(Continued from first page.)

to be used, when these evils are realized against America, in order to destroy the union of her councils, or impair the confidence in her rulers, much less indeed for the purposes of deterring, by the fear of pecuniary expenditure, this nation from submitting again to be taxed by G. Britain. If I have truly learned the character of that great man, he was among the first to resist the right of taxation from England. Could he have lived to behold this day, when his arguments are quoted for the purpose of paralizing our resistance against her renewed attempts of taxation, by forcing our vessels into British ports, there to pay a tax on the products of our soil, how extreme would have been his anguish!

But, sir, to return to the subject of discussion: Considering the course recommended by the committee as it must be, and ought to be avowed to be, adopted for the direct purposes of coercion, and serious action upon the interests of our commercial enemies, I would not determine to carry it into immediate and unconditional effect, if any hope still remained of amicable adjustment, but where can such a hope be supposed to exist? The two great belligerents, each propose a relaxation only in case if their enemy should do so. Let us examine then, what are the votes of relaxation from either?

As to France, if the doctrine of the British minister be correct, and England is vitally dependent on commerce, this is the very state of things most to be desired by France; the campaigns of 1805 and 1806, were not more fatal to the governments of the coalition, than the maritime campaign Great Britain is now waging against commercial rights, is fatal to herself, and must be ultimately triumphant to her enemy.

As to England, such has been her conduct, and so many impediments has she heaped in the way of adjustment, that although ruin and destruction should be yawning to receive her, it seems extravagant to hope for a voluntary restoration of our rights.

The considerations which forbid the hope of a change as to England, independent of her positive refusal, are numerous. In the first place, sir, it is proven by the conduct and declarations of her own cabinet, that the evils we now suffer from her, are the result of a system long meditated and now matured, for the monopoly of the commerce of the world. We need no other proof of this than the incautious mode of reasoning adopted by Mr. Canning, in defence of the conduct of his government, on the ground of French aggression; in his letter to Mr. Pinkney of the 23d September, 1808, he tells us, that "the mitigated measure of retaliation announced by his majesty in the order in council of the seventh of January, and the further extension of that measure" (by the orders in council of November, which he calls an extension in operation, but not in principle, of the orders of 7th of January.) are founded on the right of retaliation. If this be the case, sir, and those two orders are indeed of such kindred principle, I would ask of the British minister, how the order of May 1806, is to be applied. The order of blockade of the continent from Brest to the Elbe, from the bay of Biscay to the North Sea, of which our minister resident at London, was notified on the 16th of May, 1806, is in its terms and principles precisely similar to that of January 7th, 1807: It has in it these words, "and the said coasts, rivers and ports are, and must be considered as blockaded." An exception is then extended to neutral vessels, not ladened with goods, the property of the enemies of Britain; subject however to the following provision: "Provided the said ships and vessels so approaching and entering," (except as to the ports from Ostend to the river Seine, which are declared in a rigorous state of blockade), shall not have been laden at any port belonging to or in the possession of any of his Majesty's enemies, and that the said ships so sailing from the said rivers and ports (except as aforesaid) shall not be destined, to any port belonging to, or in the possession of any of his Majesty's enemies." Here then, sir, we find the commencement of the principle now said to have been adopted, in retaliation of the orders of France of the 21st November following. The proclamation of May 1806, and the orders of January 1807, are the same in terms, both but parts of that system of monopoly which Great Britain has so obviously determined to enforce. Let us hear no more then, sir, of his Majesty's retaliation in his just defence. It is not pretended, by Mr. Canning or any one for him on this side the water, that France had commenced her present career of aggression by blockade, prior to May 1806. The truth is, sir, and it did not require a warning voice from the other side of the water to inform us of it, that Great Britain is determined to make if she can, all nations tributary to her maritime greatness. From the time of the revolution, this policy has been decided on by the British cabinet, and it has accordingly made itself appear, whenever an apt occasion has called for it. Let us attend for a moment to the course she has pursued. The doctrines of Sheffield were about to be enforced upon us, and were indeed in actual operation, when the renovated union of the states, under the new constitution, gave us sufficient strength, and enabled us to afford sufficient security to mercantile enterprise to counteract them, and to defeat the hopes of supplanting us, in our natural share of commerce. But soon an occasion offered, when America might in the opinion of the British cabinet, be again reduced to a colonial system of commerce; and in March 1793, we find from the collection of state papers of that date, that Great Britain had entered into a confederation with Russia, to prohibit the exports of neutral produce to France. This determination was followed up by the British orders of June and November, 1793. I do not wish, sir, by tracing so far back the system of aggression on the part of England to go in pursuit of an enquiry, futile indeed at this day, as to the priority of aggression from France or England; but I mean by noting at different periods, the same appearance of hostility to the maritime rights of this country, to shew that it has been the effect of system and design, and not of accident, or justifiable necessity as now contended.

We have already seen how the system of aggression of 1793 was checked, in 1799 the same disposition we find renewed in the British cabinet, and by an authority emanating from the king, a principle is attempted to be enforced, which was to destroy the neutral rights of America. Several condemnations had taken place in her maritime courts, when on the representation of our minister the attempt was again relinquished, and in April 1801, the most formal recognition of our rights officially made.

Sir, it may be useful to pause, and compare those times with the present. In 1798 and '99 differences as now existing between the French and American governments, G. Britain is anxious to force us into the war, by distressing our commerce and sowing the seeds of discontent among our citizens. In 1801, when there was a most decisive expression of the public will in favor of the independent rights of this country, when an administration was introduced into this government which it was known would neither be driven or persuaded to compromit its interests, the hopes which were raised of success in the British cabinet, were again dissipated, and they hasten to renounce the principles they acted on. Let the history of that time be now a useful lesson to us, if hopes of a division and a strong British interest in this country have been falsely cherished, let them now be dissipated by the vast preponderancy which has not ceased to encrease, and has so lately, on so warmly contested an occasion, been amply manifested to the world. In 1805, Britain resumed the maritime principle she had formally abdicated in 1801. The cases of the Essex, the Enoch, and the Mars, were signals to their cruizers, as the correspondence laid on our tables last spring informs us, our commerce was swept from the ocean in the little space of a few weeks. When the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Quincy) tells us of the effects of an embargo for 12 months, and goes on to estimate the cost, why has he forgotten that in one fortnight our commerce suffered more from the injuries of a foreign power than by a measure calculated to prevent a repetition of that injury, it could suffer from many years operation.

But, sir, we have reason to fear, that not even the renewed evidences of union which have lately been exhibited in this country, can now have the effect of averting the evils of this threatened maritime tyranny. And another cause to destroy our hopes of accommodation exists in what we hear of the necessities of England. Great indeed they must be if the accounts of her own writers are correct, and more perhaps than the plunder of the world can satisfy. If instead of 20 millions of annual supply, as was required at the commencement of the war of 1793, she now requires an annual supply of about 50 millions to carry on her contest with the continent, and if instead of a permanent debt requiring the payment of an annual interest of fourteen or sixteen million of pounds sterling, her permanent debt is so magnified as to require an annual supply for the discharge of interest alone, of thirty five or forty million of pounds sterling, we may indeed conceive something of the necessities of that kingdom, and find in other considerations, independent of a natural jealousy and hatred towards us, sufficient ground for her piratic exactions. If the commerce of all the nations of the world is to be made to pay tribute to her superior naval strength, and thus feed the monster that devours them; if America is indignantly to subscribe her quota of immense taxation to support entire the vast expence of this dominion claimed over all the waters of the earth, I confess it is possible the grand plan of universal monopoly may succeed, and the countless accumulation of the British national debt will form no obstacle to her grandeur or the ease and happiness of her people. But this is a question which addresses itself to the honor, to the patriotism, and the virtue of every American. On this question, I believe, sir, there is no division among us; we all profess to emulate the genuine spirit of '76.

I fear indeed there are other obstacles to fair and honorable adjustment with England which will be difficult to overcome. Many are the items of injury, which we have been baffled in all our attempts to obtain redress for.

The article of impressment stands in importance at the head of the list; it is a claim too degrading to freemen, too insulting to the sovereignty of this nation, ever to lose sight of. I hope for the honor of our country that we shall never yield the rights of civility to a nation who attempts to enforce it on us; it was properly made the condition precedent to any treaty our agents at the British court were authorised to form; nor, sir, should we be content with a supposed relaxation of the practice so long as the principle is claimed; we have indeed a noted evidence of relaxation in this practice in the famous note of Nov. 8th, 1806, so much relied on by our ministers in London, but in which experience has shewn no faith could be placed; for by a recurrence to the document with which we have been furnished very lately on the subject of impressments, we find that from the date of that note to the time when it was probable the rejection of the treaty was known in England, a number of our citizens, equal to any number in the like length of time in any former period were subjected to impressment into the British service. Indeed, for my own part, sir, I never could construe that note to mean even an insinuation that the practice was to be desisted from, but rather a new avowal of the principles of it.

Another item in our account, which must have an honorable adjustment before a pacific understanding can ever return, is the outrage committed on our sovereignty by the attack on the Chesapeake. Whatever the apologists of England may say, no American will venture to pronounce in the candor of his mind, that our claims to satisfaction have not been completely sustained on our part, and most shamefully and dishonorably evaded by England. Sir, it is no secret now, and I dare say it has been avowed at St. James's, that the person sent here for the ostensible purpose of making satisfaction to this nation, was neither authorised or intended to heal the wound the feelings of America had sustained. Who is there on this or the other side of the Atlantic, who has ever heard what were the specific propositions of redress intended to be made? There may, sir, be some who hear me, who know more of the secrets of foreign governments than I do, who could tell us what that person came to this country for. From every thing I have seen or heard, if I was asked to-day to state what he had come for, I know of no answer I dare give. Perhaps he came, sir, to learn us the art of bowing, to teach us kindly something of the *etiquette* of an European court. He has indeed attended our national levee, and after presenting himself to the presiding personage, turned upon the surrounding crowd, has taken this man by the elbow, to that he has whispered, and with a third may perhaps have transacted some little matter of business, and in due time, seeming to protest with an *honi soit qui mal y pense*, has taken his leave.

There are other subjects of minor importance, for the settlement of which we have a right to look. Neither the fair principles of our commerce, as connected with the colonial trade have been adjusted or compensation for the losses we have sustained by depredations on our property on the seas been made.

But were these questions of claim settled, or did they not exist, we have I fear too satisfactory evidence of the determined hostility of the British king, to permit us to hope, that we can longer avoid measures of a strong character and quality, such as I admit those under consideration to be. For this ground of support to the measures recommended, I refer with indignation to the proclamation of the British king issued some time in the last spring. Sir, in my estimation it is scarcely possible to conceive of an act of hostility more insulting, or of a character more obviously inimical than that instruction published in our gazettes, in which the British king has proclaimed immunity to the violators of our embargo laws. Has he not thus in open, flagrant and the most undisguished terms, offered rewards for insurrection among the people of the United States, erected the standard of rebellion for them? Has he not appointed as the rendezvous of American treason, the quarter decks of his navy? And is it, sir, for George the Third or his minions to encourage in the people of the United States a disobedience to the laws, they themselves have made? For him who once endeavored to command obedience to laws, in making which they had no participation? It might indeed have been expected that before his majesty, had attempted this insidious act, against our interior peace, he would have recollected his cause, or only ostensible cause of the war of 1793 against France. France he said had attempted to alienate the obedience of his people, and stir up insurrection; if this was true it would have been certainly a just and indispensable cause of war, where a man is attacked by conspiracies, and combinations, carried on with his own domestics, it is time to defend himself, and sir if ever there was a time in my opinion, when a call of this body would have justified an order to repel insult, and injury, it was when our government was informed, of this insidious attempt upon our internal peace and safety.

The conduct of the court party in Great Britain, however evincive of of hatred to us is what we have no right to complain of. Let them stimulate their own own nation by what false means their ministry my think fit, either in or out of Parliament, to a spirit of hostility against us; they have a right to do so; and it is for us to watch the working of that sort of machinery and be prepared to meet its stroke. Of hostilities so strongly indicated in that way, I therefore say nothing, except that as a new evidence of a determined spirit of war, they ought to warn us of our situation.

Among the last, and surely not the least of the indignities offered to the government and people of this country, Mr. Canning's letter to Mr. Pinkney of the 23d of September, is certainly to be ranked. It could not indeed have been expected, sir, in candor, after the earnest and honorable endeavors of our government to reconcile our disputes with England, that we should be told in the official character of that kingdom, that we had entered into the universal combination against his Majesty. That this echo of a miserable *party*, I do not mean that *party* composed of a respectable body of American politicians, opposed to me in sentiment, (of them I will not doubt the integrity, nor can their patriotism be questioned). But, sir, I speak of a *party* —an unprincipled foreign faction, which had fixed a mercenary interest among us. It is the spirit of this poor, contemptible, and already dreadfully appalled set of miscreants on whom the patriotism of the country is frowning indignantly at this moment, of which I speak, when I say, a British minister has dared to return the echo of French influence upon our government itself; and has told us in a tone of insolent exultation, over what he falsely supposed a state of division among us, that there was a universal combination, against his Majesty, and that our embargo did come in aid of France, when if her measures could have succeeded at all, *this interposition* of the American government would have most effectually contributed to its success

I have thus, sir, in the most concise manner I was able, without taking the wide range the subject would have justified, endeavored to shew the little probability that exists, without resorting to the strong measures contained in the resolutions before us, ever to effect an adjustment of our differences. The interest of France, perhaps her disposition—the disposition of the king of England, and a false calculation of his interests; the systems in which both these governments seem to be unchangeably fixed, require the measures proposed. I believe those measures to be ten times better calculated, for all the purposes of any annoyance we are capable of, than war would be, if formally declared, and at the same time however inconvenient to ourselves, less so than war. I therefore am willing to consider the second resolution as proper to be adopted in its broadest terms, and as intended for a retaliation of injury, we ought to adopt a part of the measures of reprisal.

At the same time, sir, let it be understood, by the modification which a select committee may make on the subject of importation, what is to be the permanent, as well as the temporary plan. Let it be understood to what articles prohibitions or prohibitory duties are as an ultimate regulation to extend. Nor, sir, would I hesitate to discourage the immense importations in times of pacific intercourse, which have, and ever will so long as they remain unrestricted, drain our country of its real riches, and make an unprofitable barter of our valuable exports, for the luxuries, which enervate while they impoverish us by throwing an immense balance of trade against America.

These, sir, are the ideas which appeared to me to be applicable to this subject. When we come to consider the question of the embargo alone, it will then be in time to make the enquiry, whether the barren kingdom of Sweden, which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph) has said was open to our commerce, would form a sufficient vent for our vast products, to authorise a hope of benefit to us, from permitting our vessels to go there. I believe however it will be found, that so small is the consumption of the produce of our agriculturalists, hunters or fishermen, that a single warehouse of an American exporter would be more than sufficient to glut her, and as to the idea of the gentleman, that through Sweden we can get to the continent with our freights, I ask if he has not heard that the navy of G. Britain infests the seas of the north as well as the south of Europe, that her ships cover the Baltic and surround the coast of Sweden and Denmark? Will England allow us to go to the continent, and thus directly and effectually evade her blockade? No, sir, nor is there a hole or corner of the waters of the earth, through which we can now creep to a competent market. Sir, whatever may be the views of aggrandisement which merchants might have on this subject, they would find themselves mistaken. They may indeed in the vast labyrinth of orders, decrees and regulations perceive some crooked course to steal along with a disgraceful smuggled trade, but I can with confidence tell the gentleman from N. York, (Mr. Mumford) that if once we open our ports by a general regulation, while the orders of France and England continue, his commerce will no longer enjoy immunity from the permission even of a foreign nation; when our property shall again be fully exposed upon the sea a general grasp will be made at it; is not the enemy now hovering round you, the hungry birds of prey? Let then the gentleman send again his vessels to sea, and he will find only an addition to his great and heavy losses already stated to be sustained, by the tyranny of France and England. The scene will again shift when our property is put afloat to so great an amount as it would be, and capture and condemnation would succeed to fraud and connivance. Sir, it is time to think more of resistance, and less of refinements in the acts of submission, I hope we shall have the question, and that I shall have the pardon of the House for having contributed to day to delay it.

DECEMBER 6.

MR. GHOLSON. Mr. Speaker—Were I to yield to my embarrassments on the present occasion, I should not tresspass on your indulgence. But when I reflect upon the great national importance, of the question now before the House, and upon the high responsibility which its decision must attach to me as one of the Representatives of the people; I am impelled, from considerations of duty, to assign to you the reasons by which I am influenced.

It has been said, sir, with great truth that the present is an extraordinary crisis. It seems indeed to have been reserved for the age in which we live, to witness a combination of political events unparalleled in the annals of time. Almost the whole civilized world has been within a few years convulsed by wars, battles and conquests. Kingdoms and empires have been revolutionized; and we behold a vast continent assuming a new aspect under a new dynasty. Those laws which from time immemorial have prescribed and limited the conduct of nations, are now contemptuously prostrated, innocent neutrality is banished from the ocean, and we hear a grim tyrant asserting himself the sovereign of the seas. Thus the most essential part of the globe is attempted to be partitioned between two domineering rival belligerents. Sir, it would have been a subject of the sincerest felicitation if our happy country could have been exempt from this universal concussion. But we are fated to share evils in the production of which we have had no participation. In enquiring, Mr. Speaker, into the causes of these evils and the policy by which we are to be extricated from them, I am conscious of two things—of my utter incompetency to the elucidation of so great a subject, and of the unavoidable necessity of touching upon ground already occupied by gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate.

When, sir, I recur to the resolutions reported by the committee of exterior relations, I find one which proposes resistence to the edicts of G. Britain and France; and another which recommends a system of nonintercourse between the U. S. and those countries.

In hearing the first resolution treated as an abstract proposition, my astonishment has been not a little excited. I have always understood an abstract proposition to be the assertion of some general principle without any specific application. Here is a distinct position with a direct reference to particular orders and decrees. The resolution therefore is itself *specific and appropriate*, to use the apt terms of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Dana.) But before we can determine upon the propriety or impropriety of these resolutions,

(Continued on second page.)