state. The militia have 150 brass field pieces ready to take the field whenever called for, and which could be on the march to any point of attack at twelve hours notice. They are also supplied with a competent portion of cannon, and are all provided with uniform at their own expence. Under officers of their own choice they would go into service with alacrity, and would consider it a hardship to see their younger brethren called into a state which did not happen to join their own while they could not march to assist, for this bill provides that men between 26 and 45 shall go no further than in their own or an adjoining state. If an enemy were to land in Connecticut the brave militia of New-Hampshire and Vermont are not to assist in repelling them because they do not join on it. You are to call on your young men to be cut up, while if all the militia were to march the enemy could be repelled at once. You had better compel ever man who is able to bear arms to take part in the defence of his country when invaded in his neighborhood.

I know it was felt as a hardship in the course of the revolutionary war, that every man capable of bearing arms was obliged to take part, scarcely a man being left to till the ground; but it was all-essential to the safety of the country. Have you increased to such a degree of population that you can now leave at home three-fourths of your actual force? Surely this would be ruinous in the attempt.

This is a system which has been many times before the House of Representatives, and has always been found by the wisdom of the nation to be an improper one to adopt. I do hope in this critical juncture, because there are some persons who do not chuse to submit to subordination, that we shall not go into a disorganization of the militia altogether. I am ready to say, if this system does take place, that our militia will be disorganized, since the states have acts now in existence for the organization of the militia agreeably to the act of 1792, and the militia are now ready to take the field; we should soon acquire subordination; and when that is riveted in our breasts we shall do well. For these reasons I hope the committee will rise and lay this subject to sleep for the present.

(To be continued.)

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26.

Debate on the bill supplementary to the act laying an embargo, &c.

MR. RHEA (Ten.) said he should not vote for reference; for if this bill should be committed to the committee of Commerce and Manufactures and afterwards be referred to a committee of the whole, it would unnecessarily occupy time when it could as well be understood by being printed. It was with no pleasure to himself that he sat out to take any notice of a most extraordinary address from a gentleman from New-York on Saturday last; and it gave him pain that any gentleman should so far depart from the politeness which should characterise every one, as to have used such language as was then heard. The gentleman could not have intended to enlighten the House, for his whole speech was unconnected, consisted of no chain of reasoning, but of assertions of a most extraordinary nature, and those not bottomed upon fact. In the course of that extraordinary speech, said Mr. R. we were told that we were legislating against the interest of the nation, applying the observation particularly to the laws respecting the embargo. The gentleman had made many observations respecting the embargo, and amongst others as Mr. R. understood him, that the minority in that question to their eternal honor had opposed the system. There were many gentlemen in the minority on that occassion who supported this bill and would far from accord in their views with that gentleman.

In expressing his opposition to the embargo, did the gentleman for a moment take into view the present state of things in Europe, the decrees of blockade adopted by those mighty powers in their attempts to destroy each other? If the gentleman's mind had for a moment expanded he would not have permitted such expressions to escape his lips. For if the embargo law had not passed, what would have been the consequence? Our commerce would have been swept from the ocean and scarce a vessel left; and therefore a system was adopted to retain the property of the U. S. at home, and preserve them from capture on the ocean. Did the gentleman contemplate that there were already about three thousand of our own seafaring men on board vessels of foreign powers. Did he reflect on the frequent seizures by the belligerent powers, and that they dealt wide destruction to the commerce spread over the ocean? Had he contemplated these things the House would not surely have been so assailed. To the assertion that they had been legislating against the interests of the nation what did the people themselves say? The measure of embargo had been generally approved over the U. S. except by a few persons, probably possessing the same political opinion with the gentleman from N. York. From the East to the South West, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio the measure had been approved. With what confidence and assurance then could the gentleman say that they were legislating against the interest of the nation, or how could a gentleman permit himself to depart so far from facts, as to make these assertions.

The gentleman (Mr. Gardenier) had stated they were guided by an unseen hand. In saying this according to my interpretation of it, said Mr. R. the gentleman said more than he intended. I refer to that mighty Being who raises and depresses nations when he pleases. This is the only hand that I acknowledge; and if it is the same which the gentleman meant, I will agree with him. But if he means that we are under any other influence than such as is dictated by the honor of our country, I do positively and unequivocally deny the truth of his assertion. When a nation does an act at which no other nation on earth can justly take offence, and that act is approved by the people, it appears strange that it could be said by any one that it was favoring the designs of any nation in Europe. This nation fears not the designs of any nation in Europe; neither has it a partiality for any one. This being the fact, how can it be said that the carrying this act into effect is aiding or abetting the designs of any foreign power? I shall always agree to assert the honor and dignity of my own country. I shall never make assertions that it is under the influence of a foreign power; and before any gentleman makes such assertions he ought to have facts to confirm us in the belief. Unless strong reasoning or proof can be adduced in support of his assertions, he has descended to a gulf from which it will be difficult to extricate himself.

It has been said that this embargo is a sly and cunning deception, or a non-intercourse law. It has the same operation which every similar act has heretofore had. So long as we can support a neutrality, so long will I do any act which conduces to it; and if any thing can support it, it is the embargo, by preventing those conflicts which would take place on the ocean between the armed merchant vessels of the U. S. and the armed vessels of the maritime powers.

But it seems the gentleman has taken great offence at the present bill, because it has left no place to get out. Does he want to get out? Does he want his constituents to get out? Does he want the people of Vermont to get out? He brought down his observations from the Gallic Emperor to the pigs of Vermont. There is more honor, dignity, and magnanimity in the people of Vermont, even if a hole should be left, than to send their produce to the British provinces. And if any intercourse be carried on between the people of Vermont and the people of Canada, it must be by those who have forsworn those principles, the observance of which they owe to their country. Does the gentleman wish a hole through which the whole growth of the U. S. should float down the river St. Lawrence and thence across the Atlantic?

I have never contemplated this embargo as a war system; it is a system of peace, and holds forth to the nations of Europe this language: "We are willing to send you our produce, but you have refused to let us travel quietly, and as this is the case, we will keep our vessels and produce at home, nor expose one or the other to your friendship or depredation." This is the language of the embargo; it is therefore no war measure. I hope the House will not arrest its effect till the purpose for which it was imposed is completed; before that time arrives, the more perfect it is the better. Let us shew that we are determined to preserve and support our neutrality.

The gentleman told us that the nation must be saved by the Representatives of the people. This observation I could not understand; I always thought that the sovereign people represented themselves. I have indeed heard it said that the people were themselves their worst enemies; but I always thought that they could save themselves, and still think so; and the moment we step aside from our duty they will do it. If they think we act against their interests they will call us back with language of reprobation, and put others in our stead to pursue a different policy.

It is on the principle of anxiety for the public good that I act, and to the people I look for approbation; and for these reasons I shall vote for the bill.

MR. NEWTON—I consent to the recommitment, from a conviction that the friends of the bill are desirous of giving it that direction. Their wishes have been expressed, and I acquiesce. To have avoided a debate on the merits of the embargo—a subject which has been discussed, would have afforded me great satisfaction, particularly as it must have been foreseen that much warmth would be excited by it. It is no small gratification to me, that those with whom I am politically associated, did not provoke it. We are again called upon for our reasons, in support of this measure. We have thought, and still think, that it is one which was dictated by enlightened policy, and imperious necessity.

Assembled here for the sole purpose of promoting the public welfare, it becomes a duty to act with propriety and temper, and in no instance to suffer our passions to lead us into the adoption of measures inconsistent with that object. Maturity of consideration should always precede decision. A contrary course would be a deriliction of the public interest. The embargo is in operation, it is a subject before the public tribunal, a tribunal every way competent to decide. There the merits or demerits of the measure will be dispassionately weighed and numbered. I am not a little gratified to find that unequivocal expressions of approbation have already been made by most of the state legislatures; and that not a day passes away, without encreasing the number of its advocates. Epithets of abuse have, with no sparing hand, been spread abroad in every direction. It has been represented as the offspring of foreign influence—but declamation and accusation can avail nothing with the enlightened public—proof of foreign influence must be adduced, if the propagators of it expect any advantage from it. Let the situation of the U. States, prior and subsequent to the passage of the act laying an embargo, in their relations with foreign nations, be candidly and impartially viewed.

If the justification of the measure is not to be found in those relations; we disdain to resort to other means for it—we are willing that all the responsibility of the measure should attach to us. When our attention was first attracted to this subject the decree of the Emperor of France of the 21st of November 1806 was in operation, and that blockading decree, it was intimated would be rigorously enforced. Previous to its operation our commerce had been and continued to be greatly restricted by the orders of the British Cabinet, and our Minister at the court of London, so early as the 10th of January 1807, was informed, that if the French decree were enforced, that the British ministry had resolved to pursue retaliating measures. We saw in such acts, having the sanction of public authority, the ruin and prostration of our commerce. As the guardians of the national interest, as the depository of the national power, Congress was invoked to rescue commerce from inevitable destruction.

In the performance of this duty, the embargo was laid, as the best means of security. The subsequent acts and conduct of the belligerent powers, have confirmed me in opinion, that the measure was the result of imperious necessity.

Those whose prejudices have shut their minds against the influence of such manifestations on the part of the belligerent nations, cannot be appealed to as impartial judges.

It has been said that we should not prevent the exportation of produce in foreign vessels, while our own are detained in port by the embargo. That the reason for such a course was not evident, nor strong. To me, sir, the necessity and policy of the restriction is evident. If Congress had not inhibited the exportation of American produce, a carte blanche would have been given to G. Britain. By such an act she would have secured the object of all her wishes with our approbation, an object for which since 1793 the numerous and iniquitous orders of her cabinet, have been issued to obtain. If in retiring from the ocean, in consequence of the illiberal and execrable policy of the belligerent nations, we had thrown our ports open to them for the exportation of produce, G. Britain would have been reaping the whole harvest; she would have enjoyed a monopoly of commerce. By such an act she would have been rewarded for her injustice and insults, and 1,200,000 tons of shipping would have been sacrificed to her inordinate lust for maritime domination and commercial monopoly.

Let it not be forgot, that the other belligerent nations are driven from the ocean. In the permission contended for, we saw the prostration of the multiplied and judicious acts of the National government framed with a view to foster our navigation and trade.

If, sir, we had pursued the policy advocated, we never could have repelled the charge of having signed, sealed, and delivered a general conveyance to G. B. of all our commercial rights.

The embargo will produce a happy effect, inasmuch as it will determine in the estimation of European nations the importance of American commerce and the value of her friendship.

In the enjoyments of advantages, they have indolently rested content. The great mass of the people have never extended their views to the source of those comforts. The period has arrived when the privations they are forced to suffer will exhibit to view the fountain from which a thousand blessings flow. Europe is afflicted with scarcity, and America is the only granery to which resort can be had to avert the horrors of pestilence and famine. The finger of Providence appears, to have prepared a crisis for the operation of a measure, the best calculated of all others to re-establish the relations of reciprocal justice, and to admonish despots, that there is a just and controlling power, that assigns to iniquity and oppression their limits.

Adhere, sir, to this measure with firmness and the accommodation of our differences will be certain and advantageous. If we yield the ground we have taken, our character for stability and firmness will be lost for ever, and it will be in vain to look for respect and justice, from those who do not apprehend a vigorous and spirited retaliation for withholding that justice and respect which we have a right to demand. The United States of America are involved in a crisis, similar to that which gave existence to their independence.

Proclamations and decrees, restrict, limit, narrow, or suspend trade, in the same manner and style as if the United States were colonial dependencies. In 1776, the genius of America inspired her sons with courage to resist oppression—in their declaration of independence they enumerated among the causes of their resistance—that "of cutting off our trade with all parts of the world." When our forefathers were few in number, they confronted dangers of every description for their liberties and commerce. The contest eventuated in the freedom and independence of the nation. A tame and submissive surrender of the acquisitions of their valor would fix on the national name an indelible stain. Their recollected patriotism should inspire us to make whatever sacrifices the crisis requires. In the choice of war or an embargo, we have chosen the last, as the least of evils. If commerce had not been arrested and confined to an intercourse among ourselves—nothing within the scope of power could have prevented war. The United States in defence of it's maritime rights must have taken sides. They would have been arrayed in battle order, either on the side of France against Great Britain, or on that of Great Britain against France, an event taken either way, more deplorable than an embargo without limitation. War, sir, is less to be dreaded as it relates to the shocks and impressions which contending armies receive from or make on each other, than as to consequences of another description; a disregard for, I was on the eve of saying an oblivion, of those principles which are the pillars of the republic. Military power seldom renders homage to justice, and rarely mounts the car of war for any other view than to inflict injuries and to spread desolation. War is Pandora's box, from which issues all the evils and calamities that can afflict and scourge mankind—rather than encounter such consequences and be entangled in the labyrinth of European artifice and diplomacy—I would cheerfully render my assent to a non-intercourse with the belligerent powers. Let them render justice to a fair and honest neutrality and I will be among the first in reciprocating it. But, sir, until reparation is made to my much injured, outraged and insulted country, I cannot press to my bosom with the cordiality of friendship, the violators of her rights. I cannot, sir, omit here noticing some inconsistencies into which our political opponents have fallen. The republicans have been charged with wanting vigor since to them has been entrusted the management of the national concerns. When strong measures were deemed unnecessary, we were told that pusillanimity deterred us from taking them. When the embargo was recommended by our opponents, it was represented as the only effectual measure to which we could resort. As soon as the crisis justified its adoption, gloomy and desponding reflections were felt and uttered as to its probable effects. The Executive and Congress were represented as precipitating the nation into ruin. This language cannot be mistaken, the traits of inconsistency are strongly marked—the struggle for power is evident; but the efforts to regain paradise are by no means calculated to ensure success. Secret influence is the caballistic word. If I am by it to understand Executive influence, I cannot either discern its application or find out the manner in which it is to operate. I cannot entertain an opinion so unworthy of myself as for a moment to believe, that the respect I entertain for the Executive magistrate of the United States, renowned for his patriotism and virtues, can ever degenerate into servility. No, sir, it cannot. I am not by nature of a temperament to become the humble minion of power

Foreign influence is likewise pressed into service—the efficacy of its magic is tried—it ranks among the political panacea of the day—but from whence, sir, does the accusation flow—is this serious and weighty charge brought against us by those worthies who atchieved the independence of their country? No—the greater number of those worthies are with us. Is that class of citizens, who have raised themselves into notice and importance by years of devotion to public services, numbered among our accusers—no—the greatest number of that class is also on the same side of the question with us. I have no skill in finding out motives—the science is too mysterious and occult for the dimness of my intellectual vision—the abortive attempts which I have so often witnessed, have disqualified me from putting in my pretensions for distinction and promotion. I trust, sir, that such language must proceed either from the intemperance of discussion or from a misconception of the American character, which can never descend from the elevated station of independence to become the pander or the puppet of despots.

Persevering firmness in the present course will have the tendency of adjusting our differences, and of giving to such adjustment the character of permanency. When all hopes of producing a relaxation in our principles are abandoned, the present crisis will no longer present a threatening aspect.

On our firmness, at this time, depends the future prosperity of the nation. To us is now consigned, Mr. Speaker, the arduous task, amidst the convulsions and tempests which agitate the world—of keeping in the haven of peace the vessel of state.

Perform this important service, and you will enjoy a reward of all others the most grateful to a patriot, the smiles of his country.

(Debate to be continued.)

THURSDAY, FEB. 25.

Mr. Jackson, a member from the state of Virginia, appeared and took his seat.

The House took up for consideration the bill for remitting the duties payable on the monument, &c. and *Mr. Milnor* having withdrawn the amendment which he yesterday offered, *Mr. Gardner* moved that the bill be re-committed. Negatived. The bill was then ordered to a third reading.

A report was received from the Secretary of War, unfavorable to the petition of Samuel French.

Messrs Dana, J. Clay and Nicholas, —were appointed a committee to join with the gentlemen appointed by the Senate to superintend the Library.

On motion of *Mr. Dawson* the House went into committee of the whole *Mr. Marion* in the chair on the bill for procuring an additional number of arms.

The bill provides as follows:

"That a sum of money not exceeding   thousand dollars, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any monies in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of procuring by purchase, or causing to be manufactured within the United States, and under the direction of the President of the United States an additional number of stands of arms, to be deposited in safe and suitable places."

Mr. Dawson moved that the blanks be filled with $ 125,000.

Mr. Burwell announced his intention to move another section appropriating 200,000 dollars for the purchase of arms from Europe if opportunity should offer.

Mr. Dawson then moved to insert 300,000 in this blank; and it was so filled, Ayes 61.

Mr. Quincy moved to amend the bill by striking out "causing to be manufactured within the U. States" and insert "contracting for their manufacture within the United States or causing to be manufactured at the present manufactories for the U. States."

[The reasons urged for this motion were that this bill now authorised the purchase by the United States, of private manufactories, which was not expedient, as the extension of the present manufactories of the U. States would be both cheaper and produce better arms. The reasons urged against it were that it was proper to leave a discretion in this respect with the Executive, and that it was essentially necessary to allow the establishment of a manufactory on the other side of the mountains, which might be precluded by the amendment.]

The amendment was carried 46 to 44.

The committee then rose & reported the bill as amended.

The sum with which the blank was filled was agreed to without a division.

The amendment offered by *Mr. Quincy* and agreed to in committee of the whole, was negatived—51 to 49.

Mr. Quincy, as the objection of western gentlemen to this amendment seemed to proceed from the supposed prohibition by it of the establishment of a manufactory beyond the mountains, proposed the following proviso:

Provided, that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the President of the United States to purchase any existing manufactories of arms within the U. S.—Negatived, 49 to 42.

When the bill was ordered to a third reading to-morrow.

On motion of *Mr. Basset*, the House went into committee of the whole, *Mr. Cutts* in the chair, on the bill concerning public contracts.

Messrs. Basset and Troup opposed the bill generally, and Messrs. Holland, Sloan & Kelly opposed it. In the course of the discussion *Mr. Cook* made a motion to strike out the 1st section of the bill; which was negatived 57 to 41.