

THE MARYLAND REPUBLICAN.

"FREEDOM IS THE BRILLIANT GIFT OF HEAVEN;—TIS REASON'S SELF,—THE KIN OF DEITY."

Vol. I.]

ANNAPOLIS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1809.

[No. 8.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
JOHN WEST BUTLER,
OPPOSITE THE CHURCH,
ANNAPOLIS.

CONDITIONS

OF THE
MARYLAND REPUBLICAN.

THE MARYLAND REPUBLICAN is published twice a week during the annual sessions of Assembly, and once a week during the remainder of the year. Its regular day of weekly publication is Saturday; and, during the Session of Assembly, Tuesday and Saturday.

The terms are three dollars per annum; the first year payable six months from the date of subscription—to continue half-yearly in advance. The Editor confidently trusts that Subscribers will be particularly attentive to punctuality in their payments, as that can alone enable him to meet those necessary and unavoidable expenses naturally resulting from such an establishment.

All communications (post-paid) from literary gentlemen, will be thankfully received; and, if admissible, shall receive immediate attention.

Political.

(The following excellent and energetic remarks on the tergiversancy and infamy of the British government in their late conduct towards us, are taken from "THE ANTI-MONARCHIST," a spirited and well edited paper printed at Northampton, in Massachusetts. It cannot fail to arouse those indignant and patriotic feelings which should glow in every American bosom.)

BRITISH PERFDY;

OR,
AMERICA DECEIVED, INSULTED,
AND ROBBED BY BRITAIN.

The fatal 20th of July is passed, and the people of the United States have now the happiness to learn, that their trade with independent nations, is regulated by the king's orders, and this too, in violation of a solemn engagement entered into by his own Minister! Our property is shut in every sea. British ports are glutted with American produce. The "noble English," have derived plentiful supplies of cotton, tobacco, flaxseed and naval stores; and the United States have obtained—what? An assurance from his Majesty, that the solemn compact of his Ambassador is of no validity! Was ever a nation before so deceived, insulted, and cheated? If there is a spark of national pride, any attachment to independence, any love of country, in the American government or people, then they will call forth all their energies, to punish this faithless, perjured nation.

But we are told that another Ambassador, one Jackson, is coming out to this country, to settle all things amicably. Indeed! Another negotiation? Is the Rose farce to be played over again? Is the British faction to receive fresh supplies of cash, to be organized anew, to overawe our government, and counteract their operations! It is time for action. Negotiation will be death to us. It will flatter away the rising spirit of the country; it will give life and activity to the Pickering faction, who have been the cause of all our calamities.

Admitting the fact as stated by the British government, that Mr. Erskine exceeded his powers, what is to be gained by another negotiation? Did Mr. Erskine engage any thing that we had not a right to demand? By the laws of nations we have a right to a free trade with all the world, places actually blockaded excepted.—Mr. Erskine did not guarantee even that. Why, then, are we told that his agreement is not such as his Majesty can approve, unless there is a deliberate design on the part of the British government to destroy our independence? Mr. Jackson comes to this country, and as a preliminary to negotiation, will declare to our government, (for such is the language of

the new order) "You must submit to the orders in council, or I cannot treat with you; that is, you must contract by treaty to cut yourselves off from the trade of the continent of Europe, or a greater part of it." Will our government consent to treat on these terms? Or, in other words, will they consent to cede this great continent to Great Britain, and reduce the American people to the abject state of colonists to the pirates of the ocean. This, in truth, is the point to be settled. The decision of the government cannot be doubted. We are not yet prepared to be slaves. They must maintain the independence of the country, or sink with it. It is now more than two years since the attack on the Chesapeake roused the indignation of all America. We negotiated. The spirit of the people subsided, and we obtained nothing but fresh insults and outrages. The orders in council were issued, authorizing the plunder of American property. We still negotiated, and obtained a sort of half-way settlement, which, we are told by the British government, is not to be regarded, and is now wholly set aside.

With such evidences of the futility of negotiation, are we still to treat; are we to negotiate, until, to use a homely expression, we have negotiated ourselves "out of house and home;" until our liberties are gone, and the people sold as slaves?

It will be the anxious enquiry of every citizen, what will the Government of the United States do under this altered state of things? Indeed, this enquiry is already in every man's mouth. We shall express our opinion freely what the Government ought to do on this momentous occasion.—Let Congress be called together immediately. Let them concert the best means of defence, spend less time in speechifying, less in party bickerings, and more for the good of the country. Let them unite with one heart and soul in the defence of our rights. The British government has already declared war against us. The late Orders in Council amount to nothing less than a declaration of war. This shew of an attempt to renew a negotiation, is only intended to deceive us, to excite cabals in our country, to paralyze the energies of our government, that we may fall an easy prey. Let the government demand of Mr. Jackson, the new Envoy, whether he is prepared to fulfil the agreement of Mr. Erskine, whether he is authorized to release the American Seamen already impressed, to make indemnification for the millions plundered from us, and to renounce the pretended right of searching our ships for men. If he refuses to give a prompt and decisive answer in the affirmative on these points, and declines to enter into a treaty which shall guarantee the fulfilment of these demands, then let us arm by sea and land to defend our property and our rights against the Barbarians of Europe.

From the Enquirer.

MR. ERSKINE'S INSTRUCTIONS.

In reviewing the letter which Mr. Canning has laid before the House of Commons, as a copy of his instructions to Mr. Erskine, the first question which naturally seizes upon the mind, is, "Were these the instructions under which Mr. Erskine acted?"

Much as an answer in the negative would rebound to the infamy of the British ministers—thus proving an almost unparalleled complication of vices and wrongs, beginning with force and hypocrisy—yet are the characters and measures of the present ministry sufficient guarantees against such a presumption?—We appeal to the circumstances of the case itself.—And we ask, whether there are not in these very circumstances, the strongest reasons for suspecting, that some of the papers and instructions under which Mr. Erskine has acted, have been suppressed by the ministry.

Let these circumstances be duly weighed.

These Instructions bear date on the 23d of January.—Mr. Oakley left England about the 20th or 21st of February.—Why was he nearly four weeks detained after the composition of this paper—in that long interval was there no new turn of events which might have dictated rather a new view of their relations with the United States?

It was late in the night of the very day on which this paper seems to have been penned, that the dispatches of Lieutenant General Hope arrived—announcing the battle of Corunna, the death and defeat of Moore, the gloomy state of the British arms and efforts in Spain. For the "London Gazette Extraordinary" of January 24th, thus introduces the dispatch—"The Hon. Capt. Hope arrived late last night with a dispatch, &c. &c."—Was not this intelligence calculated to have at least some effect on the mind of Mr. Canning?

The course of negotiation, which took place at Washington on the 17th and 18th of April, seems to have been of so close and systematic a nature, as to have been chalked out by the ministry to Mr. Erskine. The first point which he seems instructed to bring forward is the infamous affair of the Chesapeake. "It having been, says he, represented to his Majesty, that the Congress of the U. States, &c." in this way opening the negotiation, as Mr. Canning's letter of January 23, directs him—"I have accordingly received his Majesty's commands, in the event of such law's taking place, to offer on the part of his Majesty, an honorable reparation for the aggression, committed by a British naval officer, in the attack on the U. States frigate Chesapeake." He then goes on to submit, "conformably to instructions," these "terms of satisfaction and reparation."—But where, in the note of the 23d January, is this point once touched upon?—Not a word is said about the order, in which the disputed points were to be adjusted—not one about the Chesapeake.—Where, then, we demand is the copy of the instructions which he received on this jointly with the other subjects?—It is suppressed.

To suppose besides, that Mr. Erskine would have made such propositions, in the very teeth of such instructions—is really to stagger credulity itself. Where could have been the understanding or the faith of the son of Lord Erskine? An idiot might have seen the difference between these instructions and his propositions. Well indeed might Mr. Canning have said that "no minister ever went wider of his powers." Would Mr. Erskine have gone so wide of his instructions—when he was dependant for his post upon a party who were in direct opposition to his own—whose eyes were ever bent to detect some *faux pas* in his conduct as an apology for driving him from his office? Could he have so explicitly assured our government, that he was "authorized" to take these steps; that he was only acting in obedience to "his Majesty's commands?" Not only once—when the first blush of the adjustment was on him—but some weeks afterwards, when he had all the lights of mature deliberation and of subsequent dispatches.

The failure to lay Mr. Erskine's letter of justification, with the other papers before Parliament, is besides another circumstance calculated to raise suspicion.—Mr. Canning might call it a justification to please himself—but perhaps we might be disposed to give it a different name.

But even admitting that Mr. Erskine has thus flagrantly flown from his powers—that these were the only Instructions under which he has acted—let us think what we please of him—what are we to think of the British ministry?

What are we to think of the propositions that he was instructed to make? If there be the ultimatum of the ministry, does the slightest hope of any accommodation with them exist? What more preposterous and insulting propositions were ever offered to the independent government of the United States? That American citizen must be wrapt in worse than polar darkness and cold, whose heart does not feel the fiercest resentment at such overtures, and whose mind does not despair of making any accommodation with such a ministry!

What were the concessions which were to be demanded of the U. States? 1st. We were to pledge ourselves to fulfil the decrees of France.—2d. During the present war we were to abandon all "pretensions" to carry on the colonial trade, prohibited in times of peace.—3d. As a means of enforcing our own interdictions, we were to permit the British cruisers to capture our own vessels bound to France and those countries which might act under her decrees. A moment's peace, sweet *Patience*, whilst we review these concessions!

We were to pledge ourselves to Great Britain, to assert our own rights against the encroachments of a foreign power—and to redress our own wrongs!! How insulting to the honour of the U. States.—How derogatory to the sovereignty of an independent power! The United States must engage to defend their own rights, not from any regard which we may feel for them, but because a foreign nation is pleased to make such an insolent demand: and to this nation we are required to give security for our good behaviour!

The next concession amounts to the absolute extinction of the colonial trade not open to us in time of peace—a trade which is a necessary substitute for the trade which is shut against us in times of war—which exports those productions to the colonies of her enemy, in our own vessels, which, in times of peace are transported in French vessels—a trade which is protected by the laws of nations—which constitutes one of the symbols of our sovereignty—a trade, of which Great Britain herself does not hesitate to reap the profits by granting licences to her own vessels, and this trade we are to give up to her.

And what makes this concession of our rights more humiliating to the U. States, is that this branch of trade has no connection whatever with the orders of January and November—that it is to be thrown as a mere *non-sequitur* into the scale along with the restoration of our trade with Great Britain—and that it breaks through the spirit of that contract which we were to have made with her, which was to have consisted of a mere commutation of a repeal of our interdictions for the repeal of her orders.

But it is the third demand which caps the proud pyramid of her presumption. After we should have pledged ourselves to continue our interdictions against France, we were not even to be complimented with the poor privilege of enforcing our own regulations. The independent government of the United States was to be informed, that it was too weak to execute its own laws, and that it was to solicit the aid of the British navy to enforce them for us!

Where is the noble hearted American who does not spurn at such an insinuation? A few days must Mr. Canning, who has been once already caught in the *faux pas*, have attempted to calumniate the name of Mr. Pickney! Such a suggestion could never have fallen from the lips of the minister who has hitherto baffled every artifice of the British secretary to entangle him in dishonourable negotiations.

So much for these propositions, taken by them *separately*. Let any man combine them together—There is a contradiction on the very face of them. The concessions which we were to have made, would have defeated those very concessions which we were to have obtained. The British orders were to be revoked—those branches of commerce which they interdicted, were to be renewed—and yet in the same breath, we pledge our solemn consent, that the cruisers of Great Britain should capture those very vessels of the U. States, which carried on a trade with France or any of those countries which she might pronounce to be subservient to the decrees of France.

So much for these instructions! We shall take a view in our next paper, of the situation in which we now stand. It is such as to require all our skill, all our energies, and all our virtue, to guide us through the storm which afflicts us.—Should we fail in this momentous effort, what prophet will pretend to estimate our losses, or set limits to the encroachments of the powers of Europe?

AN HONEST CONFESSION.

What more distinctly shews the real principles by which the British government is actuated, than the proceedings of the 160 merchants of London? These men frankly avow, that the Americans are not to be permitted to pour "their produce into Holland, and supply the market *directly* from the U. States," and for this honest reason, that we could do it "under advantages which could not be enjoyed by the British merchant, who has all the difficulties of a *contreband* intercourse to struggle with." In plain parlance, because we would carry on a fair and reputable trade—and they are merely *jaugglers*.

Is it then come to this? Are the citizens of the United States to be debarred from the fair profits of a neutral and customary trade—because they must come into competition with a nation of *jaugglers*? By what other argument than that of force, is such infolence to be defended?

Such, however, is the real clue to the impudent pretensions of Great Britain. It is no longer the poor pretence of retaliating the acts of her enemy—it is no longer the absurd attempt to retaliate upon an enemy the *profits of the war*, and the "evils of his own injustice." But it is to push her own commercial prosperity over the ruins of a rival, that she issues her orders of council and decrees of admiralty. It is the commercial spirit of these United States as which Great Britain

suckles—it is our increasing wealth, that tempts her rapacious cupidity.

Read the letter of Mr. Erskine, communicating the orders of 1807—read the third report of the committee on the distillation of molasses—scan the words and resolutions of the 160 merchants of London—trace the bearings of a most every order and proclamation that she has issued, and the same conviction irresistibly bathes upon the mind.

And will the American merchant patiently suffer these aggressions upon his most sacred rights? When he perceives himself thus rudely thrust out of the most lucrative branches of his commerce, by the jealousy of a self-created rival, will he want the spirit to assert the rights of his country? Has he no pride; no patriotic enthusiasm; none even that *eternally* sense of prudence, which is so peculiarly provident of its own interests? Will he be weak enough to detract from the efforts of his own government to procure him protection? Will he be base enough to bargain with the merchants and ministry of Great Britain, defend her insults, lust upon our acquiescence in her edicts, and vindicate the tyrant who would sink him into the degraded rank of a *colon* and a *subject*?

He must be a miserable fool indeed, who cannot print by his own experience. It is time for every honest merchant to unite with the firm yeomanry of our country, in the vindication of these rights upon the ocean, which "Nature and Nature's God" have allotted to us.

From the Republican Watchman.

Our intelligence is official that, in the language of our revolution, "even he who haunts the wood for prey, the wild untutored Indian, is less a savage than the king of Britain." The time is come, to nerve our arms for a contest which is the last resort against accumulated and accumulating wrongs, heightened by a perfidy for which none but traitors can apologize, and for the punishment of which, not an American but must stand ready to pour out the best blood of his heart.

ANOTHER BRITISH MINISTER

Is said to be arrived—and who do you think they say it is, people of America? No less a personage than the celebrated JACKSON, the negotiator at Copenhagen!

Whether he has brought with him, as an adjunct to his mission, the arguments he used to the Danes, and whether murder and confiscation are the logic to be again employed by him, we may perhaps know too soon.

As, however, secretary Canning has asserted that Mr. Erskine did not act agreeably to his Majesty's wishes, and that he has not conformed to his instructions, in the arrangements with the American government, would it not be advisable that before Jackson shall have been accredited, that he exhibit his instructions to the Secretary of State?

A wise man may be imposed upon once, but a fool may be twice tricked by the same person; now as Canning has played upon our credulity already, would it not indicate folly to permit him to do so again? What security have we, that any arrangements which might be entered into with the Copenhagen negotiator, would not also be displeasing to his Majesty, and disavowed! What more reliance is to be placed upon the declarations of Jackson than those of Erskine? [N. York Journal.

Admiral Harvey, third in command of the English channel fleet has been dismissed the service by sentence of a Court Martial for "vehement and insulting language" to Admiral Gambier. The facts are stated to be these. Admiral Gambier called a council on board the Caledonia, at which Admiral Harvey, after indulging a little in the seamen's privilege of prophanity, offered to volunteer for a certain Service. Admiral Gambier who is a conscientious man, observed, he wanted no such volunteers—on which Harvey immediately called him "an old, canting, psalm singing hypocrite." An apology was demanded; which being refused, he was sent home, tried, convicted, and dismissed the service.

[The conscientious Gambier, indeed! This is the privileged incendiary who acted with Jackson and others in the famous Baltic expedition, and who actually commanded the fleet and mercenaries that enveloped the women and children in the flames of Copenhagen.] *Ibid.*