

THE STAR.

Vol. I.]

RALEIGH, JUNE 15, 1809.

[No. 33.]

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY, BY THOMAS HENDERSON, JUN. FOR SELF & CO. AT THE UPPER END OF FAYETTEVILLE STREET, NEAR CASSO'S CORNER.—PRICE THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, PAYABLE HALF YEARLY IN ADVANCE.—SINGLE PAPER 10 CENTS.

AGENTS FOR THE STAR.

- NORTH-CAROLINA.**
- Ashe, John Blair.
 - Bladen, J. or M. Pickett.
 - Burke, Atlas Jones.
 - Camden, Thomas Brown, jr.
 - Carteret, George Swaine.
 - Chatham, Samuel Gurock.
 - Clay, Alex'r. Henderson.
 - Crawford, Bryan Helen.
 - Cumberland, John Graves.
 - Darlington, John M. Aden.
 - Edgecombe, John H. Brown.
 - Franklin, Dimmicks & Warden.
 - Gaston, R. Freeman.
 - Granville, Hendon Standen.
 - Halifax, Duncan M'Bea.
 - Hatteras, Daniel Redmond.
 - Johnston, Joel King.
 - Lincoln, Stephen Sneed.
 - Martin, Lewis LeMay.
 - Mecklenburg, William Sneed.
 - Moore, Joseph Davis.
 - New-Haven, James Dick.
 - Orange, William Burt.
 - Person, Francis Tate.
 - Pitt, John Stevens, jr.
 - Randolph, Durant Hatch, jr.
 - Richmond, James Irwin.
 - Rockingham, Christopher Houston.
 - Salem, Abraham Croom.
 - Swain, V. M'Bea.
 - Tarboro', Robert Williamson.
 - Wayne, H. Hunter.
 - Yadkin, Jesse F. Jones.
- SOUTH-CAROLINA.**
- Union C. H., John Carson.
 - Jeffrey's Creek, David Bigham.
 - Charon, John F. Wilson.
 - Columbia, James S. Guignard.
 - Lancaster, William Howe.
 - Windsorville, Joshua David.
- TENNESSEE.**
- Greenville, A. P. Fore.
 - Knoxville, John N. Gamble.
 - Nashville, John M. Goodloe.
- VIRGINIA.**
- Prince-Edward, Charles H. Kennon.
 - Petersburg, Solomon High.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.

Edgcombe County.

Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions—May Term, 1809.

Evans and Hines,

CITATION.

The Heirs of Abraham Combs, dec. }
IN this case it appearing to the Court that the personal estate of the said deceased is insufficient to discharge the debts; and on motion it appearing that the heirs of said deceased are not residents of this State—The Court therefore Order, that unless the heirs of said deceased do appear at the next Court, to be held for the said county of Edgcombe, at the Court-House in Tarborough on the fourth Monday in August next, to shew cause, &c. that the real estate of said deceased will be condemned for the payment of his debts.

It is further Ordered, That a copy of this order be published in the Raleigh STAR for three weeks successively. Extract from the Minutes.

E. HALL, Ck.

Entertainment at Chapel-Hill.



THE Subscribers respectfully inform the public in general, that they have opened a House for Private Entertainment at Chapel-Hill, where, by their exertions to please, they hope to obtain a share of public patronage. Their House is furnished with the best of spirits, &c. and their Stables with good provender. They have also rented a Two-Story House, with four large rooms in it. Those rooms shall also be well furnished by the 22d of June, when the Examination of the Students will commence.—Those gentlemen and ladies who favour us with their company may be assured that nothing will be wanting on our part to render their situations comfortable.

DAVID & ELIZABETH NUNN.

June 1st, 1809.

Notice

I hereby given to all the Creditors of the late JOHN GALBRAITH, of Orange county, that the Subscribers at the last Orange County Court took the Administration upon the Estate of the deceased; It is therefore requested that they will bring forward their Claims, properly authenticated, within the time limited by Law, otherwise this Notice will be plead in bar of their recovery. Those indebted to said Estate must make immediate payment, as no indulgence can be given.

MAT. CUNNINGHAM, ROBERT DIXON, WALTER GALBRAITH. } Adm'rs

March 23, 1809.

31—3w.

Notice.

THE Subscriber at the last Term of Wake County Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, qualified as Administrator of the estate of Patrick Conway, deceased, late a resident of the City of Raleigh. Notice is therefore given to those indebted to the said deceased that unless they make immediate payment, necessity will compel the Administrator to have recourse to measures as unpleasant to himself as they will be disagreeable to others.

Those having claims against the said deceased will present them properly authenticated within the time limited by law, otherwise this notice will be plead in bar of their recovery. JAMES HENDERSON, Adm'r. May 22, 1809.

Public Auction.

On Saturday the first day of July next, at the Store-House lately occupied by Patrick Conway, dec. in Raleigh,

WILL commence the sale, at Public Auction, of the Personal Estate of said deceased, and as the whole, or nearly so, consists in a well chosen assortment of DRY GOODS, and some valuable GROCERIES, it is useless to attempt to enumerate the different articles, and only observe that the sale may be well worth the attention of those who wish to purchase valuable articles at a reduced price. The sale will continue from day to day until the whole is sold (Sundays excepted.)

A credit until the first day of May next will be allowed for all sums over Four Dollars, the purchasers giving bonds with approved security before the delivery of the property. JAMES HENDERSON, Adm'r. May 22, 1809.

Positively to commence drawing, On Monday the 9th of October next.

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT.

TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS

May be gained for the small sum of two and an half dollars!!!

IN THE THIRD CLASS

OF THE

River Lehigh Lottery.

The capital prizes are, viz.
2 of \$10,000 3 of \$1000
2 5,000 6 500
2 2,500 15 200, &c.

Less than two and an half blanks to a prize, the lowest of which is \$5 dollars.

To draw 500 numbers each day, at the state-house in Philadelphia, where the prizes will be paid by Thomas Allibone, Esq. the Treasurer, 30 days after the conclusion of the drawing; subject to a deduction of 15 per cent.

This is one of the richest Lotteries published here for many years, and the moderate price of the tickets places the grand prizes within the reach of every individual who chooses to become an adventurer, which he may do for so small a sum as sixty-two and an half cents. The object, moreover, is such as must interest every well-wisher to the internal improvement of the state.

Letters post paid, and inclosing the cash, will be duly attended to, and prizes of lotteries of this city and of New-York, as well as bank notes of the different states, received in payment. The price of the tickets will advance with the approach of the drawing.

Whole tickets, \$2 50
Half do. 1 25
Quarter do. 62 1-2 cents.

GEO. TAYLOR, junior.

No. 85, South Second-street, Philadelphia.

N. B. The earliest information will be given to distant purchasers, of the state of their tickets. Those of the Secord Baptist Church, Universalist Church, Pennepack Academy, and Vineyard Lotteries, also for sale as above. May 1, 1809. 30—3m.

UNITED STATES.



CONGRESS,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Friday, May 26.

DEBATE

On Mr. Randolph's motion for approving the late conduct of the President of the U. States

Mr. Bacon's amendment was in these words, proposed to be added to the motion;—"And furnishes an additional proof of the spirit of accommodation on the part of the government of the United States, which has at no time been intermitted."

Mr. J. G. Jackson moved that the whole subject be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. RANDOLPH said, that as an indefinite postponement was considered as tantamount to a rejection—for it prevents a renewal of the subject during the session, and a rejection does nothing more—he certainly was opposed to the rejection of his own motion. He could not have believed that this motion would have been rejected by the house; though he said he had certainly calculated on its being opposed by those who condemned the promptitude and frankness with which the President had proceeded to restore, as far as depended on him, the intercourse between the two nations. It is this part of the conduct of the President of the U. States (said Mr. R.) on which I mean to give an opinion—"By the President of the U. States a proclamation"—and in that proclamation in my opinion, he has deserved well of his country. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Findly) if he is near enough to hear me on this vast room, when have I proposed bringing in review the whole measures of the former administrations—when have I proposed an answer to

an address to the two houses? I have proposed no such thing, sir—altho' my motion is nearly tantamount to it; because it so happens that the only act of which we have any knowledge, except the laying up the gun-boats in dry dock, which I also most cordially approve, is this very thing. Now, I have not the slightest objection, if the gentleman chuses, that the hon. and worthy gentleman from Massachusetts should insist on a *venue* on the conduct of any former president of the U. States—but I beg leave to be excused from serving on it. As an unqualified juror, I chuse to except to myself—for, really as to one of those presidents, his career does not seem yet to be finished—it would seem as if he yet meditated another batch of midnight judges and another midnight retreat from the capital. I do therefore except to myself as a juror, as to him or any other president.—*De mortuis nil nisi bonum*—agreed, sir.—Let the good that men do live after them and the evil be interred in their graves. But I would ask the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Pennsylvania also, if this be one of their abstract propositions? How abstract, I pray you? Or if it be one of those unmeaning propositions, the discussion of which can answer no good to this house? It would be idle in us now to be trying Mr. Adams on the merits of the sedition law, the 8 per cent. loans, or any other such act; it would answer no purpose—and it would be equally idle and futile to pass any opinion on the merits or demerits of the first four or last 4 years of the late administration, for this plain reason; the question bolts upon you; *cui bono*?—What earthly good can result from it? But is that the case in relation to the Executive, on whose future dispositions rest the best interests of this nation? Is that a mere idle discussion? And is it come to this? Is this house so sunk in the Executive opinion? I trust not, sir; I scout the idea—that its approbation of a great course of national policy is to pass for nothing, is to have no influence on the conduct of the executive of the United States? This, sir, is taking higher doctrine than was ever advanced by those who wished to see the president open Parliament by a speech from the throne, and to see the faithful commons return a loyal and humble address in reply to the gracious speech from the throne. Sir, this is a great question which I have presented to you—and gentlemen may hamper it with as many amendments as they please; they cannot keep the question out of sight.—It has been presented to the American people and they have decided it, decide you how you may.

With respect to the gentleman's amendment I need not tell him, I presume, that I shall vote most pointedly against it, because in my opinion, it does not contain the truth. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Bacon) will be among the last of the members of this house to attribute to me an improper sentiment in regard to him when I say that it does not contain the truth. If the gentleman from Massachusetts chuses, in imitation of another eastern nation, not those who tried their kings after they were entombed, but those who consigned to one common grave the living and the dead—if he be willing to attach the sound healthy body of the present administration—healthy so far, & I trust, fortifying itself against contagions—to the dead corpse of the last, let him. He shall not have my assistance in doing it; nor have I the least desire to draw a marked distinction between the two administrations—the gentleman will hardly suspect that I am seeking favour at court. My object is plain—it is to say to the president that in issuing that proclamation he has acted wisely and we approve of it. I wish the president of the U. States to have the approving sentiment of this house, and to have that approbation as a guide to his future conduct—and I put it to the gentleman from Massachusetts whether it be fair to mingle it with the old, stale, refuse stuff of the embargo. No, sir; let him not put his new wine into old bottles. There is a difference of opinion in this country. The president of the United States stands condemned by men in this nation, and, as I believe in this house, for having issued that proclamation and put that construction on the non-intercourse law; I wish to see by how many he is thus condemned. I do not wish to see the question shirked, to see it blinked. If there be a majority of the house, as I believe there is, in favour of the conduct of the President, I wish him to have that approbation expressed, as a guide to his future and a support to his present conduct. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, shall we go back and approve of what he conceives to be similar conduct of the late president of the United States in relation to the embargo. I hope not, sir. But if a majority of this house chuse to do so, let them. I shall say no. And why should we make a sort of hotch-potch of the two subjects on which we do not think alike, for the purpose of getting us all united against both?—It is an old adage and a very homely one, perhaps too much so for the delicate ears of this assembly, that if you put one addled egg into a pudding you may add fresh ones *ad infinitum*, but you can never sweeten it.—And, sir, I defy the gentleman from Massachusetts with all his political cookery, by pouring out of the jar of our present situation into the old mess to sweeten it. I am here prepared to prove, as I conceive that gentleman deny it, that the conduct of two administrations has been radically, essentially and vitally different; that owing to this difference is the change which we now experience in the state of our foreign affairs; that there is no sort of analogy between the offer to suspend the embargo as it was acted Great Britain and the situation in which we put ourselves in relation to France and Great Britain by the suspension of the non-intercourse act towards the latter: And to the promptitude and frankness with which the President met the overtures of the British ministry do we chiefly owe the difference in the situation of the country.

In the year 1806 we passed that miserable old non-importation act which last session we repealed; and really, sir, we got rid of it with an adroitness

which pleased me exceedingly. Never was an obnoxious measure more handsomely spotted by its avowed friends. Gentlemen said it was merged in the non-intercourse act, and therefore as a matter of indifference they would repeal it; and when the non-intercourse act shall expire by its own limitation at the end of this session or be suspended by the President's proclamation, as it is in relation to Great Britain, there is an end of both; and thus the old measure, the old original sin to which we owed our first difficulties, was completely gotten rid of as if a majority of this House had declared it an unwise measure, and therefore repealed it. I do recollect to have heard one gentleman (Mr. Eppes) say that unless the section repealing this law were stricken out he should be compelled to vote against the non-intercourse bill. He conjured the House to cling to the old non-importation act as the last vestige and symbol of resistance to British oppression—but the House was deaf to his call, and the non-importation act was plucked beneath the wave, never (I trust) to rise again. When, therefore, the late President of the United States made an offer to Great Britain to suspend the embargo as to her, provided she would withdraw her orders in council, I will suppose that she had accepted that offer. In what situation would she have stood in relation to the United States? Her fine cloths, her leather, her watches, her this and her that would have been prohibited admittance into this country under the old non-importation act of 1806, which would have been in force. Contact in point of fact had no operation on her adversary. Her ships would have been prohibited the use of our waters whilst the ships of war or her enemy were admitted. Did that make no difference? That, sir, would have been the situation of the two countries, provided she had accepted the offer to suspend the embargo as to herself—the old non-importation act in operation, her ships of war excluded and her rivals admitted. I pray you, was not that the condition of the country when Mr. Ross arrived? Was there not some difficulty under the proclamation, in the admission of the *Satira* frigate bearing that minister into our waters? And were not French ships of war there, and have they not since been riding quietly at Annapolis, Norfolk and elsewhere? Has not in fact the gallant captain Decatur taken our own seamen out of one of them? And yet, sir, the offer at that time made by us has been identified with the negotiation between Mr. Secretary Smith and Mr. Erskine. What then was her situation? The non-importation act in force, her ships excluded, and those of France admitted—and nothing in force in relation to France except the embargo. What is now the situation of affairs? Trade with her is restored to the same situation in point of fact, in which it stood when congress met here in 1805-6—at the memorable first session of the ninth congress which generated the old non-importation act of 1806.—Her ships of war are admitted into our waters, her trade is freed from embarrassment, while the ships of her adversary are excluded and the trade between us and that adversary forbidden by law. While, therefore, I am ready and willing to approve the conduct of the present administration, it is not because I conceive that they have effected any thing so very difficult, that they have obtained any such mighty concession, but because they have done their duty. Yes, sir—we all recollect the objections made to the treaty by colonel Monroe and Mr. Pinckney on two great leading accounts—1st. that it contained no express provision against the impressment of seamen. Is there any provision now made? No, sir. The next objection to the treaty was the note attached to it by lords Holland and Auckland.—What, sir, did gentlemen on this floor say was the purport of this note? That its object was to put us in a state of amity in respect to Great Britain at the expence of the risk of collision with France. On account of this note the treaty and treaty-makers have been politically damned. And yet we are now, in point of fact, in that very situation in relation to the two nations, in which it was said that the British commissioners by the note aimed to place us—and which was a sufficient reason, according to the arguments of gentlemen, for rejecting the treaty. The note was a sort of lien, gentlemen said that would put us in a state of hostility with regard to France, and amity with regard to England. We refused to give our bond, for such it was represented (however unjustly) to be, to be sure, sir—but we have paid the money. We have done the very thing which gentlemen say the note aimed to induce us to do. We have put ourselves in a situation endangering collision with France and almost ensuring amity with England. And what, I ask this House, has the British minister given us in requital for this change of our position in relation to him and his rival belligerent? The revocation of the orders in council—this is the mighty boon. For, with respect to his offer in relation to satisfaction for the attack on the Chesapeake, he made that offer to Mr. Monroe spontaneously, on the spur of the occasion, and there is not a doubt in my mind but that we had nothing to do but receive it at that time, provided the instructions of our minister had permitted him to receive it—but perchance, sir, if he had received it, we might have been at this day discussing his message, and not the message of another President.—All that Mr. Canning has given this country is a reiteration of his offer to make reparation for the affair of the Chesapeake, and his withdrawal of the orders in council—and to what did they amount? So soon as you, by your own law, cut off your trade with France, he agrees to revoke the orders interfering with it. Mr. Canning might as well have withdrawn blank paper. They had nothing left to operate upon. The body upon which they were to operate was destroyed by our own act, to wit, the trade of France.

If, sir, we are not to have a full discussion of the conduct of the present administration, and it is to be blended and identified with the conduct of the last—which I very much deprecate, because I see nothing