naturally excited in England by this language? Why, as Mr. Marriot's pamphlet says, "Let us hold out: our friends will soon rise into power, and thus we shall gain a complete victory." The successful invasion of France or the decapitation of the despot of Europe would not to the British ministry and its friends be a more desirable event than the overthrow of the republican party in the U. S. They are blinded to their true interests, and hold out in their injurious conduct to us with the hope of producing such an event. I wish the practice of judging of us by looking to the opposition were abandoned in England, and the government of that country would then be convinced that the people of this have no interest foreign to that of their government, nor the government any interest but that of the people, and a wish to do them all justice; that neither the government nor the people are disposed to surrender their rights or tremble at their threats: and that they have hitherto been deceived by misrepresentations of our dispositions. To these we may attribute the insolence of Mr. Canning's late note, not much less insolent than those to which I have already referred. I will read a single paragraph from it.

"His majesty would not hesitate to contribute, in any manner in his power, to restore to the commerce of the U. S. its wonted activity; and if it were possible to make any sacrifice for the repeal of the embargo, without appearing to deprecate it as a measure of hostility, he would gladly have facilitated its removal as a measure of *inconvenient restriction* on the American people."

Kind, philanthropic souls! They have great charity for us, they would forgive us all our sins of hostility proven by their friend's (Pickering's) letter which passed through eight editions, but they regret that they cannot remove an inconvenient restriction on us, though they would be very glad to do so. The cry of French influence recoils on its authors, sir; if there be any foreign influence, it is British: but I am unwilling to believe that there is either. I should not have indulged myself in this insinuation, were it not that I every day see some communication justifying it: and I would not perhaps have troubled the House with any remarks at this time, were it not from an intimation which I have received from a meeting of my constituents, asking that we should treat with both belligerents without favor or affection to either! I despise the governments of both nations from my soul. Altho' at no remote period my ancestors came from England, I think alike of the despoiler of Europe, the usurper of Spain, the great tyrant of the land, and of the robber of the Spanish frigates in time of peace, the destroyer of Copenhagen and the murderer of its helpless women and children. I have no confidence in either. These are times in which we ought to speak out. It is time that the people should know that we have nothing to expect from either belligerent; negociation has been spun finer than the cotton can be which is to pass through British ports and pay a transit duty. I know it is impolitic and unworthy of the magnanimity of the Representative of a free people to abuse foreign governments when the times do not call for decision; but we cannot be guilty of treason to our own people, because our remarks wound the feelings of our enemies.

I have said that I have no sympathy for either of the belligerents. For their governments I feel equal hatred, indignation and resentment; and will submit to accommodation with neither till the injuries committed on the rights of my country are atoned for. Yet it is true that G. Britain has done and will continue to do us most harm; and in that proportion I feel my enmity to her increased. Bonaparte, whenever it is in his power, seizes our vessels. His majesty retaliates because we have not given security for our good behavior, such as is asked of a malefactor released from confinement for a bailable offence. But it is said that punctilio prevents a settlement of our differences. Why, then, if that be the case, let us give it up. It is shameful, scandalous and unworthy of a free people whom we should misrepresent if we stood on punctilio. Is a determination to protect our citizens punctilio? I have always understood that the object of associations for self-government was to preserve the personal rights of the individuals composing it, in comparison with which property is as nothing. I will not say when our citizens are torn from their families and compelled to fight the battles of a foreign nation, that is mere punctilio. Is the carrying trade punctilio? Let us look at the language of gentlemen themselves on this subject, some of whom are now accusing us of punctilio.

[Mr. Jackson here quoted a passage from a memorial from the merchants of the town of Boston, presented two years ago, remonstrating warmly against the captures by Great Britain of the vessels of the U. S. employed in the carrying trade.]

"Is this then a matter of punctilio? We were asked by the gentleman from Connecticut to engraft an amendment on this resolution saying that we will not abandon the navigation of the ocean; and are told that punctilio only precludes us from submitting to navigate the ocean as G. Britain pleases. Was the affair of the Chesapeake punctilio? Was the murder of Pearce a mere matter of punctilio? Was the jurisdiction of the officer in the harbor of N. York within the length of his buoys a mere matter of punctilio? Is every thing in dispute punctilio? The payment of tribute?—this is a little more punctilious than any other; yet our refusal to submit to the dishonor and disgrace of it is but a matter of punctilio. I hope in God there will be a punctilious resistance, so long as the American name exists, to the payment of tribute. The resignation of our independence is punctilio; and the three penny tax on tea which kindled a flame that burst the shackles of tyranny, was all punctilio too sir!

The embargo was produced by this punctilious spirit of avoiding ruin—of avoiding dishonor and disgrace—and of avoiding the payment of tribute, when ruin and tribute were assailing us under the decrees and orders of the great land mammoth and the shark of the ocean. It is denied that the British orders induced the embargo. What has that to do with the question? Whether they led to the embargo or not is immaterial, for the contention for that point is an admission of the fact that they would have justified it. The effect of the embargo was to bring home our citizens from abroad. Unfortunately some have disgraced themselves so much as to receive British licences. By calling those home who were abroad and retaining those who were here, till they could launch on the ocean again without danger of confiscation and ruin, and what is worse than all, of compulsion to pay tribute, we were not at all dishonored. It may be likened to the case of an unarmed man who is amongst his enemies—he retires home to associate with him his friends, arming himself and launching forth in resistance of the infraction of his rights. The time is not yet come for us to make a sally. 'Tis due to the spirit of this people, that every effort should first be made to preserve peace. The governments of Europe, whether ruled by monarchs or despots, wage war when they please; the people march to war without enquiring why or wherefore, and imagine that in so doing they display their patriotism. But that ignoble spirit does not pervade this country, and thank God that it does not; the people will enquire and will examine also: they will believe that it is no dishonor to retire from the scene where they cannot carry on their usual occupation, and refuse to go to war, till every preliminary step is taken. It is no disgrace to say that unprepared we cannot fight both G. Britain and France. We are appealing to the justice and interests of those nations. It is to be hoped that their eyes will at length be opened to their dictates. Thus far the appeal has been in vain, and trade could only have been carried on in its accustomed channels under submission to pay tribute.

But it is denied that this refusal to carry on trade will have any beneficial effect at all, and it is said that it is withdrawing from the contest; that it is an abandonment of our rights; that G. Britain was struggling for the trade of the world, and we have relinquished it to her. What does this trade consist in, sir? The trade with us is cut off, and consequently through us with her enemies. She may trade to some of her own dependencies and back again, and to Spain and Portugal if they are not yet overwhelmed by the victorious arms of the usurper: and to that extent only can she go. But gentlemen say, remove the embargo and all will be well; we can trade. Sir, honest men are restrained from trading by respect for their own and their country's honor; and it is our duty to restrain those who disregard all such considerations. Shall we submit & trade? Is trade to be purchased on such terms as these? Were these sentiments fostered for a moment during the period of our revolution? No, sir. If the fathers of the revolution, many of whom are still living, had set them down and calculated the profit and loss in a pecuniary view of resisting the three-penny tax on tea, they would have lost the opportunity of performing those glorious exploits, which are recorded in the page of history, and gave birth to a nation.

But it is said by gentlemen, that we may trade to the West-Indies, and a proposition to that effect was laid on the table by a gentleman from North Carolina, now absent from his seat, (Mr. Sawyer.) Apropos, comes intimation that the trade is blockaded by an order, unquestionably issued under the circumstances referred to by my colleague yesterday, under an expectation that the embargo would be raised and our commerce be flowing into those ports.

Others say, let us trade to Spain. Spain may be, and in all human probability is, by this time, a conquered country; for whether one party or the other prevails, the Spanish kingdom loses its independence. Look at the late capitulation between the British and French in Portugal. It was not a surrender made to the Portuguese, for whom the British were nominally fighting, but to the British themselves. They come not as allies, but as conquerors; each party is contending for the supremacy, & manifests a disposition to maintain it when acquired. But gentlemen say, let us carry on a trade to aid the Spanish patriots; let us extend to those struggling for liberty, the same assistance which we sought for in the struggle for our independence. I warn gentlemen against the imposition. The Spaniards are fighting for a monarch who has transferred them to another like a flock of sheep. There is a little patriotism to be sure in fighting for a king of their own choice; but it is not a patriotism to enlist the sensibilities of such a people as this in their favor. They are fighting for *one* king against *another*; and though I participate in the feeling which others profess, and wish that they should have a choice of despots, yet I will not interfere in any manner between Great Britain and France who are contending for the empire there. If we were to trade to Spain it would be the *ne plus ultra* allowed by Great Britain, who would there receive our domestic produce, and furnish her manufactures in return. Remember that we are contesting her monopoly of the trade of the world; and there we should surrender it. The principle would hold good if the trade were confined to the West Indies. G. Britain would there receive the products of this country, and we hers in return. We might as well permit them to take our produce at the mouth of the Chesapeake; and indeed it would not be a great extension of the principle contended for, if we were to allow her to establish a custom house, and appoint collectors of duty in every seaport town in the union.

By continuing the embargo we can prepare to defend our towns. The fires lighted up in Copenhagen are scarcely extinguished; they are glowing before us in imagination at least; and we ought to recollect that if we do not submit, it is *war*—if we do submit, it is *tribute*. And if we have war our towns will share the fate of fortified Copenhagen, unless we strengthen and fortify them. First, let us prepare to defend ourselves. Gentlemen say defence is not resistance. Let us prepare to defend ourselves, sir, and then we will be better able to resist and attack our enemies.

But we are told that the system is ruinous. If we become bankrupts in money, sir, we shall be sound in honor; and if we carry on trade without adopting stronger measures, we shall be bankrupts in fortune and reputation also. We have been told of the condition of the country; that it is deplorable; and have been warned, inasmuch as there was a rising against the excise laws, to guard against the consequences arising from the embargo laws; & in depicting the various distresses of the country, it is said (by Mr. Randolph) that there is no sale for tobacco or cotton. What say the cotton planters, than whom none are more interested in foreign commerce? I may venture to assert that they are unanimously unwilling to place their bales of cotton in one scale, and national honor in the other. They are unwilling to put interest, sordid interest, in competition with the national independence, which would be sacrificed by the payment of tribute. This tobacco business and insurrection among the planters, reminds me of the humorous letter of Sampson to lord Spencer, requesting him to send over an hundred thousand pounds for the purpose of exciting a civil war, ravaging the tobacco country, and destroying the plantations with fire and tow, to be called the Segar War, and if he did not succeed it would end in *smoke*. This idea is not more ridiculous than that the tobacco planters will rise in insurrection on account of the low price of that article, when they know that their whole market to any extent is cut off by the orders in council. Will gentlemen say that we shall carry our tobacco to England, there pay a duty, and then carry it to France, and fight the legions of Bonaparte to compel him to receive it? If we are to have a war with France, I hope it will not be a war of that kind.

A doubt has been raised as to the constitutionality of the measure; the power of Congress to interdict trade is denied because it is alleged our form of government grew out of commerce. I have always understood that the constitution was adopted for the purpose, as it imports, of establishing union, for promoting the common defence and general welfare, and if for these nobler purposes foreign commerce be suspended for a season, I trust that it will not be considered as violating the principles of that constitution.

A charge has been uttered in anonymous publications in newspapers, as well as in the famous letter of Pickering, to which I have alluded, of a hostility to commerce in the southern states. I for one protest against this declaration. I do not know where that individual is that is opposed to foreign commerce? Where are the Southern or Western people who are opposed to commerce or navigation in our own vessels, navigated by our own seamen, and owned wholly by our own citizens? The insinuation is unjust. There never was a question brought before this House affecting the commercial rights, in which the Southern and Western people have not strenuously supported them. It has never been objected to me by my constituents, that I voted for building 74s and frigates, and for fortifying our seaport towns: and this has afforded me an opportunity of ascertaining that my constituents are not hostile to commerce.

But we are told that the Eastern people are peculiarly affected by our measures, and that they will not submit to them. What, sir, is the present subject of dispute, which has involved the U. States in difficulties? Foreign commerce altogether. Who have it? The Eastern people; they have it all. The Southern people have but little navigation, and care for little more in relation to it than the raising their staple commodities, permitting their brethren of the East to carry them to market. And because we would not give up their commercial rights, & have adopted measures for asserting them, we are charged with an hostility to and abandonment of commerce. The charge comes with very little grace indeed from gentlemen who say that our present difficulties have grown out of a pertinacious adherence to every principle of commercial right. If principle were not concerned, we (the Southern people) might say it is immaterial to us who carries our tobacco, cotton and so forth; but we are contending for principle, for the interest of our brethren of the East, and we will not desert them, though we are threatened with being deserted by them. We will disbelieve the assertions of the leaders of faction, and hope that the disposition does not exist, although attempts are made to excite it, as manifested by handbills published there. Were it not for principle we would not care any thing about it; but acquiescence would resemble the case of a farmer's stealing his neighbour's waggon and destroying his team, and saying no one but himself should carry his produce to market. We grow; they carry. Who is injured most by the suspension of commerce, the grower or the carrier? The former. It is true that as their ships are lying at the wharves, rotting as we are told, and our farms do not rot, they feel it a little more severely than we do. But it is a time when all should sacrifice a little for the public good.

But if we are wrong, what shall we do? All who condemn the course are silent as to what ought to be done. Every quack condemns the prescription of the pyhsician, and tells you all is wrong. When pressed for his *projet*, he shrugs up his shoulders and is silent. Is this the course of patriotism? The patient he tells you is treated improperly. All's wrong, but he will not tell you what is right. If that patriotism pervades their breasts, which one would suppose from hearing their language, we expect from them as Americans and as friends, in the plenitude of their wisdom, to tell us what is to be done. We say our measures are right, and as they condemn them, they should tell us what they will do. Surely they do not mean to submit. Gentlemen escape by saying all's wrong, and they have an advantage in so doing. If measures prove abortive, they may say I told you so; if they prove right, they are silent; their admonitions did no harm. This conduct may be *politic*, but it is not *patriotic*.

But say gentlemen, will you abandon commerce? The refusal of the House to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Dana) may be represented to the people as evidence of an intention to abandon commerce. I will not abandon commerce, I will only suspend it for a time; I will make our laws operate uniformly, and not permit a few worthless individuals to make fortunes at the expence of the community, by the evasions of them. Cut off all intercourse; encrease our force. It would be madness to rush into the contest unarmed, unprepared, and vulnerable at all points. Take every step short of war, march up to the threshold, and if possible accomplish our purpose by pacific means, before we pass it. We need not fear the legions of Bonaparte or the minions of George III. We are not now subject to the temptations of exclusive privileges offered to his majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, or the proscriptions exempting our patriot from the pardon offered. When convinced that every thing has been done that can be done, the people will rally around us as one man; and whether for defence or offence, will present a phalanx irresistible and unconquerable. I will consent to withdraw the embargo as to either, on a withdrawal of his decrees, and to issue letters of marque and reprisal against the other. Arming our merchant vessels would be war in disguise. I would not wage war and then declare it. If we are to have war I wish to have it openly in the face of day, and not secretly, and in the night, assailing the enemy without notice, *when he suspects no danger*. I would not make war except it were declared, according to the provisions of the constitution.

But a gentleman asks why do not we act and not spend our time in talking. I know, sir, that much time has been occupied to-day to little purpose; the remark made by the gentleman from Virginia yesterday, (Mr. Randolph) that he has done but little good, may apply to me. But this observation of the waste of time comes with an ill grace from them, after having occupied two or three days of your time this session with motions to violate the confidence reposed in us, by the [illegible] and two or three hours more on a question of order. The [illegible] has done no good; [illegible] much harm, sir, by a [illegible] of the measures adopted, and throwing all the blame on [illegible] government, instead of [illegible] what the good of the country [illegible] requires.

Gentlemen have protested against the invocation of the spirit of '76. I wish it would appear and purge the body politic of tories and British influence. I wish the line of demarkation to be drawn, that we may ascertain who is for his country, and who is against his country; and I regret that the noble spirit which operated like enchantment and conjured up a pretence for plunging us into a war with France, after the famous X Y Z negociation, does not exist, when just cause excites it, and give efficacy and sanction to the principle contended for then, which I hope will become our motto now—MILLIONS FOR DEFENCE AND NOT A CENT FOR TRIBUTE.

WASHINGTON CITY

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 23.

The Electors of the State of Ohio have given three votes to James Madison as President, & three votes to John Langdon as Vice-President.

The House of Delegates of Virginia, a state ever foremost in the day of danger, have *unanimously* adopted the following resolutions, which are prefaced by an able exposition of the state of the country.

1. *Resolved, That it is better for us to cease to exist as a nation than to exist [illegible] honor and violated rights—*

2. *Resolved, That the aggressions of G. Britain and France, have infringed our honor; have violated our rights, have usurped upon our sovereignty as an independent nation.*

3. *Resolved, That we will stand by the government of our country; and that we will support them with the last cent of our treasure and the last drop of our blood, in every measure, either of defence or offence, which they may deem expedient, to vindicate our injured honor and our violated rights.*

IN SENATE, Dec. 21.—*The act to enforce and make more effectual an Act, entitled an act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the United States, and the several acts supplementary thereto, was read the third time. Messrs. Giles & Pope supported and Messrs. Hillhouse & Pickering opposed its passage. The debate was continued till about 8 in the evening, when the question was taken by Yeas and Nays as follow:*

YEAS—Messrs. Anderson, Condit, Crawford, Franklin, Gaillard, Giles, Gregg, Kitchell, Milledge, Mitchill, Moore, Pope, Robinson, Smith N. Y. Smith Md. Smith T. Sumter, Thruston, Tiffin and Turner—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Gilman, Goodrich, Hillhouse, Lloyd, Mathewson, Pickering, White—7.

In the House of Representatives—Yesterday, the bill from the Senate for enforcing the embargo, was twice read and referred to a committee of the whole on Saturday next.

Mr. Newton reported "a bill to deprive in certain cases vessels of their American character, and to prevent under certain disabilities any citizen of the U. S. from taking a licence from any foreign power to navigate the ocean or trade with any other foreign and independent power."—Twice read and referred.

The bill authorising the President of the U. States to employ an additional number of seamen and marines (2000) went through a committee of the whole.

Details postponed.

Philadelphia, Dec. 21.—Capt. Rymers, 18 days from Havanna, states, that a few days previous to his sailing, a national brig from Cadiz, and a schooner from Malaga, arrived there in short passages, with the important information of the surrender of king Joseph and his army, as prisoners, to the Spanish patriots.

THE WASHINGTON BRIDGE COMPANY.

NOTICE is hereby given, that an annual meeting of the STOCKHOLDERS will be held on the 1st Monday in January next, agreeably to the "Act authorising the erection of a Bridge over the river Potomac, within the district of Columbia," at Long's tavern, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

By order of the President & Directors,
SAML. ELLIOT, Jun. Ck.
December 23—ep

ITALIAN MARBLE.

ON Saturday the 24th inst. will be sold at the U. States Navy Yard, at 12 o'clock, sundry Blocks and Slabs of Marble, part of the Base intended for the Monument in memory of the American Officers who fell before Tripoli; but which the severity of four winters rendered it improper to use.

The proceeds are to go towards defraying the expence of erecting the Monument.

Terms, Cash, under [illegible] above 50 dollars [illegible]

B. HENRY LATROBE, S. P. B. U. S.
December 23—1t