STAR

OR,

E'n. Shore General Advertiser.

EASTON, Tuesday Morning
May 3, 1803.

VACCINE INOCULATION.

Dr. Smith, of Baltimore, and Dr. Douglass, of Georgetown, (Ptk.) in order to advance the invaluable discovery of Dr. Jennings; and to extinguish that destroying malady, the Small Pox, have opened public subscriptions at one dollar each subscriber, with the privilege of sending four persons to receive the inoculation whose circumstances will not admit of the expense—and we are happy to hear that they are likely to meet with public approbation. We are not exempt from indigent characters in Talbot, whose lives are equally valuable; and to whose aid we are convinced the hand of benevolence will be readily opened, if some gentleman of the faculty would step forward in promoting an act of benevolence so highly important.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. Dr Gantt, Chaplain of Congress, dated 28th ult. to Dr. Waterhouse.

"I inoculated twelve of the Miami Indians at the request of their chief, and supplied them with matter. About two months after they left *Washington*, I received a letter from their interpreter, informing me that the matter proved active, and that three hundred had been inoculated and gone well through it; and that by the time I could receive the letter, double that number would submit to inoculate; so that it is probable it will extend through all the neighboring tribes."

We understand that in the course of the ensuing year a line of STAGES will be established from RICHMOND to FRANKFORT IN KENTUCKY, by which the mail will be carried.

We congratulate the public on the measures which have been taken by the general government to effect this great object, the importance of which will be fully appreciated by every citizen correctly impressed with the growing consequence of the western country, which it will then be practicable to reach in a period of ten days.

The political and commercial advantages of this arrangement will be equally felt by those who reside on the Atlantic, and the western waters. Integral parts of one common empire the prevalent opinions and feelings of the one will be easily and promptly communicated to the other; and a more frequent intercourse of the citizens of each will add a new tie to that connection which we trust time will only render more indissoluble.

VIRGINIA ELECTION
For Members of Congress.

The following *republican* citizens are elected:

Messrs. Randolph, Moore, Jones, Newton, A. Trigg, J. Trigg, Goodwyn, Clopton, Dawson, Eppes, Holmes—*eleven* republicans certainly elected.

Mr. Lewis.—*one.*

In two districts the only contest is between republicans.

Thus stands the election of Virginia: of the result of which we hear so much federal boasting.

Being called on by Mr. Earle, clerk of the General Court, to explain what "*strange fatality*" it was which caused the *suppression* of Judge Duvall's explanatory letter, at the time the opinion of the court was delivered for publication, as stated in the Star of the 19th of April; what was intended by inserting the price that was paid for the copy of the court's opinion; and what was meant and intended by the charge of his "*withholding the dissent of an associate.*" We feel ourselves justified by the facts, and the desire of wiping off any imputation that may have attached to Mr. Earle, in stating that we believe the only reason why Mr. Earle did not deliver a copy of Mr. Duvall's letter with the opinion of the court for publication was, that it was not in his possession, until five days after the publication of the court's opinion; that of course the term suppression was entirely inapplicable to Mr. Earle's conduct.

In mentioning the price paid for the copy of the court's opinion, we intended only to create the presumption, that as we had paid for that copy we should have been willing to have paid for a copy of Mr. Duvall's also; and did not intend to insinuate that it was an illegal charge, for we believe it to be correct.

By "*withholding the dissent of an associate,*" we did not mean that Mr. Earle had *refused* or *withheld* improperly *any information* on this subject, nor in *any manner* to arraign Mr. Earle's character or conduct; but merely to express the opinion that it would have been friendly in Mr. Earle, to have published Mr. Duvall's letter.

From the Mediterranean.

By the ship Margaret, captain Cleverland, arrived at Salem from Salou, near Barcelona, the following information is obtained:

The Margaret was at Malta the 10th January, where she left the frigates Chesapeake, John Adams and New York, and the schooner Enterprize, bound off Tripoli in a day or two. The Chesapeake was to come home shortly, under command of captain Baron. *Buonaparte has declared war against the dey of Algiers.*—This news was not doubted at Barcelona. It was reported that the dey had made enormous demands upon England, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and the United States. The Tripolines were expected to come out in the spring, and the Americans complained loudly of the want of some small cruisers which would be much more serviceable than frigates. [*Tr. Am.*

April 23.

The trustees of the college of New Jersey, at their stated meeting held at Princeton on the 13th April, conferred the honorary degree of doctor of law on the honorable Bushrod Washington, one of the justices of the supreme court of the United States, and on the honorable Aaron Burr, vice-president of the United States.

From the Boston Chronicle.

WAR!—WAR!—WAR!—*Let loose the dogs of* WAR!

Observations on the necessity and propriety of war, at the present moment, by ARISTIDES.

(Continued from the STAR of April 12.)

There is another cause for hostilities assigned by that party, who have been in flame for war several years past. They say that the Spanish government has ceded *Louisiana*, and the *Floridas* to the French republic, by means of which we shall have bad and dangerous neighbors. The expected possessors are people who have no regard to religion or good government; but are a turbulent, uneasy, ambitious and violent people.

Suppose this description to be exactly true, yet the question is, whether it is a just and reasonable cause for war? The question ought to be divided, and considered in two points of view: first, whether the cession of the territory, independent of the character of the people to whom it is ceded, is a cause for war; and, secondly, whether their character, let it be what it may, is a just occasion for commencing hostilities? The first will apply as well to a war with the one of these nations as the other, the second to a war with France only.

The history of the *Floridas* and of *Louisiana* is well known, so far as it has a relation to this matter, to every body. In the treaty of 1763, which put an end to the war of France and Spain on one side, and England on the other, the country was ceded by the French crown to the Spaniards. The reluctance with which the French people bended to the yoke of the Spanish government, is pathetically described by the *Abbe Raynal*, and other writers. Indeed the cession has been a source of pain and mortification to the French people, more especially the provincials, from that day to this. The wish to be emancipated from the dominion of one of the most arbitrary monarchs in Europe, and from one whose people have suffered under the tyranny of the church for ages, has no doubt added to the stimulous, which was before quite irresistible. Bad as that government is, yet every one will yield the point, that they are less dangerous neighbors than the French would probably be. To examine whether, under any circumstances, such a cession would become a just cause of war, the subject may be viewed in a variety of positions.

The Spaniards never agree by any treaty with us that they would never cede *Louisiana* and the *Floridas* to any other nation. Their treaty, as to privileges allowed to the people of the United States, is binding upon them whilst their dominion remains to be exercised over this territory. We have by the treaty of 1795, with that nation, consented that we will relieve their vessels driven into our ports by stress of weather; that their property taken by pirates and brought within the United States shall be restored to them; that we will relieve their shipwrecked people; that the estates of the subjects of that sovereign when they shall die in the United States, shall be settled, by his ministers and consuls, according to the Spanish laws. Now, if after all this there should be an occasional treaty between the United States, and the king of Great Britain, in which they should cede to him the *District of Maine* in exchange for *Upper Canada*, would this be a just cause for a Spanish war against us? They might say with truth, that the important privileges ceded to them, to be improved in an extensive sea coast, and throughout an extensive country, were taken from them, because the English nation would be under no obligation to perform the treaty which had been in subsistance between us and Spain. The answer to their complaint would be, that when the treaty was made, it was understood according to the custom, usage, and law of nations, to be obligatory so long and no longer as the territory should remain within the dominion of the sovereignty which granted the privileges. This argument alone is sufficient to shew the folly and absurdity of the violent party, which are so zealously determined to involve this country in a war merely on account of the cession of territory made by the Spanish monarch to the French nation.

But the character of the French people, to whom the territory is ceded, is made a pretext for war.

It is true, that the French republic has rendered itself terrible to those powers of Europe which had combined to overthrow and destroy it. It is as true that they have treated the Christian religion with contempt, and have attempted to establish a vain philosophy. They have decried and subverted hereditary authority and agreed, in theory at least, that all power is the gift of the people. But are we to involve ourselves in a war with them for these sentiments and measures be they ever so erroneous? Why have they not the same right to choose their principles of government, and dogmas of religion as we have? Our principles of religion are opposed to those of the Mahometan empire, the Chinese nation and Indian quarter of the globe. Are we to begin another crusade, and make war with three quarters of the world because they are not Christians? Are we to make war with those nations who have monarchical, aristocratical or hereditary forms of government, because we have an elective republic? The feudal system reigns in Russia with nearly all its ancient cruelty; three quarters of the people of that immense empire are the property and slaves of the other quarter. Are we to wage war with them for the folly and unjustness of such a domination? These systems, added to the usurpation of the priests renders the empire of Germany miserable and wretched. The domination and despotism of the Prussian monarch exhibits his subjects as mere cattle; are we to fight him? We need not speak of the poverty and distress of the people of Ireland and Scotlnd, under the government of Great Britain, where bread is a rarity, and the taste of meat is not to be recollected by a hungry and wretched people!

To bring this case nigher home, and to render it yet more familiar to us, we will inquire, what would be the sentiments of united America, if the monarchs in Europe should assume the right to judge for us in regard to our religion and government? If they should say that our struggle for freedom and independence was a licentious, unjustifiable measure; that we made an undue rebellion against a lawful sovereign, who had before protected us; that we had openly denounced and violently opposed the principles on which all the governments in Europe have been long established; and that we had, in fact, lead the way to the late French revoution; and that therefore they will make war with us, as with a people hostile to the politics and manners of Europe; should we not at once declare our right to act for ourselves? Should we not assert our own sovereign independence, and declare them to be invaders of our national authority, and sovereign powers?

[*To be continued.*]

Paris, February 14.

Challenge from Gen. Napper Tandy, to Mr. Elliott, member of the British Parliament.

SIR,

I addressed you the 11th of December last, by post, and not having heard from you, in reply, I am induced to adopt *this* mode to come at you, though the Argus, which, if not a *favorite* paper of yours, is avowedly *read* by you—But first, you shall have a fair copy of the letter I allude to.

[COPY.

SIR,

The illiberal attack which you have made upon me, in your speech of the 24th of November last in the British house of commons, is the cause of my troubling you with this. "*My ignorance and insignificance,*" which you have painted in such glowing colors ought, with a man of sense, to have been my protection: but you have proved yourself as deficient in this, as in point of good manners and politeness, which are the true criterion of a gentleman.

You cannot, sir, but know, (for you pretend to be a man of information) that I hold a high rank in the army of this great and generous nation, which places me upon a footing with the proudest peer of your island. You know, also, that the honor of a soldier is dear to him than life—yet, with these facts before you, you have dared to traduce my character, and have attempted to affix a stigma to my name, which nothing can now wipe out, but the blood of one of us. *A French officer must not be insulted with impunity*, and you, as well as the country which gave me birth, and that which has adopted me, shall find, that I will preserve the honor of my station. Therefore demand of you to name some town on the continent, where you will be found, accompanied by your friend and pistols—giving me sufficient time to leave this, and arrive at the place appointed.

NAPPER TANDY, Gen. of Division.

Bordeaux, 12th December, 1802.

P. S. A sufficient space will be permitted to elapse for an answer, previous to my addressing you through the medium of a news-paper.

Elliot, Esq. M. P. London.

[General Napper Tandy receiving no answer to the above letter, has addressed the following communication to the Argus.]

To —— ELLIOTT, Esq. M. P. London.

SIR,

Eight weeks having elapsed, since I wrote to you, and my invitation not being accepted, or acknowlekged, have I not a right to appeal to the public, in vindication of myself from the wanton and unmanly attack, which you made upon me? If the state of my unhappy native country had been the subject of discussion, some allusions might be drawn, some reasons assigned for the introduction of my name. But this was not the case. The debate was for laying a tax on Great Britain, in which I, as a French citizen, could not possibly be implicated, and therefore, it is evident, that I was wantonly dragged in for the sole purpose of calumny and abuse. That such conduct was unmanly must be admitted on all hands, as no *brave man* would ever attack a *defenceless* person, much less an *absent* one. In my letter I scrupulously refrained from retorting upon you, or using any harsh or ungentlemanlike expression, though perfectly justifiable from the treatment I had received. I contented myself with that appeal which a man is entitled to, when his character is injured, and his honor impeached. But as you skulk from this, and shelter yourself under undefined privileges, or that more than monstrous idea, that a *British senator can traduce mankind with impunity*—I am necessitated to say [after having thus exposed your rascality to the world] that *Mr. Elliott is a calumniator! a liar! a paltroon! and a scoundrel!*

NAPPER TANDY.

Bordeaux, February, 1803.

We have recurred to our file of English papers, and find the following to be the expression in Mr. Elliott's speech, which so wonderfully incensed general Napper Tandy:—"He believed the great object of Buonaparte to be the destruction of this country. If any thing was to be done in the way of conspiracies in this country, it was not to be supposed that he would neglect that means. This was apparent from the encouragement given by the French government to Napper Tandy and other traitors, and the publication of an English newspaper in Paris, which has dared to assert that Irishmen owe no allegiance to his majesty." *P. Gaz.*

The Synod of Philadelphia,

IS to meet by adjournment, in the Third Presbyterian Church, in this city, on Tuesday the 17th day of May next, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

NATHL. IRVINE, Stated Clerk.

Philadelphia, April 20.

N. B. Printers of public papers in Baltimore, Easton, [Maryland] Lancaster, Carlisle, Northumberland, &c. are respectfully requested to republish the above. N. I.

MARRIED—On Thursday evening last, by the Rev. *Joseph Jackson, Andrew Skinner*, Esq. to Miss *Elizabeth Harrison*, both of this county.

Wanted

AN ELDERLY WOMAN of good character, to superintend a dairy and poultry yard. Also,

A HOUSE-KEEPER,

Who can come well recommended, may hear of an eligible situation and good wages. Apply at this office. 3q

May 3, 1803.

For Sale, at Public Vendue,

On the first Tuesday in June next, (being the second Tuesday in the County Court) at Easton, pursuant to the last will and testament of Samuel Edmondson, *late of Talbot County, deceased, the three following houses and lots: viz.*

THE house and premises at present in the occupation of Richard Stanfield, Washington-street; also the house and lot wherein Philomon Willis now lives, and the house and lot where Thomas Bradshaw lives, situate on West-street—the two latter have a title in fee, the former a permanent lease on a moderate ground rent—the buildings have been erected but a few years; they will be sold on the following terms: viz. the purchaser to enter into bonds with approved security for the payment of one half the money on the 1st day of January next, on compliance whereof possession will be given; the other half to be paid on the 1st day of August following, 1804; on compliance wherewith sufficient deeds shall be made and acknowledged, agreeable to the last will and testament of the said deceased, by

ELEANOR EDMONDSON, Ex'rx.
of Samuel Edmondson, dec'd.

May 3, 1803. 3

N. B. All those having claims on the estate and those indebted are desired to come forward without delay, in order for settlement, to E. E.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT
Of Mr. Adams' extravagance, and Mr. Jefferson's economy.

Money wasted—by Mr. Adams.

	Dollars
John Adams came into office the 4th of March, 1797, and continued therein until the 3d of March, 1801. In about two months after the induction, he convened an *extraordinary* congress which met in May, 1797, and continued in session about two months. The effect of this meeting, was the *stamp act*, an *additional* duty of eight cents per bushel upon salt, with a law authorising Mr. Adams to loan on the credit of the United States, a sum not exceeding	800,000
limiting the interest to six per cent.	
In Novem. of the same year, (1797) congress convened agreeable to law. They continued in session *more* than eight months, during which time an act was passed to lay and collect a *direct tax* of	2,000,000
The whole of this sum was borrowed from the United States bank in advance.	
There was enacted likewise a law directing Mr. Adams to borrow	5,000
In this instance he was not restricted as to interest.—For the payment of this loan the *duties on impost and tonnage were pledged!*	
In May 1800, another loan was authorised by the Adams administration, amounting to	3,500,000
Increasing at the same time the duties on *brown sugar and molasses.* The revenues to arise from which were also *pledged!* for the payment of the public debt.	
Increase of the national debt for the four years that Mr. Adams was president.	11,300,000

Money saved—by Mr. Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson came into the presidency on the 4th of March, 1801; in seven months thereafter, there was a saving effected of	1,154,673 88
At the first session of congress, in due course of law thereafter, the *repeal* of the internal taxes took place, to the amount of	900,000
Paid on account of the national debt, out of the treasury, during the first 18 months of Mr. Jefferson's presidency,	5,339,886 44
Saving by the reduction of the standing army,	522,000
Ditto do navy,	200,000
Do repealing judiciary,	33,000
Do reduction of marine corps,	39,000
Do by annihilating offices dependent on executive will,	161,695 91
Do by reducing the commission of the collectors of customs,	17,000
Balance remaining in the treasury, on the 1st of October, 1802,	4,539,675 57
Total—cash saved to the people, and monies on hand,	10,852,258 80

Shall we offer a comment on the foregoing? No. The eloquent of silence will find its way to the understandings of men, and delusion will vanish from among the people. [*Rep. Adv.*]

☞ The Managers of Chester Church Lottery flatter themselves, that the drawing of said Lottery will commence on the first Monday of August next. As a proportion of the tickets are yet undisposed of, they recommend it to the public to make early application, or they may be deprived of the advantage of getting them at the original price.

Centreville, 12th April, 1803.

WAS committed to the jail of Baltimore county, as a runaway, on the 19th ultimo, a negro man named JACOB, who is about 23 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches high, stout and well made; has a scar under his right cheek, about an inch long; has on a short green coatee with red cape, blue waistcoat, Russia sheeting trousers, and oznaburg shirt, mixed grey worsted stockings, and half worn shoes and wool hat. He says he belongs to Mr. Robert Hodgson, of the state of Georgia. If the owner of said negro does not release him, he will be sold for his jail fees according to law.

JAMES WILSON, Sheriff.

Baltimore, May 3, 1803. tf

ANY person having timber to fall this spring, and no convenience of securing the bark, the subscriber will undertake to save it and give them a reasonable compensation for the same. A generous price will also be given for well cured tan bark.

WM. ATKINSON.

April 5, 1803. tf