those of that illustrious; other of our sea port towns would afford a prize to a marauding fleet. Her fleets are always ready for the purpose of attack; her 10,000 men in Nova Scotia can be transported in a week or ten days to any part of our coast, and yet there is no danger. I have intentionally omitted to say any thing of the attack on the Chesapeake, it was an unauthorised attack, the government has disavowed it—it never has to be the case, yet the same licentious and diabolical spirit which induced unauthorised individuals to attack the frigate, might induce them to attack our cities, and if they had to fear the same punishment which is likely to be inflicted on them for this flagitious act, they might safely make a coast trip to Boston for the purpose of plunder from port to port from one end of the continent to the other. Of the loss and alarm of any of the Atlantic states with a view to conquest, I have no apprehension. In this I know that the opponents of this bill—it is against authorised or unauthorised freebooters, but I wish the measure to be raised. We have in this session of Congress appropriated one million of dollars for the erection of fortifications; the expenditure of former years amount to very large sums; these fortifications in almost every instance are erected and erecting on detached commanding points at the entrance of the harbors they are designed to protect; they are not hedged within the walls of our cities; provisions and military stores are there deposited. Do the opposers to this bill propose to place these forts under the militia? No—it is acknowledged on all hands that the militia are unsuited for garrisons, or are they to be left unprotected, as strong holds erected and well filled with warlike stores to be taken possession of by the first comer, and to be turned against the cities and towns they were meant to protect? Do we wish to make no provision for fortifications, if we consult consistency. If we consult what we think discreet the good of the nation dare not refuse to man them in the way proposed by this bill. The immediate point of New Orleans, can be defended in no way but by a regular force. It is here only that I apprehend an attack from France—the Spanish provinces on the east touching, *incorporate* our possessions on the Great river are not so far, but that a hostile force has already been drawn thence and appeared in hostile array against us; those to the south may also be called our neighbors. The same wish to one nation, yet he goeth, to another come, & he cometh, could at a word stir up an attack from this quarter, not to be resisted by the present military force of both regulars & militia we have in that territory, our head quarters of New Orleans cannot be rendered impregnable against the opposite side of the Mississippi, that is, the France. It is here the contest will be made, if made at all for our rights. Shall we leave it defenceless and unprotected, because gentlemen tell us, and tell us truly of the inconsiderable number of Kentuckians and a thousand miles from the scene of action? Shall we wait to have this territory invaded from the east and have the glory of recovering it—but it is well known that the citizens of the state of Kentucky are not require a force to this their camp, the fevers of that country would but too soon, if not. The great depot of the produce and for the commerce of South Carolina and Georgia, Charleston and Savannah are similarly situated with New Orleans; the thick white population of these two states is more than a thousand miles back, the national service it would be more dangerous than Kentucky to be called from their homes to be ordered down for the defence of these places. Both these places are strong, and kept in readiness with these perilous times last. But is urged against the bill that those fortresses are sufficiently manned, divided among the different ports and harbors on our coasts, they will possess no effective force at any point of attack; and because we are monopolists in our opposers, because we are the infantry would give, we are, but this force proposed to be raised with addition of the peace establishment will amount to 10,000 men. The gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. R.) has said that the proportion to each city or town would not be equal to the effective militia of such places respectively. The gentleman commenced his observations by giving us one of the absurdes of Euclid. I will but go so far in mathematics, I will take the first rule in arithmetic. When two numbers are added together, the sum or aggregate will be equal to the one or the other of the two numbers first given, or not to be too learned, that two and two make four. Thus if the regular force applied to the defence of any city be equal to the force of militia, in the place, the effective power of resistance will of course be doubled. This is our system; we do fear, we know that the opposers of this bill, give up the defence of our country by militia, we claim to be as much the advocates of the militia system as they are. We only wish to reinforce the exposed points of attack, to make these 10,000 appointed and properly divided the advance picket guard in the 800,000 freemen, citizen soldiers in the great camp of the nation, to make these positions the rallying points; places of rendezvous for our militia, as has been well observed by my worthy friend from North Carolina.

A great deal has been said of the danger of standing armies; I for one believe that there was the least danger to the liberties of 800,000 or one million of freemen by the force now to be raised, I should think very little of my country, I should think very little of the spirit I enjoyed. But sir, the whole nation would laugh at such fears as these, and yet we are cautioned against the fears are—they are as absurd as would be the man, who because by the loss of his little finger, he has demonstrated that fire would burn, and therefore he would fly to the Arctic regions, and cover himself in ice and snow—or that because his great grand father was crucified on a gibbet, he is afraid with as eternal hydrophobia. With respect to economy I have but one more to say and have done—I cheerfully leave the nation to judge whether it will not be economy to defend our cities and towns, the depots of the greatest part of our wealth, from plunder, rapine and ruin, than to recover them after they have been sacked and destroyed, after wealth sufficient to maintain the whole militia, and the proposed has been wrested from us and transported across the Atlantic.

(Delete to be continued.)

STATE PAPERS.

Papers presented by his Majesty's command to both houses of Parliament, Feb. 1808.

UNITED STATES.

Note from Lords Holland and Auckland to Monsieur Monroe and Pinkney.

Dispatches from Lord Viscount Howick to the Hon. David Erskine, dated Downing-street, 8th January 1807.

Papers presented by his Majesty's command to both houses of Parliament, Feb. 1808.

UNITED STATES.

Note from Lords Holland and Auckland to Monsieur Monroe and Pinkney.

Dispatches from Lord Viscount Howick to the Hon. David Erskine, dated Downing-street, 8th January 1807.

Sir—Your dispatch No. 1 announcing your arrival at Annapolis on the 4th October, and your wait, was received here on the 6th of December, and together with Mr. Pinkney's dispatches which we received at the same time, has been laid before the king.

It is with great satisfaction that I inform you that the treaty of amity, navigation, and commerce, which you and Mr. Pinkney have concluded and signed on the 31st ultimo, at Lords Holland and Auckland on the part of his majesty, & by Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney on the part of the United States.

Mr. Pinkney, Secretary to the American Legation here, who leaves Britain in a few days, will be bearer of the treaty for ratification. I have the honor herewith to transmit a copy of the treaty, signed by your Excellency, together with a copy of a note delivered previous to the signature, by the Lords Holland and Auckland, relative to the complaints of the Canada merchants on the subject of the early operation of the decrees on the inland trade in certain parts of the United States. These complaints, which are communicated by Mr. Stoney in the early part of last year, but from some unfortunate circumstance, not perfectly understood, certainly must not be lost sight of by his majesty's government, and every attention will be given to obtain redress for the removal of the inconveniences complained of.

I transmit to you also the copy of another note presented by their Lordships, which your Excellency and commissioners previously to the signature of the treaty, on the subject of the proceedings of the British court of admiralty at Malta, in the month of November last, which we trust will be the means of obtaining