked; and thus to justify the outrage for which atonement was by the *memoranda* proposed. The reservation for the restoration of British subjects and deserters, is to all intents and purposes such a demand. Besides, the satisfaction was not a point of *interest* but a point of *honor*. And what nation ever yet made *conditions* in a case of honor? Mr. Jackson imagines that the government of the United States is so mercenary that it is eager to seize the trifling sum which is to compensate the surviving relations of the slain and the maimed in that vile attack? Let him, if he does, shake off his day-dream, and learn henceforward that it is the *honor of our flag* that requires satisfaction, and that the reparation is not to be accepted upon the principles of bargain and sale.—This is the doctrine maintained by Mr. Madision in his correspondence with Mr. Rose; and it is the doctrine which the British themselves maintained in the case of Falkland's Islands.

The subject of this exposition requires, it is conceived, very few remarks more in a serious point of view. As a topic of ridicule, Mr. Jackson's letters will be exceedingly acceptable to those who delight in bewraying arrogance of the garb of duplicity. The *appeal* which that minister has made to the public, casts upon him additional odium in the estimation of all worthy men. It is not only unbecoming in an envoy, but it is not unbecoming in a gentleman;—it is not only a departure from the rules which ought to govern his diplomatic conduct, but it is a perversion of the truth. Excepting one point, the falsehood of the *appeal* is sufficiently developed in the preceding strictures: that point is where he endeavors to persuade the public he is charged with "*important* negociations." Nothing can be more certain than that he was *not* so charged; or, that if he was, his negociations were not "*important*," in an amicable view, to the U. States; and this conclusion is abundantly veri-

* The following article, copied from the London Gazette of October 12th, 1809, puts this fact beyond all doubt.

"*London, October* 12.

"A deputation of the merchants interested in the trade to the continent, had an interview yesterday with the board of trade. It was signified to them, that it was the intention of government to extend the permission for importing corn, and *exporting colonial produce and British manufactures, to Holland, as it is allowed to and from France*, and that licences would be granted for that purpose."