

THE TRUE REPUBLICAN,

OR

American Whig.

Chronicle

"THE TRUTH OUR GUIDE—THE PUBLIC GOOD OUR END"

[Vol. 1

WILMINGTON, (N. C.) TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1809.

[No. 16.

PRICES CURRENT.

WILMINGTON, APRIL 18, 1809.

Merchandise.	quan- rated	from	to
		p. c.	p. c.
Bacon,	Lb.	9	10
Batter,		18	20
Bees-wax,		33	
Beef,	Bbl.	9	10
Brandy 4th proof,	Gal	2 50	2 75
Corn,	Bush	56	60
Cotton, Upland	Lb	14	15
Coffee,		30	
Flour,	Bbl	7 50	8
Flaxseed,	Cask	7 50	8
Gin, American	Gal	75	
Lumber, pine			
Boards 1-4 inch	th. ft	9	10
Scantling,		8	8 50
Timber, sq'r pine	no sale.		
Shingles, Cyprus	M.	1 25	1 50
Staves, w o Hhds		20	25
" " " " "		9	9 50
" " " " "		10	10 50
Heading w o Hhd		23	30
Lard,	Lb	10	12
" " " " "	Gal	20	20
Naval Stores,			
Tar 32 Gallons	Bbl	1 75	2
Rosin,		2 50	
Turpentine,		3	3 25
520 lbs gro fs			
Spir. Turpentine,	Gal	57	40
Pork,	Bbl	13	14
Peas,	Bush	58	62
Rum Jamaica,	Gal	1 50	
4th proof,		1 25	
3d proof,		70	
American ditto		70	
Rice,	100b	2 25	2 50
Salt,	Bush	75	
Liverpool		70	
Sugar, Muscovado	100b	11	15
Loaf,	Lb	21	22
Tobacco,	100lb	4	4 50

demerit; five commissioners were to be appointed; two by G. Britain, and two by the President, and if they could not agree upon the fifth, *lots* were to be cast—well, sir, the British commissioners decided against our merchants, the American ones in their favor; they could not agree upon the fifth, and accordingly drew *lots*, and the lot fell upon Jonah? we got the commissioner, and our merchants were paid for *unlawful applications*. We had to be sure a hard bargain for this favor, as we engaged to pay the old British debts, due from individuals, to an enormous amount; but through the provident management of the present administration, we commuted them for a gross sum of 600,000l. sterling.

Let it be recollected, sir, that were then in the gristle; now we are hardened into the bone of manhood; and what might have been a good treaty then, while our resources and industry were merely untold themselves, would be a bad one now, that we are a great, free and powerful nation. Such as I have rapidly reviewed them, are some of the inherent objections to the treaty of 1794. It had many *clauses* to answer for. It contained no provision concerning improvements. The West Indies were shut to us. There was no regulation about the colonial trade—and nothing concerning blockades.

Well, sir, the administration have been accused of error in refusing to accept the treaty of 1806. It is worse than the former, & proceeding with my first design to make this a matter of fact argument, I will take a review of that treaty also.

1st The first article, like that of the treaty of 1794, stipulates that there shall be a firm *inviolable peace*, and a true and sincere *friendship*. As the article in the treaty of '94 was still in force, this was superfluous, unless indeed that Great Britain having often violated it, was willing to give it new proof of *friendly dispositions* which her conduct rendered necessary.

Art. 2d renews the ten permanent articles of the treaty of '94 by way of brightening the chain of our recollection.

Art. 3d regulates our trade to the East Indies, and is materially worse than that of '94: by it we are confined to a *direct trade* from the United States to them, and *directly* from them to the United States. The great value of that trade, as regulated by the treaty of 1794, consisted in carrying the produce of the United States to a market in Europe, receiving specie and other articles of traffic there, and going thence to the East Indies; thereby deriving all the benefits accruing from double freights and double profits. The same benefits resulted from the traffic on the return voyages. Under this article the trade would drain the country of specie as with specie *principally* is it carried on. It, like the treaty of '94, prohibits our citizens from settling or residing there, and from going into the interior.

Art. 4th relates to the trade with the U. States and Europe—all our states and territories are thrown open for *Europe* alone: it is precisely similar to the 14th article of the treaty of '94 and the objections urged to that, apply to it.

Art. 5th is like the 15th of the treaty of '94. It repeals our non importation act, and prohibits all other restrictive measures which it may be politic to enact hereafter. There is no reciprocity in it: we are not a manufacturing people and through restrictions upon manufacturers we wield a potent engine—and the power of discriminating ought to be relinquished.

Art. 6th declares that the subject of intercourse with the West Indies shall be postponed. Sir, they cannot submit without the supplies received from us; and yet they will not allow us to trade thither, at a time when every port we own is thrown open to them.

Art. 7th relates to consuls, and is similar to the 16th in the treaty of '94—the same objections apply to it—their consuls are at liberty to reside at any of our ports—ours are confined to Europe, and excluded from the East and West Indies & all other places.

Art. 8th concerns captures on just suspicion of being enemy's property—it is similar to the treaty of '94, and liable to all the objections urged in relation to it.

Art. 9th is on the subject of contraband, and includes timber, hemp, plank, &c

which should have been exempted, after the example of the Russian treaty; and being the growth and produce of our country, such exemption was the more important to us.

Art. 10th relates to the *notification* of blockades: the *definition* of them, which we are so much interested in, and had pressed so strenuously, being totally omitted. A provision on this subject acquired fresh importance every day: we had witnessed the most alarming innovations upon the established definitions in the laws of nations—information that paper blockades were substituted for real ones, and whole islands, kingdoms and continents, were *declared* blockaded when the combined fleets of Europe could not effect it.

Art. 11th is on the subject of the colonial trade: the restraints upon it are incompatible with the character of independence, and at first view, the mind is struck with the outrageous attempt of Great Britain to dictate to us in what manner we shall trade with the possessions of an independent nation—and how we shall be permitted to trade with her enemies. The regulation is a humiliating one; for by it G. Britain assumes the prerogative of directing to what extent at least it shall be taxed by us. 1st If we trade in the productions or manufactures of Europe, destined for the West Indies, they are to be first brought here and subjected to a duty of at least one per cent. before they can be carried there. If we desire to carry the productions of the colonies to Europe, they must be first brought here, and a like duty of two per cent imposed. I am aware that to this it has been answered we derive a revenue from the traffic; but, sir, I am not for collecting a revenue of our citizens at foreign dictation—besides, the double voyages and expenses to enhance the price that we cannot compete in the market with the British productions: and it operates as a bounty to that amount on them.

Art. 12th concerns maritime jurisdiction, but within the defined limits permits the right of search, to see if the vessel belongs to an enemy. Within our jurisdictional limits we must maintain exclusive jurisdiction or winter away our independence—within them it is an universally acknowledged principle, that the national sovereignty is as complete at sea as on land, nay, so inviolable is that sovereignty, that even enemy's vessels are exempt from attack and capture. It is true, that in case of the Impetueux, Great Britain trampled upon the law of nations; but it is not the less obligatory, although we submitted to the degradation of its violation. Once allow the right of search for the purpose expressed, and the most alarming abuses will follow. In this article there is no provision against hovering around our ports, and taking stations there, to surprise and vex our inward and outward bound trade—a provision of indispensable necessity, taught us by the melancholy lessons at New York: for that important place has been effectually blockaded by British vessels—Our jurisdiction must be complete and exclusive.

Art. 13th regulates the right of search: It is to be exercised as *favorably* as the course of the war may permit, observing as much as possible the principles of the law of nations. This is a latitude, boundless as the universe; it is completely undefined; it is a mockery of our understandings. G. Britain may give new aspects to the war every day, and being sole judge of the favorable course which the war may permit, will riot upon our rights. It acknowledges the justice of, nay, sanctions a departure from the law of nations; better therefore be without the article entirely! Every man who has attended to the history of our humiliations at sea, must recollect the many complaints of abuses in relation to the right of search. Instead of keeping at a proper distance, and limiting the number allowed to visit our merchant vessels, for the purpose of examining her character and lading, our captain is ordered with his papers to come on board of the British ship, launched in his crazy boat upon a boisterous sea, at the imminent danger of his life, and there saluted with the most abusive, ungentlemanly language. It further relates to judgments in prize cases, and to restitution for unlawful captures: a copy of the sentence and proceedings of the admiralty courts shall be given, if required. Sir, it should

have gone further, and compelled the admiralty judge to have stated the grounds of his opinion. Let it be recollected that the court is *ex parte* one: we have no security for its integrity, and the abuses committed by them are alarming. Their forms of judgments are, "condemned as enemy's property, or otherwise"—and our courts, where cases depending upon those decisions have come before them, decide that the decree is conclusive, unless there is error apparent on the face of it. Indeed, I believe they go further, and condescend to be the mere registers of the British admiralty edicts. How can an error in the opinion of the judge appear when he condemns on the ground of *enemy's property or otherwise*?—There is an extreme necessity for some checks. Sir William Scott, judge of the high court of admiralty, who has assumed to himself the high character of impartial expounder of the law of nations, for all nations, with all his great talents, has been unable to reconcile his inconsistent, time serving, varying decisions; and, failing in that, has been at length compelled to take refuge under the orders of the British privy council; the laws of nations, of reason, morality, and every thing else being disregarded. Sir, there is no provision for a *bona fide* restitution; and in proof of the abuses practised, I will state a case which occurred last summer; A vessel belonging to an American merchant was dispatched in ballast to Guadaloupe, under a permission from the President, to collect a debt due to him there. Being prohibited by the embargo laws from carrying any lading, the owner drew bills upon his debtors and not being able to obtain specie, or perhaps desiring to import some of the productions of the island into the U. States, as he lawfully might, he received sugar, &c in discharge of the debt. On the return voyage, the vessel was captured and carried into Antigua, and labelled there. The judge was disposed at first to condemn the property under the order of June, but finding a better expedient, he determined that it must be enemy's property, as there was no cargo to purchase it with, and inasmuch as drawing bills might be converted to the fraudulent cover of enemy's property, he determined it was enemy's property, and condemned it. Well sir, altho' the cargo was worth, and would have sold here for 12,000 dollars, by being exposed to sale in a glutted market it brought only 3,000 dollars. The costs of prosecuting the claim, in the vice admiralty court, were 1,400 dollars, and it was admitted on all hands, that the expenses of appeal would be 2,000 dollars more. Altho' it was manifestly certain that the decree would be reversed, it was equally to that nothing would be restored but the proceeds of sale, so that after succeeding, our citizen would lose his property, and 400 dollars in the bargain. Suppose a vessel captured merely for the *spot*, carried into and sold at St. John's, where there are no bidders able to exceed 150 dollars, and in such case restitution of the proceeds (which is the universal rule) were decreed—what is the effect?—Invitation to plunder, although they have sufficient already. Sir, I am for exposing their judges by making them expose themselves, and for breaking the chains of vassalage, which our judges have put on thereby. Such a provision would effect the object.

The 14th article relates to piracy.

The 15th prohibits citizens from joining others in hostility.

The 16th prohibits reprisals until complaint is made, and *unreasonable delay*, it is similar to the 23d of '94.

The 17th, like the 23d of the treaty of '94 admits all their armed vessels into our ports, and requires the punishment of those insulting their officers—I will not repeat the objections already urged, when discussing the 23d article.

Art. 18th relates to arming, in the ports of the two nations.

Art. 19th provides for the admission of their privateers, with their prizes—when *ever they please*—I wish not to be misunderstood, in discussing this treaty, as intimating, that the provisions are not reciprocal upon paper, what I contend is, that there is none in reality. We are a peace loving nation—Great Britain loves war—We preserve peace if possible—We have comparatively no navy.—Great Britain has 1000 ships of war." This article

Speech

DELIVERED BY Mr. J. G. JACKSON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Of the United States,

On the motion for raising the Embargo, and authorizing letters of marque and reprisal.

(Continued.)

The 26th provides, that in case of war, the merchants may remain as long as they please amongst us, to carry on trade. Sir, to this there are two strong objections. 1st; they are a curse to us in time of peace, and they would be far worse in a period of war—spies upon us—and monied spies too; their whole wealth and power, would be brought to bear upon our people for the purpose of corrupting them. 2d; I will ever maintain the position, that private property is no more justly liable to seizure at sea, than on land; and unless they would refrain from taking ours at sea, I would retaliate by sequestering theirs on land.

The 27th requires that fugitives, shall be delivered up. Under this article Jonathan Robbins was offered up and sacrificed.

The 28th relates to the limitation of the articles; the first ten to be permanent, the other to be in force until two years after the signature of preliminary articles of peace. This being the import of the treaty, and the effect, of all the articles which I have separately considered, lest it might be supposed that those omitted contained something favorable, I ask any candid man if it ought again to be renewed? And if it were, wherein is to be *indemnity by security*? The good, if any were contained in the first ten articles, and they were executed; except so far as relates to their permanency. They indeed contained much good; and one article relating to the Western ports, swallowed up all that was obnoxious. You must recollect Mr. Chairman, with what eloquence & exact, that consideration was pressed upon Congress—gentlemen who never saw an Indian, all at once felt uncommon sympathy for our Western people, they painted in vivid colours, the relentless barbarity of the savages, who waged a war of extermination against us; no age, no sex, no condition exempting any, from the indiscriminate murder of all; led on by British officers, fighting in their ranks and commanding their expeditions—deriving supplies and protection from these ports, and stimulated there, to lay our country to waste and cut off its scattered population. It contained a *lettery* provision too, for in-