NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VI. | WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. | No. DCCCLVIII.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. | WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1806. | *PAID IN ADVANCE.*

A LIST OF LETTERS,
Remaining in the Post Office at Washington city, on the 1st day of April 1806.

A.—Jonathan Arnold, William Abbott 2, Peter Allen, Thomas G. Addison, E. Avery, Anthony Addison, Lieut. George Armistead, Mr. Anderson, John Armstrong, Jacob W. Albright 4, Thomas Arnold 3.

B.—Mrs. S. Bacon, captain Benjamin Briggs 2, Richard Butler 2, lieutenant Charles A Budd, rev'd Stephen Bovalle, William Bazvan, Phillis Burr, Theodore Burr, Frederick Betz, Samuel Brooke, Alexander Brent, rev'd John Brackenridge, doctor Edward Briscoe, William Bainbridge, William Ballard, James Barry carpenter, John Bowin, William Brent, Eleanor M. Brown, James M. Bradford, Wilson Brown, George Budd, David Bassarn, mr. Brown 2, captain Robert Bailley 3, Johnson Blakely, Benjamin Brown, William Barton, esq. Ignatius Boone of Nichs. mrs. Rebecca Bickly.

C.—William Cowan, John Coval, lieut. Eli B. Clinison, Dores Chrous, Smith Craven, George Chism 3, Thomas Cantfield, James Chamberlain, Louis Chadiure, William Coffee, esq. John H. Carr, esq. George Carroll, Mary A. Caton, Robert Coane 4, Enoch Campbell, David J. Cox, dr. Peter Custis, Joseph Cuvera, esq. captain Hugh Geo. Campbell, Thomas Clark, Archibald Cheshire 4, John Clark, gen. Henry Caroery, Joseph Cobb, John S. Crawford, Adam Cuzan, George Cozens.

D.—Captain Decatur, Aaron Dayton, William Dolley, William Dunlap, Plumard Derieux, miss Sally Davis, David Duncan, esq. Lewis De Mun, captain John H. Dent, John Darby, Silas Dinsmoor 4, miss Dur, Joseph Duncastle, Jeremiah Donovan, Joseph Duly, William Dilman, Gustavus Douglass 2, Matthew Davis, Robert Deverson, miss Catherine Derrer, mr. Dehor, captain Thomas Dulton, mr. Deyleson.

E.—Rufus Easton, esq. 3, St. Clair Elliott, John H. Elton 2, Jesse D. Elliott, Edward Evans, Elizabeth Evanans, Francis Eppes.

F.—Thomas Freeman, messrs. D. Floyd and William Chambers, esqs. Henry Fisher, Robert Fell, Isaac Foster 2, captain John Francis, Elizabeth Flanagan, mrs. Charlotte Fitzhugh 2, Richard Farrell.

G.—Lewis H. Guerlain, esq. 12, William Gantt, Jacob Gibson, esq. William Green 4, Johanna Gallaspy, Catharine Gardiner, Hezzy Gatton, Robert H. Goldsborough, James Gardner, Joseph Gray.

H.—Mr. John Heath 2, captain Halsselle, Nathaniel H. Heath, Robert Howison, miss Susannah Hutchins, care of Richard Cutts, esq. midshipman Wm. E. Hill 2, doctor J. L. Henry 3, Thomas Haughy, Elizabeth Hughes 2, John Henricks, Mary Horner, doctor Elisha Harrison.

I.—Catharine Jauvier, mr. C. Janson, mr. Thomas Jenkin, Kinsey Johns 2, William Henry Jackson 2, hon. judge Johnson, Charles Jouett, Susan Johnson, William Jones, care of Thomas Hutchison, Samuel Johnson, John Innis 2.

K.—James Kenan, Jacob Klieber, mr. Kusick, John Kale, Richard King, Edward P. Kennedy 2, George Kennedy.

L.—Captain Meriwether Lewis, lieut. John Livington, John Lincoln 2, Abraham B. Lindsly 2, Morris Lewis, miss Sarah Lowmox, Law and Bruce 2, John Lowery, Isaac Lewis, Alexander Laws 3, Andrew Leddy, Jeremiah Love, B. H. Latrobe, esq.

M.—Mrs. Jane Murray, colonel John Mercer 2, mrs. Hannah Maxwell, John Ripley Madison, lieut. George Morrill, captain John McClellan 2, Obadiah Maurice, John N. Maus 2, William Morton, esq. 3, captain Len. Mackall, William S. Moore, Elizabeth R. Morris, Briston Mayo, William Mattox, Washington Morton, esq. 2, colonel Return J. Meigs 3, Malcolm McGee, Franklin Metcalf, Eliakim Morse 3, Jacob Miller, Moses Mershon, John Moore, captain Alexander Murray 3, John Maysey, John Mackey, William Minchin, Francis Marion, jun. general Francisco de Miranda.

N—Benjamin Naylor, Jeremiah Nelson, John Nelson, John M. Noyes, Miss Frances W. Nance, doctor Joseph W. New, Rebecca Nalley, Peter Norbury, John M. Nally.

O—Major Ogden, Nathaniel Ownes, Samuel Overton.

P—Garrett Penderghast, William Prentis, Mr Potts, Mr. Pitman, lieutenant Daniel N. Patterson, Joseph Persons, lieutenant R. Pinckney, 2, John Pringle, Ralph Potts, Robert Patterson, Miss Ann Fryse, William Pitman, Edward Preble, 2, James Pebels, Norman Prindle, Miss Milly Perry, Mrs. Price.

Q—Henry Quinley, esq. 2.

R—James R. Rodgers, Madame La Bland de la Rochefaucault, Joseph Reilly, George H. Rodgers, Mr. Terrien de Rivere, Miss Ridenhouse, Charles D. Ross, esq. Lewis F. Rush.

S—Captain Amos Stoddard, John Saunders, esq. Jonathan Shoemaker, 2, doctor Simeon Smith, William S. Shaw, Gilbert Stewart, captain James Somerville, Miss Eliza Swaine, John Smith, esq. 2, Mrs. Merier Smith, George Stanley, 2, William Scott, William Sprague, 2, captain John Shaw, Michael Sheely, 2, Walter B. Smallwood, Rays Sands, Samuel Shuter, William Spelman, Eliza Shorter, George Singleton, John B. Scott, colonel commandant, 10, John Strode, esq. 3, Enoch Silsby, 2, Samuel Shaw, Hugh Steel.

T—Charles Tomkins, 3, Charles Tuckett, esq. John Lloyd Tilghman, John Tulk, Richard Teril, Miss E. Thomas, William Tilghman.

V—Joseph Varden, Lewis Valli, 2, colonel James Van, John Vermonet, Martin Volch.

W—Joseph I. Wood, esq. Thomas Watson, Timothy Winn, Molly Wright, Thomas Walbert, John Winthrop, esq. Walter Winton, esq. Francis White, Henry R. Warfield, James Wallis, Henry Waddell, George S. Washington, captain Richard Whiley, 2, Francis Wayne, Isaac Williams, captain Thomas Wiley.

Y—John Yerby.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, MARCH .

DEBATE
On Mr. GREGG's Resolution.

[CONTINUED.]

MR. D. R. WILLIAMS.—Mr. Chairman, I feel the necessity of appologising to the committee for that portion of their time which I shall occupy; not presuming to offer reasons to others why this resolution should not to be adopted, I beg their indulgence, while I do that which presents itself at the time as a duty, to declare what are my reasons for voting against it; the deep stake my constituents hold in the measure is my apology.

Such is the magnitude of the subject under discussion, spreading itself over a prodigious extent, running to the heart of some of our most valuable institutions, subverting unmeasurably the plighted faith of the government and overturning the foundations of a considerable portion of our revenue, that I feel myself inadequate to trace its influence over even a ramification of that vast interest it lays hold of, much less, do I pretend to a view of the whole ground; but, imperfect as that comprehension is, it takes in much more than sufficient to fill me with fear and trembling for its consequences.

We have heard during the present, and the three last days discussion, a great deal said about the spirit of the nation, and that it demands energetic measures. Sir, I ask the gentlemen who urge this as an argument, if there had been as much pains taken, to apprise the nation of its true position with Great Britain as there has been to alarm it, whether its anxiety would not have been, at least by this time, quieted? If gentlemen, standing in such a responsible situation to their constituents, as they do upon this floor, had, instead of urging war measures, spoke out the plain language of truth, that at the date of Mr. Monroe's last dispatches, Lord Mulgrave had acceded to his request, to enter upon an examination of the dispute between the two governments, whether they would now venture to represent the spirit of the nation as excited in every part of the continent? I presume not. But whence do they learn that this spirit is so excited? It is true we have received spirited resolutions from two towns in Virginia, and a few well written memorials from a few merchants at a few of the seaport towns, refuting the British doctrine; but what else do they say? At Baltimore they believe "redress for the past may be found in amicable explanations." From Philadelphia, you are called upon for a naval force on the West India station; for what? to defend their trade to St. Domingo I suppose; for that appears to be the pith of the memorial. The merchants of New York pledge themselves to support "all measures *adopted*," reserving to themselves the right to judge, not such measures as may be adopted by Congress. From Boston "a special mission" is recommended. The inhabitants of the town of Salem tell you "they wish to take no part in the contests, which now convulse the world." Where else, than from these documents do gentlemen find the spirit of the nation? Certainly not from the cabinet, not from the executive; for if it were good authority, to talk about what we hear out of this House, they have no such wishes. Is it fair then to force the passage of this resolution, by attributing that to the nation, which perhaps it does not feel, which it certainly would not, if it were fully apprized of its situation abroad, and which the memorials on your table do not speak. Does the resolution provide for "amicable explanations," for a "special mission," for a squadron on the West India station? No such thing, sir.

In arguing this subject it is material to ascertain what is the true cause of our present dispute with Great Britain and to what extent it goes. I say cause of dispute, because it strikes me that, had not the present difficulty arisen, her insults offered in the impressment of our seamen, were in train for amicable adjustment, and will be arranged when the present uneasiness shall be quieted. It cannot be unknown to gentlemen that an investigation of that subject was nearly completed, and in fact would have been, but for the hasty departure of our then minister, from the court of St. James.

It is taken for granted, that the present aggravations originated in her attempts to cramp, say destroy, if gentlemen like it better, our carrying trade. This is the grand pivot on which, the whole machinery of national honor, and dignity, and wrongs, and insults, are made to turn. Yes, sir, this carrying trade which Spain and Portugal once shared, but could not retain, which Holland attempted to monopolize, which Van Trump and De Ruyter fought for, but which she was obliged to relinquish; this carrying trade is the bone of contention for which, the sweat, the blood, the lives and fortunes of the American people are to be lavished in maintaining: and what is this carrying trade? Is it any thing different from a partial right which, but a very small part of the community can enjoy, which but a small portion of that part do improve? Is it not a right which is still problematical, whether the exercise is of real national utility? There are many who believe it has been of no solid advantage to G. Britain herself, notwithstanding she has possessed a much greater share of it than any other nation. Certainly it has been the cause of several long and ruinous wars to her, and if we look back a little upon our own experience, we shall see it has been the germ from which has sprung all our difficulties with that government since the commencement of a political hurricane, the French revolution. Since that period our commerce has become a rival of increasing strength, with that of G. Britain, and finding it to grow in this branch above competition, to the exclusion of hers, she has commenced a system to counteract it, and has commenced it, I have no hesitation in saying mildly, to what it will progress, if we drive her to it. Gentlemen are surely not unmindful of the untamable pride of that ministry; they cannot forget that it is formed of men who, never do acts of aggression by halves, and who feel no other restraints than those of power: national rights, injuries and insults, are not graduated on the scale of their policy. The only enquiries with them are, can we gain by the war? Is this the time to strike the first blow with the most effect? I need not give an instance of this fact; If G. Britain ever had waited for a *just* cause of war, that is when she wished for it, we might console ourselves with our safety in agreeing to this resolution; but it is well known that she never did, and in my opinion, with her present minister, she never will. Do gentlemen then wish for war? How is it possible they can believe, this measure will not produce it? Sir, I would rather vote for war, than for the resolution, and indisputably it would be the better of the two evils; because under the operation of the resolution G. Britain can amuse you with negociation, till she had completed her precautionary measures, and would then break it off, or what is worse, commence the war first, and make that the denouncement to your peace commissioners; whereas the reverse would be the effect under a prompt declaration of war; here we should strike the first blow; she holds upwards of 20,000,000 dollars of your public debt; her merchants and capitalists, notwithstanding the declaration to the contrary, by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Jos. Clay) I believe, have additional enormous sums in this country; if you suffer these to slip through your fingers, you may as well whistle, as attempt to make an impression upon her afterward. I know, sir, the treaty of 1794 bars this measure; but this committee are not now to learn that G. Britain herself has given frequent proofs that the parchments of peace have no influence over the deeds of war; the order of the day would be to do each other the most harm, and we certainly should not be so squeamish, as to be restricted by the provisions of a treaty which never ought to have been made, from inflicting the worst punishment upon our enemy. But, sir, neither of these measures need be resorted to. If gentlemen will only delay the decision, and they appear very much disposed to do so, just time enough for fair discussion, they will see that this resolution goes to the destruction of the great mass of the community, to the entire sacrifice of the whole of the agricultural interest, to the probable advantages of a small portion of the commercial world. There cannot be a clearer position than this; the whole of the agricultural will be sacrificed to a part of the mercantile interest. A trade which must be supported by such means is not worth preserving; it is in no way reciprocal, and never can be carried on to the advantage of the whole nation, while its circumstances are so desperate, as to involve the peace and happiness of the country.

It is fair to draw a comparison between this favorite branch of commerce, to support which, the whole energies of the nation are to be held in requisition, and the other branches. What does it yield to the revenue? The secretary of the treasury, eagle-eyed as he is, has searched the whole record through to the last page, and has not been able to discover more than 850,000 dollars per annum.—Are gentlemen prepared thus to relinquish the sources, to cut up by the roots, the supplies to government of at least 6,212,000 dollars; I take this to be the amount of revenue collected from the imports this resolution will prohibit; I ask are gentlemen willing to relinquish 6,212,000 dollars, to preserve 850,000? To say nothing about the immense disadvantage the causes of such conduct should be most cogent and necessitous. Are there any such causes? To men whose minds are inflated with those high notions of honor and dignity, which have been the burthen of every war speech to the British parliament, and to maintain which, poor John Bull has waded up to his eyes in national debt and national misery, there may be such causes: but to men of plain understanding, who measure the quantum of national honor and dignity abroad, by the degree of national happiness and virtue at home; and who understanding nothing more or less by these terms, than blood and taxes on the people, there have been no such causes offered. Sir, I will never vote to plunge this nation into a war. I believe this resolution to be nothing short of it, to preserve the foreign, partial, privileges and advantages of any set of men, or the separate interest of any description of the community whatever. By war we can gain nothing, we have every thing to lose; many years should roll over us before we admit more than one cause of war, when negociation has been exhausted.—There is a line round this country which when trespassed on, should burst the faculties of every man's soul into hatred; should kindle all the fiery particles of his system into a flame of vengeance and redress; it is upon such an occasion, when the whole mass, when the people are invaded, we should think of war, not when a few merchants find themselves hampered by foreign commercial regulations: there are other remedies for this disease; war is worse than the disease itself. I spurn the thought of relinquishing any one right of our fellow-citizens, I only wish to shew that this is not the measure best calculated for the present injuries. And am I therefore an enemy of the merchants? A hatred of war measures does not involve the idea; but I freely declare I am not; there are many among them whom I respect, some I love; and when such permanent commercial regulations shall be proposed, which shall secure to the merchant his rights and privileges, without endangering the peace of the nation, I will then prove as friendly to his interest, as I possibly can be, on any other occasion, to any separate interest whatever.

Sir, I am opposed to this resolution, because when you have deprived the government of the revenue which is derived from the importations contemplated to prohibit, I know not how the deficiency is to be made good. Gentlemen have digested this subject, perhaps they do. I shall be glad to hear from what source they will secure to the nation, the permanent appropriation of 8,000,000 dollars for the redemption of the public debt; how will they effect the disbursements of the civil and the pension lists? How pay the army? How support the navy? A very important item, sir. That navy upon which has been, and I am sorry to say, still are squandered, such enormous sums of money, that even the secretary himself cannot tell what it will cost to repair a single frigate. That navy, for the support of which, the expenditures for the last year exceeded the estimates, by at least sixty per cent. That curious navy, indeed, which costs less to keep the whole in actual service than a part; for such is made to appear by the report of estimates and details of expenditures on the table.

When the advocates of the resolution have done this, when they have provided for the ordinary, I shall be glad to hear from them on the extraordinary expences of government. One party are determined to fortify New York, where immense sums have been already expended; New Port must not be forgotten, for there too has been a scene of prodigious folly and extravagance; Baltimore is not safe; Norfolk is exposed; Charleston is in danger. I have a letter in my pocket from the Governor of South Carolina, which states, that there is mounted upon the ruined fortifications of Charleston, but one gun, and that is a four pounder, on a crazy carriage. At one time you hear that your ports & harbours must be fortified, at another, with all the solemnity of a death warning, your navy must be augmented; in the name of God where is all the money to come from! Is that single solitary million about which so much has been said, to do all this? I believe, and I trust there will be a majority with me, that neither of these measures are necessary, if you will pursue a line of conduct, just to yourselves, prudent and moderate to others. I would rather ask, why are all these extravagancies to be blundered into? Are gentlemen determined on war? If so, let them speak manly and outright, and then we shall understand each other; but I suspect not, considering the quarter the resolution came from. Why then all this rashness, all this eagerness to rush into the mischiefs which hastened the ruin of the former administration, and into war measures, when peace is as desirable now, as it ever was, and is as easily maintained? The nation is prosperous and happy; to a degree of prosperity and happiness, the annals of the whole world bear no analogy. Is it prudent, is it wise, is it expedient to tear up the foundations of all this prosperity and happiness, when they are not even threatened by the rough, the unhallowed hand of war? God forbid!

Take the British rule, inforced lately, in its greatest latitude, it does not effect the exportations of your own products in the least, nor your imports for domestic consumption, or the exportation of the surplus of that trade, except as to the regulations of reshipment. Those branches of commerce remain as free and as unshackled as formerly. What is the comparative importance of the carrying trade with these? Their interests run parallel with the other great interests of the community, and are so intimately connected, the vibration of a stroke on one, is sensibly felt by all the rest; but, this other branch, this carrying trade, carries no principle of reciprocation with it; but is entirely confined to the few merchants, who embark in it. In what degree are the general interests of the nation affected, by the right which that honorable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Crowninshield) has, of lading his ship at Batavia with cotton, and carrying it round to Canton upon freight? So far as it yields him a profit I rejoice, and wish to maintain the right for him, but certainly not at the expense of the lives and fortunes of the whole people, especially when they are no sharers with him.

We have witnessed, and sorely felt the injustice and deliberate robbery of Great Britain on a former occasion, to a tenfold greater degree of importance than the present; yet, she retracted her errors and made us amicable adjustment of the injuries. Shall we take the same important stand now, upon a less important occasion, than we did then? I hope not, sir. At any rate, let us go to this work with clean hands; before we attempt to coerce Great Britain into justice, we should set her an example of it. Is there any gentleman in this House prepared to say our merchants have not given some cause of aggression? Have they never been detected covering enemies property? Is it reasonable to believe, there is active American capital enough to carry on the trade of France, Spain, Holland, and our own besides? I presume not, sir. We should look well to our own acts, before we commence war upon another nation for its injustice towards us.

I cannot vote for this resolution. I believe it calculated to produce greater injuries than are now complained of, and not redress for those already committed. I should abuse the indulgence of the committee, to shew that Great Britain would go to war with you, rather than remain at peace under the operation of a law bottomed on this resolution; there is no proposition clearer to my mind. It would be equally a loss of time to prove, that peace is the true interest of this country; the whole nation test it; will you outrage that general sentiment, by adopting the very measure least calculated to procure a change of her injustice?

The influence of this resolution, if agreed to, will be incalculable; thousands of innocent persons must inevitably fall sacrifices to its enormous pressure; it will throw convulsions over the whole body politic; it is to avoid these convulsions, to spare the spasms necessarily resulting therefrom, to every neighbourhood in the United States, that I vote against it.

What will be its operation on the banking interest? Sir, if it could annihilate the whole system, if it could erase every fragment of its massy walls, without tearing down others. I would rejoice, for I believe the very system to be a national curse, erecting the most potent political engine against the freedom of our institutions that can be devised; but this is impossible, the mercantile world is so enveloped in bank influence, that they feel a run on the banks, as they would a shock of electricity. There are established within the United States, not less than eighty banks, which keep afloat certainly at least fifty-five millions of paper dollars; will gentlemen venture on a line of policy which, shall promptly stop, such an immense circulating representative of specie, without previous concert, without previous notice? Indisputably the merchant would be the first victim; but the destruction woul