NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VI. | WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. | No. DCCCXCI.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. | FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1806. | *PAID IN ADVANCE.*

Just received from New York and for sale at Wm. Duane's Book store, Pennsylvania Avenue,

1st & 2d Speeches of Mr. J. Randolph on Gregg's resolution.

Also for sale the first 4 vols. of Plowden's invaluable history of Ireland; the 5th and last vol. is now in the press.

June 25—3t.

A POCKET BOOK was found on the post road leading from Baltimore to Spurrier's Tavern on the 18th inst. the owner can obtain it by applying to the subscriber in Washington city.

PHINEAS BRADLEY.

June 25th—3t.

PUBLIC SALES,

ON Monday 30th inst. at 11 o'clock A. M will be sold on the foot a fine crop of OATS, about six acres; and also, a lot of CLOVER on the enclosed ground at Mr. Flaut's tann yard near South Capitol street. Sixty days credit will be given on approved notes negotiable at the Office of Discount and Deposit in this city.

JOHN SMITH, and
ROBERT UNDERWOOD,
Executors to the estate of Mark Stockwell, &c.

JOHN STEPHEN, Auct.

Washington city, June 25—3t

FIVE DOLLARS REWARD.

STOLEN from the subscriber, on Thursday morning the 19th inst. a quantity of wearing apparel, consisting of two Dimity Petticoats, small cord, a Cotton Cambric Gown and a dark Chintz Gown, a Muslin Shift, a Bandanna Handkerchief marked G. R. and also a Silver Tea Spoon. The person suspected of carrying off the said articles is a Mrs. WILLIAMS. Whoever will bring them back shall receive the above reward.

GEORGE RICE, near Navy Yard.

Washington city, June 24——3t

PUBLIC SALE.

By an order from the Orphan's court of Prince George's county, will be sold at public sale on the 8th day of July next, the property of Justinian Greenwell deceased, consisting of some Negroes, Henney & Lucy, Household & Kitchen Furniture, one Riding Chair, one Bay Mare about 8 years old, one do. 5 years old, two Cows and some Hogs & plantation utensils. A credit of six months will be given by the purchasers giving bond with two approved securities.

Sale to commence at 11 o'clock, and will continue until every thing is sold.

ANN GREENWELL, Administratrix.

June 23——wts

PUBLIC SALE.

IN obedience to the direction of Wm: Cranch esq. given in the case of Henry Schnizely an insolvent, I shall sell at auction, on Saturday the 28th inst. at the house owned by Mr. Voss and next adjoining the one occupied by the hon. James Madison in F street, Washington. The personal property of said Schnively consisting of store goods, &c. The terms of sale are cash, for all purchases not exceeding 20 dollars, for purchases above that sum on a credit of six months, securities to be approved of by the judge to be given. Hour of sale, 11 A. M.

Those who have claims against the said Schnively will please to exhibit them to me within six months from this date, proven in the same manner as is required by the Orphan's court. Creditors will be allowed to bid to an amount which will not exceed their dividends.

JOHN HEWITT, Trustee.
JOHN STEPHEN, Auctioneer.

June 16 - tdf

City of WASHINGTON, Sept. 9, 1805.

Several persons under the impression that the public lots in this city are to be disposed of in future by *public sales only*, having made enquiries when the next sale will probably take place, we are requested to state that those lots may at any time be purchased at private sale of the Superintendent of the City.

Sept. 9——tf

ICE FOR SALE.

THE Subscriber respectfully informs the Citizens of Washington that ICE may be had by the [illegible] BUSHELL or PECK at his house on F street [illegible]orth, two doors from Mr. MADISON'S.

HONORE JULIEN.

June 20—3t

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

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

APRIL 15.

DEBATE

On the bill for fortifying ports and harbors and building gun boats.

MR. D. R. WILLIAMS moved to strike out the first section of the bill, appropriating 150,000 dollars to enable the President to cause the ports and harbors of the U. S. to be better fortified and protected.

MR. MAC CREERY. Mr. Speaker—I shall not only vote against striking out the first section of this bill, but mean to renew the motion made in committee of the whole by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Dawson) to appropriate 500,000 dollars for the building of three frigates.

When we take into consideration the present unsettled state of Europe, the great and growing importance of our commerce, and the defenceless state it is in, can any man think of lessoning the very small protection afforded to it by the nation. Will our constituents not be shocked at the small attention that is paid to such an immense property. Sir, the stake is too great to be trifled with. According to the report laid on your table a few days ago by the secretary of the treasury, our exports amounted to upwards of 95 millions of dollars for the last year. I have not yet seen an account of our imports for the same year, but as they commonly exceed our exports, both together, must amount to nearly 200 millions, to which I add for one million tons of shipping 50 millions, which gives an active property of near two hundred and fifty millions of dollars belonging to our fellow citizens; the greater part of which is almost constantly exposed to depredation.

Now, sir, according to an estimation which I have made of 15 per cent. gain on our imports and exports, and of 20 dollars per ton, carried annually by our shipping, it appears that our merchants have brought more wealth into the nation last year, than all our native produce and manufactures which were exported the same year amounted to——I, therefore, appeal to the good sense and candor of this House, whether it is consistent with the duty we owe our constituents, to abandon such an interest.

When this subject of our carrying trade, as it is called, was lately before the House; some gentlemen gave it credit for about 890,000 dollars, which arose from the system of debentures. The same item in the last report is, I believe, stated at one million and an half—But this, sir, in comparison to the other immense advantages of our trade, I consider as mere drippings in the pan; and I only mention it now in order to shew to the House the manner in which it arises; because, it will be a complete refutation of all these little insinuations and gross charges lately uttered on this floor, against that part of the community.

Agreeably to the system of drawback, all goods imported which pay a duty, are entitled to debenture on being re-exported, provided they remain in the same package, and are not altered. Therefore, if a merchant on examining his goods, which he commonly does, is tempted to dispose of a piece of linnen, a pair of gloves, or a piece of ribbon, he loses the drawback on the entire package; and, therefore, because he will not take a false oath, the nation gains these sums of money.

I know, sir, that custom-house oaths are proverbial in Europe; but they are not so here yet; and I think it will depend on this House that they never shall.

Notwithstanding the present great extent of our trade, we have the means of extending it much further from our increased circulating medium; and this will certainly take place should Europe remain in its present situation. It, therefore, appears to me to be wisdom in this House to afford to our commerce the necessary protection it requires. So much wealth pouring in will soon lower the interest of money. Banks are multiplying, but their dividends are lessening so fast, that these riches must soon be applied to agriculture and to manufactures.

The question was then on MR. WILLIAMS'S motion, which was disagreed to—Ayes 20.

MR. MASTERS moved a new section, appropriating a sum not exceeding   to enable the President of the U. S. to cause the port & harbor of New-York to be better fortified and protected.

MR. SMILIE opposed the motion, under the impression that no sum in the power of Congress to give, would accomplish this object.

Various motions were made to incorporate in the section, a provision for fortifying the several ports of Charleston, Norfolk, New-Orleans, Baltimore, and George Town.

MR. QUINCY: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen seem disposed to treat this subject lightly, and to indulge themselves in pleasantries, on a question very serious to the commercial cities and to the interests of those who inhabit them. It may be sport to you, gentlemen, but it is death to us. However well disposed a majority of this House may be, to treat this bill ludicrously, it will fill great and influential portions of this nation with very different sentiments. Men, who have all that human nature holds dear—friends, fortunes, and families, concentrated in one single spot, on the sea coast; and that spot, exposed every moment to be plundered and desolated, will not highly relish or prize at an extreme value, the wit, or the levity, with which this house seems inclined to treat the dangers which threaten them; and which are sources to them of great and just apprehensions. I do not rise, Mr. Chairman, merely to support the motion made by the gentleman from New-York. It is not the fortification of this or that particular city, which I mean to advocate. I should have preferred a general appropriation, leaving it to the discretion of the executive to apply it to these ports and harbors, which are either most exposed, or most important. And if by any thing that shall occur in the course of the discussion, the house shall be induced to change, what at present seems to be its disposition, I hope the augmented appropriation will be made in that form. It is to the general duty which is incumbent upon this legislature to protect the commercial cities, that I would call its attention. This duty is so plain and imperious, that, in my opinion, an awful weight of responsibility rests upon this House. Every class and collection of citizens have a right to claim from government, that species of protection which their situation requires in proportion to their exposure, and to the greatness of the stake which society has in their safety. Our obligation to protect the commercial cities does not result from the particular exigency, which at present impends over our nation; but from the nature of those cities. The duty is permanent and ought to be fulfilled by a permanent system. A regular course of annual appropriations may in a very few years put all our capital cities in a state of reasonable security, and at no very distant period of time, without any additional imposition on the people, give every city on our coast an adequate defence. It is in this light that I consider the question now before the committee to be important. Not that any sum which may be inserted will be immediately sufficient for all the objects for which we have to provide. But that any augmentation of the appropriation will be a pledge to the nation of the disposition of this house, to commence a system of defence for our cities. Any evidence of which will give just satisfaction to great masses of your citizens—as an appearance of a want of it, will fill them with no less discontent and dismay. In this point of view I ask the indulgence of the committee to a few observations on the importance of fortifications, their utility, and practicability.

As to the importance of the objects, for which we ask a defence, it seems to me either not understood or not realized. Almost all, who have spoken upon the subject have dwelt chiefly, if not altogether, on the amount of revenue drawn from the commercial cities; as if their value was to be appreciated, and our duty to defend them measured, by the annual product they yield. This, it is true, makes a natural part of the estimate of their worth, but as I apprehend, by no means the most important. Their situation, the number of their inhabitants, the great portion of the active and fixed capital of society, which they contain, are in a national view, standards, much more just and more elevated, by which to ascertain their value and our obligations. I ask, sir, what is the amount of the capital of this nation, which is invested in the single city of New-York? The annual product it yields to our revenue, is three millions of dollars. Now suppose the average of import duties is only ten per cent. advalorem (a sum certainly below the real average) the annual amount of capital deposited in imports, is then thirty millions of dollars. The amount of value, in exports cannot be estimated at less than twenty millions. If to these be added the capital of its banks, the amount of stock always on hand, & that of its shipping and other personal property all of which no one can rate below another fifty millions, the result is, that there is an annual deposit, within the city of N. York alone, *one hundred millions of the active capital of this nation.* I know how far this is below the real estimate, but I state this sum that no one may hesitate to admit my position. I ask then, what is it worth to insure this sum against the risk of an invasion, not on calculations on the great national scale, but on a mere insurance office arithmetic? I have been told that to ensure that city against such a risk, for one single year of war with any of the great maritime nations of Europe would be worth five per cent. *That is the ensurance for a single year of war would repay the expence of fortifications, even should they cost five millions of dollars.* But suppose this calculation extravagant, can any one doubt that such an insurance in time of peace against the double risk of war and of attack in case of war, is worth one half per cent.? Even at this premium six years of insurance, in time of peace, would repay the expenditure of three millions—a sum more than adequate to the defence of that city. In making this statement, I would not be understood to pretend nor to propose such an appropriation: it is not asked. My object is to call gentlemen to consider what is the market worth of security, and that they may not deem the monies they apply to these objects—as they seem willing to deem them—absolutely thrown away. This great mass of the national wealth, thus concentrated on the bank of one of the most exposed harbors in the world, is liable to the insult and depredation of the most despicable force. Two 74 gun ships may at this moment, lay that city under contribution, or in ashes altogether with impunity. They might make it the interest of the inhabitants of that city, to pay an amount equal to the whole annual revenue, we derive from it rather than submit to the hazard and miseries of bombardment and conflagration. For in such case, the mere destruction of property is but an item in the account of anticipated misfortune. The shock to credit, the universal stagnation of business, the terror spread through every class, age and sex, the thousands who have no refuge in the country, but must take the fate, and be buried under the ruins of their city; all these circumstances would enter into a consideration and make the pecuniary sacrifice, however great, appear trifling in comparison. I have used the city of New York only by way of example. The same observations are applicable to every other commercial city in the U. S. in proportion to its magnitude and the nature of its situation. Two seventy fours might sweep the coast from Savannah to Portland, and levy an amount equal to the whole annual revenue of the U. S. It would be better for any city voluntarily to pay a contribution equal to its proportion of that amount rather than to take the alternative of that destruction to which, on refusal, it would be obliged to submit. Is such a state of things as this a light and trifling concern? Are such portions of the wealth of the community to be left exposed to the caprice of every plunderer; and are propositions to protect them to be treated with contempt, or with ridicule? Can any duty be more solemn, or imperious than that which has for its object a rational degree of security for those points in the U. S. which are beyond all others exposed to hostile attack, at the same time that they comprise within the smallest possible compass, immense masses of the national wealth and population?

The importance then of the objects to be defended will be admitted. But the utility of fortifications, as a means of defence, and their practicability in certain ports and harbors are denied. With respect to the general utility of fortifications, I ask, by whom it is denied? By men interested in that species of defence? By the inhabitants of cities? By those, the necessity of whose situation has turned their attention to the nature of fortifications and their efficacy? No, sir, these men solicit them. They are anxious for nothing so much. They tell you, the safety of all they hold dear, their wives, their children, their fortunes, and lives are stated upon your decision. They do not so much ask fortifications as a favor; they claim them as a right. They demand them. Who are they, then, that deny their utility? Why, men, from the interior Men, who, in one breath tell you they know nothing about the subject, and in the next pass judgment against the adoption of any measures of defence. It is true, sir, to men, who inhabit the White Hills of N. Hampshire, or the Blue Ridge of Virginia, nothing can appear more absolutely useless than appropriations for the defence of the sea coast. In this, as in all other cases, men reason very coolly and philosophically concerning dangers, to which they are not themselves subject. All men, for the most part, bear with wonderful composure the misfortunes of other people. And, if called to contribute their relief, they are sure to find in the cold suggestions of economy enough apologies for failure in their social duties. The best criterion of the utility of fortifications is the practice & experience of other nations. Now, I ask, was there ever a nation which did not defend their great commercial deposits, by either land fortifications, or sea batteries? All history does not exhibit such an instance. Are we wiser, then, than all other nations; or are we less exposed than they? Are we alone to escape the common lot of humanity? Can we expect to be rich, and not tempt the spirit of avarice? To be defenceless amid armed pirates, and in no danger of robbery or insult? I ask, again, sir, how is the inutility of fortifications proved? Suppose, for the sake of argument, it should be admitted, which however, I deny, that they cannot be erected, in sufficient force to defeat very great armaments; yet is it nothing to prevent the piratical attempts of single ships? Is it nothing to deter an invader? Nothing even to delay an attack? Is it worth nothing to have the chance of crippling an assailant? The only argument I have heard urged against the utility of fortifications, is, that the whole coast cannot be fortified, so that, protect as strongly as you will particular points, the invader will land somewhere else. Sir, this is the very object of fortifications. No man ever thought of building a Chinese wall along all the indentations of our shore from St. Mary's unto St. Croix. The true object of fortifications is to oblige your enemies to land; it is to keep them at arm's length. If they cannot reach your cities with their batteries, and would attack, they must come on shore. They are then only a land force and our militia will find no difficulty in giving a good account of them. The only remaining evidence in the possession of this House, against the utility of fortifications, are the opinions of various gentlemen, delivered on this floor; and that of the Secretary at War, as stated in his report. As to the former, they certainly do not merit a serious refutation, because no gentleman who has spoken, has pretended to a practical or even theoretical knowledge of the subject; but on the contrary, most, if not all of them, have candidly confessed ther ignorance. It is of more importance to consider the opinion of the Secretary at War. That part of his report which relates to the harbor of New York contains his general opinion, against the practicability of defending such a harbor by land batteries; and two facts in support of that opinion. Now, as to the general opinion of the Secretary, I am willing to allow it, whatever weight any gentleman may choose to attach to it; but certainly it ought not to be conclusive in an affair of such immense importance; especially when it is contradicted by the tenor of the applications on your table, and by the opinions of other individuals, of as high military and scientific reputation as the Secretary. Much less does this his opinion claim from us an implicit confidence since the only two facts he has chosen to adduce, are very far from being a sufficient basis for the broad opinion he has built on them. The first fact is one which occurred in the harbor of N. York, in 1776. A British ship of 40 guns passed the batteries on the Hudson, under circumstances favorable to the effect of the batteries, and sustained "a tremendous cannonade," without being sensibly "incommoded." Allowing this fact its full force, it can weigh but little against the utility or practicability of fortifications. That was the second year of the war. Our batteries were erected on a sudden emergency. Our artillerists had probably little experience.

Will it be pretended that the batteries this nation, in its present state of affluence and experience, can erect, will not exceed, both in location and power, those which at that time protected the Hudson?—Besides, to draw from a particular instance, a general conclusion, is contrary to all rules of just logic. Various circumstances altogether accidental, might have occurred to have produced that result, which might never occur again. If this instance be a good argument against the validity of land fortifications, there is an equally strong argument in the history of our revolution, against the fashionable mode of defence by gun boats. *I* take the fact only from verbal information, and if I am incorrect, there are gentlemen on this floor, who can set me right. During the war a British frigate of forty-four guns, called the Roebuck, took ground in the Delaware, and though we had gun boats *quantum sufficit*, who pelted her to their heart's content during one whole tide, she received no manner of injury, at least none of any importance. If I have this fact correctly, it is just as strong against the efficacy of gun boats, as that produced by the secretary is against land batteries. One word here concerning this mode of defence by gun boats; which seems to concentrate all the naval affections of our rulers, and to have on freight all their military hopes. It is not denied that these are weapons of considerable effect, or that in certain situations they are useful, or that, in aid of other and heavier batteries, they may not sometimes be important. It is only, when they become the favorites, to the total exclusion of more powerful modes of defence; and draw away to the less power appropriations which are wanting for the greater, that the system which upholds them, becomes an object of contempt, or of dread. Now-a-days, sir, put what you will into the crucible, whether it be seventy-fours, or frigates, or land batteries, the result is the same—after due sweltering in the legislative furnace, there comes out nothing but gun boats. I ask if our cities are attacked by any maritime nation, will it not be by line of battle ships? And who ever heard that a line of battle ships was defeated by gun boats? *I* do not pretend to be learned in these matters, but as far as *I* have been able to gain information, it is, that when there