porary inconvenience from a small reduction in the price of the produce of our farms, are we to put a few cents difference in the price of a pound of cotton, or tobacco, or a barrel of flour, or a quintal of fish in competition with the honor and general interest of our country? Is there a member of this House, is there a man in the community that would submit to see his neighbor dragged into ignoble bondage, merely because it would produce a slight shock in the market for his produce? Such an idea would, I believe, be universally spurned at.

But, Mr. Chairman, the strongest objection I have heard mentioned is, that if we do pass a non-importation act, it cannot be executed, and either we shall be laughed at by Great Britain, or it will afford a pretext to her minister, whose decision is well known, to let loose his cruisers, and sweep the ocean. This is the language used in Britain. Their writers acknowledge that a non-importation act would be to them a serious calamity, but comfort themselves with the reflection that it could not be executed. Now I ask, what reason can be assigned why it could not be as well executed now as it was in former times? Are we so abject, so degenerate as to submit to such national indignity, rather than forego the pleasure resulting from an indulgence in British luxuries? But it may give offence to the British minister who will *sweep* the ocean with his cruizers. This, to be sure, is a *sweeping* objection, but how will it apply? What right has the British minister to take offence at any regulations we may see proper to adopt? We have a moral, & we have a constitutional right to manage our commercial concerns in our own way, provided we dont infringe, or violate the rights of other nations. This sacred trust has been committed to us by the people of this country, and I trust we will never feel disposed to resign it to any foreign minister.

But admitting that great man with all his decision, should let loose his cruisers, what will he gain? Is he not more at our mercy than we are at his? If he attempts to make a general *sweep*, self defence will justify reprisals. The debts owing to British subjects, the immense property owned by them in this country, will of course be laid hold of. I will perhaps be told here, that by the treaty of 1794 sequestration of debts is prohibited. True—But if one of the contracting parties violates the contract, the other is released from his obligation. If Britain violates nine articles of the treaty, she cannot consider us bound by the tenth. Besides, her provinces are quite contiguous and open to us, and by securing them, we would make ourselves masters of the fur trade, from which she derives such important advantages. Even on the ocean I doubt whether she would be a gainer in the contest. And this is not mere theory. During the last war, our privateers captured more of their vessels than they took of ours with all their navy. Our shipping then was not more than a fourth of what we now possess, and the number of seamen about in the same proportion. And it is worthy of remark, that owing to the difference in the value of their cargoes and ours, the one consisting entirely of bulky articles, necessaries of life and raw materials for manufactures, and the other made up of these materials after they have received the last touch of art and industry; if we succeeded in taking one for their three, the balance perhaps would be about equal.

The resolution has also been called a war measure. Now, I would ask, what is there warlike about it? Sir, I before have said and I repeat it, that I deprecate war. With me it will always be a last resort. Recourse should be had to every peaceable means to obtain justice, before an appeal is made to arms. The resolution I consider purely as a measure of that kind, & so it must appear to the British minister, unless he is determined on war, and then he will find some pretext. It is common for nations going to war, to publish a declaration, stating their reasons in justification of their conduct to other nations. Let the British minister take the resolution & publish it at length, and will any other nation consider it as a sufficient ground for war. It merely states that we consider ourselves injured, and that in justice to ourselves, we must suspend our intercourse until we obtain redress. The British minister will never put his reputation and character at hazard on such a foundation.

Mr. Chairman, in every point of view in which I have been able to consider this subject, the propriety of adopting the resolution which has been read, appears to me equally impressive; and therefore altho' it may be opposed, I cannot but hope it will receive the sanction of a large majority of the House. In this hope I am confirmed when I refer to the journals, and see what was done by the House of Representatives under circumstances somewhat similar to the present in the year 1794. The same nation of whose conduct we now complain, was then committing depredations on our commerce. She had on the 6th of November issued her celebrated orders, and it is worthy of remark, that these orders were first published by the cruisers which were acting under them. The late captures unauthorised by any public orders, but proceeding on a decree of their admiralty court, which it appears was to be considered as the signal for making the sweep, evince a fixed system of hostility towards our commerce, and an ungenerous mode of making its attacks. The unwary and unsuspecting fall a prey to their hidden designs. She was at that time also stimulating the Indians to commit hostilities on our frontiers, and the western posts were not surrendered agreeably to what we considered the true intent and meaning of the treaty of 1783. To counteract these hostile measures, a proposition was made in the House of Representatives, for suspending all commercial intercourse with that nation. That proposition was at that time adopted by a very large majority. All parties united in giving it their support. The great political distinction, which has unfortunately prevailed too long in this country, did not on that occasion discover itself a great deal. The representation from the state in which I live, was at that time about equally divided betwixt the two great contending parties, and yet on that question their votes were completely blended. The representation from the southern states, I observe, was generally in favor of that measure. The respectable state of Virginia in particular, which was represented by a constellation of talents, not only ranged itself on the affirmative side of the question by its vote, but also bore a very distinguished part in the argument in support of the measure. From a similarity of circumstances, are we not now to expect a similar result. Altho' the evil complained of is in the first instance more severely felt in a particular section of the country, its effects will ultimately extend to every part of it. And so far as the honor of the government is implicated, a sensibility arising from that source must necessarily be experienced by all its citizens at the same time.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say, that although my opinion on this subject is formed on the most mature reflection, yet if a majority of the committee think differently, if they prefer something more energetic, or if they have any other system which they consider more efficient to obtain the object, I may for the sake of unanimity be disposed to yield my opinion. Unanimity I consider as all important. We are told by a document on our table, that the nation against whose conduct we complain, calculates on our divisions. Her hopes of being enabled to pursue her system, are built on an idea, that divison among ourselves will prevent our adopting any efficient measures. In this hope I trust they will now be disappointed, and that we will shew to them and to the world, that however we may differ as to the administration of our internal affairs, on all great national questions, in which the honor and true interest of our country in relation to foreign governments is involved, that we are but one people.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, MARCH 10.

The House of Representatives are still engaged in the discussion of Mr. Gregg's resolution; on which it is scarcely probable that a question will be taken for several days. The debate has assumed a character of the highest interest, and involves a full disclosure of our relations with Britain, connected with much allusion to our relations with other foreign powers.

At a meeting of the President and directors of the bank of the U. States, on Tuesday the 4th ult. the following gentlemen from Washington, George Town, and Alexandria were elected directors of the office of discount and deposit for the district of Columbia, from the first Monday of this instant, until the first Monday in March next, viz.

Joseph Carlton, *Joseph Nourse*,
Thos. Tingey, *David Peter*,
Wm. Brent, *Wm. Stewart*,
James D. Barry, *Lewis Deblois*,
J. P. Van Ness, *Ben. Shreive*, *Jun. C. Swan*, *Phineas Janney*,
Thomas Monroe,

And on Monday the 3rd inst. the said directors met at the office in this city, for the purpose of choosing a President, when *John P. Van Ness, esq.* was duly elected.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, MARCH 7.

Mr. J. Clay presented a petition from Messrs. Nicklin and Griffiths, representing the losses they have sustained, owing to the conduct of general Armstrong, in the case of the New Jersey, under the convention with France, and praying for indemnity, which was referred to the committee of Claims—Ayes 54—Noes 31.

Mr. Crowninshield moved a resolution, instructing the committee of Commerce and Manufactures to enquire into the expediency of amending the 18th and 77th section of the act to regulate the collection of duties on imports and tonnage, so far as to remove the disabilities and restrictions at present imposed on vessels arriving at several ports of entry of the U. S. from the Cape of Good Hope, and from places beyond the same.

This resolution, after a modification suggested by *Mr. Dana*, making it more comprehensive, was agreed to.

The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the union—MR. J. C. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. Gregg's resolution still under consideration—Messrs. Sloan, Findley, and Elmer supported, and Mr. Early opposed it; when after a few remarks connected with several commercial details from Mr. Mac Creery, the committee rose, and the House adjourned about the usual hour.

SATURDAY, MARCH 8.

Mr. Cook submitted a resolution, for the continuance of the duty of two and a half per cent. on goods chargeable with ad-valorem duties, commonly called the Mediterranean fund, on the condition that the same be exclusively applied to the augmentation and support of the naval force, and the protection of our ports and harbors against insults and injuries.

Ordered to lie on the table.

A communication was received from the Secretary of state, transmitting a detailed statement of the impressment of American seamen.

The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the state of the union—Mr. J. C. SMITH in the chair.

Mr. Elliot supported, and Mr. D. R. Williams opposed the resolution of Mr. Gregg.

The debate was closed by Mr. Bidwell, who enforced the propriety of adopting efficient measures, without expressly declaring himself either for or against the resolution.

LETTER

From the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual statement of the district tonnage of the United States, on the 31st day of December, 1804; together with an explanatory letter from the Register of the Treasury thereon.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Feb. 20, 1806.

SIR,

I have the honor to transmit the annual statement of the district tonnage of the United States, on the 31st Dec. 1804, together with an explanatory letter of the Register of the Treasury.

It appears from those documents that the actual tonnage of the United States on the 31st Dec. 1804, might be estimated at about 983,000 tons, *viz.*

Registered tonnage,		672,500
Enrolled	do.	252,800
Fishing	do.	57,800
		983,100

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
ALBERT GALLATIN.

The hon. the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Register's Office, Feb. 18, 1806.

SIR,

I have the honor to transmit the annual statement to 31 Dec. 1804, of the district tonnage of the United States.

	Tons 95ths.
The corrected registered tonnage is stated in said abstract at - -	672,530 18
The enrolled & licensed at	317,536 57
The fishing vessels at	52,337 26
Amounting to *Tons*	1,042,404 6

The tonnage on which duties were collected during the same year, amounted as follows:

Registered tonnage, paying duty on each voyage	1,132,769 00
Enrolled and licensed tonnage employed in the coasting trade, paying an annual duty, -	252,890 000
Fishing vessels the same,	57,857 00
Amounting to *Tons*	1,443,456 00

The registered tonnage having been corrected according to the mode prescribed for the government of the collectors of the several districts, and as stated in the communication made by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress the 27th Feb. 1802, is considered the true amount, as near as may be, of that description of tonnage,	672,530 18
The enrolled and licensed tonnage is stated at the amount upon which the annual duty was collected in 1804, on that description of tonnage as being the most correct, and may be considered nearly the true amount, - -	252,890 00
The fishing vessels the same, - - -	57,857 00
The district tonnage of the United States on 31 Dec. 1804, is stated at -	983,277 18

Of the registered tonnage, amounting as above stated to 670,530 18, it has been ascertained, that there were engaged in the whale fishery, - - -	12,015 71
Enrolled and licensed tonnage, also in the whale fishery, -	323 40
Amounting to *Tons*	12,339 16

It appears by the collector's abstracts that 103,753 91-95ths tons new vessels were built in the year 1804, whereof 73,649 39-95ths tons were registered, and 30,104 52-95ths tons were enrolled.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
With the greatest respect,
Your most obedient,
And most humble servant,
JOSEPH NOURSE, *Register*.

Hon. ALBERT GALLATIN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Nassau, (N. P.) Jan. 31.

COURT OF VICE ADMIRALTY.

NOV. 12. 1806.

Before his honor Henry Moreton Dyer, esq. sole Judge & commissary.

SAMPSON, PHIPPEN, master.

[*CONTINUED*]

The two next witnesses, whose evidence I shall consider, are the cook and the mariner. Upon these persons something of stigma and discredit was attempted to be thrown, but I must say, the attempt was quite unfounded. Nothing has been advanced either against their competency, or their credibility; they appear, throughout their depositions, to speak without prejudice or affection; their evidence will be found to be very substantially fortified by many facts of the case, and I can see no good reason why they are not to be believed.

By the cook we are told, that the name of the master is Thomas Phippen; that he has only known him from the beginning of the present voyage; that he was appointed to the command by capt. Mann; he knows not the precise time, but it was at the commencement of the present voyage; that he himself served on board of said ship in the capacity of cook; that he has known the ship from the 2d of April last, when he was first shipped in her; that he saw her first on that day at Marseilles in France; that the ship was then called the Two Friends, but since her return from Marseilles to Philadelphia, she has been called the Sampson; that she carried from Marseilles a cargo consisting chiefly of wine with some oil he believes, brandy, fruits preserved in brandy, and other articles; that the cargo was landed at Mr. Foussatt's wharf at Philadelphia, and all put on board again from the same wharf—that he was informed by Mr. Dulaunay, that captain Mann had purchased the ship after her arrival at Philadelphia; that he and Mr. Delaunay were the only persons now on board the ship who came in her from Marseilles.

From the mariner we learn, that he came on board for the first time at Philadelphia, and knew nothing of the former transactions of the voyage, excepting that he assisted to unload the ship on her arrival at Philadelphia from Marseilles; that her cargo then consisted chiefly of wine, and from the marks on the casks he believes the same cargo [with perhaps some additions] is now on board, having been reshipped in her, and is of the growth and produce either of France or Spain; that the cargo was put on board at Philadelphia, before any of the crew, except the mate, were hired.

The united testimony of these two persons tends to establish the following history of her present transactions: That this ship, then named the Two Friends, commanded by another capt. and with another crew, sailed originally from Marseilles to Philadelphia, with a cargo of wine and other articles, under the charge of the same supercargo who appears here; that arrived at Philadelphia, the cargo was landed at the wharf of the principal owner, Mr. Foussatt; that the former captain and crew were then discharged, new ones appointed, a transfer of the vessel effected to a new set of owners, the same cargo again put on board from the same wharf, [whether after the payment of duties or not, does not appear] a new voyage to Havanna commenced under the direction of the same supercargo, and with only one man besides, accidentally on board of the former crew.

To speak of the case thus made out in the mildest and most favorable terms, it must be admitted to be a case of considerable suspicion. Let us then see how those suspicions are cleared up by the deposition of that person who is most intimately acquainted with the whole transaction. From Mr. Delauny, the supercargo, who has the best means of knowing, we may expect to receive the fullest information.

The sum of Mr. Delauny's deposition is this: That he has known the captain only from the beginning of September, (that is the commencement of the present voyage): that he took possession about that time at Philadelphia; that he himself served on board in the capacity of supercargo; that he does not recollect how long he has known the said ship, he first saw her at Philadelphia (from whence of course he would have it understood that he knew nothing of the vessel before her sailing lately from that port): that the ship has been called the Sampson since September, but he cannot recollect her former name; that her last voyage began at Philadelphia, and was to have ended there; that he knows not the quality of any cargo the said ship has carried previous to the time of her capture, (that is to say, that he knows nothing of the cargo brought from Marseilles); that the ship sailed from Philadelphia as her last clearing port, about the 15th September; that for the present voyage she has been under the direction of the owners, Messrs. Foussatt and Mann, with whom he corresponds; but to the question "under whose care and direction the said ship has been during preceding voyages," he refused to depose, notwithstanding that he was reminded by the examiner of his having sworn to depose the whole truth. That the cargo was all put on board at Philadelphia, in August and September last, (meaning I presume, to infer, that the cargo was put on board there for the first time); that the ship was sold at Philadelphia to her present owners, Foussatt and Mann, but he refuses to answer by whom; that the sale took place in September; he presumes there was a bill of sale, but knows nothing about it, or whether any agreement was entered into concerning the purchase further than what appears upon it; that there were on board, as passengers, the Spaniard, whom I first mentioned, as having been examined, and 8 boys who were going to their father at Havanna; that they all came on board at Philadelphia (here again intending to infer, it must be presumed, that they came on board for the first time. Such indeed was the fact as to the Spanish gentleman; but as to 3 boys there is distinct evidence, by the consular passports, that they had come originally from Marseilles—a fact which it is too evident this gentleman wishes to suppress, and has in so doing completely falsified himself). He goes on to say, that he is confident that the sale to the present owners was truly made, and not for the purpose of covering the real property: rather an inconsistent declaration this from a person who before knew about a bill of sale: and finally he avows that he has given every information in his power relative to the present cargo, but he refuses to depose any thing as to preceding ones.

Of this most extraordinary disposition, the decorum of justice restrains me from speaking in the terms which it might deserve; but the energy of justice does not the less require that penal consequences should be fixed to such improper conduct.

The court is not insensible to the petition which was presented from Mr. Delauny, to be permitted to be re-examined upon those interrogatories which he before refused to answer—a petition which was instantly rejected, on a reference to the rule of court, which directs, that where once refusal should take place the examiner should admonish the witness of the oath taken to speak the whole truth, and notice such refusal upon the examination; and also after previous information of the facts from the examiner, and a subassurance from him that the rule had been observed.

(To be Continued.)

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Public are notified that the partnership of Thomas Hunton of Fauquier and George Britton of Shenandoah was dissolved on the second day of August 1805.

March 10—3t

For Sale.

The subscriber has from 5 to 600 bushels of the first quality of James river coal to sell, which if not sold by private sale, will be offered at public sale, on Saturday the 15th inst. at 11 o'clock A. M. All sums above 20 dollars 90 days, by giving negotiable notes at the banks of Columbia, or in the city.

JOHN STEPHEN, Auctioneer.

March 5—

Ten Dollars Reward.

STRAYED or STOLEN, about six weeks ago, a dark BAY MARE, 15 hands high, has a star in her forehead, one of her hind feet white to the foot lock, and one of her fore feet has a white stripe on it, she has a bushy tail, and was heavy with colt. TEN DOLLARS reward will be given if brought to Mr. Waterston's Capitol Hill by

ADAM POWELL.

March 10—3t

In the case of Charles Tomkins an insolvent debtor.

SIX months from and after the first day of March next is limited and appointed for the creditors of the said Tompkins to bring in and exhibit their claims to the trustee. Ordered that this notice be published in the Washington Federalist and National Intelligencer once a month, during said term

By order of the hon. Wm. Cranch esq. an assistant judge of the circuit court of the district of Columbia.

WM. BRENT, Ck.

Feb. 7, 1806.

The subscriber being appointed by the court trustee in the above case, solicits the attention of the creditors to the above order.

JOHN MITCHELL.

March 10—3t

FOUND IN DECEMBER LAST, TWO Good SADDLES—The owner by proving his property and paying costs may have them again. These saddles were advertised at the Capitol during the sitting of the district court but no owner appeared. If an owner should not be found before the first day of April next, they then will be sold by public sale at 10 o'clock in the morning at the door of the Capitol, by

JOHN PHILLIPS.

March 10—taw3w

WANTED,

A WOMAN that understands plain cooking and house work; likewise a GIRL of about 14 years of age to take care of children—none need apply but those who can bring unexceptionable recommendations. Enquire at the 2nd house from the west end of the Six Buildings and at this office.

Nov. 27—tf

This is to give notice that if the heirs of a certain STEPHEN REYNOLDS, who died on his way from the western country in the month of August 1803, and supposed to have been a native of the state of New Hampshire or one of the Eastern states will apply to JOHN RINE administrator living in the town of Cumberland, Alleghany county, state of Maryland, will hear of something to their advantage.

By order of Alleghany county orphans court.

March 3—epam

On a liberal credit.

THE subscriber will dispose of at private sale, his estate called Chichester, lying on the eastern branch, immediately opposite the city of Washington. This tract of land containing 697 acres is laid off in lots from 83 to 144 acres for the convenience of purchasers. Plats of the estate and the terms of sale are in the hands of colonel Hanson at the navy yard, and Charles Wayman of George Town. The lots will be shewn by Mr Wedden, living on the premises, near the Eastern Branch bridge.

ANTHONY ADDISON.

Barnaby, 12th June 1805—tf

ELIAS B. CALDWELL,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

HAS removed his Office, to the house lately occupied by Mr. LAW, on Capitol Hill, Washington, July 26—tf