committee may think proper to give it, solely with a view to further a favorable negotiation. But will any member say that the President has not already excepted all the powers vested in him, and all the limits of which he is possessed, to accomplish an amicable adjustment? They say that he will not say that every President of the U. S. has not done every thing in their power to negociate, to prevent the pressure of the crisis, since the impressment commenced in 1793—the first time indeed in the history of nations that it ever was the fate of any nation over the citizens of another independent nation so outrageous?

The President in his first message to this Congress officially brought the subject before them, and in a subsequent message he informed them of the instructions he had given to the ministers that had been made, and, in short, that vigilance was exhausted. What, then, should we refuse such legislative aid, as in the present state of the business is admitted to have been under negociation successful? Can we expect success without some effective expression of the national will? Former Presidents did not expect it, and they failed.

Mr. F. said the gentleman who have given opposition to the resolution, have taken notice of the impressment of our cities, as though it is for the most aggravated grievance. They seem to give to G. Britain a prescriptive right of that essential portion of our independence. Sir, however the exercise of that most tyrannical power has been practised with great moderation, yet every administration since that unprecedented tyranny began to be exercised, finded the first instance of acquiescence which has been manifested by the gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this resolution.

The Spanish tyranny, within yesterday, the second time he has been up on the question, acknowledged the citizens, and extended to make an effect of the conduct of Spain in the Mississippi territory last summer to balance the impressment. It appears that when Don Jaun Jaurrent from the ministers possessed by Spain, and were pressed sail taken in our territory, but afterwards released on the officer of Spain. This might be balanced by the outrage committed by the Spanish, in Florida, but without dwelling on this insult, it is sufficient to observe, that the seamen are free from bondage, and that there has not been time to reminutiate and regenerate the Spanish slave trade voage happened, and that a court of justice is competent to decide on it. In Britain had impressed and two men, if she had impressed but two hundred, we had demanded and obtained of doing so any more, if the court of London had not acknowledged and expressed, that the unprecedented outrage on the laws and usages of nations, if that government had not vindicated the conduct and trained to manage a convention on that subject, (some agreement) without, an unpleasant exception, it may be presumed we should have been some time brought before the legislature.

The observations of this gentleman, however, are often, bring out comparison with Spain into view, without explanation, claims, that Congress have no connection with the subject before us, he would wish to add, that in the purchase of Louisiana from France, which the gentleman from Virginia himself has in strong terms acknowledged was a good bargain, that even the channel of the river was without a doubt, Sir, in the various transfers between France and Spain, and the final transfer to the U. S. the rights of the lines had never been settled. By a bill reported to the last Congress, it is believed by the gentleman from Virginia himself, which passed into a law, it was made the President's duty to take possession of the Mobile district. He did so, and Spain objected to the territory, and the affair became a subject of negotiation, as well as the other subjects mentioned. As soon as this became a subject of negociation the President proceeded no Farther, but he was embodied, immediately in the state it was, until the boundary would be amicably settled. This, Sir, is the way I understand the case to stand, and I have understand it since the President has conducted with great correctness, agreeable to the law of nations, if he has not been too accommodating to a foreign authority; one example for illustration is sufficient, though the western boundary between the U. S. and the British territory had been clearly defined in the definitive treaty of peace. Britain, yet the western forts within our acknowledged territory were not withdrawn from us by British troops; but while the negociation conducted by Mr. Jay was in progress, with the court of London, the President Washington, not only withdrew his armed troops which he engaged in war with the Indians, from advancing, but in fact gave, in the treaty, going with a party of Pennsylvania militia to lay out a town on the margin of Lake Erie, in Pennsylvania, to prove it was not known that ever the British had advanced on the ground since the revolution or taken possession; but neither had we actually occupied it before, but it was within the acknowledged boundary of that state. Retaining possession until the British attempted to make aggression on the party of Spain.

Mr. F. said, he are alarmed with danger instead of being convinced by argument. If the gentleman from Virginia is not indeed much mistaken we are first to be ruined by war with Britain, and afterwards overwhelmed by France, and distressed with numerous privations. Is it true if Britain or any other nation find it to be their interest and design to go to war with us they will never be at a loss to assign a cause; we cannot turn our feet on regulating our own commerce; but they can in a manifestic give it the colouring of a caused war. Without imputing to Britain a less degree of justice or honor, or calculating on her possessing a higher sense of national dignity than any other nation, we must all admit that she is a pretty good judge of her own interest and sufficiently disposed to pursue it. What is admitted is the most obvious interest of Britain to cross from her aggressions, and make reasonable restitution in preference to any of the privations we can make her suffer without going to war. At present and for considerable time past the commerce has been excluded from the greatest extent of the most fertile and wealthy wars of Europe, and in these we decided to have been encouraged that the British goods can not be again be in the same demand in that quarter. For some time past extensive and important manufactures she depends on the Continent. Among the plents of the latter description are the Ardrens and Brabant, which are formed of which unequivically pronounces it the best measure which could have been adopted, and we begin to think that vindicates it against the objections which are made to it, and which have been raised against it. We should insert this article, but for length, confirm its taking nearly the same ground taken by the friends of the measure in the Senate, which we have, we are solicitous to give without delay.

It is with satisfaction that, amidst the unjust decisions of the British tribunals which have been made, it is a fact to be before the public the following interesting extract from the Sun of Scott, in the case of La Anna, in which it becoming evident, that in the United territory of the United States by outrages committed in her rivers and on her coasts.

LA ANNA, A. LA PORTE, MASTER. *Minutes of proceedings of the Court of Admiralty, of England, on the 20th day of June, 1806, in the recovered question of costs and damages, the ship and cargo having been released.*

The right honorable sir William Scott, judge, delivered his opinion, that the ship was taken with a cargo of logwood and specie, on a voyage from the Spanish Main, to Cadiz, and, that she was seized as expressed in the log book of the captain, that she had been sent for clearance or register on board, which if it be correct, it is a fraud upon the revenue, in this case I think both these *prima facie* irregularities satisfactorily explained. The ship was in the contraband trade and therefore could have no clearance, and, as it was Spanish property, and therefore no register. The matter from the extracts in the log book, I think, sufficiently given a very fair testimony at all times, no disposition to hide it, the contraband trade evidence ought to have satisfied the captors. It is a very unfortunate circumstance and consistent, considering the course of trade in which the vessel was employed, that the captain, in the relation of the seizure on these grounds, is to whom the ship belongs, and the commanding a privateer last war, he had a right to do so, being then a Spanish subject. The ship has been brought to England and it certainly the duty of the captor in cases such as this to do, the instructions of the Lords of the Admiralty, to the Privateer; if the cruise was expired and it was of a very serious nature, it should have abstained from capture, the crew of a vessel, in such circumstances, but the person who takes a commission subjects for the good conduct of his crew—they that be a captain in that quarter it is the fault of the owners, to be right to make, and, if he sends their vessels to cruise there—this has been productive of much inconvenience, and the ship, the captain, and the crew of further proof, but a case I think in the case of the ship, the contraband would have restored. This vessel was taken in two years, and, consequently, every danger, and I am of opinion the conduct of the captors in that respect, I think to every one, I think the ship was taken not for deficiency in the papers, but for the contraband trade, several thousand dollars—captors should not look to value, but whether or not there is probable cause. The captor incurs a claim to gloss of a very grave nature, by joint Harrington, the proconsul of the United States under the Spanish, and the commanding officer, require, the ambassador, as being taken within the territory of the United States; this is the substance of discussions and charts have been exhibited. The point in such cases, the mouth of the Mississippi, within the bounds of the American territory—the general rule on this subject, is, where power of arms is limited, there is the territory of the sovereign—where arms have been introduced, there rules a considerable part of the territory, guns, but it has been said the mouth of the Mississippi cannot be considered as territory, being partly inundated with trees—it is pretended these form a part of the territory, argued to be in fact, no man's property, only occasionally resorted to for the purpose of shooting birds, their only inhabitants. It is urged that the territory can only begin at the Belize, where officers were established by the Spaniards; I am of a different opinion. Clearly these islands are to be considered as a necessary and indispensable part of the American territory—by universal contrary so allowed, be the constituency of the earth great or small, it must be considered as territory formed from thence, as elements from thence made. If the course of a river carries away any part of the land the rule of general law is that it still remains your territory; it would be hard even if such removal occupied the property of another, but in this instance there is no other person to claim—it is not a no man's land, any other state might occupy, embank and cultivate, because upon these islands—but that case what is there it would be in the power of the rich, other nations might there construct the same as the British Parliament at the river would be no longer in possession of America—it must therefore be considered as within the United States territory, so consistency of earth being formed, and, the principle therefore being within the territory the distance from the taken from thence, the ship seized was captured as far as I can judge from the evidence within this threshold of a water of the American territory, I said the property began before, and that although you may be right which that neutral territory you may pursue there, and I should be inclined to concur with that, if the capture had been on an legal cruise, and had legally condemned the vessel to warrant and the capture made without violence, and I think if another court should be appointed to the captor, it would hold good. If he brings me to a part of the case that calls for great caution in the captor. Captors have no right to stay in the territory of a neutral, to exercise the right of capture. Then the privateer of the United States, in question long, they are not justifiable in such a the conduct of kind, when I do not believe, if I have to see, it would call for equal caution on them. Captors this capture, the vessel seized, captured vessels, and collected to the Admiralty ships coming down the river, seeking very opportunity to commit hostility. One case demand, in particular attention, that of the Bilbao, which vessel they captured and sent off with the prize master, whose what they had no right to do; they were principles of the kingdoms, which cannot be the court will, if their own officers, revolting the principles of the Admiralty, the vessel was restitutions, if the court relied upon the claim it would be relying upon a claim as least on the ground of which the Islands are described to consist—and they by such inappropriate claim, I consider a certain of condemnation, I think the court will be satisfied, I, for that manner? I think it discovers in not also in this transaction. They have, Sir, that they brought the vessel here at the request of the captain; the vessel was captured, and, they did so there, but be very properly refused to do so. I think, in this opinion, there, for, that in every part of this transaction there is misconduct on the part of the captor and that of a great kind, and that he has been guilty of a violation of treasury committing the property, in future with his conduct in that territory, the property afforded no justification of his actions. I should therefore hesitate short of that justice due to the property of the captors, as well as to those of the individual, if I did not consider the captor in case such damages.

The court pronounced the ship and goods to have been seized and taken in violation of the territory of the United States of America, and condemned the captor in costs and damages.

CRESWELL & ADAMS,
*Proctors for the Claimant.*
Doctors Commons,
6th January, 1806.

## WASHINGTON CITY.

*HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,*
*MONDAY, MARCH 25.*

WE are happy to see resilient, what we have under obs expected, that the sentiment of the nation would go with their representatives in the adoption of these measures which, after mature deliberation, they have thought proper to recommend as best fitted to promote the public interest. The public opinion which are, whatever may be said or insinuated to the contrary, among the best informed of the public will, so far as they have yet expressed any opinion, are decidedly in favor of the measures pursued by the House of Representatives. In a business so new, as we then, have they condemned these measures, while in many they have received the strongest approbation. Among the plents of the latter description are the Aurora and Boston Gazette, formed of which unequivically pronounces it the best measure which could have been adopted, and we begin to think that vindicates it against the objections which are made to it, and which have been raised against it. We should insert this article, but for length, confirm its taking nearly the same ground taken by the friends of the measure in the Senate, which we have, we are solicitous to give without delay.

It is with satisfaction that, amidst the unjust decisions of the British tribunals which have been made, it is a fact to be before the public the following interesting extract from the Sun of Scott, in the case of La Anna, in which it becoming evident, that in the United territory of the United States by outrages committed in her rivers and on her coasts.

LA ANNA, A. LA PORTE, MASTER. *Minutes of proceedings of the Court of Admiralty, of England, on the 20th day of June, 1806, in the recovered question of costs and damages, the ship and cargo having been released.*

The right honorable sir William Scott, judge, delivered his opinion, that the ship was taken with a cargo of logwood and specie, on a voyage from the Spanish Main, to Cadiz, and, that she was seized as expressed in the log book of the captain, that she had been sent for clearance or register on board, which if it be correct, it is a fraud upon the revenue, in this case I think both these *prima facie* irregularities satisfactorily explained. The ship was in the contraband trade and therefore could have no clearance, and, as it was Spanish property, and therefore no register. The matter from the extracts in the log book, I think, sufficiently given a very fair testimony at all times, no disposition to hide it, the contraband trade evidence ought to have satisfied the captors. It is a very unfortunate circumstance and consistent, considering the course of trade in which the vessel was employed, that the captain, in the relation of the seizure on these grounds, is to whom the ship belongs, and the commanding a privateer last war, he had a right to do so, being then a Spanish subject. The ship has been brought to England and it certainly the duty of the captor in cases such as this to do, the instructions of the Lords of the Admiralty, to the Privateer; if the cruise was expired and it was of a very serious nature, it should have abstained from capture, the crew of a vessel, in such circumstances, but the person who takes a commission subjects for the good conduct of his crew—they that be a captain in that quarter it is the fault of the owners, to be right to make, and, if he sends their vessels to cruise there—this has been productive of much inconvenience, and the ship, the captain, and the crew of further proof, but a case I think in the case of the ship, the contraband would have restored. This vessel was taken in two years, and, consequently, every danger, and I am of opinion the conduct of the captors in that respect, I think to every one, I think the ship was taken not for deficiency in the papers, but for the contraband trade, several thousand dollars—captors should not look to value, but whether or not there is probable cause. The captor incurs a claim to gloss of a very grave nature, by joint Harrington, the proconsul of the United States under the Spanish, and the commanding officer, requires, the ambassador, as being taken within the territory of the United States; this is the substance of discussions and charts have been exhibited. The point in such cases, the mouth of the mouth of the Mississippi, within the bounds of the American territory—the general rule on this subject, is, where power of arms is limited, there is the territory of the sovereign—where arms have been introduced, there rules a considerable part of the territory, guns, but it has been said the mouth of the Mississippi cannot be considered as territory being partly inundated with trees—it is pretended these form a part of the territory, argued to be in fact, no man's property, only occasionally resorted to for the purpose of shooting birds, their only inhabitants. It is urged that the territory can only begin at the Belize, where officers were established by the Spaniards; I am of a different opinion. Clearly these islands are to be considered as a necessary and indispensable part of the American territory.

*Mr. Dawson* reported a bill for defraying the pay of the harbors of the U. S. and for building gun boats, which was referred to a committee of the whole on Monday.

*Mr. Crowninshield*, from the committee of Commerce and Manufactures, presented an unfavorable report on the petition of Jonathan Merry, in which the House concurred. Mr. Crowninshield having previously declared he did not agree in.

The House took into consideration a resolution directing the post master general to cause to be post office at the city of Washington to be kept at a suitable place, on which a short and decisive debate ensued, which terminated in the indefinite postponement of the resolution.

Ayes 63.

*Mr. Sammon of Mr. J. Randolph*, the House resumed itself into a committee of the whole—Mr. J. C. SATTER in the chair, on the Louisiana Bounty Land, minuted some time since by Mr. J. Randolph.

*Sec. Resolved*, That a contractor under the provisions of the U. S. in the officer within the purview of the act, relating of the constitution, and, as such, is incapable of indicating a Bounty Land.

*Sec. Resolved*, That the union of a single individual, for the person of a single individual, for more specifically the purpose of which the civil authority, is propagated in the U. S. and in the Territories of the U. S. and tends to the disturbance of an adjacent government.

*Sec. Resolved*, That provision ought to be made for the case of a minor any where, in the area or any part of the U. S. incapable of holding any civil office under the U. S.

The question was taken on these resolutions, and, carried.

The first was agreed to—Ayes 54—Nays 44.

The second was agreed to—Ayes 73—and

The third was agreed to without a division.

Then the committee rose, and reported their agreement to the resolutions.

The House immediately considered the report.

Concurring with the committee of the whole in their agreement in the first resolution, a debate of length and interest ensued, which terminated in a course in negatives.

*Sec. Resolved*, 2, Random and 3, Clay supported a concurrence in the report of the committee of the whole, Mr. Fisk, Espeis, Alston, Findley, G. W. Campbell, Bacon, Earle, Sackle, Slosh, Bidwell, Rhea of Tenn. Smith, Kelly, Dawson, Elmer, and Southard opposed the report. The question was taken about 4 o'clock by yes and nays, Yeas 28—Nays 84.

As we shall give this debate hereafter at considerable length we shall content ourselves with stating, that the most concise notice of the most prominent points of the debate.

The friends of the resolution advocated it on the ground that the constitution, in giving to each House of Congress the power of judging of the returns and qualifications of their members, authorized them with a reference to the constitution, to give a construction to the constitution which they conceived was the just construction; declaring the power of a contested seat was the power of incompatible with a seat in the House; and, consequently, that the constitutional provision that "no person holding any office under the U. S. shall be a member of either House of Congress during his continuance in office," included contractors under the provision.

On the other side it was generally conceded that it was highly desirable that some provisions, either constitutional or legislative, should be adopted to exclude contractors from the legislature. But that the members of the House have no power to support the constitution, and were not at liberty to give it a construction which it would have been, if they had the power, which and effect to be distributed. They disapproved of giving the constitution the construction on abstract ground; but declared their readiness to act upon any resolution which should be presented to them, and their opinion that it would be the most correct course to pursue. Some gentlemen likewise expressed their willingness to make in the passage of a law prohibiting any other of the U. S. to enter into a contract with any person in the House.

SATURDAY, MARCH 28.

A Message was received from the Senate informing the House that they had passed a bill to carry into effect the cession of the eighth section of the 7th Act regulating the grants of land, and authorizing for the disposal of the lands of the United States, south of the state of Tennessee.

The bill relates to what are generally denominated the VAZOO CLAIMS.

The bill having been read a first time, *Mr. R. Nelson* moved to reject it.

*Mr. Grigg* moved to postpone to a low time for considering it.

*Mr. Clark* supported its rejection.

*Mr. Grigg* advocated the same course.

*Mr. Clark* was in favor of a short postponement.

*Mr. Goldsborough* was anxious to be allowed a sufficient time for examining the merits of the bill, and moved a postponement to the 1st of April.

The Speaker decided this motion not to be in order.

*Mr. Goldsborough* then asked that he might be excused from voting on the bill.

*Mr. J. Randolph* spoke at considerable length in favor of rejecting the bill.

*Mr. Bid* declared himself uninformed with regard to the merits of the bill, and said that if precipitated into a de-


WANTED,

A WOMAN that understands plain cooking and bread work; likewise a Girl, of about 12 years of age to attend to children. Inquire of Mr. Jones, Pa. Avenue, near the Capitol.

TO RENT,

THE NEW AND UNPAINTED BRICK STORE near the CAPITOL, in the occupation of Messrs. P. Healy & Co.

Possession to be given on the 1st of May. Inquire of Frederick May.

March 26—tf

To Lease on Ground Rent,

ON VERY MODERATE TERMS,

TWENTY-NINE unimproved Lots of ground in the vicinity of the Navy Yard, in very eligible situations for private residences. For particulars apply to the fubscriber, who is in possession of the part, and will show the property.

SAMUEL LOWDERMILK.

March 18—6t.