



AND NEW-BRUNSWICK ADVERTISER.

Vol. 3.

SAINT JOHN, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1810.

No. 114.

Printed and Published by JACOB S. MOTT, Printer to the KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY, at the Sign of the BIBLE and CROWN, Prince William-Street; where Subscriptions, Advertisements, &c. will be thankfully received.

FRENCH BRANDY.

JOHN L. VENNER

HAVING the last Spring Imported a Stock of real FRENCH BRANDY from LONDON, which, owing to the introduction of great quantities from the United States of inferior quality and low price, he has been hitherto unable to sell at a fair rate by the Pipe, is now under the necessity of offering it in any quantity not less than FIVE GALLONS, at the low price of NINE SHILLINGS.

That generally offered for sale here is from the States, whence it is well known, inferior SPANISH is alone brought, French Brandy having been enormously high in that country ever since the restrictions placed on its Trade. Those persons therefore, who apply as above, will secure the two-fold advantage, of a reduced price and an excellence in the quality.

He has also for Sale, on the most liberal conditions, PORT WINE, BOHEA TEA, LOAF SUGAR, WHITE COTTONS, BOLT and BAR IRON, SOAP and STARCH. Besides a General Assortment of ENGLISH GOODS. LIKEWISE—One Hundred and Seventy Barrels Small HERRINGS, dry salted—and a quantity of SMOKED HERRINGS in boxes. 13th February, 1810. 4w

GEORGE MCALL,

BEGS leave to inform the Public that he has Removed to his New Store, on the South side of the Market-Square, adjoining Messrs. PETERS and WIGGINS, where Business in future will be carried on by

MCALL and HENDERSON,

They having a General Assortment of DRY GOODS and GROCERIES by the latest Ships from London, Liverpool and Greenock, which will be sold on reasonable terms. Saint John, 18th September, 1809.

JOHN BLACK, & Co.

Have Received by the Ship ROSINA from GREENOCK, Brig JANE from LIVERPOOL, and Ship TRIUMVIRATE from LONDON.

AN EXTENSIVE ASSORTMENT OF BRITISH MERCHANDISE,

Suitable for the Country and the Season, as usual. Saint John, 12th June, 1809.

JOHN ROBINSON,

Has Received by the Ship SUSPENCE, from LONDON, THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES, viz.

SECOND and coarse CLOTHS: 6-4 Fearnought; Patent Web for Pantaloon; Lisbon Baize; White, Red, and Yellow Flannels; Point Blanketing; Rose Blankets 7-4, 8-4, 9-4 and 12-4; Calmanco; Durants; Wilbores; Bombazets.

Which with his former Stock he will sell on reasonable terms. Saint John, 6th November, 1809.

ROBERT SHIVES, & Co.

Have received per Ships ARGO and SUSPENCE from LIVERPOOL and LONDON, and Ship MARY, from GREENOCK.

AN ASSORTMENT OF

BROAD and narrow Cloths, Bath Coatings, Men's Silk and Beaver Hats, and a General Assortment of White and Printed Cotton Goods,—which with their Stock previously on hand will be sold very low for prompt payment. ST. JOHN, 11th DECEMBER, 1809.

SPRING GOODS.

P. FRASER,

Has Just Received by the JANE, HARRISON and TOMB, and FORTUNE, from LIVERPOOL, and TRIUMVIRATE, and VENUS, from LONDON, (IN ADDITION TO HIS STOCK ON HAND)

A GENERAL ASSORTMENT OF MERCHANDISE,

Suitable for the Season, which will be sold on the most reasonable terms for Cash or Bills of Exchange. FREDERICTON, 8th MAY, 1809.

THE SUBSCRIBER

RETURNS thanks to the inhabitants of FREDERICTON for past favors, whilst under the firm of RING, HARTT, & Co. and informs them, that he still carries on Tanning, Currying, Harness and Shoemaking in all its various branches at the shop formerly occupied by RING, HARTT, & Co. where he hopes to receive a continuance of their favors in his line, which will be executed at the shortest notice. JARVIS RING.

FREDERICTON, 18th JANUARY, 1810.

From the BOSTON COLUMBIAN CENTINEL. The Diplomatick Policy of Mr. MADISON Unveiled. No. IX.

(Continued from our last.)

MR. SMITH'S MISREPRESENTATIONS OF MR. JACKSON'S LETTERS, CONTINUED; AND SOME REMARKS UPON THE PRINCIPLES PRETENDED TO BE SET UP BY GREAT-BRITAIN AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

In reviewing the whole correspondence, we discover this to be the result, that Mr. Jackson was not authorized to insist on the conditions stated in Mr. Canning's letter, although they were known to have been previously agreed to by our own officers;—that on the contrary he was ordered to receive our proposals and fully empowered by special authority to conclude a treaty on such terms as should be mutually advantageous;—and further, that the events of the war had rendered the conditions stated in Mr. Canning's letter less important to both parties, and therefore it was to be expected that Great-Britain would more readily consent to modify them.—All this is stated by the British Minister, and although from our reception of all former proposals he could not see any benefit, nor could he be expected to state before hand the full extent of his instructions, yet from what he intimates it is unavoidably to be presumed he was directed to agree to something more agreeable to us than the former conditions.

It was precisely the discovery of this full power and of this disposition to concession, which produced Mr. Jackson's dismissal. Let any impartial man peruse this whole correspondence, and he will find an invariable disposition to seek an occasion of collision on the part of our cabinet, and as sedulous a desire on the part of Mr. Jackson to avoid it. One thing he must particularly notice, that although Mr. Jackson's offensive insinuations (if any man can discover them) must be found in the early part of the correspondence, yet there was not the slightest intimation of discontent on our part until Mr. Jackson's letter of the 23d of October, disclosing his full powers and removing every possible obstacle to a final, full and satisfactory adjustment.

It is then proved, that the sharp, irritating introductory letter of our Secretary of State, comprising four articles of charge against the British Minister, was perfectly refuted in the subsequent correspondence; but notwithstanding the British Minister's allegations they were offensively adhered to. I anticipate, that those outrageous partizans who exclusively arrogate to themselves the virtue of patriotism, will here interrupt me by saying, that the declarations of our Ministers are more to be relied upon by a True American than that of "Copenhagen Jackson."—I grant every thing on this subject to national prejudice—I agree, which is as much as can be asked of me, that on an indifferent subject, Mr. Jackson, though supported by fact and evidence, is not to be credited by an American Patriot in opposition to Mr. Smith unsupported by any proof: but still I most humbly contend for the peace of our country, for the avoidance of the horrors of war, that were the point of discordance conflicts in what are or are not the pretensions upon which Mr. Jackson does insist that his declaration solemnly repeated as to the extent of his pretensions is conclusive evidence of those pretensions.

We shall now state one or two other instances of Mr. Smith's offensive, and as far as we can see, unprovoked harshness, towards Mr. Jackson, the representative of his Britannic Majesty.

Mr. Smith, most unaptly and unfortunately, had cited a case from Vattel, to shew that Great-Britain had no right to reject the arrangement with Mr. Erskine. That case was, unhappily, most directly against our side: It went to prove, that "where a bargain was made by a Minister in virtue of full powers it could not be rejected without solid and weighty reasons."

Mr. Jackson turned both parts of this quotation against Mr. Smith, and with unanswerable force:—

1st. That Mr. Erskine had not as Mr. Vattel supposes in his quotation, full powers.

2dly. That his Majesty had solid and weighty reasons for the rejection:—to wit, the total violation of instructions—the failure to obtain any of the conditions or objects expected by the agreement.

How does Mr. Smith reply to these forcible objections?—By a sarcasm which partakes as much of temper as of weakness:—

"I understand, Sir, (says he to Mr. Jackson) for the first time, that you object to Mr. Erskine's want of full powers. If that be an objection, the same applies to yourself, and we ought not to have heard you as long as we have done, because you have exhibited no full powers."

This was an admission of the principle; for if it had been true that a Minister plenipotentiary ex officio had a right in cases to bind his Sovereign, it would have been the most natural, the most perfect, and certainly a less insulting answer.

But Mr. Smith's reply was defective on another ground, as proposed by the correspondence between Mr. Jefferson

and Mr. Hammond, cited by me in a former number:—For though a full power is requisite to conclude and sign, yet a general letter of credence is sufficient to negotiate.—

Thus in common life we are satisfied to make a bargain with a reputed attorney, but when we come to take the deed or contract, we require—and we examine the letter of attorney. In this case Mr. Jackson was only paving the way to a treaty: It was therefore premature and indecorous to demand his powers:—It was still more, than that to demand them in so taunting a manner;—but, what is still worse, Mr. Jackson declares that he had long before this verbally stated to Mr. Smith that he possessed such full powers. To these very irritating remarks of Mr. Smith's, which one would have expected would have roused the utmost resentment of a haughty man, as Mr. Jackson has been represented by our democrats, he calmly replied, in his letter of the 4th Nov.

"That he was surprised at the transition by which it appeared to Mr. Smith that this part of the subject was connected with the authority empowering him to negotiate with Mr. Smith. It will not, (says Mr. Jackson) escape your recollection that I informed you, at a very early period, that in addition to the usual credential letter his Majesty had been pleased to invest me with a full power under the great seal of his kingdom, for the express purpose of concluding a treaty of convention. I well remember your testifying your satisfaction at the circumstance; and I now add, that whenever it suits your convenience, I am ready to exchange my full power against that with which you shall be provided for the progress of the negotiation."

Thus we see that the lacerating taunt of Mr. Smith was not only an unprovoked, but in face of a positive knowledge that Mr. Jackson was furnished with special and plenary powers.

One would imagine that it would be impossible, in a free country, a country enjoying the privileges of the press, for a Minister to question, after such a declaration, Mr. Jackson's powers, which such Minister had a right at the very moment to demand and examine.—But we shall find that it is more easy to palm off an impostor in this Enlightened Country, than we could imagine;—and the result of this affair will shew, that even when detected, its effects on the authors of it, will not be perceptible, unless it be to raise them in the estimation of their devoted partizans.

After this offer of Mr. Jackson to shew his full powers, Mr. Smith says in his letter to Mr. Pinkney, of Nov. 22.

"That although Mr. Jackson had given us to understand that the ordinary credentials, such alone as he delivered, could not bind his government, on such a case, his proposal had neither been preceded by, nor accompanied with the exhibition of other commission or full power."

In this paragraph two ideas are endeavored to be conveyed. 1st. That Mr. Jackson's objection to Mr. Erskine's ordinary credentials as the foundation of a treaty, was an unfounded one, although Mr. Smith and Mr. Madison must know that it was perfectly correct and supported by our own conduct in the case of Mr. Hammond.

2dly. That Mr. Jackson really had no other power because he had not exhibited any.

If any man, after reading the above, can find any means of getting rid of a direct and indecent contradiction, we shall, for the honor of our Cabinet, be happy to see them pointed out.

Amidst these charges of perfidy and falsehood, advanced so liberally against the British Cabinet and Minister, one loses sight of a great number of offensive and rude clauses and injurious suggestions. It would be hardly worth our time and the public patience to notice the strong and offensive paragraph which notified Mr. Jackson of his indiscoverable and indiscribable offence; but there is one sentence which, for the honor of his country, I hope, (since one will be able) will explain differently from its apparent meaning. In Mr. Smith's letter (page 81, of the printed documents) he thus writes to Mr. Pinkney:—

"You will perceive that throughout the early stages of the correspondence, this case (that of the Chesapeake) was in some respects improperly confounded with, in other improperly separated from that of the Orders in Council."

Now, in the name of candour, what course was Mr. Jackson to take? If he connected it with the Orders in Council, it was improper:—If he separated it from them, he was equally in fault. Is it not then clear that Mr. Jackson could not satisfy our Government at any rate? This we have long known, and this the present documents prove beyond all contradiction.—They who run, may read it—and even the blind may perceive it.

We have now finished this part of our subject—and we flatter ourselves redeemed the pledge we had given to the public. It is obvious from what has been said, that Great-Britain adheres to no offensive propositions in relation to her Orders in Council:—That those Orders rest, as they always have done, on ground which our own Government have admitted to be correct in principle, that of retaliation on her enemy:—That Great-Britain was willing to repeal them on the terms which her Minister assured her were proposed by us:—That finding we would not admit them she