Yeas.—Messrs. Bassett, J. Campbell, Casey, Clark, J. Clay, Earle, Early, Eppes, Garnett, Goldsborough, Goodwyn, Gray, Holmes, Jones, Leib, Lewis, Jr. Masters, Nicholson, J. Randolph, Sandford, Spalding, P. R. Thompson, Verplanck, and D. R. Williams.

Nays.—Messrs. Alston, Jr. Anderson, Bard, Barker, Bedinger, Betton, Bidwell, Bishop, Blackledge, Blake, Jr. Blount, Broom, Brown, Boyle, G. W. Campbell, Chandler, Chittenden, Claiborne, M. Clay, Clinton, Jr. Conrad, Cook, Covington, Crowninshield, Cutts, Dana, Darby, Davenport, Jr. Dawson, Elliot, Ellis, Elmer, Ely, Findley, Fisk, Fowler, Gregg, Green, Halsey, Hamilton, Hastings, Helms, Hough, Jackson, Kelly, Kenan, Knight, Mac-Farland, Magruder, Marion, M'Creery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, J. Morrow, Mosely, Mumford, J. Nelson, Newton, Jr. Olin, Pitken, Jr. Pugh, Quincy, T. M. Randolph, Rea, of Pen. Rhea, of Ten. Richards, Russell, Sailly, Sammons, Schuneman, Seaver, Sloan, Smilie, J. C. Smith, J. Smith, S. Smith, Southard, Stanford, Stanton, Stedman, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmadge, Tenney, Thomas, T. W. Thompson, Tracy, Van Cortlandt, Van Rensselaer, Varnum, Wadsworth, Walton, J. Whitehill, R. Whitehill, Wickes, M. Williams, N. Williams, Wilson, Winn, Winston and Wynns.

The question was then taken on discharging the committee from *Mr. Sloan's* resolution, by yeas and nays—Yeas 26—Nays 98.

The House then resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the union.

The Chairman put the question, on considering *Mr. Gregg's* resolution, on which the committee divided—Ayes 47—Noes 70.

MR. J. CLAY moved to consider the resolution offered by himself, and that of his friend from Maryland (Mr. Nicholson.)

MR. SMILIE moved to consider the latter resolution.

MR. J. RANDOLPH said he would make a superseding motion, which was that the committee should rise, and he would assign his reasons for this motion. I am well aware, said Mr. R. and I consider it the happiest and fairest feature of our policy, that in a deliberate body a majority must govern. This is a position which has often been enforced on me, and which I have sometimes enforced on others. But I hope no majority will be indisposed to act honestly—though a majority ought to govern, it should not be on motives of caprice, freak, or passion, but wisely; and it ought not, at this time of day, to feel power, and forget right. The reason why I am in favor of the committee rising is the same which I advanced the other day against the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—a reason which it is astonishing to my mind does not operate on every member of the committee—the state of things here and abroad. Is there a member prepared to vote for the resolution of my excellent friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. J. Clay) or of my worthy friend from Maryland? (Mr. Nicholson) I believe not—I for one am not prepared. The other day, when I said I was disposed to treat with Britain for the very reason that I was indisposed to treat with her in 1793, I perceived a sneer on the faces of gentlemen and that they scouted the idea. But what is the fact? The gentleman from Massachusetts quoted the message of the President shewing that this business is still *pendente lite.* What information does the President in that message give us? That he had tried negociation and failed? That, as in another quarter, our minister had been shoved neck and shoulders out of the cabinet? No—that negociation is still pending between our minister and the minister of Britain. Can then gentlemen, while the business is *re infecta,* feel disposed to act on either the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or that of the gentleman from Maryland?

Again—Must we not every day expect information from Europe; and ought not this information to have an influence on this assembly, if indeed we are a deliberative assembly. Surely it ought. On political empirics who prescribe the same medicine to every disease, this information may have no effect. But on the minds of sober men, it ought to have, it must have an effect. The situation of the powers with whom we have these momentous discussions may have been materially changed by the events of the last ninety days. Will gentlemen undertake to say that motives which influenced the mind of a Bernstoff, ought to have no weight with us? Will they, under these circumstances, go into committee to grope in the dark, to catch at something, on a subject of which they know little in relation to events of which they know less? No—this is not the moment to act. The committee have declared that that moment has not arrived. They have, in their capacity of a House, refused to discharge them from the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, & have in the same capacity refused to act upon it. And what does this prove but that the moment for action has not come; unless, indeed, this venerable assembly will condescend to become the wet nurse of the bantling of the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania, who, provided they can maintain it at a distance, hope their indiscretion will be overlooked—a *faux paux,* which, if it can be kept in an obscure farm house, may be smothered over. I, however, am not disposed to offer it the pap-spoon; still less am I disposed to be disturbed by its cries, or those of its brethren.

It must be obvious to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the fit time to decide on our British relations—that while there is a pending negociation with her all such discussion must be premature. These resolutions are the productions of a political hot-bed—they are not the growth of a genial sun, but reared in a forcing house; and I will tell gentlemen, that politics bear forcing as little as the physical productions of nature.

A gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I now see in his place, offered a few days ago to this committee a string of observations, which he declared were not intended either for a resolution not then before the committee, or for that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now the committee having determined not to discuss the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and as those remarks were not offered on the subject then before the committee, they may have been left to guess that they were intended for the question now under consideration; and as I believe they were full as applicable to this as any other question, I hope to be indulged in making a few observations relative to them. But at the same time I disclaim the preface that gentleman prefixed to his remarks, viz. that he did not mean to examine the question before the committee. I do mean to examine that question, to shew why this is not the proper time for acting on this subject;—to shew that all discussion on it is premature; and that we ought to abstain from acting upon it until we shall have heard from the other side of the Atlantic.

As well as I remember, the gentleman set out by recalling the attention of the House to the message of the President of the 17th of January last. Yes, sir, he began in the style of old times—*infandum renovare dolorem*—to call the House back to the message of the 17th of January. To what part of it? To that part which is public, or to that part which is locked up in the escrutoire of the clerk, or is in his breeches pocket, for aught I know——that part which it is his business to keep from the eyes of the nation? Now what is our situation? A brave Senator, with our doors open, calls the attention of the House to an amphibious and ambiguous message, part secret and part public. And is this the situation in which gentlemen would put us? Are we thus to be knocked down with the hammer of Executive infallibility? I hope not. When that message came, on the 17th of January, how long had we been in conclave? I believe a fortnight. When did the dispatches arrive? I undertake to say, because I know it, it was prior to the 20th of December—because I made proper enquiry at the office of the Secretary of State, where *I* had myself received dispatches from London. What are the contents of those dispatches? Did they advocate the course this House has pursued, or a course totally different? And yet that very message has been quoted under the idea that no man could say to the contrary, and that we would sink beneath the weight of its authority. Those dispatches came to this country before the 20th of December. On that day *I* returned from Baltimore, and received a communication from their author of a contemporaneous date; *I* have called at the office of the Secretary of State, and was informed by the head of that department that they had both arrived at the same time. And it was when *I* discovered that the head of the second department under the government did not know that they were in existence, much less that his opinion on them had not been consulted, that *I* declared, what *I* repeat, that there is no cabinet. You have no cabinet. What! the head of the treasury department, a vigorous and commanding statesman, a practical statesman, the benefit of whose wisdom and experience the nation fondly believes is always obtained before the great measures of the government are taken, unacquainted with, and unconsulted on important dispatches, and yet talk of a cabinet! Not merely unconsulted, but ignorant of the documents. Well—the act passed, and on the 16th of January was sent to the other House—and on the 17th dispatches come which might have materially changed the decision of the House; and am *I*, feeling this, and knowing the House had been trifled with, to be denounced for telling you if you had had the necessary information, your decision would have been different from what it was? *I* know this—for many gentlemen who voted for the measure adopted, told me their votes would have been different had they had the necessary information. *I* say the decision of the House, if we had known what we ought to have known, and which had been received four weeks before, would have been different; and *I* have no hesitation in saying there is no cabinet, when *I* see a man, second to none for vigorous understanding, and practical good sense, ousted from it. *I* say as *I* have said before, if the Executive wants our confidence, let him give us his. But when we are excluded from his confidence, let him not demand ours. *I* will not give mine on these terms, and *I* have no hesitation in saying so. Yes, sir, *I* now say with open doors what *I* said when your doors were shut, & what *I* believe—that it is not for the master and mate (and I speak it without disparagement to any man) in bad weather to go below, and leave the management of the ship to the cook and cabbin boy. The nation expects to know—they believe they do know, the opinion of the Executive. But do they know it? Where have they got it? Does it appear in this string of resolutions? Have we the opinion of the President? Have we his constitutional recommendation? No. You have nothing—Let the clerk produce the budget! But we shall be told that this House has a right to give a direction to the President. This is the last refinement on courtly flattery. Shall the House act on information neither official or constitutional, on the stale pretext of giving the executive a direction, when they believe they are acting on what gentlemen get up, and give us reason to believe are the secret wishes of the executive. It is out of the question for any persons who are men of standing to condescend, under such circumstances, to do the work of the cabinet or the water closet. No—tools must be found; and to such tools such work will be, as it has been uniformly committed. I do not only say they must be, but that they have been found. But at the threshold of every thing I can offer, I am met by these Nestors of the land, by these old coachmen who love the smack of the whip, who talk of old times, of the stamp act, of the non-intercourse, and other revolutionary acts—But let me tell gentlemen this is all violence and declamation. You would not suppose that the maxims of Chesterfield had been studied by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and yet the fact is that manner is every thing. But I beg you to compare the matter I have offered with the mild, meek, and peaceable sentiments of gentlemen. Because one gentleman has delivered his sentiments in a voice that freezes before it reaches this quarter of the House, and another gentleman mumbles out confiscate the national debt; does that affect the principle at issue? And because another man, with some warmth, recommends a different course, are you therefore to stone and crucify him?

The gentleman from Massachusetts, to whom I have alluded, has told us what the question between this country and G. Britain is. He says it does not respect enemy's property, but the colonial trade. He says that the tobacco and flour, the rice and cotton, transported by our vessels, come as much within the question *quo ad* enemy property, as the colonial trade. But is there any presumptive evidence that the rice, the cotton, the tobacco, or any other articles of American growth that are carried by our vessels, are enemy's property? There is none. Now take the other side of the question—Recollect that Holland, France and Spain have not a ship on the ocean; that the coffee, sugar and cotton of her colonies, which find their way to Europe, must go there under the cover of a neutral flag. What is the presumption? That a large part of those productions, thus transported, are relatively to Britain enemy property. How is a discrimination to be made between those products which are, and those which are not the property of an enemy? Is it not a fact that a few disreputable neighbors will bring a stigma on a whole neighborhood? Will any man deny the fact? Are the French and Spanish colonies independent? And what is the fact? That under the neutral flag the whole of the immensely valuable productions of those colonies find a conveyance. What do we say? That we have a right to carry those productions from the colonies to the belligerent nations? No—We say, the bringing them to the U. S. and paying duties on them, neutralises the property. But do they? Indisputably not. The moment you concede the point that you cannot carry on a direct trade, it becomes a question no longer of principle—but a question on which you must treat on the ground of expediency. And you must treat—you will treat—relative to it. There is one consideration, which, whether it has or has not engaged the attention of gentlemen, ought not to be lost sight of—and that is that our bulky productions can be carried by only two powers in the world—by ourselves or G. Britain—No other nation possesses the tonnage—Go then into war with G. Britain, and where will you find the tonnage to carry your products? You cannot find it. But, on the other hand, the British fabrics may be brought in Danish bottoms. There will be neutral tonnage enough to bring to your doors the productions of Britain. But where will you find the neutral tonnage to carry your produce abroad?

We are told that this is not a war measure—that Grotius and Puffendorf, and other distinguished civilians have decided that it is a pacific measure. But it unfortunately happens that great statesmen, on the theatre of active life, will not suffer themselves to be dictated to by the mumblers of antiquity; and gentlemen, who will not be governed by circumstances, who exclaim *fiat justitia ruat coelum,* must be content with making diagrams in their closets, while these active statesmen are deciding the destiny of nations. They tell us they have Grotious & Puffendorf at their backs—But *I* would rather have at my back the *posse comitatus* of the ten miles square, weak and inefficient as *I* know it to be—Yes, it is too true, the gentlemen will not listen for a moment to circumstances. *It* is in van that we say G. Britain is armed, that she has a fleet in the West Indies——that she has a ship over every square league in the ocean. They will not consider the propensity of an armed nation to strike—They will listen only to newspapers, & pamphlets & circular letters. Putting all these things out of consideration, they are for playing the part of Bobadil. They will not reflect that circumstances always govern practical men—they persist in their abstract theories. These Laputian and Lilliputian politics won't do. What are gentlemen about? While they are disputing whether the egg shall be broken at the big or little end, and whether the committee shall be discharged from the resolution in the House, or the House shall first go into committee, and the resolution be there discharged, they are pursuing measures which will be felt in Britain, and which will forcibly re-act on ourselves. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Crowninshield) has told us what he would, and what he would not do, if he were a citizen of the republic of St. Marino. We would suppose from this declaration that he was an inhabitant of Fusco, about to carry on war against Lilliput. Such a man may be celebrated as a seaman, and may be able to make an able first Lord of the Admiralty over a fleet of privateers; but as a politician he is a Lilliputian delegate.

But we are told again, that this is a peace measure, and that we ourselves are the belligerent parties, who style it a war measure. One of the profoundest statesmen told Joseph the second, one of your jimgrack men, that if he should attempt to force the navigation of the Scheldt, the fort would fire upon him. What said Joseph? *I* will not stoop to time and circumstance——he talked of natural rights, and go he would——The Dutch would never dare to fire. Compare the relative situation of the little republic of Holland, when her days of glory have passed away, when she has fallen into the hands of a conqueror—compare her present situation with that she enjoyed before the wings of her power were clipped by France. The emperor Joseph sent out his fleets, and the only intelligence he received of their fate, was that the Dutch had fired. He deemed it impossible——he could not believe that the little republic of Holland should fire on the Austrian Eagle. He thought as gentlemen think, and he was deceived; and you will be deceived too. For this commercial principle is not a principle of peace, but of war. Gentlemen may go to Carthage, if they please, stop at Genoa, and pass on to London, and they will invariably find it so; and they will find each of those nations commercial in proportion as they were warlike, and warlike in proportion as they were commercial. And why do commerce and war go thus hand in hand, but because commerce always disposes the nation to go to war, which is not disposed to give up a lucrative trade. The idea of the pacific tendency of commerce is a mere *ignis fatuus.* We find Holland ceased to be a great commercial power, when she ceased to be able to fight the combined fleets of France and England.

But I shall be told that whithersoever it may lead us, this spirit of commercial monopoly ought never to be extinguished—I shall be told it is a base principle to crouch even to necessity; that we ought to set not only reason and common sense at defiance, but likewise necessity, which knows no law, but prescribes law to all. Well, *I* am free to confess, if this assertion is not beyond my comprehension, *I* have for the first time in my life found the reason of the planter's servant, who, on being asked what was the matter with his horse, said he was ashamed because he was dead—The poor animal had ingloriously crouched to the base principle of necessity, and had given up the ghost, when he ought to have kept the field. And this is what we are called upon to do by gentlemen who will not acknowledge the law of necessity, and who scout it as a principle which it does not become us to act upon. If these notions are to prevail, let us take Don Quixotte as our first minister of state and Sancho Panca as the second in command. These are the natural hands to hold the reins of government, in case all regard to the principle of necessity is disclaimed. *I* hope gentlemen, who hold this doctrine, never mean to die, to sleep, or to weep at the distresses of their fellow men, or in any other respect acknowledge the base principle of necessity. But *I*, who profess to yield a compliance not only to the laws of necessity, but of probabilities, and who consider politics as only a science of probabilities, can no longer find a medium between myself and those, who disclaim all regard to the laws of necessity, and am obliged to confess that *I* am among the number of those who would negociate with Great Britain.

I am perfectly aware of the tedious time the Committee must have had in listening to my remarks—not more so, *I* assure you to them than to myself. *I* am aware of the arguments offered directly out of doors, and indirectly in this House, against the course which *I* believe it is for the interest of this nation to pursue. One of the first causes of surprise which presented itself to me on coming to the seat of government was that, while the people of the U. S. thought all eyes were fixed on the shores of the Atlantic, all eyes were in fact fixed on the half way house between this and George Town—that the question was not what we should do with France, or Spain, or England; but who should be the next President. And at this moment, every motion that is made—*I* do not mean, in the parliamentary sense of the word, at this place—is made with a view to the occupation of that House. And it is for this reason that certain men are to be put down, and certain men are to be put up—As *I* have said before, I have conceived it the greatest happiness attendant on the government of this people, that all their political relations, the different parties and their connections and bearings and effects, could be debated in the face of the nation. Now, we are told from good authority, that there is a certain party called the federal party, and that there are other parties in the United States, called republican parties. Well, sir. Certain gentlemen have been held up as willing to court the attention and support of the federal party—men by whom no villain has been spared, let him belong to what party he may—men by whom no villainy has been spared, to whatever party it may have attached. So much for federalism—There is another question relative to what is generally called *quiddism.* I am willing to meet gentlemen on that ground: If we belong to the third party, be it so. I am willing to meet them on other ground.

[There was here a loud call to order in which Mr. Thomas joined. The Speaker decided that Mr. Randolph was in order. An appeal was taken to the House, who confirmed his decision.]

Mr. Randolph proceeded. I am obliged to the gentleman for the respite he has given me, as I really felt much exhausted. I knew where the shoe pinched. I will take gentlemen on another principle—on the principle of Burrism, as it is called. Will gentlemen attack us on that ground? Will they say we are the rotten part of the republican party—the go-betweens of any sects—the solicitors of any office—the tools of any faction? Now, sir, on the subject of federalism—I mean no imputation to any man or party of men—are we the advocates of federalism? Does the administration, and especially the department of the navy, or does it not administer the government on the principles of federalism? Has that department ever been administered, or can it ever be administered on principles more federal? There is another department—the post office department—the sweetest engine ever put into the hands of an unprincipled man. Are we for administering the government on principles of Burrism? This is a delicate subject—I speak with a full consciousness that it is. Now for the last *ism*---*Yazooism*---Are we Yazoo men? Have our enemies ever charged us with this?

Mr. Randolph here made an allusion, which from noise in the House we did not hear, to a misconception by Messrs. Sumpter and Marion of a previous remark made by him relative to militia generals:—and then asked; Is there a man that would disdain to sit aside of such men? The allusion I made was fully understood; but those, whom it fitted, were willing to shift it from their own shoulders on those whom it did not fit.

I am really sorry, Mr. Speaker, for the time *I* have occupied. When *I* came into the House yesterday, it appeared to me as if the proposition before us was to appoint a board of commissioners to settle the account current of every member with the House. We heard a great deal of palaver and blarney; but of that description which can never take me in. *I* abjure it. *I* raise my hand against it——*I* will never become its dupe. *I* am willing to allow that in the heat of debate, expressions improper for me to use, but not improper in their application to those to whom they referred, may have escaped me——the *verba ardentia* of an honest mind. *I* scorn to retract them. They were made in the presence of the nation, and in their presence *I* will defend them. *I* will never snivel, whatever may be the result. *I* have moved that the committee should rise with a perfect knowledge of the existing circumstances. *I* knew the moment we adjourned over on Saturday, that the old story would be repeated, that gentlemen would seek the Lord, agree upon some given principle, that all might go together. And *I* have not been disappointed. But it is for you to say, whether at this moment, when you are watching your daily and nightly mails for news from Europe——when you are oscillating between Bonaparte and the coalition—you are prepared to decide ultimately on this subject. I feel for one that I am not. As to the accusation of being the apologist of Britain, it is idlest charge that ever was made. When I first took a seat in this House I was denounced with being a French partisan, because I opposed those men who then held the reins of government in their hands in their measures for carrying us into war with that nation; and now that I am for pursuing the same course towards G. Britain, which I was then in favor of pursuing towards France, I am charged with being the apologist of Britain—To this denunciation I am willing to submit, which all men must submit to who are not willing to risque the peace of their country.

(Debate to be continued.)

FOR SALE.

UPWARDS of 2000 acres of Land lying on each ſide of Little River in Loudon county being part of the Gooſe Creek tract of land purchaſed of the late col. Charles Carter; the river runs nearly through the middle of it and forms on each ſide upwards of two hundred acres of low grounds, of which about forty acres is timothy. It is in general good farm land, and remarkable for the production of graſs and of timothy in particular. About three fourths of the tract in my own occupation, the remainder in the poſſeſſion of tenants. The land lies well, abounds in good ſprings, and has a ſufficiency of white and red oak timber, and ſome fine poplars. The purchaſer may be ſupplied with ſtock of every kind, alſo with from 20 to about 30 negroes in families, and taking them in that manner upon very reaſonable terms; the land lies about the ſame diſtance (40 miles) from Waſhington, Alexandria, and Dumfries, eight miles from Leeſburg & ſix from Middleburg; there is on the part in my occupation a ſmall dwelling houſe containing two rooms and an entry below, and two rooms above ſtairs, a kitchen, good ſtable and carriage houſe and other neceſſary buildings, all of them erected within the laſt five years, a good garden. The purchaſer may be accommodated in the payments.

JOSEPH JONES.

Near Leeſburg, Loudon County,

April 7——2pm