

**BALTIMORE
PRICE CURRENT
OF
COUNTRY PRODUCE, &c. &c.
CORRECTED WEEKLY.**

Articles.	Per	Prior.	
Archer, ship	lb	11	12
Bread, navy	4		
pilot	6		
northern mess, hbl.	14	15	
cargo, No. 1	12	13	
No. 2	10		
Bacon	10	11	
Butter, for exportation	14	15	
Cotton, W. I. Island	17	19	
Louisiana	17		
Georgia, upland	14		
Sea Island	none		
Currants, Zant	11		
Cordage, Baltimore	18		
do. Russia	14		
Chocolate	20	30	
Candles, mould	19	20	
dipt	10		
Spermaceti	41		
Cheese, American	9	10	
Coal, pit, foreign	30		
do. American	20	22	
Fish, cod, dry	quint	50	
Salmon	12		
Herrings	4	50	
Mackerel	7	8	
Shad	7	8	
Furs, beaver	1	1	50
fox, cross	1	1	50
fox, red	1	1	50
bear	1	2	
otter	1	1	6
Flax-seed, (rough)	bu.	12	50
do. cleaned	cash	12	50
*Flour, superfine	bbl.	7	50
do. W. C'try	7	50	62
fine	7		
middlings	6	50	
rye	50		
Ginseng	lb.	50	
Gunpowder Balti.	25lb.	15	
more manufac.	75	80	
Grain, Indian corn bu.	1	37	1 40
wheat, Virginia	1	45	1 50
do. Maryland	80		
rye	75		
Barley	8		
clover seed	40		
oats	42		
Glass, Boston 8 by 10 box	18	16	50
Baltimore 8 by 10	16	14	
Hemp, country	lb	10	12
Hops (fresh)	10	12	
Hides, dried	14		
Hogs-lard	35	40	
Iron, pig	110	112	
country bar	1	75	
Indigo, N. Orleans lb.	8	50	9
Lead, pig	10		
bar	15	13	50
sheet	17	18	
white dry	19	20	
ground in oil	18	19	
Lumber per 100 ft.			
oak, timb & scant	2		
boards, all sizes	1	25	1 50
pine scantling, do.	1	50	2 50
boards, 4-4	1	50	1 75
do. 5-4	2		
white do. com. 4-4	1	50	1 75
do. clear 4-4	2		
shingles, cyp. 18 in. M	2	50	8 50
juniper, 24 do.	4		
do. com. do.	4		
staves, w. o. pipe	65	70	
do. hbl.	30	34	
do. bbl.	10	18	
red oak hbl.	10	12	
do. hbl.	18	20	
hhd heading	40	45	
Molasses, Havana, gal	57		
Trinidad, &c.	69	62	
Meal, corn, kiln dried bbl	4		
Nails, from 10 to 20 lb	11	12	
Naval stores, tar	bbl	3	
pitch	3	25	
turpentine	3	50	
rosin	3	25	
spirits turpentine gal	60	65	
varnish bright	40	45	
black	40		
Pork, northern mess, bbl	17		
prime	15		
cargo	10	11	
Baltimore navy	18		
prime	15		
southern 24	14		
do	12		
Porter American doz	1	50	2
Rice (fresh) per 100 lb	3	25	
Soap, Amer. white	10	12	
ditto brown	8	9	
Snake root, black do	30	37	
Salt-petre rough Am do	55		
refined do	70		
Gin, Hollid. 1st p. gal	90	1	
do. American	1	25	1 50
Rum, Jam. 4th proof	1	25	82
American	75		
Whiskey	12	50	
Sugars, Hav. white cwt.	9	75	10
do. brown	10	10	50
clayed white	13	15	50
do. brown	11	14	
Muscov	11	14	
Louisiana	11	12	
India 1st qual.	19		
loaf	17		
lump	17		
Salt, St. Ubes bu.	18	20	
Steel, London cwly	9	11	
no. 3	15	16	
Ger. per 100 lb.	9		
Lon. blistered cwt.	9		
country do	12	50	
Shot, of all sizes	15		
Skins, deer, in hair lb	15		
Red	15		
Grey	75	80	
Goat skins pc	6	8	
Tobacco, Maryland cwt	4	50	5 50
fine yellow 1st c. lb	3	50	4 50
Up. Patuxent 1st	3	50	4 50
Low. Patuxent 1st	3	50	4 50
Potomac 1st	3	50	4 50
East shore 1st	3	50	4 50
Virginia fat	6	7	
Do middling	4	50	5
Rappahannock	5		
Kentucky	11	12	
Tallow, American	11	12	
In block	20	25	
Tin in plates	25	50	
Hr. bees	25	50	

THE WHIG.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
B. IRVINE.
Corner of South Gay and Water Streets.
"GIVE US BUT LIGHT."
BALTIMORE:
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1809.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE WHIG.

SIR, The Federal Republican appears completely enlisted in the cause of Mr. Jackson. The editors of that paper are certainly at liberty to choose between their own country and England; but having taken their stand on British ground, they ought, at least, to argue fairly. I am sorry to find, however, that in addition to their having deserted the interests of their native land, & attempted to tarnish the reputation of its rulers, they deal most villainously in flagrant falsehood, and scatter wide the most mangled quotations from Secretary Smith's letters. Even Mr. Jackson ought to blush for such meanness.

I fear, sir, that these editors are incorrigible: they are undeniably very audacious. They no longer appear to think it necessary to use the least precaution in garbling facts; and they impose upon the public without any apology. Formerly, it was thought expedient to intermix a little truth with their falsehoods; but now, they offer their sacrifices to the father of lies by the lamp.

Since, then, they are so enormously wicked and so brazenly bold, all that you, and I, and other republicans can do, is to contribute our mite of correct information to the public, and trust the event to the understandings and the virtues of the people. In this temper of mind, I proceed to perform my portion of the task. I shall speak briefly, for laconic strictures are best understood.

Federal Objection.
The British government had as much right to disavow Mr. Erskine's arrangement, as the President had to reject Col. Monroe's treaty.

Republican Answer.
There is no similarity in the two cases. Col. Monroe informed the British commissioners, that he was signing the treaty contrary to his instructions, and that the American government must not be considered as bound to ratify it. Mr. Erskine said, he was authorized to conclude the arrangement. Col. Monroe's treaty contained a special provision, stating that it was not to be binding until it was ratified by the respective governments. Mr. Erskine's arrangement was to go into immediate effect, as is proved by the 10th day of June being fixed for the repeal of the orders in council. From the 19th of April to the 10th of June, is 60 days—and sixty days were not sufficient time to send the arrangement to England for ratification and receive it back again. And Mr. Canning, in his despatch of January 23, tells Mr. Erskine, that whatever day he agreed on should be adopted by the British government.

Federal Objection.
But, Mr. Smith admits that he saw the conditions.

Republican Answer.
Not before they were printed in the newspapers. Mr. Erskine never showed them to Mr. Smith. He mentioned certain propositions at the time of the arrangement, which afterwards, when the arrangement was disavowed, Mr. Smith perceived were the same with those in the printed despatch. Mr. Smith never saw the despatch, nor any part of Mr. Erskine's instructions. And why do the federalists garble Mr. Smith's letters? Why do they not quote him fully and fairly? Why do they pick a sentence here and a sentence there? Does not this garbling mode of citing his expressions look as if they were afraid to meet the case upon its true merits?

Federal Objection.
But why dismiss Mr. Jackson? He had something friendly to offer.

Republican Answer.
Mr. Jackson said he was authorized to propose nothing. He said the orders in council would be enforced, and nothing would induce Great Britain to relinquish them, but a compact by the U. States amounting to the same thing as the orders. Mr. Jackson was dismissed, because he was insolent; because he repeatedly insinuated, asserted, that the government did not tell the truth; and in this he departed from the rule of his functions, which requires, as Wicquefort declares, moderation and decorum. "There is a great deal of difference (says Wicquefort, in speaking of the ambassador and his functions,) between the liberty of speaking and petulance; between a free and witty repartee and an offensive sarcasm; between lawful and respectful complaints and gross reproaches, which partake of rusticity and impudence. The ambassador ought to keep within the bounds of respect, notwithstanding his prince commands him to express himself in words which cannot be agreeable." All the respectable authorities are against Mr. Jackson. And common sense is against him too.

Federal Objection.
But the Chesapeake—Mr. Jackson offered reparations for the attack on the Chesapeake.

Republican Answer.
It was no reparation, but a new demand. Before the reparation was to take place, the United States were required to guar-

antee the discharge of the very men who were seized on board the Chesapeake. This would have been to acknowledge that the outrage was just. At present Mr. Editor, I shall trouble you no further.

AN AMERICAN.
Extract to the Editor.
WASHINGTON, Dec. 9, 1809.
"The annual report of the secretary of the treasury was yesterday laid before the house of representatives. The finances of the nation, though not embarrassed, are by no means in a flourishing condition. How could they be? When order upon order, decree upon decree, have been thundered forth against the fair harvests of neutral commerce; when successive and accumulating spoliation have swept from the ocean every vestige of security in trade; is it wonderful that our exchequer has felt the effects of the distant but overwhelming shock?"

"Mr. Gallatin very decisively pronounced upon the inefficiency of the present feeble interdiction of commerce; and recommended either the complete reinstatement of our former restrictive system, with effectual and vigorous provisions for its execution, or its total abandonment. In this he certainly displays his wonted wisdom. The American people have reason to deplore, in deep sadness and humiliation, the raising of the embargo. We shall, I fear, never cover from the triumph which that event gave to the sordid and mean policy of vile speculation, over the virtue and dignity of those honorable maxims which will ever govern honest and wise nations, as well as individuals. The New-England federalists chuckle at the success which their bug-bear resolutions & town meetings met with, against the federal government."

It is est ab hoste doceri.
THE FINGER OF SCORPION
Pointed at the eleventh Congress,—by Rivington's Gazette, or Federal Republican of Baltimore, Friday, December 2

"Threatening speeches,—proclamations,—PAPER,—and WORDS,—are the ONLY weapons of DEMOCRACY."
The tenth Congress (ever memorable!) was ridiculed and contemned in a similar tone, by Quincy, of Boston: "You go to war with England! You cannot be kicked into a war!"

A nation or individual might pocket an insult or a drubbing, or even a few dozens of these commodities,—if bestowed softly and quietly in the dark; for, shame and dishonour are tolerable when there is no witness by;—but, who could endure the scorpion lashes of triumphant contempt brandished by the aggressor, and applied to the back in open day—before all the world?

I do indulge the hope, that the emissaries of Britain have underrated the courage and patriotism of the United States.

HONESTUS.
We are told, that the collector at New Orleans, (one Brown) has gone off, with about nine thousand dollars of the public money.—Brown, though appointed to office by Mr. Jefferson, is a most violent federalist, or to speak more correctly, a Tory.

An article is copied into our paper of to-day from the Missouri Gazette; which is interesting from a territory so remote as Upper Louisiana. Even there, the enterprising spirit of the people, and the resources of the country are displayed, in the establishment of a shot manufactory, &c. &c. It is also worthy of particular notice, that "British factors" have carried the English system of treachery into the recesses of the wilderness, and are exciting the savages to hostility against us.

Thus, we are subjected to British printers in the seaports, and "British factors" in the forests!

FOR THE WHIG.
MR. IRVINE,
The laws of chance is a science capable of strict demonstration; for, by the probability of the happening of an event is understood the ratio of the chances by which that event may happen, to all the chances by which it may either happen or fail. Let us now suppose a lottery, where, in the number of blanks are to those of the prizes nearly as 2 to 1; then the probability that any one ticket will come out a prize is $\frac{1}{3}$; and, that it will come out a blank, is $\frac{2}{3}$. Next, let us suppose that 16,000 tickets of the lottery are yet in the wheel, of which 500 are to be drawn on a certain day; then the probability that any one ticket in the wheel will be drawn on that day is $\frac{1}{32}$, or $\frac{1}{32}$; that is, there are 31 chances to 1 against it being drawn on that day; consequently its chance for drawing a prize is $\frac{1}{32}$ of $\frac{1}{3}$, or $\frac{1}{96}$; or 95 to 1 against it drawing a prize. Let us now suppose the original price of the ticket in question to have been \$10 and it is evident that its probable value on the day assumed, is $\frac{1}{96}$ of 10 dolls, or 21 cents.

Lastly, to make the matter still plainer, let us suppose one ticket hired out at the rate of one dollar per

day, and it will appear that the borrower pays at the rate of no less than 220 per cent per day, or 80,300 per cent a year for the principal!!!—Perhaps the attorney-general can tell whether this be legal interest!

These, sir, are plain deductions; and from them it must appear, (and the writer of this holds himself responsible for the assertion,) that the existing practice of hiring tickets, by the day, is one of the most flagrant species of fraud ever attempted in an enlightened country, and imperiously demands the immediate attention of the Legislature.

LUDUS INGENUUS.
Congressional Register.
IN SENATE.
Friday, Dec. 8 1809.
A communication was received from the Treasury Department, and was ordered to be printed.

Mr. Leib, agreeably to notice, presented a bill to repeal the act to suspend for a limited time the recruiting service.

The bill supplemental to the act extending the right of suffrage in the Indiana territory and for other purposes, was read a second time, and, on motion of Mr. Pope, referred to a select committee which consists of Messrs. Pope, Meigs, and Crawford.

RUPTURE WITH MR. JACKSON.
The resolution reported by Mr. Giles, approving the conduct of the executive in refusing to hold any further communication with Mr. Jackson, was taken up by the senate as in committee of the whole.

The resolution having been read, Mr. Giles rose and spoke as follows: Mr. President—Before I proceed to perform the duties enjoined upon me as the chairman of the committee who reported the resolution before you, permit me to express my regret, that the consideration of a subject, which justly excites so much sensibility, should have been delayed even only one day on my account; and be assured, Sir, that nothing less than an indisposition sufficient to justify it, would have caused me to have been absent from my place yesterday. Perhaps, sir, I owe an apology to senate at this time, for entering in this debate under a state of hoarseness, which must necessarily disqualify me in some degree, from discharging my duty on the present occasion. But, sir, it is a subject of great consolation to me, to reflect, that I am fortunately favoured with associates on the committee, either of whom could perform the task I am now engaged in, better than myself, and some of whom, will certainly do me the favor of correcting any errors I may unintentionally commit, or supplying any omissions I may inadvertently make.

Although it appears to me, that the propriety and urgency of the resolution now under consideration must be strongly addressed both to the judgment and sensibility of every gentleman, who has carefully attended to the distribution of powers under our constitution, and who has carefully attended to the correspondence which gave rise to the resolution, yet in a case of so much delicacy, it would naturally be expected, and is a respect due to the senate, from the chairman of the committee, to present to it at least some of the general motives which induced the committee to report the resolution at this time.

It is to be observed, Mr. President, that our constitution is peculiar in its organization and distribution of its powers; and in no respect is it more peculiar, than in the distribution of the particular powers embraced by the resolution. In all other governments known to us, the same department which possesses the power to receive and negotiate with foreign ambassadors and other public ministers, also possesses the power to make war. It has been thought wise in our constitution, to separate these powers. With a simplicity of language, and a solidity of wisdom almost peculiar to our constitution, the President is invested with the power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers; thus using the broadest terms in granting this power without even an attempt at limitation or specification; evidently with a view, that all the incidental or consequential powers might flow from this general expression to the department, thus invested with this general power. It was easy to foresee, that the multiplicity and diversity of cases, which would arise in the course of various diplomatic manoeuvres and negotiations, would set at defiance all attempts to limit or specify the powers of the department in this respect, to which these powers were confided and to be exercised on the part of the United States, and therefore, every attempt of that kind was wisely avoided, leaving to the President to exercise his authority upon his own responsibility, to be regulated by the only established standard among nations, (to wit, the laws and usages of nations. For it never can be presumed, sir, that the wise sages who framed our excellent constitution could for a moment have tolerated the idea, that the ministers of foreign nations residing near the government of the U. S. should possess greater privileges and immunities, than the ministers of our government residing near foreign courts—of course the same laws, to wit, the laws and usages of nations, were

left reciprocally to govern in every reciprocal case.

But, sir, notwithstanding the President is invested with the power "to receive ambassadors and other public ministers," and as I think all other incidental or consequential powers applicable to the various agencies with such ambassadors and other public ministers; yet congress is invested with the power without limitation or qualification, "to declare war." Now, sir, it must be obvious to every understanding, that these several powers are so intimately connected, and may be so dependent upon each other, that the exercise of the power conceded to the President may consequently involve the necessity of the exercise of the power conceded to congress; as in the case now under consideration; the refusal of the executive to receive any further communications from his Britannic majesty's minister, Mr. Jackson, may consequently involve us in a war with Great Britain; or in other words may serve as a pretext to Great Britain to make war upon us, if she should conceive it her interest to do so, which I think not very improbable. Hence arises in my judgment, the propriety and urgency of expression of the congressional opinion upon this executive act, and a declaration of the congressional will as to the course of conduct congress will pursue under any consequences which may flow from, or possibly be attributed to this executive act.

I conceive, sir, that the expression of this opinion, and the pledge of a solemn declaration, by congress, are due to the people; because the people have the deepest interest in the character of their government; and in no part of its attributes, have a deeper interest, than in its efficacy to resist and repel injuries & insults from foreign governments; the people also are either the media or immediate electors of congress, and as such have a right to expect and demand, that congress will execute all their duties and will never shrink from their constitutional responsibility in any case; & last of all, in a case of so high and solemn a character, as the one under consideration.

This course of conduct is essentially due to the executive. The president ought to know, whether, with the indispensable cooperation of congress, he ought to proceed with dignified moderation and intelligence, to assert and maintain the rights, the honour and the interests of the American people; or whether, for the want of that cooperation, he shall with shame and confusion of face be compelled to retrace his steps, and leave to congress to abandon these high attributes of the nation, and with their degradation, to record their country's ruin and disgrace. No, sir, it is not possible that an American congress does exist, or can ever exist, that would not spurn from themselves every vestige of an idea, that they could be brought under any circumstances to perform so degrading and dishonourable a task.

It is imperiously demanded by the dignity and candour of congress itself. What, sir? shall the exercise of one of the highest constitutional functions of congress be brought into question, and every individual in the nation engaged in expressing an opinion on it; and shall congress alone stand aloof for fear of incurring a responsibility imposed on them by the constitution? Shall congress stand by as idle spectators, and see a contest before the people between the president and a foreign minister, and feel no interest and take no share in such an unprecedented scene? especially when one of their highest constitutional functions may be affected by it? No, sir! congress must speak—congress must act—congress never can shrink from its constitutional responsibility—it is due to the dignity—it is demanded from the candour of congress.

Above all, sir, it is important to the United States as a nation, that the Congressional will should be proclaimed upon this delicate and solemn occasion. It is of importance, it may be of the last importance, to the United States, that Great Britain should know, before she decides upon this subject, what is the Congressional will in relation to it? Whether she will be called upon to act against an united, harmonized government and people? or whether she shall have for her prey, a divided people and a discordant government?

Do you not believe, Mr. President, that the conduct of Great Britain, would be very different under these different conditions of the people and government of the U. S.? Let me ask you this question, sir, would you not, sir, if you were prime minister of Great Britain, consulting her interests alone pursue a very different course of conduct under this different state of things? Let every gentleman put the question to himself; and the answer of every one would be the same. Why then, sir, do we not unanimously take the ground here, which if we were called upon to act in an opposite hostile character, would most certainly deter us from persevering in that hostile character against the U. States? Sir, if there had been any doubt upon this subject, our late experience ought to have removed it; for, sir, I have no hesitation in saying, and with pain at heart I shall be compelled to shew it in the course of this debate, that in my judgment, our present embarrassments are too much to be ascribed to our former unfortunate dissensions and divisions.