parliament, at the time of their adoption. As an evidence of this fact, let me call your most serious attention, sir, to some of the observations made in Parliament, at the time of their adoption, particularly the observations of Lord Grenville in the House of Lords.

Speech to be continued.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

NOVEMBER 30.

DEBATE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS CONTINUED.

MR. TROUP said he was extremely happy to agree in one thing with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that the southern had not suffered less by the operation of the embargo than the eastern states; but when in differing from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Quincy) on a point of still greater importance he was also compelled to differ from the hon. gentleman from Virginia; he did so with the deepest regret. It has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (observed Mr. T.) that for the last 11 months the country has suffered by this system of embargo, the extreme of disgrace and humiliation, and the gentleman from Virginia has called it a measure of degrading submission. Sir, it is not a measure of submission; it is a measure of resistance, and of the most formidable resistance. Whatever may have been the object of the Executive in recommending the embargo, it has ever been supported by me as a measure of coercion, as a measure of justifiable retaliation. I contend that it is not submission. Acquiescence in the orders & decrees; submisson to seizure and condemnation, would be submission to all intents and purposes; but that measure which keeps at home the ships and property which our enemies seek to capture on the high seas is not submission, but resistance, and the gentleman from Massachusetts will find it so to his sorrow. Commerce, sir is the life-blood of England; it is the foundation of her wealth, her prosperity and her maritime grandeur. But the gentleman says we have retired from the high way of nations and left our great rival free to navigate it. True—we have retired from the ocean; we have left our rival free to navigate; but very little more than between port and port of her own dominions. We have given the finishing stroke to her exclusion from the commerce of the whole civilized world—she has not one tittle of it left other than what you yourselves would have if your embargo were raised to-morrow, and your committee have told you what that is—a scanty, contemptible commerce of 7,000,000 of dollars. England lost 100,000,000 when France shut the continent against her—she lost 50,000,000 by the occlusion of your own ports, and nothing of trade is left her but that which she may drive with the native powers of Asia and Africa, with Sweden, and precariously with Spain, Portugal and their possessions. No more then of raising the embargo to carry on commerce, when without a sacrifice of independence, without a dishonorable submission to the orders of cou- -il we cannot carry on more than 7,000,000 of commerce.

I know it is said that the people of the southern states are the enemies of foreign trade; that their spirit and their interest are anti-commercial. Sir, in this sentiment which is itself without foundation, nay without even the shadow of foundation is to be sought that jealousy which has given rise to so many evils and from which such serious evils are yet to be apprehended—but sir it is a mean, pitiful, contemptible jealousy. The southern states are not the enemies of commerce—indeed how can it be said of a people who raise 70,000,000 of pounds of cotton and for which they have not a home market for 10,000,000, that they are the enemies of commerce! No sir, they have from the beginning of your government to the present day sacrificed as much to the prosperity of commerce as any people of the union; they have been at all times as ready to go to war for commerce—on the attack of the Chesapeake they were even more forward to go to war for the honor and dignity of the flag than the people of the eastern states.

A little more than was said by my friend from Virginia, as to the comparative operation of the embargo on the Eastern and Southern states—compare the operation of this measure by its proper test—the only true and correct one; the depreciation of the respective staples of those two sections of the union. Let the gentleman from Massachusetts state to the House what has been the depreciation of his *beef, pork, fish, butter, cheese, onions, potatoes, and cabbages*, and I will tell him what has been the depreciation of our great staples *cotton* and *rice*. The ordinary market price of cotton is between 18 and 22 cents; the embargo price is from 10 to 12; the ordinary price of rice is from 5 to 6 dollars; the embargo price is from 2 to 3. Our people are besides in proportion to their number more in debt than the people of the Eastern states.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts warns us against a perseverance in the system of embargo—a perseverance according to the gentleman is to be followed by open hostility to the laws. Sir, I dread no such hostility; we have no reason to dread it; it is altogether impossible that men who are actuated by the basest of human passions, can make a serious movement in a revolution. No, sir, I insist upon it, we have no cause to fear the anti-embargo men of Massachusetts; one brave, independent, generous yeoman of Massachusetts, would drive a half a dozen such fellows into the ocean. But the truth is, the gentleman seems to have wholly mistaken the condition of his countrymen. He told us they had suffered every thing but famine, that the distress and ruin were co-extensive with the country, they could or would not suffer longer. Yet, sir, the gentleman was not well seated before his colleague (Mr. Bacon) rose, and with equal claim to veracity and the same opportunity of forming a correct opinion, told you that his honorable colleague had given a very high coloring to the picture; that the distresses of the people were by no means as great as they were described, and that if they were less prosperous and flourishing than before the embargo, they were far, very far, from that state of misery which his colleague had represented.

Sir, many of these observations have been made with extreme reluctance; they have been extorted under circumstances which must give pain to every American, but which cannot fail to kindle in him the liveliest indignation. No man can read without horror and disgust in the paper of the day, the most treasonable and flagitious libel that ever disgraced our country (the anonimous publication circulated in Newbury-Port.)

Sir, it is remarkable that we have been so gradually familiarized with British outrages, and have at length become so completely reconciled to the most extravagant excesses of them that what, two years ago you would have been willing to go to war for, would now be considered a matter of too trifling importance to merit your attention, much less your resentment. Two years ago you were willing to go to war to limit the right of search; you would have gone to war to prohibit the practice of impressment, you would have gone to war to overturn the lawless system of blockade; you would have gone to war for the colonial trade; for the attack on the Chesapeake; two years ago you would have gone to war for the orders in council, and now that all these outrages & more than these have accumulated on your head until you are bowed down to the earth—you are content to beg a little commerce of England—you tell England if she will be pleased to grant you a little trade you will open your ports to her and shut them against France. This last, this humiliating overture she rejects with indignation—you have no choice left, as your committee has reported, but between war and embargo. We cannot go to war with one without going to war with the other; because the wrongs done by one are not less than the wrongs done by the other—unless indeed you consider the shedding of innocent blood the greatest of all possible wrongs.

I know this measure of embargo has been condemned, loudly condemned; but only by men who propose to reseat themselves in power by an appeal to the feelings and interest of the community. In one part of the country this appeal has been made with effect. The avaricious have been corrupted, the ignorant have been duped. In all countries there are the avaricious and the ignorant, and the passion of the one and the credulity of the other have been wielded with success by the anti-embargo men. Sir, the people have been led to believe, that a great commerce could be carried on under the orders and decrees, when in fact no commerce could be carried on without compromitting the honor of the nation. They have been led to believe that a commerce could be carried on without hazarding the peace of the country, when in fact no commerce could be carried on without involving the country in war, and whilst the great object of the government was to protect commerce the embargo was said to aim a deadly blow at commerce. It is by such misrepresentations that the noisy enemies of embargo out of doors have been deluded and corrupted. And are these the people to whom we are called on to turn a respectful and deferential ear. The merest Shylocks—men who cry out, away with your honor, your independence, your neutrality—they are all stuff—give me gold! British merchants, British agents, and malcontent Americans—the depraved of the cities, and the ignorant of the country—men who are ready to sacrifice the honor and independence of the nation for a little trade in codfish and potash. If we are thus degenerate—if we are thus fallen in thirty short years, it is high time to abandon your republican system of government. Sir, will posterity believe that this very people, who thirty years ago magnanimously offered up their lives and fortunes for the acquisition of independence, are now prepared to sacrifice that very independence to their avarice? Will posterity believe, that this same people, in one short year forgot the affair of the Chesapeake? That they were ready to shake hands with the murderers and robbers of their countrymen? I will not, for myself, assent to such a base barter of honor for gold. No, sir! If it has come to this—if we cannot for a year or two years endure the privations incident to a measure of embargo, if we cannot exist without the luxuries of life, notwithstanding the most imperious calls of honor and of duty, we are unworthy the blessings we enjoy—we have lost our virtue, and are ripe for the dynasty of the Bonapartes or any other dynasty, and whether you are conquered by France into miserable servitude to-morrow, or corrupted to sell your country to England, is not worth a reflection. This accursed avarice will ruin you.

Sir, it is not to such a people as those, and I trust in God, a majority of the people of New-England are very different, that I would appeal to test the correctness of the measure of embargo. Were I disposed to test its correctness by its popularity, I would appeal to the people of Virginia, too honorable to be corrupted, too enlightened to be duped. I would ask them what they thought of the embargo, and they would answer with an almost unanimous voice—they would go further—they would be ready to support it with their lives and fortunes.

You have done every thing for commerce—you have negociated for commerce—you have jeopardized the peace of the country for commerce—you have passed an embargo to protect commerce—and commerce is the first to abandon you. God forbid that I should speak thus of the whole mercantile community. I have seen too many instances on this floor of noble and magnanimous sacrifice of private interest to the public weal—they are not the Smiths or the Grays, or the Crowninshields, of whom I speak.

If the embargo were raised to morrow, none would trade but men of desperate character and bankrupt fortune—the real *bona fide* American merchant, would not venture a ship at sea—and where would they trade? Why to be sure they might drive a trade in beef and pork and flour to the West Indies, and some of our cotton and rice and tobacco, would find their way to England, if the French privateers did not catch them—but the market would soon be overrun—it would soon be no better than the home market, and where would you trade to besides? If you are determined to pay the nine pence per pound tribute, for permission to re-export your cotton to the continent, the French decrees would take it, and if they did not, the price of the article would be so enhanced by the tribute, that the market at the continent would be lost to you.

Permission to arm is tantamount to a declaration of war, and the people of this country want peace, as long as they can preserve it with honor. And do you think, sir, we are ready to plunge headlong into a ruinous war, naked and unarmed, to gratify a few bankrupt commercial speculators! It is easy to declare war—it is more difficult under present circumstances, to maintain peace, and it is most difficult of all to wage a successful war. Sir, beware! It is the object of the gentleman from Massachusetts and his friends, to lead you step by step into a war, and if he can, into an unpopular war, which the moment you cease to conduct with effect, you are ruined, and he and his friends are exalted. To such an event, deplorable as it would be, I could be reconciled if I believed the gentleman and his friends would govern in the true spirit of the constitution; but liberty has been hunted down in the old world—there is scarce a remnant of it left, save in America—*here* it is sustained by the ruling party; and sir, the moment this party ceases to rule, republicanism is gone, and with it the hopes of all good men forever. On this account I deprecate such an event.

It would appear to me from the tenor of the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that he wants war with France and alliance with England. If this be the fact, the gentleman is not consistent. If he is really as much afraid of the gigantic power of France as he affects to be, (and I must confess, for my part, I am very much afraid of it,) assuredly it is not policy to provoke France—it is policy to keep out of the way of both monsters as long as we can, and to husband your resources. And what would avail an alliance with England?—You could only furnish men to be slaughtered on the continent. I can tell the gentleman from Massachusetts in what he would much better exemplify, both his patriotism and consistency—*in union*—in uniting to call into activity the resources of the nation for its defence—in organizing and arming and disciplining—and what is not less desirable in adopting a system of finance, which would not fail you in any exigency—in short, in pursuing the course, in which you are—which the soundest policy points to as the safest and the best, the course of impartial neutrality, if indeed neutrality has any thing to do with it.

As to the embargo so much has been said both in and out of doors in its justification, that I will forbear to touch it. It is only necessary to observe that it has been supported and will be continued as a measure of security and of just retaliation—as a measure of security it keeps the property at home, which but for it would have enriched your enemies—as a measure of retaliation, it would have had its effect but for the anti-embargo men of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will co-operate to make it efficient he will soon find the great mercantile politicians of England from Anderson down to M'Call Medford, have not been mistaken in the belief that this country can vitally affect the colonial & manufacturing interests of that by an embargo system.

As to a declaration of war against France and G. Britain, and the policy of making it immediately, no local considerations should be permitted to enter into our view of it; but this much is to be said, that the Southern people are more interested in raising the embargo than going to war; by the first they would find a vent for a small proportion of their staples—by the latter they could get nothing but taxes and fighting. The anti embargo men of Massachusetts would not make more by the first than ourselves, and by the last they would make nothing more than their privateers would make for them, but the great object is to postpone the evil.

One word before I sit down, as to what fell from the gentleman from N. York. He proposes to repeal the embargo in relation to Spain and Portugal; sir, is the political condition of those states characterized by a permanency and stability which would warrant a commercial connexion with them—trade with the junta of Seville, a mere political ephemeron—a being of a day. Sir, I wish the Spanish patriots success with all my heart, but success is impossible. Ten thousand to one that whilst I am speaking, this same Junta of Seville is imploring clemency at the footstool of the great usurper. Indeed, sir, if we are bound to consider this people of any definite description, we are to consider them rather as French subjects than Spanish patriots, for the only official paper in relation to them is the instrument of abdication and renunciation by which this unhappy people have been transferred over like a flock of sheep to the emperor Napoleon, and by the very men for whose rights of empire they are said to be contending.

(Debate to be Continued.)

SENATE—DECEMBER 11.

MR. GILES, from the committee appointed the 11th November, on that part of the message of the President of the U. States which relates to the embargo laws, & the measures necessary to enforce the observance thereof, made a further report, in part, of the following bill, "To authorize and require the President of the U. S. to *arm, man and fit out for immediate service all the public ships of war, vessels and gun boats of the U. S.*"

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled*, That the President be, and he is hereby authorized and required, to cause to be fitted out, officered, manned, and employed, as soon as may be, all the frigates and other armed vessels of the United States, including gun boats; and to cause the frigates and armed vessels, so soon as they can be prepared for actual service respectively, to be stationed at such ports and places on the sea-coast as he may deem most expedient, or to cruise on any part of the coast of the United States, or territories thereof.

"Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That for the purpose of carrying the foregoing provision into immediate effect, the President of the United States be, and is hereby authorized and required in addition to the number of petty officers, able seamen, ordinary seamen, and boys, at present authorized by law, to appoint, and cause to be engaged and employed as soon as may be midshipmen, corporals of marines, able seamen, ordinary seamen and boys, which shall be engaged to serve for a period not exceeding years, but the President may discharge the same sooner, if in his judgment their service may be dispensed with: And to satisfy the necessary expenditures to be incurred therein, a sum not exceeding dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated; and shall be paid out of any monies in the treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The bill for extending the terms of credit on revenue bonds in certain cases and for other purposes, was read the second time and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. BRADLEY gave notice that he should on Thursday next ask leave to bring in a bill in addition to the act, entitled "An act for the more effectual preservation of peace in the ports and harbors of the U. S. and in the waters under their jurisdiction.

The bill making further appropriation for the public buildings in the city of Washington, was considered, without any definitive order being taken thereon.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13.

The bill to authorize and require the President of the U. S. to arm, man and fit out for immedite service all the public ships of war, vessels and gun boats of the U. S. was read the second time and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

After consideration, the bill making further provision for enforcing the embargo was recommitted to the original committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 12.

MOTION FOR PUBLISHING CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS.

After the reference of some petitions and resolutions of a private nature—

Mr. Randolph observed, that it was not without some embarrassment that he rose to submit a motion to the House, not because he conceived that there was any thing improper in the motion itself—far otherwise—but because he was not perfectly sure whether, previous to making it he ought not to request the galleries of the House to be cleared. But inasmuch as the motion itself could convey nothing to the spectators in the galleries which would be improper to be disclosed, and it would be competent for the chair to decide whether the discussion (if any should arise) ought to be carried on with closed doors or not, perhaps it would be better in the first instance to submit the motion with the doors open, because he knew what sensations the closing the doors of the House frequently excited. The public had already seen, by the supplemental journal of proceedings with closed doors, the fate of several motions made in order to give publicity to several communications from our ministers abroad. They had also seen, he presumed, because he had seen, in the public newspapers, a letter purporting to be written by a member of this House, (Mr. Sawyer) containing what was stated to be a disclosure of those dispatches in substance. It could not be forgotten that during the discussion of propositions to give publicity to those communications, gentlemen, one in particular from Massachusetts, had conceived that nothing could be more unhappy than to give substantially their contents; that it would be infinitely better, in fact to publish them verbatim, than to give what each individual might chuse to call their substance: and Mr. R. said, it was well known that his worthy friend from North Carolina, (Mr. Macon) though zealous for their publication, had voted against giving permission, to any individual to make public what he thought to be their substance.

It was with extreme reluctance, Mr. R. said, that he had drawn into question the name of any member of this House, particularly of one who was not present. He said, he had deferred the motion which he was about to submit, in hopes that the gentleman whose name had been used by the public papers would be present to inform the House whether his name had been properly used by the public papers or not. He wished not to be understood as vouching for the proof of the fact; but the impression on the public mind was the same from that letter as if it had actually been written by the member in question—and it must be well known to every member of the House, and that as far as it went was a proof that it had not been written by the gentleman in question, that the letter did not contain substantially the amount of the dispatches. He said he perceived in that printed letter that an important letter of Gen. Armstrong, he thought of the 22d of February, was not alluded to at all. He thought it important not only that the public should see what the members themselves had seen, that they should know what they knew, but that they should be apprized of what in his opinion was not of much less consequence, of what the House did *not* know. For this purpose he said he would again submit a motion to the House, which had been once rejected upon ground which in his opinion could not at this moment have weight; since the principal objection had consisted in the impropriety of permitting any thing purporting to be the contents of the communications to be known, on account of the misrepresentation to which they might be liable. Mr. R. then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy imposed on the communication from our respective ministers at Paris and London, which accompanied the President's message of the 8th instant, be taken off, with the exception of the extract of a letter from gen. Armstrong to the Secretary of State, dated Paris, December 27th, 1807.

The *Speaker* observed that in his opinion the rules of the House re-