the means of remittance fail, and your revenue must also feel the shock, and suffer in the same proportion as your importations are lessened. This is a view of the subject, which I presume, deserves, at least the serious considera tion of gentlemen, and I beg of them to pause before they agree to relinquish without a struggle this portion of our national rights. For if you submit in this instance to the interdiction impos ed by G. Britain of carrying colonial produce to the ports of her enemies, she will assuredly advance her pretensi ons as already stated, still further, and insist on the right to prohibit you from supplying them with your own; and it may fairly be asked, on the ground she has taken, where is the difference, between sending colonial produce to her enemies & sending your own produce? The quantum of injury to her, and of benefit to them will be the same—and she will have nearly the same right to prohibit in the one case as in the other. This shews the necessity of taking some decisive step that will convince G. Britain we are determined not to submit to their aggressions, that will tell her in firm and manly language, thus far you may go but not farther. On this subject also our government has remonstrated to that of Great Britain without effect—No satisfactory arrangements could be obtained, and there is no greater prospect of an amicable adjustment of our differences with that nati on at this moment, than there was a year ago, nor have I any idea we shall find ourselves in a better situation, in this respect, one, two, or three years hence, if we tamely acquiesce, than we now are. There is, therefore, no ground for delay—we can derive no benefit from it—this is the time we ought to act the most propitious that is likely to present itself.

I shall in the next place, Mr. Chairman, notice the present state of our relations with Gt. Britain, in order to ascertain whether we are prohibited by any existing treaty or regulation, from adopting such measures in regard to her, as the present state of our affairs may seem to require. We have no commercial treaty with that nation, except in relation to her colonies on the continent of America, adjacent to the U. S. We are therefore at liberty to adopt such regulations in regard to our commerce with her, as our situation may require. We are certainly not bound, before we adopt a commercial regulation, to enquire how Great Britain would approve it—or that it might affect her interest—except so far as to ascertain its efficiency to induce her to remove the grounds of complaint. We undoubtedly have the right to declare with what nation we will carry on commerce, and the nature and extent of that commerce, without giving just cause of war. This is a right inherent in every independent nation—and in the exercise of it we are not to be guided by the power or weakness of the nation it may effect. The right is the same whether Great Britain has one hundred or one thousand ships of war—and if you resign this right to regulate your own commerce, you may as well resign your independence as a nation. But in justifying this conduct towards us, does Great Britain pretend we have acted unfriendly to her? No—she has taken no such ground—except indeed in stating that this part of our commerce is beneficial to her enemies, which would equally apply to any other part of our trade with them. There is, therefore, no concession we can make, consistent with our just rights as a nation, that would be likely to produce a relinquishment on her part of the ground she has taken. Believing, therefore, the conduct of Great Britain to be such, as requires some efficient measure to be taken on our part, and believing also we have a right, without giving just cause of war, to adopt the resolution under consideration, or any other of a similar nature, I shall proceed to inquire the effects such a measure would have on Great Britain, and the probability that it would induce her to do us justice. There is at present annually imported into this country from the dominions of Great Britain, merchandize to the amount of thirty five millions of dollars—for the greater part of which she receives specie, or American produce, equally valuable, and more necessary for her support as a nation. In this trade there is in her favour a balance of twelve millions of dollars. Surely, sir, it can require no argument to convince any man of the vast importance to Great Britain of a trade that furnishes a market for so great a quantity of her produce and manufactures—supplies her in return with those articles, which are most necessary for her support, and produces a balance in her favour of twelve millions of dollars. A total or partial interdiction of this trade would diminish her profits derived therefrom, in proportion to the extent of such interdiction. Her manufactures would remain on hand and rot in her store houses—there would be no demand for them in European markets—when the like articles are furnished from the manufactures of their own countries, and the resources of the nation would suffer in proportion as the trade was stagnated. If we are to pay any regard to the public prints of that nation, we must conclude, such a measure would have a very serious effect upon her interest. They inform us, *that* country would sustain an annual loss of seven millions sterling, by the operation of a measure similar to that before you. Is it likely, sir, her merchants would tamely submit to such a loss? No, they would not—they would call on their government to remove the cause, and their power and influence there, are too well known to believe they would not be heard. Further, Mr. Chairman—such a measure would induce our merchants to seek other markets, where they could vend our produce and receive the necessary supplies. In this Great Britain would discover the dangerous consequences likely to arise from her injustice, and feel sensibly the effects it might produce on her mercantile interest. This measure would have another effect in regard to us. It would render us less dependent than we now are on Great Britain—which I conceive would be a very fortunate circumstance—for I cannot consider it the interest of this country to be united too closely with, or rendered dependent on any foreign nation, by means of mercantile connections with her citizens—and in proportion as our connections with, and dependence on Great Britain, would cease in this respect, in the same proportion we should be freed from foreign influence, and from the effects produced by her mercantile interest on the public mind, in some portions of this country. Permit me here, Mr. Chairman, to notice an observation made by the honorable Speaker, (Mr. Macon) when he enquired why our merchants did not now go to other markets, than those of Great Britain? The answer is obvious, from what has been already said. Many of our merchants are connected with British merchants—many of them the mere factors of British merchants, trading with British capital—such men will not seek other markets, while they are permitted to procure their merchandise in that country, where they have their capital and connections—where they are better known, and have more extensive credit—our real American merchants have also large connections, and extensive credit there, and they will be unwilling to relinquish these, unless government shall, by some effective measure, give a new direction to trade and a new impulse to our commercial affairs. But let this once take place, and I am convinced, our merchants will be able to procure most, if not all, of the articles we consume at other European markets; those of France, Spain, Holland, Italy and Germany, &c. on as good terms, or very nearly so, as in G. Britain; and the channels of trade once changed, Great Britain will find it difficult to restore them to their former direction. This she must know, and when she sees the conduct she is now pursuing will produce this effect, there is reason to believe she will relinquish the ground she has taken and do us justice. It is her interest—it is her true policy to do so.

It is said however, that though we interdict importation from G. Britain, she will be able, notwithstanding, to discharge, or dispose of all her manufactures—that they will find other markets, and through them find their way to the United States. This is an evasive, and an inconclusive argument. It may be a sound general principle, that commerce on a large scale, will seek its markets, and find its level, as the waters do in the ocean; but regulations, such as that before you, will affect its course, change its direction, impede its progress, and determine its channels, so as to deprive some countries of its benefits, in favor of others, in the same manner, that mountains, hills, and vallies change and shape the directions of water courses in their progress to the ocean.

But it is insisted this measure will produce war,—I consider it entirely in the nature of a commercial regulation, and such as cannot, as already stated, give any just cause of war. But it is asked will Great Britain inquire, whether it is or is not just cause of war? Will she not consider it so, because it is against her interest? If gentlemen will have it, that G. Britain has abandoned every principle of justice, it is in vain to expect she will, on any occasion, be governed by reason or motives of propriety in her conduct towards us, if she is totally regardless of common right, and governed by her interests alone, she waits only a more favorable opportunity to give our commerce a more deadly blow—and it is therefore high time to withdraw ourselves from all connections with her. But I am not prepared to go this length; I cannot believe a great nation, who holds a high and dignified rank among the powers of the earth, would expose herself to the indignation and derision of the world, by abandoning all respect for justice and public *right*. I must believe she still retains some regard for her national honor—and if not for her honor, she does for her interest all that she could say, with any colour of justice, would be that she has the right to adopt other regulations on her part to counteract yours. Let us inquire into the effect of such regulations. She may say, your produce shall not go to her colonies, her islands or any of her dominions. If she takes this measure, she will prepare the most effectual scourge for her own subjects. She will reduce the inhabitants of those islands, not only to a state of starvation, but force them at length, in all probability, into insurrection.—We have already witnessed the complaints of those people to the mother country. We have seen the picture they have drawn of their sufferings and distress, and their declarations that they cannot exist without the produce of the United States. How then shall Britain retaliate? She cannot do it effectually, without injuring herself more than she will you. Hence I am clearly of opinion, the adoption of proper measures on our part—of measures similar to that before you, would be likely to produce the desired effect in the conduct of G. Britain, towards us.

An important inquiry remains to be made. And that is, the effects such a measure, as that now before you, would produce on the commerce of the United States—on the revenue, and on the agricultural interest. It has been insisted that it would destroy your commerce. This must be on the supposition that it would produce war. I have endeavoured to shew this would not be the necessary nor even the probable consequence of it. I am not, however, prepared to vote for it, at this time in its present shape—but I do not refuse my assent to it, because I believe it to be a war measure—nor because I think Great Britain herself would consider it so;—but because I conceive it more advisable to adopt a measure that will not so materially affect, either your commerce, your revenue, or your agricultural interest. On this ground I would myself prefer a measure that would impose additional duties on British merchandise, or I would agree to interdict the importation into this country, of certain specified articles, the growth or manufacture of Great Britain, as proposed by the resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland. This measure would not have a very serious effect upon the commerce of our country, as such articles might be selected, and indeed are in the resolution alluded to, as could be conveniently enough procured at other markets. It would at the same time paralise the most valuable and profitable portion of British manufactures, and inlist the mercantile interest of that country against the present unjust proceedings of their government; the result cannot well be doubted, by those who know the powerful influence their merchants have over the affairs of that nation. The amount of duties arising from merchandise imported from G. Britain, paying a duty ad valorem, is somewhat less than three millions and a half of dollars. The articles proposed to be prohibited are chiefly of the description paying such duty, but do not include the whole of them. The introduction will not probably extend to more than one half the merchandise in value, paying such duty. But suppose the amount of duty on the prohibited articles, should be two millions—the only diminution of revenue that could take place must arise from a failure on the part of our merchants to obtain those articles at other markets—and would be only proportioned to such failure. Suppose they should fail in obtaining those articles to the extent of one fourth of the whole—the loss of revenue would be proportioned, and might be estimated at half a million; though I do not myself, from the best information I have been able to obtain, believe it would exceed one or two hundred thousand dollars. This loss of revenue is certainly not so important as to prevent us from adopting, and once adopted, adhering to a measure we deem calculated to vindicate our rights. I shall not descend into details, as to the countries in which those articles can be procured. Merchantile gentlemen have spoken, and differed on this subject; but from the most correct information, to be obtained here, I am of opinion there are few articles now got from the dominions of G. Britain, which are necessary for our consumption, that may not be obtained from other markets. Hence, sir, it does appear to me, that such a measure as that above proposed, would not in any great degree affect your commerce or your revenue.

(Mr. Campbell's speech to be continued.)

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, APRIL 21.

On Saturday the Senate considered the bill, sent from the House of Representatives, repealing the acts laying duties on salt, and continuing in force, for a farther time, the first section of the act, entitled "an act further to protect the commerce and seamen of the U S. against the Barbary powers," and struck out the two first sections which repeal the acts laying duties on salt—Yeas 16—Nays 9.—

Our last paper contains an erroneous statement, into which which we were led by an error in the Journal of the Senate from which we made an extract relative to the proceedings of that body on the bill to prohibit the importation of certain goods, wares, and merchandize.

In this statement the Yeas and Nays are given, as though they had been taken on the resolution offered by Mr. Tracy, whereas they were in fact taken on the *motion* of Mr. Tracy to postpone the bill, for the purpose of considering that resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, APRIL 17.

On motion of *Mr. Ely*, the following resolution was adopted.

Resolved, That the President of the U. S. be requested to take effectual measures to cause the south wing of the Capital to be prepared for the accommodation of the House of Representatives by the commencement of the next session of Congress.

Mr. Varnum offered a resolution, for making provision by law for allowing the military commandants in the territory of Louisiana three months pay, from the period of the expiration of their appointments, to enable them to return to their homes, except in cases where such commandants shall have been appointed to some other office in the territory of Louisiana under the government of the U. S.

This resolution was opposed by Mr. R. Nelson, and disagreed to, Ayes 15.

Mr. Dana offered the following resolutions which he said it was not his purpose to press on the consideration of the House this session, if they should be found to interfere with other important business.

Resolved, That provision ought to be made for the better protection of the commerce and seamen of the U. S. against aggressions and outrages in the seas of the West Indies.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for regulating the conduct of such merchant vessels as, by agreement of the respective owners, may sail in concert for mutual assistance and defence in any lawful commerce, and also for settling, according to the course of proceeding in courts of admiralty, the respective rates of contribution to be made between them on account of any loss or damage which may be thereby incurred.

Resolved, That for the encouragement and security of seamen of the U. S. it is expedient to make provision that registered ships or vessels, which may be employed in voyages to foreign ports after the   day of   next, shall not continue to enjoy the benefits and privileges appertaining to ships or vessels of the U. S. unless some proportion of the mariners on board the same shall be citizens of the U. S.

Mr. J. Randolph from the committee of Ways and Means, reported a bill making appropriations for carrying into effect the treaty with the Cherokee tribe of Indians, which was referred to a committee of the whole House this day; and which, having passed through such committee, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading on Saturday.

Messages were received from the Senate stating that they had rejected the bill prescribing the effect in each state of the records of judgement, and decrees of the courts of record of every other state—that they had passed the bill making a further appropriation towards completing the south wing of the Capital, and the bill making appropriations for the navy during the year 1806—and that they had passed the bill establishing trading houses with the Indian tribes, with an amendment. In this amendment the House concurred; the bill has consequently passed both Houses.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole—Mr. Gregg in the chair—on the bill making provision for the compensation of witnesses, who attended the trial of the impeachment of Samuel Chase

Mr. J. Clay moved to insert after the word "summoned"—"on behalf of the House of Representatives"—so as to limit the payment of witnesses to those summoned on behalf of the House of Representatives,

This motion prevailed—Ayes 44—Noes 39—when the committee rose and reported the bill.

The House concurred in the amendment made in committee of the whole—when the bill was read a third time and passed.

The committee, who were appointed on the 21st of March, 1806, to enquire into the conduct of Gideon Granger, Post-Master General of the U. S. and report whether, in their opinion, the said Gideon Granger hath so acted, in his capacity as post-master general, as to require the interposition of the constitutional powers of this House, submit the following

REPORT—

That the committee, without loss of time, engaged in the duties assigned them, and have made some progress therein. It was the sincere desire of the committee that the enquiry should be concluded during the present session, as well as the wish of the post-master general; but from the distance and dispersed situation of the witnesses, whose testimony was deemed necessary, and the approaching close of the session, it is found impracticable. While the committee regret the situation of a public officer laboring under the suspicious appearance of a constitutional scrutiny into his conduct, yet in a government like ours, where watchfulness of men in office is the surest guarantee of the preservation of the liberty of the peope, the public functionaries must yield their feelings to the general benefit, and endure a temporary inconvenience as an honorable sacrifice to the freedom of our institutions.

That a hasty and premature result is less to be desired on the part of an officer supported by a consciousness of the integrity of his conduct, than the suspension of an inquiry that may terminate in a satisfactory refutation of charges, which, on the part of the accused, are affirmed to be without foundation, the committee have no hesitation in believing.

Justice to the public as well as to the individual requires a thorough investigation, which is found to be impossible before the final adjournment.

The committee, therefore, recommend a postponement of the farther inquiry until the next session of Congress.

Ordered to lie on the table.

FRIDAY, APRIL 18.

The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the bill supplementary to the act fixing the naval peace establishment.

Much discussion took place on the details of this bill, and particularly on augmenting the number of officers beyond the number fixed by the act of 1801. Various motions were made to reject the parts of the bill having this effect, as well as to make an appropriation for building frigates to replace the Philadelphia and General Greene; all of which were disagreed to—when the bill was read a third time.

Mr. Chandler spoke in favor of, and Messrs. *J. Clay* and *J. Randolph* against its passage, which was carried—Yeas 58—Nays 28.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19.

The House considered the message of the Senate, to amend the bill to carry into effect the treaty with the Chickasaw tribe of Indians, by striking out those sections which authorise a resort to military force to expel persons attempting to settle on certain lands in the Mississippi territory, without having received titles to the same from the U. States—and having disagreed to the amendment passed by the Senate—Yeas 53—Nays 35—resolved to adhere to their disagreement thereto.

A short time after a message was received from the Senate stating that they had resolved to adhere to their amendment. The bill is consequently lost.

The House went into a committee of the whole on the bill authorising the settlement of the accounts of William Eaton.

This bill provides for the settlement of these accounts by the accounting officers of the treasury, under the direction of the secretary of state.

After much discussion the committee rose, and the bill was ordered to a third reading on Monday.

[We have been obliged to postpone a full detail of the proceedings of the three last days to our next paper.]

Philadelphia April 16.

On Tuesday, the 15th April instant, died suddenly the honorable Edward Shippen, late chief justice of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, in the 78 year of his age.

At a meeting of the gentlemen of the Philadelphia bar,

Jared Ingersoll, in the chair.

It was unanimously resolved, that the gentlemen of the bar will attend, as mourners, the funeral of the late chief justice of Pennsylvania, the honorable Edward Shippen, & that they will wear crape on the left arm for thirty days, as a testimony of the respect they bear to his memory.

HOR. BINNEY, *Secretary*.

April 16, 1806.

The brig Herculous Courtney, Philips, in 7 days from Havanna, has arrived at Charleston. Captain P. left Havanna, the 25th March, and informs that while there, a vessel arrived from St. Thomas, the captain of which stated that the ship Leander, from New York, had been spoken in the Mona Passage by an English vessel, which permitted her to pass, as the captain of the Leander said the ship was bound to St. Domingo; she was afterwards spoken by another British ship to the southward of St. Domingo, when the same declaration was made, but the British captain observed that this was not probable, as she was entirely out of the way if she was bound there, and that he would send her in for examination; that general Miranda, who was on board, then shewed him some papers which he had from the British government, the British captain immediately permitted the ship to proceed on her voyage. It was supposed she was bound to some place near the Carraccas.

A letter from Laguira, dated the 17th March, says "We have 10,000 men in arms to receive Mr. Miranda, who will have a warm reception. An embargo is laid on all vessels, and very uncertain when it will be taken off."

TYBER NAVIGATION.

The Committee appointed to superintend the improvement of the Tyber Navigation having made considerable progress, it is their wish to lay before the Subscribers a statement of the expences which have been incurred, with other information relative thereto. They therefore request a Meeting of the Subscribers at Mr. Rhodes's tavern on Wednesday evening the 23d instant at 6 o'clock.

April 21—2t

FOR SALE,

A Handsome two story BRICK HOUSE, 22 feet front by 34 feet back, with a kitchen stable and carriage house, its situation for a public or private dwelling is superior to any house near the Navy Yard, it commands a perfect view of the Yard and shipping and is now rented for 300 dollars per annum. I will also sell a valuable unimproved Lot near the premises in sq 881—young negroes will be taken in part payment. For terms apply to the subscriber living near the Navy Yard, or to Mr. Samuel M'Intire.

NICHOLAS VOSS.

Washington, Feb. 14—wtf

TAKE NOTICE.

The creditors of Peter Van Wagener (late merchant in the city of New York an insolvent debtor) are requested to exhibit their accounts properly authenticated in or before the first day of May next to the subscriber for examination—when a dividend will be made of the said insolvent's property by

JOSEPH T. BALDWIN, assignee,

Newark, New Jersey, April 21—w4t