be otherwise. And it is remarkable that G. Britain did not consider this as a cause of war, though the people of this country were then her subjects. Coming down to later times, and approaching the period of our national independence, the same measure was resorted to, and considered an effectual expedient to obtain redress of our grievances. In 1776, what was the sense of the people of England on this subject, and how did they feel the effects of the non-importation agreement of the colonists? Let them speak for themselves.

"There scarce was ever any affair debated in a British Parliament in which the public thought themselves more deeply interested, or for the result of which they felt a more impatient anxiety than the present, nor was the rest of Europe especially the commercial part, inattentive to the event.

"The second speech from the throne, as well as the first, pointed out the American affairs to the parliament as the principal object of its deliberations; both houses by their addresses shewed that they looked upon them in the same important light.

"Petitions were received from the merchants of London, Bristol, Lancaster, Liverpool, Hull, Glasgow, &c. and indeed from most of the trading and manufacturing towns and boroughs in the kingdom. In these petitions they set forth the great decay of their trade, owing to the new laws and regulations made for America. The vast quantity of our manufactures (besides these articles imported from abroad, which were purchased either with our own manufactures or with the produce of our colonies) which the American trade formerly took off our hands, by all which, many thousand manufacturers, seamen, and labourers, had been employed to the very great and increasing benefit of the nation. That in return for these exports the petitioners had received from the colonies, rice, indigo, tobacco, naval stores, oil, whale-fins, furs, and lately pot ash, with other staple commodities, besides a large balance in remittances, by bills of exchange and bullion, obtained by the colonists for articles of their produce, not required for British market, and therefore exported to other places.

"That from the nature of this trade, consisting of British manufactures exported, and of the import of raw materials from America, many of them used in our manufactures, and all of them tending to lessen our dependence on neighbouring states, it must be deemed of the highest importance in the commercial system of this nation, that this commerce, so beneficial to the state and so necessary for the support of multitudes, then lay under such difficulties and discouragements, than nothing less than its utter ruin was apprehended, without the immediate interposition of parliament."

"At the conclusion of our last volume we saw the nation involved in the most distressful circumstances that could well be imagined; our manufactures at a stand, commerce almost totally annihilated, provisions extravagantly dear, and a numerous populace unemployed, without the means of procuring a livelihood. Such, and so gloomy was the prospect that opened at home."

Vol. ix. Ann. Reg.

Down to the beginning of the American war, this was uniformly considered as the most powerful instrument in our hands to oblige Britain to do us justice. Since that time, it will be found that the same sentiment has been expressed by the House of Representatives of the United States. By recurrence to the journals it will be seen that on the 21st of April, 1794, this resolution was adopted.

"Whereas, the injuries which have been fuffered, and may be fuffered by the United States, from violations committed by Great Britain, on their neutral rights and commercial interefts, as well as from her failure to execute the feventh article of the treaty of peace, render it expedient for the interefts of the United States, that the commercial intercourfe between the two countries fhould not continue to be carried on in the extent at prefent allowed:

"Resolved, That from and after the firft day of November next, all commercial intercourfe between the citizens of the United States, and the fubjects of the king of Great Britain, or the citizens or fubjects of any other nation, fo far as the fame refpects articles of the growth or manufacture of Great Britain or Ireland, fhall be prohibited."

This resolution was decided by the Yeas and Nays, and I find there were for it 58 Yeas, and against it 38 Nays. Among these who voted in favor of it, I find my own name, associated with the names of men, with whom it has always been my pride and pleasure to act. And among these I find the names of a Madison, a Baldwin, a Nicholas, a Clark, a Venable, a Blount and a Macon. It will be seen, too, that this resolution went much farther than that which is now proposed, that it went to the length of prohibiting all intercourse, while the present resolution is confined to prohibiting imports, and does not apply at all to our exports.

With regard to the effect of this measure upon the revenue, I believe it will have such an effect to a certain degree, but I am far from believing it will be to the amount talked of. I have no doubt that we will obtain from other countries what will suffice for our wants, without applying to Great Britain. But suppose there should be a greater deficiency in our revenue, and suppose we shall not get from other countries all the articles we want. Are we to compare these privations with the sacrifice of our rights as a nation? I, for one, am of the opinion, that if we were not to consume half the luxuries, and many of the conveniences at present imported, we should be as happy as we now are. This would have one excellent effect. It would revive that spirit of industry which our large importations, so far as relates to family manufactures, have almost annihilated. I cannot see what is to prevent every family among us, manufacturing what is necessary for their own wear. 'Tis true, we might want the fine cloths we wear, and our wives be deprived of their silk gowns. But would this diminish our happiness? Are such privations to be put into competition with the preservation of our rights? I hope there still remains too much of that ancient virtue, which once glowed in the American breast, to consider this as an evil. I confess I was exceedingly surprised yesterday, to hear my colleague (Mr. J. Clay) coming from one of the first commercial cities in the union, expressing his despair of the virtue of the American people, expressing the opinion that our people could not hold out six or eight months against such a measure. Is it possible that such an idea can be correct? Is it possible that a few years have wrought such a change in the character of a people famed for their virtue, distinguished for the sacrifices they have made? Is it possible that luxury has made such inroads upon us, that all our ancient virtue is gone? I, for one, cannot but believe, that if the American people are placed in the same situation, they will not shrink from danger. I shall be reluctantly obliged to believe so. I think better of them. I have seen them true to themselves, in worse times than these, and I never have yet seen them in any times, flinch from a performance of their duty.

Another expression of my colleague also surprised me. He said this measure would, in the opinion of every man, justify retaliation. This is pronouncing it a war measure, unless by retaliation, he means commercial retaliation. If he means retaliation by means of fleets and armies, it is a most strange opinion, as there is not a feature in the resolution that points to war.

In order to get rid of the effect of the opinion, expressed by the legislature in 1794, the gentleman assigns a most extraordinary reason. He tells you at that time there was such an enthusiasm and attachment to the French nation, that the American people were ready to draw their swords in her favor. I am sure, however, that by a retrospect of the opinions which at that time prevailed in the city, where that gentleman, as well as myself resided, he will perceive the incorrectness of his remark. I never yet met with any man who thought we would be justified in interfering in the contest of France with the despots of Europe. The enthusiasm felt for France I well remember. We considered her as contending for the rights of human nature, and our wishes were ardent for her success. Another circumstance heightened these feelings. We recollected the services she had rendered us in times of distress. But with regard to entering into the war in her favor, I never knew a man, who I could say was in his senses, for it. This therefore could have no effect in carrying the resolution I have just read.

The gentlemen from Virginia has told us, that in adopting this measure, we shall be goaded by commercial interest, into a contest with Britain on the seas. For one, I hope we shall have no war. I view this measure as a peaceable measure, and entertain great hopes that it will have the effect we wish. When we consider the situation of Britain, we may be confident that she will not wish to increase the number of her enemies, and it will surely be good policy in her to avoid taking that ground which will have this effect.

But the gentleman from Virginia tells us, that the situation of England is different from what it was in 1793. Agreed—but that change is in our favor. G. Britain has at present her hands so full, that she will not wish to increase her enemies. The events of the present contest are extremely uncertain. If the emperor of France shall prove successful, and make a peace on the continent to the exclusion of G. Britain, he will undoubtedly shut out British manufactures from every part of Europe. The present therefore is the most favorable time for pursuing our measures.

The gentleman also enquires what will England say of our conduct to Spain? He laments that his lips on this subject are closed. I too lament that mine are closed. I wish to God that every word said, while our doors were closed, and that every measure entered into, were known to every man, woman & child in America. I shall not, on this occasion, say more, but to express the hope that the day is not distant when the gentleman's statements will be rectified by a complete disclosure.

The same gentleman has avowed his hostility to a certain nation, and he is willing to go to war with her, because he considers her feeble, and because she has been guilty of aggressions on our rights. Mighty aggression! Which is nothing more than what happened the other day at Detroit, where certain British officers seized a man, with the view of carrying him over the line. I hope such trivial things, the offspring of accident or personal resentment, will never be considered by us as cause of war. I hope the American people will never go to war when they can avoid it without a sacrifice of honor or justice. For my part I cannot see what this measure has to do with our affairs with Spain. Have we not a right to manage those affairs independent of England? Have we got to this, that we are to consider England as a party to our transactions with other nations? In our affairs with Spain, we are doing England no injury, and she has no right to interfere with the exercise of our rights as an independent nation.

The gentleman asks will it be politic to strengthen the hands of France, to invigorate the power that threatens the subjugation of the world? How this topic has been brought into view, I cannot tell. I have no predilection to France—I have no attachment to any country but the one in which I live. I am willing to do justice to all nations, and to require it from all. But suppose Bonaparte should succeed in the conquest of Europe? It will be a long time before it can be effected; and if effected, it will be found that a fleet is not the work of a day. It will be found to be the work of years, and years of peace too, before he can possess sufficient ships and seamen to destroy the British navy. And what are the dreadful terrors of the French government! There appears at the head of her affairs a man who transcends in talents and ambition the other potentates of Europe. But is there any thing permanent in this? Much, every thing may depend on his brittle life. On his fall, she may become as feeble as she ever was before. The nation we ought to fear, according to the gentleman from Virginia, is not that which has the *actual command* of the sea—No, the gentleman is not afraid of her, but of the nation which *may* have the command of it *hereafter*. I should regret to see any nation of Europe blotted out of existence. I hope that Bonaparte will never conquer England, or England conquer France. But I cannot attach much importance to distant, while I am menaced by present dangers.

The gentleman has also pourtrayed the great danger to the constitution from war. I agree with him. I too deprecate war. I consider it one of the worst evils that can befall mankind. But as I have already shewn that this is not a war, but a peace measure, his remarks do not apply. I know that war is attended by numerous evils, that it not only exhausts our blood and treasure, but that it has a still more fatal effect on our manners. Still am I not willing to prostrate the dignity, the interest and the honor of my country, even if war should be the consequence.

The gentleman has also sounded an alarm among us because this is not a measure of the cabinet. That gentleman however knows full well that any member on this floor, without even consulting any of his fellow members, much less the cabinet, has a right to bring forward any resolution he pleases. But he said at the same time there was no cabinet. How then could he expect us to consult the cabinet when no such thing exists? My friend, who offered this resolution, showed it to me before he presented it. I concurred in it, and I now advocate it, because I think it right, and the gentleman will not deny that every gentleman on this floor has equal rights.

The gentleman has also told us that France in 1793 was doing what England now does, that she was fighting the battles of the world. For my part I do not believe the world is indebted to either of those nations, much less do I believe that we are. But this same England can do wonders, and it seems we are not to contend for our rights with her, lest she should get out of humor with us. I know the power of the English fleet, and I know we cannot contend with it. Debauched however as her government is, I do not believe she will go to war with us; but if she does not, it will not be owing to the caution we have observed in discussing this subject. Of this nation thus represented as fighting the battles of the world, I may perhaps have formed a wrong opinion, in the estimate I have formed of her humanity and justice. Go to the East Indies—throw your eyes on Africa, look back on the American revolution, and talk of her humanity! Applaud her for justice, when there is not a nation on earth at this day so much disposed to be hostile to us. Sir, she will never forgive us for having atchieved our independence. Her hostility is invigorated by another circumstance. She is the first trading nation in the world, we are the second. We interfere with her aggrandisement, and she has determined to crush us. She is proceeding step by step in the work of destruction, and if we are so pusillanimous as to submit, she will push on to our ruin and disgrace. The gentleman has told us that if we aid any power, in her efforts to destroy Britain, we shall endanger ourselves. Indeed, sir, so many evidences of the friendship of this nation are brought before us, that I only want *experience* to believe them.

We are also told by the same gentleman, that France will do us the honor only to make us the last nation she devours. Why all this clamor about France, when she is not injuring us, while we are so tame to other nations who are violating our dearest rights? I trust we shall know how to respect ourselves with whatever nation we have to deal, and if France acts to us as England has done, that we will treat her as we are now for treating England. But till this time arrives these remarks are misapplied.

I come now to reply to one thing said by the gentleman from Virginia, which I am very sorry I am under the necessity of doing. The fate of this country is placed in irresponsible hands. Tom, Dick and Harry ought to be put into straight waistcoats. Whether this language is consistent with the respect due to this House, or to this nation, I leave the gentleman to judge for himself. I will grant that that gentleman has a right to the exercise of his opinion on all political subjects. I will even allow that he has a mind more luminous than belongs to most men. But I will also say, that the rights which he claims for himself he ought to allow to his fellow members. If I entertain an opinion which is wrong, and any man can convince me it is so, I am ready to acknowledge it; but how comes the gentleman to represent all the members on this floor as a set of fools? Why, sir, if I were to pretend to say that John Locke was a fool, that Milton was a bad poet, that Bacon was a miserable lawyer, whatever my intention might be, I should not derogate from their characters. I believe this will be the case with the members of this House, and that the character of no man in it will be affected by his charge. I can look through this body and see many of my fellow members, whose voice is never heard on this floor, on whose judgment I can place as high a reliance, as on those whose talents are the most conspicuously displayed. I beg the committee will excuse me for the large portion of their time I have consumed on points so little connected with the question under consideration. I will conclude what I have at present to say, reserving to myself the right of making some additional remarks before the question is taken.

(To be continued.)

WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26.

We understand that the latest dispatches received from Mr. Munroe bear date the 28th of January, and that they state, that in consequence of the indisposition of Mr. Pitt no ultimate arrangements had been made for the adjustment of our relations with Great Britain, but that hopes of such adjustment were entertained from the complexion of the new administration.

From the Boston Centinel.

We have seen several letters from London, by the packet. They mention that no condemnations of American property had been made for many weeks previous. Mr. Munroe was to have had an audience with Mr. Fox, on American affairs, the 9th February. It was expected, that no further detentions would take place. The New York, and other memorials, on the subject of neutral commerce, had been published there.

The President's Message at the commencement of the present session of Congress, was published in England early in the month of January. The New-York memorial had been published. It is said that Mr. Fox, a short time previous to his coming into the ministry, expressed himself averse to the proceedings respecting neutral commerce, which we have recently complained of.

Extract of a letter from Liverpool, dated the 8th of February.

"The memorial of the merchants of New-York on the encroachments lately made by this country on neutral commerce, has appeared in some of our public papers. In connection with this interesting subject, we cannot help considering the late change in administration as particularly important; and shall be much disappointed if the remonstrance, which has been made, is not treated in a very different manner by such men as compose the present ministry, than what it would have been by the abettors of the former system."

The London Courier says:

The Fox party in the cabinet is more numerous than the Grenville, and should a difference of opinion occur, as it is scarcely possible that it should not occur, the small Addington party can incline the scale which way they please. The following division will prove the truth of our assertion—

The Grenville party.

Lord Grenville, Earl Spencer, Mr. Wyndham, Earl Fitzwilliam.

The Fox party.

Mr. Fox, Mr. Grey, Lord Henry Petty, Mr. Erskine, and the Earl of Moira.

The Addington party.

Lord Sidmouth, and Lord Ellenborough.

It is said *Jerome Bonaparte* is at sea, with a squadron of 7 sail of the line, supposed to be bound to the Cape of Good Hope.

NEW KINGDOMS.

As Bavaria, Wirtemberg and Baden have been lately erected into kingdoms, the following account of their extent, population and revenue may not be unacceptable:

The electorate of Bavaria contained

Square miles,	16,176
Population,	1,934,000
Revenues,	1,666,000
Forces,	12,000

Now this is converted into a kingdom, according to accounts more recently received, it will have its revenues and population doubled, and all that at the expence of the House of Austria.

Wirtemberg contained—

Square miles	3,200
Population	600,000
Revenues	255,000
Forces	6000

This electorate most probably will be more than trebled, else it will ill be able to support the royal dignity intended to be conferred upon it.

The revenues, territories and population of *Baden*, another of the favored princes, are still inferior to those of the duke of Wirtemberg, and were as under—

Extent in square miles	832
Population	200,000
Revenue	140,000
Forces	1,500

After the treaty of Luneville, Austria contained——

Extent in square miles	179,904
Population	19,439,000
Revenues	10,840,000
Forces	365,000

The united revenues of the three favored powers amounted to 1,941,000, or between one fifth and one sixth of the revenues of the imperial family; their territories united, to 20,208 square miles, which is only one eighth of those of the emperor; their forces to 19,500 men, which is not equal to much more than one twentieth.

Within a few days past a great mass of interesting foreign intelligence has been received by various arrivals at different ports. By an arrival at Norfolk from Bordeaux the 33d, 34th and 35th bulletins of the Grand French army are received, giving details of events already known—The ship John Morgan arrived at New York brings Liverpool papers to 13th of February. The Abeona, arrived at Baltimore, brings London dates to the 10th and Liverpool to the 12th ult. and the Packet arrived at Boston, brings London papers to the 10th ult.

The interesting proceedings of Congress forbid our going at present into a wide detail of the foreign events, detailed in the prints brought by these vessels—We shall, however, give enough to advise our readers of the present state of European affairs.

T. Erskine is appointed British Minister to America.

LONDON, January 18.

Hints are thrown out of a Congress for a General Peace to be assembled through the mediation of Prussia. The Emperor Alexander returned to Petersburgh on the 21st ult. and an official statement of the reasons which induced his majesty to withdraw his troops from the Austrian dominions has been published in the Court Gazette. There is yet no authentic intelligence of the Russian and English troops which landed at Naples having re-embarked; but in the 37th Bulletin of the French army, general St. Cyr is stated to be on his march "to punish the Queen of Naples." It is probably Bonaparte's intention to add a considerable portion of his Sicilian Majesty's dominions to his favorite kingdom of Italy, and, we are much afraid, it will be impossible to prevent him from carrying this plan into effect.

It is confidently reported that a convention was signed by the Count Haugwitz and Talleyrand, which settles in the mean time the affairs of Hanover, and secures our troops. This convention contains in substance, that

The English and allied troops shall retire behind the Weser;

That the recruiting for the German legion shall cease;

That no more English troops shall be sent to Hanover;

That the armies of Prince Louis and Angereau shall not advance—the former not to pass the frontiers of Holland, the latter not to pass the Rhine.

Prussia engages to oblige the English troops to evacuate Hanover within a given time, not to exceed three months from the signing of the convention. In the mean time the French garrison in Hameln is to be supplied with provisions.

It is also reported that Prussia is to cede Bareuth and Anspach to Bavaria; and it is likewise said East Friesland and Embden to Denmark, for which she is to be indemnified by receiving part of Hanover, namely, Luneburg and Lunenburgh, the territories of Bremen, &c. But she is to cede Lubec. Bonaparte, it is said, has declared that the electoral dignity shall be conferred on a neighboring prince, supposed to be the duke of Brunswick, others say the king of Denmark as duke of Oldenburgh.

January 20.

Bonaparte not only gives the law in the disposal of kingdoms, but in matrimony; his son in law, Eugene Beauharnois, it is reported, is to marry the princess Augusta of Bavaria, and master Jerome, a princess of the House of Wirtemburg.

The late report of the king of Spain's demise appears to have arisen from a very severe illness. He has been attacked by an apoplectic fit, and his life is, by the last accounts, said to be in great danger.

February 1.

Orders have been issued in France for renewing the preparations for the invasion of England. The flotilla at Boulogne is to be considerably augmented, and the grand army is immediately to return to the coast.

Another insurrection in Italy.

The inhabitants of Parma are in a state of rebellion against Bonaparte's authority; in consequence of which prince Eugene has addressed a proclamation to them, in which he threatens them with exemplary vengeance, if they return not immediately to their obedience and implicitly submit to the will of their oppressor.

The insurrections in Parma and Liguria were encouraged by the debarkation of the British and Russian troops at Naples, and appear to have embraced not only the mass of the people, but the principal inhabitants, who were already weary of the tyranny of their French rulers. Had the allies prevailed in Germany, there is no doubt that the whole of Italy would have united to throw off their yoke.

Sir *Hyde Parker* is dead.

February 4.

The French papers bring a proclamation, in which the emperor Bonaparte fays, that England may have peace; provided fhe will reduce her maritime eftablifhments!!

We underftand Mr. Fox has already fent difpatches to all our minifters at