National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. IX. | WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. | NO. 1281.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. | MONDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1808. | PAID IN ADVANCE.

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 26.

DIED—On the 9th inst. in the 73d year of his age, the Rev. ROBERT MOLYNEUX, late President of the George-town College. Mr. Molyneux was a native of England; he came to this, his adopted country, several years prior to the American revolution; and at different periods was employed in various parts of the U. S. Unassuming merit, pre-eminent virtue, and superior talents all [illegible] placing him in the chair of precedency. The unanimous vote, and earnest intreaties of the Board of Directors of the College prevailed on him to assume a second time, though with reluctance, the Presidency of the College. His name is in benediction wherever he was known—he was a man of sound judgment, a retentive memory, and [illegible] erudition—his equanimity of temper, and the suavity of his manners, endeared him to all who approached him; and the candor and liberality, which ever beamed on his countenance, were true indications of the sincerity of his heart. It would be difficult to [illegible] the person so universally loved and respected by all his acquaintances, as was the truly amiable and deservedly lamented Rev. Robt. Molyneux—he spoke with calm composure of his approaching dissolution, and obeyed the awful summons of death, with that christian fortitude and resignation which conscious innocence and rectitude inspire. In fine, throughout the whole tenor of a long, laborious and useful life, devoted from his early youth to the greater glory of God, the sanctification of his soul, and the benefit of his neighbor, he was ever conspicuous for his genuine piety, inoffensive manners, and unsullied integrity; and by his conduct exemplified in a manner consoling to the friends of virtue and religion, the truth of that sentence of Holy Scripture—

"A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."—PROV. ch. 22, v. 6.

Ergo Quintilium perpetuus Sopor
Urget! cui Pudor, et justitiæ Soror
Incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas,
Quando ullum invenient parem?
Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit.

The two following articles are extracted from late London Prints; the first from the *Observer* of the 9th of October; the last from the *Times* of the 12th.

The *First* article needs no comment. If in Ireland nothing but the stoppage of the distilleries has averted a famine, what must be the distress endured by the wretched millions there, who even in prosperous times have scarcely enough for mere animal subsistence, by an approximation to this most dreadful of all national calamities?

The *second* article exposes the profligate length to which the falsehoods propagated in this country embolden the writers in England to go. If a sense of shame resides in the breasts of the petitioners they will feel humiliation at beholding the avidity with which their remarks are seized and wrested to the most disgraceful purposes. Their *American* blood will boil at the taunting insolence with which a ministerial paragraphist looks down upon them as pusylanimously bartering their honor for their little interests of the moment. When they thus find their *good friends* treating them in so ignominious a manner, they will, it is to be hoped, pause, before they again revile their own government, as the best means of relieving themselves from foreign injustice. They will learn that their true interests depend upon the maintenance of their rights, and that these can only be maintained by supporting their own government.

"The oat harvest in Ireland has been abundant, but the grain is small, and deficient in meal; the wheat, in most parts of the island, we lament to hear has suffered much from mildew. It is now fully ascertained, that a famine must have taken place in Ireland had not the distilleries been stopped, and the state of the late crops require a continuance of that salutary restraint."

"It is not altogether foreign to the present situation of affairs in Spain, to make some observations upon those of America, with which the Americans themselves have coupled them. The inhabitants of Boston, in their petition to the President of the U. S. against the act of embargo, say, that 'but for the *great events in Europe, which materially change the aspect of their foreign relations*, they would have silently waited for the removal of the existing restraints upon their commerce.' By which it is evident that they mean this—that they would have continued the very dutiful and abject slaves of the French government, and submitted to all the restrictions which he through the means of his organ JEFFERSON might have been pleased to impose upon them, but that now BONAPARTE's 'luck is changed,' they think they may venture to resume their natural rights of free trade. We would have America, however, to beware, lest BONAPARTE if (which Heaven avert) his luck should change again, should remember this her insolence: for, though an explication may perhaps be penned in more gentle terms than that which we have above given of the extract from the Boston petition; yet that its absolute meaning is such as we have represented it to be, is unquestionable; namely, that the Americans think, that, 'in consequence of the recent great events in Europe,' they have less need to fear and respect, and be obedient to the tyrant of it, than they have hitherto been: so that they are really kicking the lion before the lion is dead, and when he is only out of breath. This, however, when coupled with other declarations, clearly indicates the origin of the embargo, inasmuch as the subjects of it state as a reason for its removal, a diminution of the power of France: that power, therefore, in its unimpaired state, must have been the sole cause of its imposition.

"Of the contempt with which BONAPARTE is disposed to treat the Americans, we need no other proof than the XIIth article of the Fontainbleau treaty, wherein he consents to recognise the king of SPAIN as emperor of the two Americas. We are not supposing, as some have done, that by this he meant to consign the whole thirteen United States to CHARLES IV. but only to give him the fresh and foolish title of emperor of Mexico & Peru, his old possessions in North and South America: yet is there no insult in this title? What would have been said by Russia, in the time of her independence, if BONAPARTE had agreed to acknowledge the GRAND SIGNIOR as emperor of all the Russias, on account of some territories he might possess in the Ukraine. The cases are precisely similar."

The following articles, also extracted from a late London print, merit particular notice, especially that relative to *gun-boats*, in the capacity of which, as instruments of defence, pacific and neutral nations are deeply interested. The instance here cited is completely in point, and exhibits their powers of offence as well as defence in a striking light.

London, Oct. 11. "To the conviction which we have already expressed, that his royal highness, the duke of York, will not take the command of the British army serving in the Spanish peninsula, we have the satisfaction of being now able to add an assurance that this appointment will not take place. A resolution to this effect has not, however, we believe, been adopted without a considerable struggle in which Mr. Canning has finally prevailed. In consequence of the defeat of a certain party, all is now confusion in the cabinet; and it is not impossible that the minister who has, in this instance, so meritoriously and successfully served his country, may ere long be obliged to resign. Should this be the case, he will find his loss of power amply compensated by an accession of character; and the love of the people will leave him but little reason to regret the favor of the court.

"In consequence of the divisions at present subsisting among the members of government, it is said that they will not venture to meet Parliament till after Christmas."

Extract of a letter from an officer on board his Majesty's sloop Kite, Great Belt.

"On the 3d of September, being at anchor off the island of Spro', near Nyborg, at 10 o'clock in the evening, the moon shining bright, observed we were inclosed in a half circle of Danish gun-boats, to the number of 22 or 24, the Minx gun-brig being in company, cut her cable, and made sail as the only means of saving herself; we being nearer to Nyborg, from whence they came, sustained nearly their whole attack, almost at the instant, in which we first perceived them; they opened a tremendous fire of round and grape shot from their whole line of three divisions. Of our crew nearly one half were absent (some in prizes, the rest lately taken prisoners in the boats), those on board the least to be depended upon; we, however, manned the guns, and kept up a fire for some time, but finding it impossible to withstand a force at least seven times that of our own (for three of them are equal to a sloop of war in a calm, which it then was), we cut our cable; the ship lay now unmanageable for want of wind, whilst the enemy, who were by this time within musket range, struck us every time they fired. At this moment our friend, Mr. Thomas, the purser, and my servant, were killed, the ship became leaky, the rigging much cut, and several of the sails falling down upon deck. Our situation became now the most critical that ever was experienced, when a light breeze most providentially sprung up, a gun-boat belonging to ourselves, out of which we had succeeded in getting our people, and cut away, got unfortunately under our bows, and prevented the ship from getting before the wind; the round shot, the splinters, the langrage, &c. were flying in every direction; the leaks increased, the enemy within hail in several places; the masts and square sails however were still standing. The first lieutenant, (the only one on board) as a last resource, jumped with a few brave fellows into this gun-boat, and happily succeeded in pushing her clear, which immediately enabled us to get before the wind; the enemy's fire now became more excessive, in consequence of our having to take the people from the guns to trim sails; the breeze, however, freshened, our lads again manned their guns, and the smoke being tolerably cleared away, enabled them to take better aim: one of the enemy's boats, with about 70 men, was soon after this sunk by our quarter-deck guns, and the enemy, thinking we had sent men in our gun-boat, which now dropped astern, directed part of their fire to her so effectually that she sunk, this desertion was of much use to us, and with the fine little breeze we now enjoyed, we drew considerably away from them; they followed for some distance, still firing, but now our crew having only to attend to the guns, our fire became much more brisk, and considerably galled the enemy. At half past 11, making just an hour and a half, they burnt a blue light, the signal of retreat, and we were unable to follow. We steered for an English 64-gun ship, who was within about 12 miles of us, and anchored near to her. At day light we found the ship a perfect wreck, two killed as before-mentioned, and thirteen wounded, being one out of every three of all on board.—Six large shots through the tottering main-mast, five through the fore-top-sail alone, and in the hull too many to be conveniently numbered; the main boom shot through, and lying across the deck, and much water in the hold. During the whole of this affair we had 18 Danish prisoners on board since the Nyborg action, which required some of our hands, together with the sick people, to prevent them from rising, and assisting their countrymen."

The votes for Governor of Pennsylvania were counted on Monday last. The official majority of *Simon Snyder* was 28,400.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DECEMBER 2.

DEBATE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS CONTINUED.

MR DAWSON. During the very lengthy discussion which took place in the committee of the whole on this resolution, and which, very unexpectedly to me, has been renewed in the House, I have indulged that disposition which I generally feel to be silent, and have attended to the observations of other gentlemen with patience; I wish I could add with pleasure. Many of them have been pertinent, pointed and ingenious, but I think ill-timed.

Sir, at a time like this, when dangers threaten our country from various quarters—when our rights and independence have been violated, and our demands for justice answered by new insults and injuries, and when it is admitted by most gentlemen, who have spoken, that the crisis has arrived when we should act as well as speak, and prepare efficient measures to meet impending dangers: at such a time, I say, I did little expect that we should have spent a whole week in discussing a *declaratory* resolution, in support of which I did believe that every American voice, heart and hand would have united—that forgetting local and personal prejudices, we should have come forward with a solemn and unanimous declaration "that we will not submit to the unlawful edicts of France or G. Britain," or any other earthly power.

Sir, I had been on the select committee who made the report on the table, I do not know that I should have recommended that resolution, because I might have thought it unnecessary—but, as it has been brought forward, and as it gives testimony to foreign nations of our determination to maintain and to vindicate our rights, which have been too often violated—and appears to me to be an invitation to us all to join in the support of those measures which a majority shall think proper to adopt, it has my hearty concurrence. What those measures shall be, I will not now determine; when they shall be presented, I shall, by the permission of the House, give my sentiments on each and on them collectively. At present I will say, that my impressions are in favor of adhering to the system which we adopted at the last session—for enforcing it with the utmost rigor, and for backing it with measures of a stronger character. If, however, on candid investigation, I shall be convinced that these impressions are wrong, I shall most readily relinquish them, and advocate that system best calculated to secure the honor, interest and independence of our country—at all events I shall be found among the foremost in "placing the country in a more complete state of defence"—and if necessary of offence. This has been my policy for the last five years, and God knows I have no cause to change it.

At present I hope that we shall take the question on this declaration, and proceed to do something.

I have another reason for wishing this resolution to pass without delay. The question, and the only question, before the House is, "whether we can submit to the edicts of G. Britain and France"—(for the embargo about which we have heard so much, is not even recommended by the select committee)—and on this question the representatives of the people have been deliberating for a whole week. What effect, I ask you, sir, is this calculated to have on those who do not see or hear what course our debates have taken? and what effect is it calculated to have on foreign nations, when our deeds are frequently misunderstood, and more frequently misrepresented? A very bad one I fear. I have another and third reason for wishing this resolution to pass. A rumor has gone abroad, unfounded I hope, that there are two parties in this country, the one under French, the other under British influence. This resolution is calculated to do away that impression, and backed by the measures which I expect it will be, totally annihilate it, and convince the world that we are an united people, determined and able to oppose any nation which dares to violate our rights; that while we respect the rights of others, we will defend our own.

If other gentlemen view this resolution as I do, I hope they will permit the question to be taken, and the several resolutions to be referred, whereby we may be able to do something; and action in my judgment will have more effect than all our tardy negociations, declarations, or all the eloquence of this House.

MR. MONTGOMERY said he could have wished very much that no discussion should have taken place on the first resolution. He considered it a declaration by this House in behalf of the United States, that the edicts were prostrations of national rights, honor and independence, and a solemn pledge of resistance. His own idea had been that it would have comported more with the respect due to the nation, that a silent vote should have been taken on it; but as discussion had been provoked, it must be met. Being a member of the committee which brought in the report, he could not, under the circumstances, reconcile it to his feelings to give a silent vote.

The proposition before the House (said he) is called, and may by many be considered as an abstract proposition. In general I am averse to abstract legislation, because it leaves the House in precisely the same situation as it found it. But there are instances in which the urgency of the case requires a departure from the general rule. And if there ever was an occasion in which this was proper, the present furnishes an example. France applied to for redress of wrongs committed on you, scorns you and gives no answer. England has given an answer, and in it utterly refuses to do you justice. We may be considered now as on the very verge of war. Is not this then one of the occasions which loudly calls for such a declaration as this? Again, an abstract proposition may contain a great leading principle which shall mark the *character of the times.* We find in 1774, when our ancestors were oppressed and attempted to be reduced to slavery; that they came forward before the people; and it was not considered at that time improper to make a declaration similar to the present. In page 73 of the journals of the Congress of '74 we find this declaration:

[Mr. M. here quoted the declaration of our rights made at that time.]

Thus we find when our ancestors were oppressed by England, and on the verge of a war, they thought it proper and expedient, and not derogatory to the dignity of the nation, that there should be a declaration, marking the character of the times. It is important in another view, that there should be something of this kind. Misrepresentations of the most atrocious sort have gone abroad, and it is important that they should be put down. To prove that such misrepresentations exist here, and in England, it is only necessary to mention that a libellous pamphlet, Pickering's letter, went through eight editions in England, one in Scotland, and one in Ireland. From these circumstances, it is highly proper that these things should be met and put down by a plain statement of facts.

But, sir, we have been accused of wasting public time. This accusation comes ungraciously from a quarter, which it will be recollected, last week occupied the House three days—on what? On a question which involved in it a violation of national confidence. If we divide the waste of time among us all, we shall find that that gentleman has had his full proportion.

This report has been said to consist of episode, prologue and epilogue; and the committee have been attacked from various quarters. It ought to be recollected by gentlemen, that others in the House have feelings as well as themselves. The gentleman from Virginia tells us that the report contains nothing, and has sagaciously discovered that no bill can be bottomed on the first resolution: and another gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Quincy) styles the report loathsome and disgraceful. When the subject was referred to the committee they acted on it in the manner which their duty required, and made such a report as they thought proper, to which no ill language can attach disgrace. I therefore hope and expect that the gentleman will not persist in the words he has used, but retract them from the respect which he owes to the House and to the committee. If the expression be persisted in, however, I must say, as one of the committee, that such language is indecorous and unmanly, and does not comport with the manners of a gentleman.

The gentleman from Massachusetts a few days ago, by his magic powers, transported us to British ground, and told us that the embargo must be repealed; that the people would not submit to it; that it was impossible to continue it longer. He stated too and went into a long calculation to prove it, that the people of the United States had not firmness to bear the embargo. Is this language novel? Look at British ministerial papers and pamphlets, and it is no more a novelty; it is the very language of British papers ingrafted into tory papers here. But the gentleman and the English nation too, will be satisfied that the people of the U. S. will bear any state of things rather than slavery and submission. The ministry of Britain also will know it.

But, says the gentleman, there was no such word in all the year '76 as *embargo*. What do we find, sir, when we examine the journals of Congress in '74, as was done by my worthy friend from Massachusetts? We find that Congress did adopt a non-importation and non-exportation law in 1774; in '75 they were not repealed; and in '76 they were in full force and operation; and no exportation took place unless by special grant of Congress. The gentleman says there was no such word as embargo in '76. There was not, sir; but still the embargo system was in full operation.

But the gentleman warns us not to invoke the spirit of '76. He says it is to be put out of the debate, together with the word tribute. What may be called the spirit of '76, sir? The spirit of a Washington. What is the spirit of which the gentleman talked so much the other day as existing in the eastern states? It may be called a Pickering spirit. The former was that which animated the heroes of 1774, 1775, 1776, which inspired the councils of the nation with zeal in their country's service, and atchieved our independence. What is this spurious Pickering spirit? It is a spirit emanating from delusion, dissimulation, disappointed ambition, and gross, palpable and execrable misrepresentations. What does it lead to? Patriotism? I deny it. To regular government, or union? I deny it. [Mr. Montgomery was here called to order by Mr. Blackledge; and the Speaker observed that it was desirable that the gentleman should avoid personal applications of his remarks.] Mr. M. continued. I am under the direction of