

50 DOLLARS REWARD.

Runaway from the subscriber's plantation on the 25th of March last in Fairfield District, State of Carolina, two negro men, named JACK and TARTON. Jack was brought from Maryland, by Mr. John Adams, about six or seven months ago, is about six feet high, about 25 years of age, of a black complexion, mustache, and a comb of a hair and yellow teeth; he speaks heavily and bends a little forward as he walks, and is about 30 years of age. A short time after he left home he endeavored to pass under the name of Free Jack. When he was out of a great coat, a dark complexion, lined with red flannel, and edged with black velvet, he wears a pair of shoes made slipper fashion, the rest of his clothes were various. Tarton is about 5 feet six or eight inches high, also of a black complexion, about 21 or 22 years of age, has a pleasant countenance, somewhat slow and listless in his walk; he lost his clothes on the great part of them at least 10 or 15 miles from home, therefore they cannot be described. He was bought about nine months ago from Mr. William Pulcher of the city of Richmond, (Va.) and was raised in or near that city. They were both heard of about two weeks after their departure a little to the south of Salisbury, N. C. and were then without hats and their heads tied up with a handkerchief. It is supposed they will endeavor to reach the city of Richmond as their first refuge. Any person that will bring them together any jail where they may be secured, shall receive the above reward for both, or 25 dollars for each, and all reasonable expenses paid. JOHN LOWRY.

STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA, STOKES COUNTY.

Original Bill. In Equity. George Deatherage, Plaintiff, vs. George Deatherage, Defendant. The Court, Geo. Deatherage and Anna his wife, and Deatherage, Anna his wife, John Deatherage and Nancy his wife, John Deatherage, Philip Deatherage, James Deatherage, George Deatherage, Wm. Deatherage, John Deatherage, and Geo. Deatherage.

It being shown to the Court, that George Deatherage the original Defendant in this case is dead—It is therefore Ordered, That the above named persons, being his devisees, and heirs at law, be made parties to this suit, and it appearing, that Milly Deatherage the widow of the deceased, Bird Deatherage, Abner Deatherage, Ashby Deatherage and Venner his wife, Wm. Edmondson and Nancy his wife, John Deatherage, Philip Deatherage, Coleman Deatherage, Wm. Deatherage, Ackalls Deatherage, and Geo. Deatherage, reside without the limits of this state, It is therefore Ordered, That publication be made for three weeks successively in the Star, printed at Raleigh, that unless they appear by next October Term and make themselves parties, the bill will be taken pro confesso against them, and heard ex parte at that term.

Copy from the Minutes. Test, ENL. SIROBER, C. M. E.

TO CARPENTERS.

Will be let, a building of a Court House in the town of Leesburg, of the following dimensions, to wit—Fifty feet long, twenty-four feet wide, and sixteen feet high—a room sixteen feet out of by a partition, and that again divided into two rooms, 12 by 16—Two fulling and four six panel doors—Sixteen four light windows and five eighteen light windows—To which will be added, a wing fourteen by twenty-four feet, ten feet pitch, divided into two rooms, 12 by 14, with two eighteen light windows—appropriate joiner work, sills, joists and beams—Celled through which and painted white—Two outside angle chimneys to be built of brick or stone. The whole to be built of good materials under the direction of the Commissioners and finished complete in a plain neat workmanlike manner. Proposals in writing will be received by the Commissioners until the 1st of Saturday of August next, at which time those who may have made proposals will attend for the purpose of entering into bond with security for the faithful performance of the contract. A plan of the buildings may be seen by applying to either of the Commissioners.

WILLIAM GREEN, JEREMIAH PERRY, ALEX. FALCONER, WILLIAM MOORE, GREEN HILL.

July 15, 1811.

NEW CASH STORE.

HENRY MORENO.

At the House lately occupied by Mr. James Thompson, buy on hand a parcel of well selected DRY GOODS and a few BROUDES, which he will dispose of at reduced prices for Cash or Country produce. N. B. Those inclined to purchase will find it greatly in their interest to apply as soon as possible as he will leave town in the course of 10 or 12 days.

THE GRAND LODGE OF NORTH-CAROLINA & TENNESSEE.

Will convene in their Lodge Room in this city on the evening of Thursday the 21st day of November next. At which time and place the Officers, Members and Representatives are required to attend. By order of the most worshipful High Priest, Benjamin Smith, Governor of the State of North-Carolina, Grand Master.

THOMAS J. WILLIAMS, Grand Secretary.

Raleigh July 15th, A. D. 1811, A. M. 1811.

ATTENTION!

Officers of Militia whose duty it is to make returns of their respective commands, who the last year failed to make such as the law requires, and whose delinquency it becomes my duty to prosecute, are hereby notified that unless such explanations in the form of legal evidence are immediately made as the Attorney General or such law officer as in his absence will conduct the suits, shall deem valid and sufficient to generate from the imposition of fine; or unless the fines and forfeitures which they are liable to incur shall be remitted and paid, I shall without delay and without respect to persons bring suits against them in the Superior Court of Wake.

CALVIN JONES, Adjutant-General N. C.

Raleigh July 15 1811.

MILITIA LAWS.

FOR SALE AT THE STAR STORE.

Political.

ROBERT SMITH'S VINDICATION. EXHIBITED TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES. (Continued from page 113.)

7th. Previously to the meeting of Congress last Autumn, I expressed to Mr. Madison my apprehension that the Emperor of France would not do as he fulfilled the just expectations of the United States; that our commerce would be exposed in his ports to vexatious embarrassments and that France and reason would probably not be freely admitted into France. He expressed a different opinion, and, indeed, was confident that the Berlin and Milan decrees would soon be repealed on the first day of November, 1810, and that from that day our commercial relations with France would be unembarrassed with no restrictions or embarrassments whatever.—I, nevertheless, told him that my impressions were such that I would have a conversation with Gen. Turreau upon the subject in my interview with him in relation to certificates of origin. In the course of the correspondence which thence ensued, I was greatly checked by the evident indications of utter indifference on the part of Mr. Madison. Instead of encouraging, he absolutely discouraged the making of any submissions upon Gen. Turreau's letter of December 13, 1810.—But irresistibly impelled, as I was by principle and by feelings altogether American, I prepared in reply my letter of December 18, 1810, and laid it before Mr. Madison.—Perceiving upon reading it that he could not but acquiesce in the sending of it, he merely suggested the expediency of adding to it what might have the effect of preventing the British Government from presuming too much upon the ground taken in the letter.

This letter of the 18th December being prominent in the catalogue of the offences that had brought upon me the displeasure of Mr. Madison, our fellow citizens will dispassionately consider whether it ought to be looked at as a sin beyond forgiveness.

The following is the letter, and is re-published for the convenience of a more easy reference.

The Secretary of State to Gen. Turreau, Department of State, December 18, 1811.

1st.—I have had the honour of receiving your letter of the 13th instant, in reply to my inquiries in relation to certificates of origin, as well as to the admission into France of the products of the agriculture of the U. States.

From your letter it appears that the importation into France, of cotton and tobacco, the products of the United States, is, at this time, specially and absolutely prohibited.

From the decree of the 18th of July, it appears, however, that there can be no importation into France, but upon terms and conditions utterly inadmissible, and that, therefore, there can be no importation at all of the following articles, the products of the United States, namely: fish oil, dye wood, salt fish, codfish, hides and peltry.

As these enumerated articles constitute the great mass of the exports from the United States to France, the mind is naturally awakened to a survey of the actual condition of the commercial relations between the two countries, and to the consideration that the practical good, worthy of notice, has resulted to the United States from the revocation of the Berlin and Milan decrees combined, as it unexpectedly has been, with a change in the commercial system of France, so momentous to the U. States.

The act of Congress of the 1st of August, 1810, is merely the recognition of a principle, which is a principle, but the enjoyment of which is a benefit. The principle here presented, is the principle of the free trade of commerce, and is a principle of the most valuable kind, that an abrogation of the Berlin and Milan decrees would leave the parts of France as free as the introduction of the produce of the United States, as they were previously to the promulgation of those decrees.

The restrictions of the Berlin and Milan decrees had the effect of restraining the American merchants from sending their vessels to France. The substitution of a system that has been substituted against the admission of American products, will have the effect of impeding upon them an equal restraint. If, then, for the reasons decrees, municipal laws, producing the same commercial effects have been substituted, the mode only, and not the measure, has undergone an alteration. And however true it may be, that the change is lawful in fact, it is nevertheless, as true, that it is essentially unjust, and that it does not at all comport with the ideas inspired by your letter of the 27th ult. in which you were pleased to declare the "distinctly pronounced intention of his imperial majesty of favouring the commercial relation between France and the United States, in all the objects of traffic, which shall evidently proceed from their agriculture or manufactures."

If France, by her own acts, has blocked up her ports against the introduction of the products of the United States, what motive has this government, in a discussion with a third power, to insist on the privilege of going to France? Whence the inducement to urge the amendment of a blockade of France, when, if annulled, no American cargoes could obtain a market in any of her ports? In such a state of things, a blockade of the coast of France would be to the United States as unimportant, as would be a blockade of the coast of the Caspian Sea.

The British edicts may be viewed as having a double relation—first, to the wrong done to the United States; second to the wrong done to France. And it is in the latter relation only, that France has a right to speak. But what wrong, it may be asked, can France suffer from British orders which co-operate with her own regulations? However sensible the United States may be to the violation of their neutral rights under those edicts, yet if France herself has by her own acts rendered it a diabolical instead of a practical violation, it is for this government to decide on the degree in which sacrifices of any sort may be required, by considerations which peculiarly and exclusively relate to the United States. Certain it is, that the inducements to such sacrifices are weakened, as far as France and weaken them, by having converted the right to be maintained, into a naked one, whilst the sacrifices to be made would be substantial and extensive.

A hope, however, is indulged, that your instructions from your government will soon enable you to give some satisfactory explanations of the measures to which reference has been made, and that their operation in view of modifications, which have not yet transpired, will not be as has been herein represented.

The president has required with great satisfaction the information, that the consuls of France have been heretofore in the official and authorized practice of furnishing certificates of origin to American vessels, as well to those destined to neutral ports, as to those whose avowments are in alliance with France; and that this practice sanctioned by the French government, did not cease in any part of the United States before the 13th of last month, and then only in consequence of a despatch from the Duke of Cadore, bearing date the 30th of August preceding. This satisfaction arises from the hope, that similar information may have been given to the Danish government, and from a sense of the happy influence which such a communication will have had on the American property, that had been seized and detained by the privates of Denmark, upon the supposition that those certificates of origin were spurious and not authorized by the French government. It is nevertheless, to be regretted, that the functions of France in Denmark had not made known to the Danish authorities, during the occurrence of such outrages on the American trade, the error of denouncing, as illegitimate, authentic documents, which had been

regularly issued by the accredited agents of his imperial majesty.

I have the honour to be, Sir, (Signed) R. SMITH, General Turreau, &c. &c.

8th. It is within the recollection of the American people, that the members of congress, during the last session, were much embarrassed, as to the course most proper to be taken with respect to our foreign relations, and that their embarrassments proceeded principally from the defect in the communications in them as to the views of the Emperor of the French. To supply this defect was the great desideratum. At a critical period of their perplexities the arrival at Norfolk of an Envoy Extraordinary from France was announced. Immediately thereon all these proceedings touching our foreign relations were suspended. Their measures, as avowed by themselves and as expected by the nation, were then to be shaped according to the information, that might be received from Mr. Serurier, especially, as he necessarily must have left France long after the all important first day of November.—Upon his arrival at Washington and immediately after he had been accredited, knowing, as I did, the impatience of Congress and of my countrymen, I lost no time in having with him a conference. This conference I concluded by stating that I would take the liberty of addressing to him a note propounding the several questions, that I had just had the honour of putting to him in conversation, and that thus by his answer I should be enabled to lay before the President with the utmost precision his communications to me. Accordingly, immediately prepared the following draught of a letter and considering the President's sanction a matter of course, I had it in due official form copied by the appropriate clerk. But waiting on the President with it, and after having reported to him verbally the result of the conference, I was, to my astonishment, told by him that it would not be expedient to send to Mr. Serurier any such note. His department throughout this interview evinced a high degree of dissimulation, which occasionally betrayed him into fretful expressions. Having in view nothing but the dignity of the government, and the prosperity of my country, and overlooking his peevishness, I expressed him, but in a manner the most delicate, not to withhold from Congress any information that might be useful to them at so momentous a juncture.

The following is a copy of the letter I had prepared, as proper in my opinion, to be sent to Mr. Serurier. It needs no comment.

Department of State, February 20, 1811.

1st.—Desirous of laying before the president with the utmost precision the substance of our conference of this day, and knowing that verbal communications are not untravertly misunderstood, I consider it proper to propose to you in a written form, the questions which I have had the honour of submitting to you in conversation, namely:

1st. Were the Berlin and Milan decrees revoked in whole or in part on the first day of November? Or have they at any time posterior to that day been so revoked? Or, have you instructions from your government to give to this government any assurance or explanation in relation to the revocation or modification of these decrees?

2d. Do the existing decrees of France admit into French ports with or without licenses American vessels laden with the produce of the U. States, and under what regulations and conditions?

3d. Do they admit into French ports with or without licenses American vessels laden with articles not the produce of the United States, and under what regulations and conditions?

4th. Do they permit American vessels with or without licenses to return from France to the United States, and upon what terms and conditions?

5th. Is the importation into France of any articles, the produce of the United States, absolutely prohibited? And if so, what are the articles so prohibited, and especially are tobacco and cotton?

6th. Have you instructions from your government to give to this government any assurance or explanation in relation to the American vessels and cargoes seized under the Rambouillet decree?

I have the honour to be, Sir, R. SMITH.

9th. In my letter to Mr. Erskine of April 17th, 1809, Mr. Madison proposed, and contrary to my ideas of propriety, insisted on inserting the following paragraph, viz.

"But I have it in express charge from the president, to state, that while he forbears to insist on a further punishment of the offending officer, he is not the less sensible of the justice and utility of such an example, nor the less persuaded that it would best comport with what is due from his Britannic majesty to his own honour."

To this paragraph I had two objections: 1st. It is not reconcilable to that dignified decorum which the comity of governments in their intercourse with each other ought to observe.

2d. As in a case of individuals, so in a case of nations, wherein a reparation may be rendered for an aggravated insult; the party insulted cannot consistently accept a reparation in satisfaction, and in the same letter insist that such reparation is not as satisfactory as in honour it ought to be.—Such an acceptance would necessarily imply, "at the pusillanimity of the party insulted, had, from a dread of a conflict, disposed him to yield to what his logic at the same time told him was not an adequate atonement."

10th. By my letter to governor Claiborne of October 27th, 1810, ordering him to take possession of the part of West Florida claimed by the U. States, he was authorized to call to his aid the regular army and the whole militia force of the neighbouring territories. To this order Mr. Madison annexed, with his own pen, the following restrictive qualification, viz: "Should, however, any particular place, however small, remain in possession of a Spanish force, you will not proceed to employ force against it; but you will make immediate report thereof to this department."

The idea of the whole military force of the U. States being in full march, and suddenly halted at the first appearance of a Spanish bayonet, or of their being restrained from taking possession to the full extent of what Mr. Madison himself considered our legitimate claim, was, to my mind, so humiliating, that I really could not disguise my opinion of the restriction under the mask of official reverence.

den, had retained in his hands, as a commissioner of 2 1/2 per cent. on the sum of 22,392 dollars, and that this sum, then retained, was the very money that had been paid by the British government, in order for the identical American claims, whose claims had thus in vain been presented for payment. Neither in the department of state, nor in any other department of the government, was there to be found any record, or indeed, any track whatever of a letter of any kind, authorizing Mr. Erving to retain that sum of money.—No circumstances in relation to it was within the recollection of any of the clerks. To my predecessor in office I then referred. From him, however, I could obtain no explanation. J. Serurier, stated to him, that the claim of Mr. Erving, as it appeared in the books of the treasury, was utterly inadmissible. Because being an officer with a fixed salary, compensation, he could not with propriety receive an extra emolument; and, especially, for the services for which the established compensation was allowed. 3d. Because the money retained by him, was not the property of the United States, but was merely in the hands of this government, in trust, for certain citizens of the U. States, who claimed under the British treaty had been duly disposed. Mr. Madison barely remarking that he had no knowledge or recollection of any of the circumstances of this affair, took occasion thereby to call my attention to some other subject. Perceiving, as I did, that he was not disposed to give me any instructions in relation to this affair, I informed him that I would lose no time in applying to Mr. Erving for the requisite explanation. And the following letter was accordingly written and transmitted to him:

Department of State, December 10, 1810.

1st.—Finding that the sums of money, heretofore drawn out of your hands, by authority of this department, in order to your hands, with a view to the payment of such claims, under awards of the board of commissioners acting under the 7th article of the British treaty, as you had previously paid in London, are insufficient for that purpose, and that upon inquiry at the treasury, there is still in your hands the sum of 5038 pounds 7 shillings 6 pence, and that you have in your hands the same in some other account made to this department; and, as stated claims, which have been presented here, must wait the arrival of this money for payment, I have further to request you to hasten this remittance as much as possible.

2d. Having learned at the treasury also that you have retained this sum as a commission of 2 1/2 per cent. on the monies which have passed through your hands, I think it proper to inform you, that no compensation of that kind can be allowed.

I have the honour to be, Sir, R. SMITH.

George W. Erving, Esq. &c.

Upon the receipt of the letter, Mr. Erving returned to the United States, he would give me the necessary information. Upon his arrival at Washington, he accordingly showed me a letter from Mr. Madison himself, fully and explicitly authorizing him to retain the sum of money in question. When then, it will be asked, did it happen, that of this letter there was no record—no trace whatever in the department of state? It is because it was not an official but private letter, and of which the original and duplicate were both in Mr. Madison's own hand writing. The following is the copy of this letter:

(DUPLICATE.)

Washington, Nov. 3, 1809.

1st.—Your several communications relating to the awards, remain, as I have just received, and with them your private letter of September 1st. As the subject of the last may render an early answer interesting to you, I hasten to give it. Your observations on the easiness of some remuneration for your services have, as you wished, been submitted to the president. The result of his reflections for the present is, that I should suggest that you retain out of the next instalment in its passage through your hands to the Baring's a percentage of 2 1/2 on the awards actually received and to be received by you, and that you state it as an item in your account with the public. This will bring the equity of your claim regularly before the government, and will leave the way open for the choice of modes and funds as may finally appear most proper.

With great esteem and regard, I am, Sir, JAMES MADISON.

Expressing to Mr. Madison my surprise and regret that a money transaction so large an amount had been made the subject of a private letter, I remarked to him that he would now have to decide whether Mr. Erving would be allowed to retain this sum of money, and that should he be allowed, then an application must necessarily be made to congress for an appropriation of a like sum to enable the state department to discharge the just demands of the claimants under the treaty. I, moreover, at the same time, stated to Mr. Madison that the agency of Mr. Erving had been from September, 1801, to September, 1803, and that the private letter of November, 1804, giving to him 22,392 dollars, was in fact, allowing him a compensation of 7,598 dollars per annum. As, however, it appeared to the president consistently with this private letter, Mr. Erving could not in candour or in equity be called upon to return to the government this money, I was consequently instructed by him to give his claim to it the sanction of the state department, and moreover, to consider and put on file a public letter, the Advocate letter of November 3, 1804. And an application was afterwards accordingly made to congress for the requisite appropriation.

The senate having passed a resolution calling upon the president for certain information in relation to this subject, I frankly declared to him that in case of his application to the state department for a report, every consideration of duty would constrain me to select all the circumstances of this transaction. He manifested great perturbation and fully said that the call of the senate was evidently made with a view to injure him. In connexion with this unprecedented observation, I perceived unequivocal indications of dissatisfaction with respect to myself. And well assured as I am, and believing as I sincerely do, that this affair had contributed in a great degree to the rupture that has taken place between Mr. Madison and myself, I cannot but consider it a proper item in the catalogue to be exhibited on this occasion, to the view of our fellow citizens. It will suggest to every mind the following questions:

1. As president Jefferson in the year 1801, with a view to save the public money, did, with the approbation of Mr. Erving, appoint him agent of the United States in London, with a fixed salary of 2,000 dollars a year, to perform all the duties, which had been previously performed by Mr. Williams, Mr. Cabot, and Mr. Lenox, why did Mr. Madison in 1803, in a private way, counteract this economical policy, by allowing to Mr. Erving a sum of money, about the same in amount, as the removed officers