

MARYLAND GAZETTE, AND POLITICAL INTELLIGENCER.

[VOL. LXX,

ANNAPOLIS, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1813.

No. 15.]

LAND AND NEGROES FOR SALE.

By virtue of a decree of the Court of Chancery of Maryland, the subscriber will offer at public sale, on the premises, on Saturday, the 15th of May next, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon,

All the right, title and interest of Henderson Sim Boleter, being his life estate in all that tract or parcel of land containing 305 acres, whereon John Lyon now lives, being a part of Trane neck plantation, situate in St. Mary's county, on Jowle's creek, a branch of the Patuxent. The property is well provided with houses, and adapted to the growth of wheat, corn and tobacco. There will likewise be sold, by virtue of the said decree, several Negroes of different descriptions. The terms of sale are, that the purchaser or purchasers shall pay the purchase money at his option, on the day of sale, or on the ratification thereof, by the chancellor. The subscriber is authorized by the decree, after such ratification and payment, to convey the premises to the purchaser or purchasers.

H. G. S. Key, trustee.
April 26, 1813.

For Sale, by Auction,

On Saturday the 24th April, at 10 o'clock, at the house of the late Mr. Frances Campbell, next door to Mr. Tucks boarding house, some articles of household furniture. And immediately after three lots of ground in the City of Washington,

Number 21 in square 665 } Thirty feet
No. 2 in square 666 } front & 125
No. 2 in square 654 } deep each

situated in valuable parts of the city and rapidly increasing in importance. Immediately after will be sold the lot of ground and tenement on Severn river, formerly occupied by Mrs. Campbell, and adjoining the present residence of Dr. Ghieslin, in this city, containing about one acre of ground, and having besides the dwelling two small brick buildings fronting the street—This property is beautifully situated for a private residence, if repaired.

The terms will be made known at the time of sale.

Annapolis, 8th April, 1813. 3X

NOTICE.

All persons having claims against John Johnson, late of Charles county, deceased, are hereby warned to exhibit the same, with vouchers thereof, to the subscriber, on or before the 1st day of Oct. next, otherwise by law they will be excluded from all benefit of the said estate, and those indebted to make immediate payment. Given under my hand this 1st day of April, 1813.

ALEXANDER JOHNSON.
Charles county, Maryland. 3w.

NOTICE.

All persons who may have business with the Commissioners of the Tax for Anne-Arundel county, will attend their annual Meeting on the first Monday in May next. It is also requested, that the assessors will make their legal returns on or before 17th May.

Signed by order
HENRY S. HALL, CLK.
Comin. Tax A. A. county.
April 15.

Don Fernando,

A Jack Ass, descended from the best Spanish stocks that have been imported into this country, rising four years old, near fourteen hands high, and remarkably well formed, will stand the ensuing season, at Westbury on West-River, at eight dollars cash, or \$10; the money to be returned if the mare does not prove with foal, and half a dollar to the groom. He is limited to twenty mares—Pasturage gratis—but will not be answerable for escapes.

William Pritchard, manager.
April 1. 4

Anne-Arundel County, SC.

An application to me, the subscriber, in the recess of Anne-Arundel county court, as an associate judge of the third judicial district of Maryland, by petition in writing of WILLIAM BARNES of said county, praying the benefit of an act for the relief of sundry insolvent debtors, passed at November session, eighteen hundred and five, and the several supplements thereto, on the terms mentioned in the said act; schedule of his property, and a list of his creditors, on oath, as far as he can ascertain them; being annexed to his petition; and the said William Barnes having satisfied me by competent testimony that he has resided in the state of Maryland for the period of two years immediately preceding this his application, and immediately preceding the said petition, and having certified that the said petitioner is now in his custody for debt only, and the said William Barnes having given sufficient security for his personal appearance at Anne-Arundel county court, to answer such allegations as may be made against him by his creditors; I do therefore order and adjudge, that the said William Barnes be discharged from his imprisonment, and that he (by causing a copy of this order to be inserted in one of the public newspapers in the city of Annapolis, every week for three months successively, before the first Monday in April next,) give notice to his creditors to appear before Anne-Arundel county court on the said third Monday in April next, at 10 o'clock in the morning, for the purpose of recommending a trustee for their debts, and to show cause, if any they have, why the said William Barnes should not have the benefit of the said act and supplements as aforesaid. Given under my hand this 26th day of August, 1812.

Richard Ridgely.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
BY
JONAS GREEN,
CHURCH-STREET, ANNAPOLIS.
Price—Three Dollars per Annum.

From the Salem Gazette.
MR. PICKERING'S LETTERS.
LETTER VIII.

To the People of the United States.
Traito of Policy
of the American Administration relative
to France and Great Britain:

OR
The Mystery of Iniquity unveiled.

In my seventh letter, I gave some sketches of Mr. Jefferson's conduct in relation to Great Britain: that he avoided (I felt myself justified in saying purposely avoided) negotiating a general treaty of amity and commerce with that country, at a time when the most advantageous was manifestly attainable. I have also stated, that at a subsequent period he explicitly avowed, "That he did not desire any treaty with Great Britain," a treaty which would restore harmony and commercial intercourse between our two nations.

This doubtless was the spirit of himself and his chief partisans, from the early period in the French revolution. In the session of Congress 1793-4, a Senator from Virginia and a Senator from Massachusetts said, "We want no treaty with Great Britain—Let us have war!" And the whole party were not less vexed than mortified, when President Washington put an end to their respective war projects, for that time, by appointing Mr. Jay envoy extraordinary, to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain.

This negotiation, conducted with candor and good faith, with a sincere desire to settle the pending disputes, was successful: differences were adjusted—our peace was preserved—commerce received immunity for losses, and increased and flourished beyond all former example; and with commerce, as the animating soul, agriculture and the mechanic arts, and every class of labor found ample and profitable employment. And, "but for the iniquity of one man," this universal prosperity would have continued to this day: that one man, who, on the page of history, will appear as such more "infamous" than he on whom, in his Notes on Virginia, in reference to the words just quoted, the fixed stigma, as his opportunities and ability of doing evil to his country surpassed (and they faintly surpassed) those of the other.

Mr. Jay's treaty rescued the nation from impending war. Mr. Jefferson's refusal to renew it, or to enter into another alliance comprehending, embracing all the relations of amity and commerce with Great Britain—which were of immensely greater importance to the U. States than like relations with all the world beside—was the commencement of a train of disastrous measures, systematically pursued by himself and his successor, which have resulted in the present unjust and ruinous war. Why this was long threatened and at last precipitately declared, may be considered when its immediate precursors have been brought to view.

The people of the United States, being and impatient under the embargo, non-intercourse and non-transportation projects—projects, if not intended according to their import, weak and contemptible towards the belligerents; and if not intended, then deceitful and injurious; and in either case, more odious to the U. States than the edicts and decrees which they affected to counteract; those projects were successively abandoned; and the people were once more left free, under their own laws, with Great Britain and France, as well as with the rest of the world. But it was not destined long to be free: A new project was contrived, worthy of the peculiar and united ingenuity of the administration, combined with that of the philosopher of Monticello. This project was exhibited in the act of Congress of May 1, 1810, prohibiting the armed vessels of Great Britain and France to enter the har-

bours of the U. S.; but leaving them open to their merchant vessels, for the purpose of free commerce; liable however to be shut against one of the belligerents upon a contingency mentioned in the fourth section of that act. This provided for the revival of the material parts of the non-intercourse law, in the following words: "That in case either G. Britain or France shall, before the third day of March, 1811, so revoke or modify her edicts, as that they shall cease to violate the neutral commerce of the U. States, which fact the President of the U. States, shall declare by proclamation; and if the other nation shall not within three months thereafter so revoke or modify her edicts in like manner, then the third, fourth, (and many other) sections of the act entitled, An act to interdict the commercial intercourse between the U. States and G. Britain and France and their dependencies, and for other purposes, shall, from and after the expiration of three months from the date of the proclamation aforesaid, be revived and have full force and effect, so far as relates to the dominions, colonies and dependencies, and to the articles the growth, produce or manufactures, of the dominions, colonies and dependencies of the nation thus refusing or neglecting to revoke or modify her edicts in the manner aforesaid. And the restrictions imposed by this Act shall, from the date of such proclamation, cease and be discontinued in relation to the nation revoking or modifying her edicts in the manner aforesaid."

The third section of the non-intercourse law so to be provided, shut our harbours against the merchant as well as the armed vessels of France and Great Britain; and the fourth section prohibited the importation of any goods from their dominions or dependencies.

Thus was laid the foundation of that system of juggling, by which our merchants were ensnared, the common sense of the people outraged, and the nation insulted.

By the act of May 1, 1810, before the President could lawfully issue his first proclamation, the edicts or decrees of one of the belligerents were to be actually revoked. The minister of France, in Paris, the Duke de Cadore, on the 15th of August following, as promptly after notice of that act as if the plan had been preconcerted, wrote a letter to gen. Armstrong, our minister there, declaring the Berlin and Milan decrees revoked, after the first of the ensuing November; but on certain conditions to be previously performed, to wit, one by Great-Britain, which, from its tenor, Mr. Madison was morally certain would not be performed; the other by the U. S. but which the law required to be performed only subsequent to the actual non-contingent repeal of the French decrees.

The Duke de Cadore's letter, then, furnished no lawful ground for the president's proclamation, that the French decrees were repealed. And the decree of the emperor, bearing date nearly six months afterwards (April 28, though not published till May, 1812) declaring the Berlin and Milan decrees to be then only definitively repealed—repealed, too, expressly on the ground of the act of congress of March 2, 1811, passed on the basis of Mr. Madison's proclamation, that the French decrees had been revoked on the 1st of November preceding, gave the lie to the president's proclamation.

If Mr. Madison was sensible of the monstrous insult he had not spirit enough to resent it.

Let us now view the effects of that unfounded proclamation. In three months afterwards, the third and fourth sections of the non-intercourse law would revive against Great Britain—prohibiting, on pain of forfeiture, any vessel sailing under the English flag, to enter the harbours of the U. States; and prohibiting the importation of any goods whatever from the British dominions, on the like penalty of forfeiture. The three months elapsed; and the British orders in council, as was foreseen, were not revoked. Congress was in session; and to render the president's proclamation thoroughly efficient, they passed a law calculated to incur to the treasury of the

U. S. a rich harvest in the spoils of the merchants, our fellow-citizens, who had their vessels and property in the British dominions, in the ordinary course of their lawful trade.—Had the French decrees been actually repealed on November 1, 1810, as the president and his ministers asserted, the British orders in council would have been immediately revoked, but not being then revoked and the president's proclamation becoming known, the vessels and property of our merchants remained in the British dominions, to keep them from falling a prey to our own government.

In this forlorn situation, and when all the proceedings of congress announced a speedy war against Great Britain, the merchants humbly and earnestly petitioned congress to permit their vessels with their cargoes of British goods, their own property, to be brought home—to save themselves from ruin—to supply the country with merchandise, for the want of which it was suffering, and the empty treasury with some millions of dollars, for the duties on the vessels and property so to be bro't home. But congress were inexorable; all relief was denied. This unaccountable & cruel conduct produced universal astonishment. Subsequent events explained the mystery, while it displayed the iniquity of this course of conduct. Congress were not then quite ripe for doubling the duties on the goods to be imported. At length they passed a law for that purpose; so that where otherwise it would not receive but five, the treasury might then fleece the merchants, and eventually the consumers, (the greatest of whom were in the northern and eastern states) of ten millions of dollars. But this was not all. War had been declared; and more money was wanted. The extra millions, of which the merchants and their customers were to be stripped by the double duties, did not satisfy the rapacity of our rulers! they grasped at more—I think at least at all the profits of the merchants on their stock so employed in trade with the British dominions! And for this purpose, the vast body of merchants, engaged in that commerce, were to be left at the mercy of the secretary of the treasury! And as by the letter of the law so cruelly and unjustly revived, an entire forfeiture of the property was incurred, it was expected that the merchants, left unprotected, would compound with the secretary of the treasury on such terms as he should prescribe—even to the loss of their fair profits; or, if he pleased, of a portion of their capital—half a loaf being better than no bread. But this monstrous stride of power and injustice shocked some men of better feelings, and by a small majority the scheme was defeated.

The whole mystery in the unwarrantable policy of the government is not yet developed.

Congress adopting and enforcing the president's unfounded proclamation relative to the French decrees, and the three months subsequent to its publication having elapsed, whereby all merchandise, the products of the British dominions, thereafter imported, became liable to forfeiture, a provision was introduced into the act of the 21 of March, 1811, by which the merchants were deprived of the means of redress from the courts of law; and such was the direct object of the second section of that act. Without it, the courts might have admitted evidence to prove the actual revocation of the British orders in council; after which the importation of such merchandise would be lawful. To frustrate this mode of judiciary relief, that second section enacted that the president's proclamation, declaring the British orders in council were revoked, should be admitted as evidence—and that no other evidence should be admitted of that fact, in any suit or prosecution under the fourth section of the non-intercourse law before mentioned, prohibiting all importations from the British dominions. The ultimate design of this arbitrary provision has now become visible. The orders in council were revoked, as soon as the French emperor's act repealing his Berlin and Milan decrees was communicated by Mr. Madison's minister in London,

to the British government. But Mr. Madison has refused to proclaim the revocation; although the act of congress required him to do it! And no other evidence of the revocation being allowed, the judges hands are tied; they can give no relief: and hence all goods and merchandize, the products of the British dominions, from whatever part of the world they may come to the United States, remain liable to forfeiture.

TIMOTHY PICKERING.
April 7, 1813.

LETTER IX. Traito of Policy of the American Administration, relative to France and Great Britain; or, The Mystery of Iniquity unveiled.

Farther to illustrate the title of this and my preceding letter, I shall mention but one more striking act of our government, the waging of an offensive war against Great Britain.—Why this was long threatened & at last precipitately declared, I am now to enquire and state.

If the administration of Jefferson and Madison could have sufficiently indulged their enmity to Great Britain, and at the same time have contented the French Emperor by any measure short of formal war, the United States might have yet remained at peace. Jefferson and Madison might have been satisfied with the injuries they could inflict on Great Britain by unmanning a large portion of her navy—by the essential reduction of her commerce—and the annihilation of the navigation and active foreign commerce of the U. States sacrificed to the interests of France, and finally to render complete Buonaparte's continental system.

Those gentlemen with their leading partisans, from 1793 down to the time of declaring war, appear to have entertained the fond but false conceit, that by withholding our demands for British manufactures and productions, we could reduce to idleness a very large portion of her people, and by stopping our supplies of provisions, especially of flour and grain, bring a famine on her dominions in Europe and the W. Indies—and by both kinds of distress excite discontents and popular commotions, which would compel the British government to yield to their demands, rights essential to the naval power and extensive commerce of Great Britain, and consequently to her safety and independence; and which therefore she would never yield but with her national existence.

The object of France was universal empire. Britain presented the chief obstacle, and for a while the only barrier, to her rapid strides, when in full march to the acquisition of that object. Britain therefore must be crippled, and like the continental states reduced to submission. Mr. Jefferson, six or seven years ago, predicted her downfall. She must, he said, sink under the enormous weight of her public debt, and the overwhelming power of France. His whole department and public acts justify the opinion, that his wishes were farther to his prediction.

The first instruction to Mr. Jefferson's favorite minister to Great Britain (Mr. Monroe) in 1804, embraced, as a primary object, the obtaining of a stipulation which should render the American flag a sure protection to British seamen; although there were at that time on board our merchant vessels a number sufficient to man five and twenty or thirty ships of the line; and with such a stipulation in their favour, by removing all fears of impressment, the number would soon have been doubled. And without this stipulation on the part of Great Britain, Mr. Monroe was told, "your negotiation will be at an end." Thus early was Mr. Jefferson determined to have no treaty with Great Britain, unless on terms which would put in jeopardy her safety and independence.

In 1805, negotiations with Great Britain were renewed by two ministers, Mr. Wm. Pinkney being joined with Mr. Monroe, accompanied with the first non-importation law, as a rod held over the head of the British government, to coerce them into terms by their fears for the loss of our custom, as consumers of British manufactures, if

they did not yield. The string of apologies which Monroe and Pinkney were furnished with, for this ungracious act, demonstrate, that Jefferson and Madison viewed it in its obvious, offensive aspect. Yet it was pretended not at all "to derogate from the amicable dispositions of the U. States towards Great Britain!"* The non-importation act being suspended, the result of this negotiation was a treaty, satisfactory to those two ministers, but which, every body knows, Mr. Jefferson peremptorily rejected; because it did not contain an express, formal stipulation on the subject of impressments, that would protect British seamen on board American merchant vessels. So the partial non-importation act went into operation.

But notwithstanding his unadvised rejection of this treaty, Mr. Jefferson was willing to receive all the advantages of its stipulations, "by a mutual understanding, founded on friendly and liberal discussions and explanations, that in practice each party will entirely conform to what may be thus informally settled."†—And why, then, not ratify the treaty in due form, seeing it contained such provisions as would usefully regulate the intercourse between the two nations? The French Emperor would have been offended, as were the Directorial Tyrants of France with the treaty concluded by Mr. Jay. Nothing short of hostilities between the U. States and Great Britain would eventually satisfy either. A formal ratified treaty, would have tied Mr. Jefferson's hands; for the people of the U. States are not yet so far advanced in corruption, as like the French government, to observe or violate treaties merely as their interest might dictate. But a very little shuffling would be requisite to get rid of an "understanding," which it would be easy not to understand.

Passing by the variety of succeeding measures, all calculated to increase and aggravate the differences between the U. States and Great Britain, and to prepare the people for the catastrophe, an open war—I have now to observe, that from the beginning of the session of congress of 1810, 11, war projects were on foot. The clamour against Great Britain was kept up. The army was to be augmented to five and thirty thousand men; and Canada was to be invaded and taken. Still there was a reluctance in congress to make the declaration of war. The public sentiment was manifestly in favor of peace. And no effectual preparations for war were made. Our seaports were to be better fortified—the army to be raised and disciplined—the empty treasury to be filled. Under these circumstances, few would believe that congress seriously intended to declare war. In the view of most men, a declaration of war, in the actual condition of the country, could only be the offspring of madness and folly.—Nevertheless, after being in session seven months, a majority in each house of congress were screwed up to the war pitch; and the fatal declaration was made: Precipitately, I have said: for every measure taken without the preparations essential to a rational prospect of success, must be pronounced precipitate. Why then, without an army—without clothing, camp equipage, and other munitions of war—with an unprotected sea coast—with an empty treasury—without credit to borrow—without courage to lay taxes, and without confidence in the people to bear them—was war thus precipitately declared—I answer, from an apprehension that the ground without which a declaration was despaired of, would be taken from under their feet. Let it be remembered, that the British orders in council—and not the affair of impressments—were the avowed main cause of the rigorous and total non-importation act against Great Britain, as well as the immediate precursor and chief assumed cause for urging a declaration of war; and but for these orders, it

* Madison's letter of May 17, 1800, to Monroe and Pinkney.

† Letter of Feb. 3, 1807, from Madison to Monroe and Pinkney.