LONDON, July 5.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

House of Lords, July 4.

Colonial Intercourse with America.

Lord Holland

Rose to bring forward his promised motion for some important information on this subject. He prefaced it with a very able and argumentative speech, of considerable length. He described the proceedings which had taken place in some of the West India Islands, particularly in Jamaica, which induced him to think the present appeal to the wisdom of Parliament necessary. They arose principally from the conduct of the governors of these islands, with respect to the discretionary power exercised by them, relative to the commercial intercourse between the islands, and the U. States of America. He alluded to the suspension of the navigation laws, in one point of view, but more especially to the restrictive power exercised by them with respect to the importation of American produce; so necessary for the sustenance of the islands, or the shipping of that country. The line of conduct to which he referred, either in a political or commercial point of view, was of the most serious importance, and still more, as it affected the supply of the islands with articles of the first necessity, as lumber and provisions. The inhabitants of Jamaica in particular felt it so strongly, that their legislative assemblies made repeated representations to the governor upon the subject, who, in one of his answers, stated, he could not permit the importation in neutral bottoms longer than a given period. With respect to the question, though as affecting the interests of the islands, of great importance, was still of greater, as it may affect the commercial intercourse and good understanding between this country and the U. States of America. He deprecated every thing like a narrow, selfish commercial policy with respect to America. Ministers should consider the circumstances and situation of America, the great importance of continuing that good understanding and extensive commercial and friendly intercourse which now happily subsists between the two countries, and to which their common origin, language, and manners, so very fortunately dispose them. One of his objects in coming forward was to give an opportunity to his majesty's ministers to disclaim any such notions or principles as actuated their conduct with respect to the restrictions on the trade and commercial intercouse between the West India Islands and America. It so happened, and fortunately, he tho't, that our West India Islands could not be adequately supplied with articles of the first necessity, except from the U. States. He thought this was eventually fortunate, because the important consideration to which he adverted would operate as an additional inducement with the government of this country to cultivate a friendly understanding with America. He adverted to some ineffectual attempts which had been made under former administrations to supply our West India Islands from the British dominions in North America. Adverting to the incalculable importance of the American commerce to this country, he observed, that any attempts to exclude America from the trade of our West India Islands, would be worse than the conduct, as related in the ancient fable, of the dog in the manger, whose determination was comparatively wise and liberal. It would go to remind him of the fable of the two petitioners to Jupiter, to whom the Godhead said, that whatever he gave to the one, the other should have double—then, said one, in a paroxism of folly and malignity, give me blindness in one eye, that my neighbor may be blind both eyes? So would it be metaphorically, did this country wish to exclude America from our W. India trade, upon the narrow principle of commercial jealousy. His lordship took a view of the policy and effects of the navigation act, in its different bearings—and argued, that the changes in the system of Europe, and the relative situation of this country, rendered the policy of acting upon it very different from what it was at its first enactment. In war, generally speaking, it was impracticable. He wished the affairs to which he adverted were placed on a liberal footing and permanent basis—and it was important they should declare what line or system of conduct they intended to adopt, respecting the intercourse between America and our W. India colonies, in time of war. Thro' the whole of his speech, more especially towards the conclusion, the noble lord expatiated upon the great national importance, either in a political or commercial view, of maintaining an amicable intercourse and close connexion with America—and repeated, that one of his principal objects in coming forward was to give ministers an opportunity, of disclaiming all notions of narrow or selfish policy, with respect to their intended intercourse in question, a circumstance which would give great satisfaction to all parties; and with respect to their intended system in future, he thought they should be explicit. His lordship concluded by moving an address to his majesty, "for the production of the communication which took place between the legislative assemblies of Jamaica and his majesty's government of that Island, touching the intercourse between that colony and the U. States of America, from the commencement of the war with France, to the 21st of May last; also for copies of the correspondence between his majesty's secretary of state for the colonial department, and the governor of Jamaica, on the subject, within the same interval—also, for various documents, respecting the quantities of provisions, &c. imported from America and the Island of Jamaica, at certain given periods, distinguishing those imported from British America, and those from the U. States of America."

The question being put on the first motion:

The Earl of CAMDEN in allusion to what had transpired on the subject on a former evening, observed he had stated that counter orders had been sent out to the Governors. The orders which were sent relative to the conduct of the Governors, respecting the subject in question, were precisely to the same purpose, during the last war. By the act of the 28th of the King, he observed, all goods and commodities were prohibited from being imported into the British West India Islands from the United States of America, with the exception of certain articles, as provisions and lumber, in cases of necessity; of these the respective Governors were generally constituted the judges. They were to act upon their responsibility with respect to the admission of these articles, and bills of indemnity were passed, when they had acted contrary to the law. The noble Earl adverted to the extensive nature of the information called for—the propriety of accompanying these documents with others which were necessary for the full illustration of the subject, and which, in this very advanced period of the session, it would be impracticable to produce. He therefore submitted to the Noble Baron the propriety of withdrawing his motion for the present; or in case he persisted, he should think it his duty to move the order of the day upon them.

Lord Holland shortly explained.

Lord Hawkesbury's objections were not so much against producing the required information, as producing that alone, which should produce a false prejudice upon the subject, and would by no means put the House in full possession of the case. Under that conviction ministers would feel it their duty also to move for a number of additional documents. With respect to what was said of the restrictions upon the trade in question, he had to observe that there were many representations made, from respectable and important quarters, of a direct contrary tendency to those alluded to by the noble Baron, and reasons adduced that government, instead of imposing unnecessary restrictions, were, in fact, too indulgent with respect to that part of the trade of the United States, to the great detriment of the British merchants; their lordships would therefore see the propriety of the proposed additional documents, in order to afford Parliament and the public an opportunity to decide and judge thoroughly of the merits of the question. He admitted the subject was one which any noble lord might fairly bring before Parliament, but the advanced period of the session rendered the production of the necessary documents impracticable. He was, therefore, of opinion with his noble friend, it would be preferable to postpone the discussion to another session, when all the information proper to be laid before Parliament could be produced. With respect to the line of conduct intended to be pursued by his Majesty's government relative to the subject in question, it would be regulated by their convictions of the true interests and character of their country, and a due respect for the principles of the Navigation Laws. With respect to what was said of their views in regard to the trade of America, they would be regulated by no sentiment contrary to those just and liberal principles of commercial policy, so well understood in the present day; upon principles, founded not only upon the true interest of their own country, but even with a proper regard to the interest and prosperity of America herself.

Earl Stanhope contended that ministers had not been sufficiently explicit, particularly with respect to their intended conduct during the recess. Instead of giving a plain answer to the queries of his noble friend, the Secretary of state answered only by generalities. His lordship then spoke in support of some of his noble friend's arguments, with respect to the great importance of a good understanding between America and this country, whose example the latter ought to follow, with respect to her line of internal and external policy.

The Duke of Montrose replied, with considerable spirit, to many of the positions advanced by the noble Earl who spoke last, whose warmth of expression, he supposed, might arise from the warmth of the present season, a period in which he generally tho't proper to attend his duty in that house.—He contended that his noble friends had been sufficiently explicit; the orders given, they stated had been the same as during the last war; and the line of conduct would be persevered in. He conceived that every country had a right to regulate the trade of its own colonies, and that no other state could properly complain of it. With respect to the noble Earl's panegyrics upon America, he understood a noble Earl had lately disposed of his property and gone to that country: perhaps if the noble Earl opposite to him would follow the same example, he might, after a short residence in that country, return home in a better humour with his own!

The Earl of Limerick was of opinion the answers given by ministers were explicit; and adverted to the consideration, how far too great an indulgence with respect to the trade of America, would operate injuriously upon the trade of Ireland with our West India colonies.

The Earl of Suffolk spoke in support of some of the positions of his noble friends, Lords Holland and Stanhope.

Lord Hawkesbury, the Earl of Camden, and the Duke of Montrose, spoke severally in explanation.

Earl Stanhope, in explanation said it was the duty of a person in his situation to watch over the interests and concerns of his country at home, and not to leave it because he might be out of humour, at the misconduct of weak, inefficient, and incapable ministers.

The Earls of Darnley and Carrysfort spoke shortly in support of the leading arguments of noble Lords on that side of the House.

Lord Harrowby briefly vindicated the conduct of the ministers on the subject in question; and he deemed them sufficiently explicit in their declarations.

Lord Holland spoke in reply, and contended that ministers had not been explicit; their declarations were mere generalities; in allusion to what was said of the emigration of a noble Earl (Selkirk) to America, he referred to his late work upon the subject, which he regarded as full of useful information, and vindicated the motives which induced that noble Lord to go to the country in question. He warmly reprehended the idea of noble Lords being told, when they openly and freely declared their opinions of misconduct or incapacity of ministers, that they should leave their country, if they did not like it. No, it was the duty, as his noble friend, well observed, of persons in their situation to stay in their country, watch over its interests, endeavor to rescue it from destruction, and to abide its fate.—Such was the duty of members of that House, and they who asserted otherwise knew little of the duties of the legislature.

The Duke of Montrose said a few words, in consequence of what fell from noble Lords opposite; he would not be dictated to, as to the line of debate or observation he would pursue. He would adopt that which he thought most likely to conduce to his object; it was not his practice to rebuke others, neither would he be rebuked. The question being loudly called for, a division took place. For the motion, 8—Against it, 14—majority 6.

STELLE's HOTEL & CITY TAVERN.

THE Subscriber takes this method of thanking his friends and the public for their favors whilst on the Capitol Square and begs leave to acquaint them that having purchased and now occupying the tavern, late Tunnicliff's hotel; which he has commenced enlarging and improving—he respectfully solicits a continuance of the patronage of his friends and the public, assuring them that 'tis his full determination to fit up his present hotel, and so to conduct it, as to merit, he hopes, the preference of the public travelling, as well as those coming to the permanent seat of the Government of our Land of Liberty.

PONTIUS D. STELLE.

Washington City, March 25—tf

MACHINE FOR CLEANING CLOVER SEED

The subscriber having obtained a patent for the said machine which must be deemed a very valuable invention and now solicits the patronage of a generous public. The machine is so constructed that it may be made to go by water, which will clean from thirty to forty bushels per day; a permit for which may be had at the rate of 40 dollars. A permit for a horse mill may be had at the rate of 30 dollars, which will clean in the neatest manner from 10 to 18 bushels per day. Hand mills are made by the subscriber at the rate of 55 dollars which will clean from 4 to 7 bushels per day which depends greatly upon the dryness or dampness of the air. Permits for hand mills may be had for 16 dollars. The subscriber also wishes to inform the public that he is a mill wright by occupation, and persons wishing to have said machine constructed in their mills upon application to him will have their work done in the best and nicest manner; any such applications will be duly attended to and the public approbation gratefully acknowledged by the public's

Humble servant,

MICHAEL ZORGER.

York county, Penn. Aug 30.

FOR SALE.

AN unfinished two story brick house with an excellent cellar fronting on seventh street, east, square No. 907, in the city of Washington, if not disposed of at private sale previous to the 4th day of September next, it will on that day be offered at public sale, for terms apply to the subscriber.

And on the same day will positively be sold a frame house situated on the same street and square as the above property; and a quantity of household and kitchen furniture.

The vicinity of the above property to the navy yard renders it an object worthy of attention.

WILLIAM PROUT.

Aug. 12—

Congressional Register.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. SATURDAY, February 1.

DEBATE ON THE YAZOO CLAIMS,

(Continued.)

MR. FINDLEY said that after the attention he had experienced in communicating his opinions on this subject two days ago, it was with reluctance he called their attention a second time on the same question. He would not have done it if the opposition had been conducted in the usual manner, and if such honorable notice had not been taken of himself, while most of his arguments remained unrefuted and some of them wholely avoided. His colleague (Mr. Clay) had lamented the want of unanimity in the members of Pennsylvania, and particularly the want of his own vote. Mr. F. said that he did not know how his colleagues would vote till the question would be taken, he had never consulted them nor the members of any other state on the subject, nor communicated his opinions to but a few of his colleagues in private, before the question came on. If the members of the state he represented had held a meeting on the subject they had not informed him, and he did not believe they had, but be that as it may, he would inform that gentleman that he was not sent there to vote on either his opinion or theirs, but on his own. That in making up his mind he could assure his colleague, that he never had taken greater pains and care to free it from prejudices on the subject, which he acknowledged had been strong, and to examine it in all its aspects by the rules of equity, expediency and national faith, and that he had decidedly made up his mind. He hoped his colleagues had done so too. It was a subject on which good men might differ in opinion. He had not in any manner denounced his colleague for voting as he had said he would do, and he did not know what authority he had to notice him in the manner he had done. If we were obliged by the constitution to be unanimous, it indeed suggested an idea of economy he had not thought of before. The state of Pennsylvania by sending one member to give the votes of eighteen, would procure a considerable saving to the United States, and he supposed his colleague would do very well to give the vote for the whole. Some other respectable gentlemen he said, had honored him with particular attention, but in such a manner as he had too much respect for the character of that house and his own character, to follow with any remarks.

Mr. F. said he would not at this late hour detain the house with any observations on the laws of Georgia of 1795 and 1796, but would offer a few remarks on the title of Georgia to the land in question as it respected these claims. A gentleman from Virginia yesterday (Mr. Holmes) had read Vattel on the law of nations to prove that some of the kings in Europe could not alienate the Royal Domains. He begged leave to observe that this maxims did not apply to this country which had a common law peculiar to its circumstances. Many of them had vacant land, but this land was not considered so much as part of the sovereignty as a source of revenue arising from its sale and the power of disposing of it was vested in and exercised by the respective legislatures, and the constitution of Georgia in this respect was similar to that of the other states. None of them had royal domains. Congress had repeatedly acknowledged this right in the legislature of the state of Georgia by soliciting a cession of land to be made by it to the United States, and finally by accepting a cession from it on specified conditions. But being in undisturbed possession was agreeably to the practice of this country, sufficient to protect her grants—He believed most of the states of the union had made compromises of territory and transfers, even of inhabitants, from one to the other on the principles of compromise. The state of Pennsylvania had done so with all the neighbouring states. The property of the islands of the river Delaware was settled by compromise with the state of New-Jersey. The boundary between Pennsylvania and Maryland had been long contested and was finally settled by compromise in such a manner as that Maryland rights for land in Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania rights laid in Maryland were both protected. But the accommodation which applies more fully to the present case was made with Virginia. On the conclusion of the Indian war which broke out in 1763, a settlement was formed at Redstone Creek, perhaps fifty miles or more within the chartered bounds of Pennsylvania, and the settlers claimed to hold under Virginia—it was forbid by the law of Pennsylvania to settle that country, and the governor sent as commissioners, Gen. Potter, Col. Allison and the Rev. Mr. Steel, to the place to inform them of the title of Pennsylvania and to forbid the settling the land, it not being then purchased from the natives. The respectability of the commissioners was supposed to give weight to the object. They informed the settlers that the land belonged to Pennsylvania, and warned them of the danger of persisting in an unlawful claim. This solemn and candid notice had not the desired effect, citizens from other colonies and even from Pennsylvania flocked to that part of the territory professing to hold under the state Virginia. At this time the government of Virginia had given no official titles to the land, but it was well known that the price of land in Virginia was much lower than in Pennsylvania. No such claim was ever made by the United States to any of the territory of Georgia nor such warning given against purchasing or settling the land.

In a short time after this however, Lord Dunmore the last royal governer of Virginia opened a land office in that country and issued land warrants at one tenth of the Pennsylvania price and less than one twelfth of the fees, and at least three counties were organized by Virginia within the chartered bounds of Pennsylvania, in which only one county court was organized by Pennsylvania, and the justices of that court were arrested while sitting on the bench at a place near one hundred miles within the chartered limits of that state, and above seventy miles from the limits afterwards made by compromise. The revolutionary war commenced and the settlers under the authority of both states made temporary compromises, by which the country was protected against invasion and property secured.

Though there had been contentions between the settlers, there had been harmony between the states, and after various attempts which failed, before the war with Britain ceased, the two states made a compromise. Pennsylvania gave up to Virginia half a degree of her chartered claim and Virginia gave up to Pennsylvania three organized counties with their inhabitants. Let it not however be said, that the actual settlers alone were secured in their pre-emption right as was usual in Pennsylvania. This was not the case. Those who proved that they held under Virginia procured patents from Pennsylvania at less than one tenth of the price which those who held under Pennsylvania had to pay, and those who claimed unseated land under Virginia grants held their claim. That fine body of land called Washington's Bottom in Fayette county, above 40 miles within the present limits of Pennsylvania, has been held without contest, and about the year 1786 gen. Washington in the character of Guardian, recovered seven or eight plantations by the decision of the state court of Washington county in Pennsylvania, on which so many families had made large improvements without suspicion of a prior claim, and there is now a claim of the same kind before the supreme court of Pennsylvania brought by Craughan's heirs to a much larger amount. There was a larger amount of land contested between Virginia and Pennsylvania than that which is reserved in the convention with Georgia and the United States to satisfy claims. The claims under Virginia had extended into what is now five extensive counties of Pennsylvania. Adding to this half a degree of latitude of the chartered claim of Pennsylvania for about ninety miles of length ceded to Virginia amounts to much more than the residue of five millions of acres, which is the greatest amount in question. All this was amicably settled by compromise, and the sister states continued in harmony and the country was settled with respectable citizens. The case, he said, which he had mentioned the other day of the claims of the settlers at Wyoming had been supposed to teach an opposite doctrine, but the members who were acquainted with the circumstances would acknowledge it did not. They must acknowledge that the southern boundary of that state, bordering on Maryland and Virginia was settled to the utmost western boundary, that the northern boundary which included the Connecticut settlement, was not settled to half that extent or at most very dispersedly settled, that at least ten or twelve counties on that side of the state laid out by law, could not be organised for want of people and that all the other side of the state east of the Ohio was thickly settled and organized long ago, and that several counties west of the Ohio are so far settled as to be organised on the south western boundary; such were the different effects of a compromise and a continued contest.

Mr. F. said he had reason to beg pardon of the House for calling their attention to so tedious a narrative and which they might suppose had little relation to the question, but it was his opinion that if the report of the committee and the treaty or convention with Georgia was not carried into effect, though he might not live to see it, the examples he had stated would be found to have a bearing on the subject, but on this view of it he would not enlarge and he hoped his apprehensions would not be realised. But he was astonished to observe his friends, who on this subject took the other side of the question, depart so widely in their arguments from the question before the house. He said that the laws of Georgia passed in 1789, 1795 and 1796 were certainly not now before the house. The law of Georgia passed in 1789 and the still more extensive and he believed from good information the most corrupt sale of 1795, were all set aside, and they were not then called on to decide on a territory as extensive as any kingdom in Europe, as the gentleman just sat down (Mr. Sloan from N. Jersey) had alledged. These monstrous speculations had vanished as many others had done, the whole square miles it would contain was but little more then was not long since contained in one county through which he had to pass going home, but which is now divided into more counties. He said he disapproved of monopolies, but still more of rendering all property insecure. He disapproved of such speculations.

Mr. Findley said though he had had the best opportunities, he had taken no share in those or any other speculations, yet while there is so much land in the U. States at market, he had found they were not attended with all the evils which he had anticipated, they payed high county and road taxes which they would not have