of this pamphlet, although he should exceed Bacon in genius, or Newton in intensity of thought. I must defend myself, the knife is at my throat. I have no more time for argument, but if you will upon it I will fight you. Sir, I have tried, but I could not get through this work. I found it so wire drawn—the thread so fine that I could neither see nor feel it,—such a tangled cobweb of contradictions that I was obliged to give it up. The first thing that struck me on opening it was the peculiar infelicity with which it had surrendered the matter in dispute. And if this appeared at once, to my unlearned eyes, do gentlemen suppose it will not be detected on the other side of the Atlantic?—That it will receive no abler examination there, than the feeble and cursory one that I have given it. And after all, what does it contain? A remedy for the evil? No, a formal declaration that we are diseased.—Sir, we wanted no ghost to tell us that. It required no extraordinary exertion of learning or genius, to shew, that we had, indeed, delicate subjects of difference with Great Britain;—the question is how shall they be adjusted. We want the opinion of the doctor on the mode of treatment, and don't choose to be referred to the apothecary, because the superior does not choose to risk his reputation in a dubious case.

A gentleman from Pennsylvania has told us that G. Britain is our commercial rival. But does not the gentleman know that the very term implies a correlative. That if she is your commercial rival, you are her commercial rival also. This is the very view that I have been endeavoring to take of the subject, to impress on the committee;——to warn the nation against being drawn into a war of commercial rivalship. Sir, when men fall out about women they are not apt to call in some learned doctor to decide the dispute—they yield to feeling or instinct—just so with nations, commercial nations especially differing on interest, which is their instinct. And would gentlemen wish to excite this young nation, as yet in the gristle, to a foreign contest with G. Britain, in the full strength of manhood? I speak of *foreign* war.—The will and ability to defend ourselves is one thing,—to act 3,000 miles off, another. They may rely as much as they please upon the French emperor's making a separate peace with the continent, to the exclusion of G. Britain. If she puts out her strength, you will feel it. This proposition will subject her to all the evils of an American war without any of the concomitant advantages. And can you expect a tame acquiescence on her part? If her minister be not a bastard; if he has one drop of the blood of Chatham in his veins he will die contending for the liberties of his country sooner than surrender her independence. He will do it. No, sir, whatever I may think of the vices and corruptions of the government of that country, I must applaud her intelligence and spirit, must admire her ability, wisdom and strength.

But another gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Smilie) asks if it is not astonishing that a man, whom he allows to possess common sense, whom he represents as trembling at the power of Great Britain, should be making calculations of the future power of France, instead of guarding against the immediate danger? Sir, France may become a naval power——G. Britain never can be a military one. I ask any practical man, if the day can ever arrive when G. Britain will be able to threaten the safety of the continent of Europe or America, or dictate to either of them. Is it my fault that the gentleman cannot, or will not see this, because (as he tells you) fools and madmen can never be brought to believe that the spirit of God hath passed them by, and enlightened the understandings of other men. But to shew that this is not just cause of war we are referred to the time of the stamp-act and the non-importation agreement of 1774, which did not (it seems) produce immediate war. Is there any analogy between the two cases? We then formed one nation. A man may make a great sacrifice to preserve his friend, but when he has lost him, he will (as has been seen to-day) be denounced as the bitterest enemy. The other instances are equally defective and inapplicable. You may as well go back to the flood. The same gentleman enquires, are you indeed so peaceable towards England, who has trampled upon you, and hostile to France who has offered you no injury? Wherefore? On this occasion I must repeat the old proverb, 'tis the still hog that drinks the swill. She finds it convenient to make a miserable stalking horse, a scare-crow of Spain. The gentleman enquires how long G. Britain has acted upon these philanthropic principles; this generous benevolent policy ascribed to her. But is any man so *weak*, or so wicked as to pretend that there is any principle of action between nations except *interest?* Give G. Britain the power, and she will to-morrow play the same part. Sir, we are not theophilanthropists, but politicians; not dreamers and soothsayers, but men of flesh and blood. 'Tis idle to talk of a sense of justice in any nation. Each pursues its sense of interest, and if you calculate on their acting upon any other principle, you may be very amiable, but you will prove a cully. We are asked what G. Britain can do to annoy us. We answer at this moment more than any other nation of the world, because she commands the ocean, the sole medium of communication between us. But draw her off from that element, and France is not less omnipotent upon it. She is a great military power, and it is because Britain is not, cannot be such a power, that it is impolitic to break her down. Go to war when you will, you must become the ally of France, you will only put off, by enhancing it, the danger you would guard against. You will but clap a tortoise under your elephant.

The same gentleman tells you that the gigantic power of France hangs on the brittle life of an individual. But do you believe it? Are you such drivellers in politics as to believe that the fate of such a military despotism hangs on the life of one man. If Mahomet II. had been killed under the walls of Constantinople, would the destiny of the Greek empire have been changed? Would not the power have passed into the hands of some Solyman or Selim, the terror of the civilized world? Shall we abandon practice for theory?

In some respects we are situated as the successors of Alexander were placed in relation to Rome and Carthage. Here is an iron republic, or call it what you will, that threatens the liberties of mankind: The government above all others, in Europe, to which our own is most hateful and obnoxious. This is beyond dispute. Does it become us to facilitate its designs? I do not enquire as to motives, nor will that government care about them. If you give it facilities to effect its purposes, those purposes are obtained so far as depends on you. Is this wise, is it proper, is it right? Am I asked for my plan? If I meant to act efficiently, I would have begun with an embargo—I would now do what was done before—I would treat with G. Britain, and for the very reason that I would not have treated with her, in the year 1794; for the same reason that the gentleman, whose resolution is now under discussion, then treated with her, I would not: now, he is for war, I am for negociation and peace. And why? Because the state of nations has since undergone a momentous change: disastrous changes indeed have been effected in the face of things. We often hear of the abuses and corruptions of the British government; whilst the continental despotisms pass unnoticed and unregarded. Let us beware of introducing such abuses into our own—We have no farther concern with them. Do gentlemen think worse of the character and motives of William Pitt than of Robespierre, and yet, monster as he was, Robespierre—that cannibal of his own countrymen, was in his day the sole bulwark of the human race. And whatever be her motives, or professions, G. Britain now stands exactly in the place of France twelve years ago. Take her navy out of the way to-morrow, and where are you? The secretary of the navy has indeed reported that the Chesapeake is fit for service, and that the Constitution is in a state of thorough repair, but would, the real *Chesapeake*, the *bay*, be fit for use in that case, and what would be the operation on the actual constitution of the U. S.? Sir, I am opposed to a French war as well as to a war with England. I would treat with England for another reason. I wish we had not a commercial treaty with any nation whatever. I am opposed to them on principle: but the principle is already settled. We have them. By your treaties with her enemies your hands are tied up from taking against them, any such measure as the one proposed: *they* are to be admitted on the terms of the most favored nation. This is probably one of the principal causes of disgust to England. Again, she made an offer to repeal her discriminating duties, if you would do so too; to trade with us upon even terms. By mercantile clamour you were deterred from meeting her half way: moreover, you have refused to ratify treaties with her, after they had been signed by your own minister. No doubt you had the right to do so. But can you be surprised under such circumstances that a haughty commercial rival has been irritated. After your oblations to France, who cannot receive a single pound of sugar, or coffee, but under cover of your flag, who is dependent upon you for services which she cannot render herself, who is *not* your rival in commerce, what can you expect from a jealous competitor in trade who stands not in need of your navigation—whose every advance towards a good understanding has received a mortifying repulse? Sir, you have at this moment a negociation pending with G. Britain. You have no cause to despair of its success: far otherwise. The plain question is, will you await its issue, or will you, *pendente lite*, precipitate yourself into a measure, which must put all negociation aside, which must eventuate in war. If you want war, there is no doubt that you may have it. Great Britain will not submit to all the hardships and mischiefs of war, because you choose to call it peace. She will prefer open war to war in disguise: and I, sir, have no hesitation in saying that I am for no half measures. Begin that system when you will, war, or disgrace must grow out of it. I am for neither. The gentleman indeed says that this, which has been denounced as a war measure, is a measure of peace. Let us have no more *quasi* wars I beseech you, sir—no half measures, no intermediate stage, but open war, or peace. I abhor this political quackery. Give us war, or negociation—if you resort to the one, let us abandon the other. But we are asked if American virtue will so far degrade and debase itself as to treat with the old and corrupt government of England. There is a plain answer to this. You have a treaty with her now, with every government, I believe, that would make one with you. But whilst we boast of our virtue, let us beware that our own sins are not cast into our teeth. Let us see, how far these punctilios are warranted by the conduct of our own agents. Look to the management of the convention of Paris, of the 30th April, 1803. You have all seen the case of the N. Jersey, Nicklin and Griffith's ship. It has created a general sensation. And yet what is the fact. Compared with others, they have almost nothing to complain of. Bad as that case is, it is amongst the least exceptionable instances of misconduct in your ministry at Paris. It is true Nicklin and Griffith's claim was cut down, I believe one half, because the sum appropriated would not otherwise (it was feared) be sufficient to answer all the drafts of chicanery upon it. These men were therefore mulcted fifty per cent! They are rich merchants—able to make their case known. It has been heard, and has rung thro' the continent. There are hundreds of cases even worse than this. The claims intended to be provided for are set aside. Why? Because government has been represented abroad by unfaithful, dishonest agents. Have they been called to account for their conduct? Three millions seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars stipulated to be paid, to bona fide American citizens—where have they gone? Into the pockets of renegadoes and the bureaux of Paris. Yes, the traders in neutral character have divided the spoil with the harpies of the French bureaux. These are they, in whose favor the bills have been drawn on the treasury of the U. S. by their own minister. Take the case of the Pigou—There was no question, indeed as to her being American property—but she was captured *flagrante bello*:—(when we were taking the Insurgente and Berceau) she was therefore good prize, and condemned accordingly. Yet the decision of the inferior court was reversed by the council of prizes, & this case brought within the convention—to the exclusion no doubt of bona fide claims for *neutral* American property captured and condemned, and for which the convention was intended to provide. This is a specimen of the mode of doing business at Paris. If gentlemen doubt upon the subject, let them call on the secretary of state, for the correspondence of the commissioners. Let them call for John Mercer, one of those commissioners, a man inferior to few in point of talents; in point of character to none. Put him to the bar and examine him.

Painful as it is to me I must defend my principles and those of my friends. Open your statute book—what does it say? That the shores and waters of the bay and river Mobille shall form a district—I brought in the bill myself. The executive had informed us, that we had purchased from France as far as the Perdido to the east.—We legislated upon it. Whence have arisen your disputes with Spain—From Pensacola or St. Augustine? No—from the very country which the statute book says is yours—in your own collection district are Spanish duties exacted and paid,—from this very quarter incursions have been made into the old United States. Do gentlemen believe that this fact will be lost on Great Britain? But we are asked (by Mr. Smilie) what has she to do with differences between us and Spain?—What right has she to interfere, to enquire, or even to know, to seem conscious of what has passed in that quarter? Is this intended as a serious question? Because you have clapped a padlock upon your own mouths and wilfully shut your eyes, do you expect to hoodwink an eagle-eyed adversary? 'Tis in vain to expect that any nation in her intercourse with you, will be blind to your conduct towards others—Great Britain must shut her eyes, and ears too, not understand the state of things here—at least negatively speaking. She must know that you have taken no imposing attitude towards Spain, done nothing to strengthen the Southern frontiers—made no addition to your naval or military force, left even the militia *in statu quo ante*. Because the doors have been shut, can people be brought to believe that we have raised armies and equipped fleets in conclave? I never heard sir, but of one army incog. and that was levied by the facetious Mr. Bayes for the service of the stage, not of the state—and from some dramatic specimens which I have lately seen, I should not be surprised to hear of a similar project being started on this floor. G. Britain will see, then, what has *not* been your proceeding towards Spain. She will say, shall I suffer myself to be browbeaten by a nation, clamouring for the right of highway, that has not spirit enough to defend her own domicile? If A. acts like a poltroon towards B. who has commited a gross outrage upon him, and shall have a subsequent controversy with C. shall he pretend to bully him, and expect C. not to call to mind his cowardly behaviour with B. and treat him accordingly? One foreign nation will be influenced, will be governed in her concerns with you by your concessions to another—and it is the idlest thing in the world to expect that your treatment by one government will not have an effect on the deportment of others towards you.

One word more, sir, before I conclude. Gentlemen miscalculate if they suppose that mere *authority* (much less at second hand) will do for us. They must shew us something better before we swallow their resolution. 'Tis an infirmity, sir, of my nature that I cannot yield to the imposing sound of great names—they never did and they never shall put me to silence, or drive me from my purpose. I am apprized of the secret denunciations which are on foot, and I despise them. They shall never affect me—I came into public life with these principles, and I will leave it with them, leave it when I may.

(To be Continued.)

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, MARCH 28.

On Sunday the 30th March the Rev. Mr. HARGROVE of Baltimore will deliver a discourse in the Capitol on the subject of the *MOSAIC CREATION.*

On Wednesday the bill prohibiting the importation of certain [British] goods, wares and merchandise, passed the House of Representatives by a majority of 61 votes. The Yeas and Nays were as follows:

YEAS.—Messrs Alexander, Alston, jun. Anderson, Bard, Barker, Bassett, Bedinger, Bidwell, Blackledge, Blake, jun. Blount, Brown, Butler, G. W. Campbell, Chandler, Claiborne, Clark, J. Clay, M. Clay, Clinton, jun. Clopton, Conrad, Cook, Covington, Crowninshield, Cutts, Darby, Dawson, Dickson, Earle, Early, Elliot, Elmer, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Fowler, Goodwin, Gray, Gregg, Green, Halsey, Hamilton, Helms, Holmes, Jackson, Jones, Kenan, Knight, Lyon, Mac Farland, Magruder, Marion, Masters, M'Creery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, Jeremiah Morrow, John Morrow, Mumford, R. Nelson, Newton, jun. Nicholson, Olin, Pugh, T. M. Randolph, Rea of Pen. Rhea, of Ten. Richards, Russell, Sailly, Sammons, Schuneman, Seaver, Sloan, Smilie, J. Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanton, Thomas, Tracy, Van Cortlandt, Varnum, Wilton, J. Whitehill, R. Whitehill, D. R. Williams, M. Williams, N. Williams, Wilson, Winn, and Winston.—93.

NAYS.——Messrs. Betton, Broom, J. Campbell, Chittenden, Dana, Davenport, jun. Ellis, Ely, Garnett, Hastings, Hough, Lewis, jun. Mosley, J. Nelson, Pitken, jun. Quincy, J. Randolph, Sandford, J. C. Smith, Spalding, Stanford, Stedman, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmage, Tenney, P. R. Thompson, T. W. Thompson, Trigg, Van Rensselaer, Verplanck, and Wadsworth.—32.

By comparing this vote with that given on the resolution, which formed the basis of the bill, it will be found that the vote of approbation has received a considerable accession of strength. This has, in some degree, arisen from several of the republican members, who were originally the friends of stronger measures, conceding their own opinions to what, on discussion, appeared to be the general sentiment, or from a change of opinion, the offspring of a more mature and dispassionate reflection.

Such is the greatness of the majority in favor of this measure, and so irresistibly does this majority prove it to be consentaneous with the voice of the American people, that we hazard very little in considering it in the light of a measure already clothed with the efficacy of a law. For, it is scarcely to be expected, that the Senate, even did they entertain a different impression from the immediate representatives of the people, would oppose their will to that of the nation. This issue is the less to be expected from a body, which, from various intimations of its sentiments, appears to be animated by like feelings and views with the House of Representatives.

Our congratulations on the adoption of this measure will not, from these considerations, be viewed as premature. Exercising that liberty of opinion, which is the pride of every American, & which we hope and believe will endure forever, we do not hesitate to say that our individual opinions were most friendly to the measure recommended by Mr. Gregg's resolution. Nothing, which we have heard, has induced us to abandon this conviction. Nor is it certain—we cannot say even probable—that this measure would not have received the sanction of a majority of the votes of the members of the House of Representatives. Our prevailing opinion is that it would have commanded a majority.

But on this occasion, as on most, if not all of the great occasions, which have occurred since our country assumed the character of an independent nation, a spirit of harmony, accommodation and compromise, has illustrated our counsels, which will convince our enemies that they will be the dupes of a miserable delusion, if they flatter themselves with deriving any advantages from our internal divisions. It was this spirit, equally evincive of the virtue and wisdom of the American character, which made us an independent nation, and which carried us, with triumph, through the perils of a desolating war; it was this spirit, that reared the proud monument of our glory and prosperity; and it is to this same spirit that we owe the measure which is the subject of these animadversions.

When the discussion commenced, it was soon perceived that the republican members of the Eastern and Middle states were, with but few exceptions, in favor of Mr. Gregg's resolution. Such was the fact relatively to Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; while at the same time it counted among its friends many members from the other states. These members believed that this measure would be most likely to coerce Britain into a relinquishment of her unjust conduct; they likewise believed, while it had this effect on her, that so far as it operated harshly on ourselves, it would operate equally and impartially. That this would have been the case, had it gone into operation, we have no doubt. But the representatives of the Southern and Western states thought differently. They declared that it would fall with peculiar and fatal injury on their interests—that it would be destructive to the interests of agriculture. At the same time that they avowed this conviction, they manifested no reluctance to express their indignation at the wrongs of Britain, or their readiness to avenge them. To manifest the sincerity of their professions, which was indeed indisputable, they offered to meet their political friends on lower ground, connected with a pledge that, if this should not prove efficient, they would unhesitatingly unite in the adoption of stronger measures. This address to the magnanimity of the Eastern and Middle sections of the nation was irresistible. The offer was accepted, and with it fell all local and professional divisions. Southern, as opposed to Eastern interests, or Middle interests as opposed to both, instantly vanished, and agriculture and commerce met on that ground of common interest, on which, in truth, neither can stand without the support of the other. It will be seen by looking over the names of those who voted for the bill, that it combined in its favor a majority of the members from the states of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio; and that the only states, which have given a different vote, viz. New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Delaware, are represented by a majority of federal members; and such examination will further shew, that of the minority eight only are republican, the remaining twenty-four being federal members, and systematic opponents of republican measures.

Let it not then be said the republican members of Congress are disunited, when of one hundred and one republican votes, there are but eight dissentients. Every man, acquainted with the world, knows that to expect absolute unanimity upon any point relative to men or measures, is chimerical, where the exercise of opinion is free. Where is the religious or political denomination whose disciples agree in all things? If any surprise exist on this occasion, it ought be at the union, instead of discordance of sentiment. Let those who contest this point, adduce an instance of any political question of equal importance carried by such a vote?

Yes, fellow citizens and fellow-republicans of America, we rejoice at the adoption of this measure. It is a pledge of union among us, and, we trust, a forerunner of a good understanding with Britain. That nation is entitled to our respect and is worthy of our esteem. We wish them well. Let them be just, & the ties that unite us need not be severed. Our prospect brightens. The affairs of that nation are transferred to men, whose past lives are a pledge that they will be animated by principles of honor, of justice, and of reciprocity. Our determination to take vigorous measures, our having actually taken them, by demonstrating the sense of this nation, and proving their unabated confidence in the Executive administration of their government, whose conduct needs but examination to be approved, will, we hope, strengthen these suggestions of honorable minds, and prostrate the barriers that intervene between the friendship of the two nations. At all events, be the issue what it may, we shall have done our duty, and will feel the precious consciousness which it always inspires.

We make the following extract from the [London] Morning Chronicle of January 3rd. As this is the print which has for a long series of years possessed the confidence of the Whigs of Great Britain, and been the organ of their sentiments, the opinions it announces, justify a hope that like sentiments are entertained by the new administration, and more especially Mr. Fox:

"We this day insert a copy of the speech of the President of the U. S. of America on the opening of Congress. It states, strongly, the complaints of the Americans respecting the depredations committed on their trade upon their own coasts, and states that measures had been adopted to repress such outrages, which appear mostly to have been done by vessels without commissions, or exceeding their commissions. The disputes with Spain about Louisiana are mentioned, and the whole of the case between the two powers is to be laid before Congress.

"The part of the speech which will be found most interesting here, is that which alludes to the capture of American vessels by our ships, on the ground of their aiding the enemy. From the attention we have had time this day to bestow upon it, we are inclined to think that, both from the disposition of the President and the point he states to be in dispute, the matter may be amicably adjusted. It never can be pretended, nor do we believe is pretended, by this country, that we have a right to prevent neutrals carrying on all that commerce with enemies which we permit to ourselves during war.—We cannot with justice accuse others of aiding the enemy if we do the very things ourselves which constitutes that aid. But it is probable, however, that the Americans will claim a much greater latitude of neutral commerce.

"The President, in the present circumstances, recommends putting the coast in a state of defence, and preparing the public force by sea and land for action, if necessary."