

Specimen
NORTH CAROLINA PORTFOLIO
10

THE NORTH-CAROLINA MERCURY, AND SALISBURY ADVERTISER.

SALISBURY:—PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY FRANCIS COUPEE.

NUM. 141.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1801.

VOL. III.

Latest Foreign Advice.

The ship Charles Carter, arrived at Norfolk, has brought London papers to the 14th November.

The first number of "THE PORCUPINE," dated the 30th Oct. (a paper published in London by William Cobett, editor of Porcupine's Gazette, at Philadelphia) contains, in his *Protractus*, the following philippic against the Government and people of the U. States.

Having, in America, witnessed the fatal effects of revolution; having seen piety give place to a contempt of religion, plain-dealing exchanged for shuffling and fraud, universal confidence for universal suspicion and distrust; having seen a country, once the seat of peace and good neighbourhood, torn to pieces by faction; plunged, by intriguing demagogues, into never ceasing hatred and strife, having seen a people, once too fond of what they called liberty to bear the gentle sway of a British King, humbly bend their necks to the yoke, nay, to the very foot of a set of graveling despot; having in short, seen the crime of rebellion against monarchy punished by the tormenting, the degrading curse of republicanism; it is with the utmost astonishment and indignation, that I find many of those, who have the pens at their command, endeavouring to bring down on my native country the very same species of calamity and disgrace. Notwithstanding the example of America, and the more dreadful example of France, I find the emissaries of the Republican faction (for such it really is) still preaching fanaticism and infidelity, still bawling for that change which they have the audacity to denominate *reform*, still exerting all their notorious ingenuity in sapping the foundation of the Church and the Throne. Those who want experience of the consequences, may, for aught I know, be excused for conniving at these attempts; but, for me, who have seen acts passed by a republican legislature, more fraudulent than forging or coining; for me, who have seen republican officers of state offering their country for sale for a few thousand of dollars; for me, who have seen republican judges become felons, and felons become republican judges; for me to fold my hands and tamely listen to the insolent eulogists of republican governments and rulers, would be a shameful abandonment of principle, a dastardly desertion of duty. With these sentiments, then, I resume the publication of a Daily Paper, duly apprized by past experience, of the hostility I shall excite, and firmly resolved to repel it: by all the honourable means in my power."

From the same paper we have also taken the following observations on our late TREATY with FRANCE.

CONVENTION BETWEEN FRANCE AND AMERICA.

The papers, last received from Paris, have brought us a copy of the Convention, as it is called, between France and America. Our readers will recollect, that, so lately as the month of July, there was little prospect of such an accommodation taking place. The Corsican Usurper discovered a disposition rather hostile than otherwise towards Mr. Adams, whose humble supplicants were treated with every mark of disrespect, not to say contempt and ridicule. It is evident, that, at that time, Buonaparte had no desire to form a convention with them, but to wait the result of the ensuing election of President of the United States, which was likely to transfer the treaty-making power from Adams to Jefferson, and thereby secure to France every gratification and advantage, that her voracious vanity and ambition could demand. The change in the Corsican's conduct, & the sudden conclusion of the present Convention, we do not scruple to attribute to the unexpected

dispute between Great Britain and Denmark, which, joined to the strange conduct of the Emperor of Russia, has excited, in the minds of the French, malignant and cowardly hope of seeing the Northern powers combine for the purpose of reviving and enforcing those exploded claims, which our country ever has resisted, and which, while she has powder, ball, and British blood, we trust she ever will resist.

But our opinion, as to the motives of the Convention, does not rest so much on extraneous circumstances, as on the internal evidence of that instrument itself, which appears to have been made, and promulgated, as a protest against those principles of public law, to which Great Britain adheres, and from which, it is well known, she cannot and will not depart.

The great point in dispute, between France and America, are left entirely unsettled by the Convention. France complained of the execution, in several instances, of the Treaty and Convention of 1778 and 1788; America complained of the spoliations committed on her commerce, of the insults offered on her flag, of the national frauds practised on her merchants, of the imprisonment, the calumny, and the murder, of her marines. The professed object of the mission to France was to obtain "satisfaction for insult, and reparation for injury." This was the language of the President, as well as of all those who attempted to defend his negotiating measures. But, behold! instead of obtaining "satisfaction for insults, and reparation for injury;" instead of adjusting the disputes which had produced a sort of shame war between the parties, their Ministers Plenipotentiary, not being able, at present, to come to an agreement with regard to the treaty of alliance of February 1792, &c. &c. with regard to the indemnities mutually due and claimed, the parties will negotiate hereafter, at a *convenient time*." Thus are all the injuries and insults, and the treaty of alliance, laid upon the shelf, 'till a more convenient time, and the parties enter into a Convention, consisting merely of commercial regulation, which, as we shall presently see, are levelled directly against the principles and the power of Great Britain.

The fourteenth article of the Convention stipulates, that *free ships shall make free goods*. It runs thus:

"14. It is stipulated by the present treaty, that free ships shall likewise insure the freedom of goods, and that all things on board shall be reckoned free, belonging to the Citizens of one of the contracting parties, altho' the cargo, or part of it, belong to the enemies of the two; it being understood, nevertheless, that contraband goods will always be excepted. It is likewise agreed that this freedom shall extend to the persons of those who shall be found on board the free ships, although they should be enemies to one of the two contracting parties, and it shall not be lawful to take them from the said free ships, at least if they are not soldiers, and actually in the service of the enemy."

This article is not new: the same stipulation is to be found in the commercial treaty between France and America, of '78, as well as in the commercial treaties of many other powers. But, while we allow that the stipulation contains nothing unprecedented, we contend, in opposition to the insolent pretensions of France, and the more insolent assertions of her hirelings in this country, that the *freedom of goods* here stipulated for may be granted, or withheld, at the pleasure of any contracting party. Whoever examines the best writers on the subject will find, that, long since the nations of Europe assumed nearly their present relative state, it was the general practice to prohibit all trade whatever with an enemy. As the nations grew more polished (as it is called), and as their relations increased by means of maritime commerce, the rigour of this practice was gradually softened, 'till confiscation was, at last, confined to the vessels, & property of enemies, to certain articles termed

contraband of war, and to the property of enemies found on board of neutral vessels. Thus far the relaxation became pretty general about the time of Queen Elizabeth. Luteus powers wished to extend the freedom of commerce still further; even so far as to protect *enemies' goods found on board of neutral vessels*; and to do this the Queen of England, not perceiving the dangerous consequences, was one of the first to assert her right. Fortunately, however, for Great Britain, the right was disputed, and that too by the United Provinces, even before their independence was fully assured. They took some English vessels laden with Spanish property, and condemned the cargoes, without paying freightage. The Queen, at first, resented this conduct in an instant state that was chiefly indebted to her for support; but notwithstanding the well known tenacity and imperiousness of her disposition, her wisdom and justice prevailed, and she, at last, acquiesced in the legality of the capture.

But the advocates for the freedom of goods, unable to contend against the host of authorities, such as we have above applied to, tell us that we are not to go back so far, but confine ourselves to what they call the *modern law of nations*. Within what limits they mean to circumscribe the word *modern*, we cannot exactly ascertain, unless they insist, that the modern law of nations dates its beginning from what they call the "new style," in which case, thank God, we are ancients yet. But however cramped may be the definition which the sons of *Fructidor* and *Fiercal* are pleased to give to the word *modern*, we Christians knew that the modern law of nations means that public law, or rather practice, which the present nations of Europe have observed towards each other. Let, however, the Example of Queen Elizabeth should be too ancient, we will defend to times full more modern; and that the example may be, if possible, yet more strikingly applicable, we shall appeal to the practice of the French nation itself.

The famous Ordinance of 1681, which might be called the Navigation Act of France, expressly declared to be good prize, not only the enemy's goods found on board of a neutral vessel, but the *neutral vessel also*. This brings us down to the close of the seventeenth century, but as that may be yet too ancient for the *Decadary* civilians, let us continue to descend, still continuing our appeal to the practice of France. The Ordinance of 1681, was mitigated by successive treaties, in which France, according as her interest prescribed, refused, or granted, the permission which is now contended for as a *right*; but after these treaties, and even so late as 1757, she declared to the Republic of Holland, that, if any goods belonging to her enemy were found on board Dutch vessels, such goods should be condemned as good prize, and to this declaration her practice was conformable, during the whole war, which ended in 1763, only *thirty-seven years ago*. So that unless the men of the "new style" will absolutely sans-culotte us, and insist upon it that our fathers were antediluvians, and that we ourselves were born in the ages of antiquity, we must on our part insist, that the principle adhered to by Great Britain, is a principle of the modern law of nations, and is, moreover, sanctioned by the practice of France.

How America will attempt to maintain this newly assumed right, after having denied its existence, in the most solemn and formal manner, we are at a loss to conceive. In her treaty with Great Britain, she stipulates, that neutral nations, as far as the contracting parties are concerned, shall not make neutral goods; and in an official vote from the then Secretary of State, Mr. Jefferson, to citizen Genet, she explicitly maintain the general principles for which we contend. The words, which are as strong as words can be, are as follows:—"I believe it cannot be doubted, but that, by the general law of nations, the goods of a friend