upright, and unbiased honor, and true and sincere friendship."

I have read this sentimental, (said Mr. Pickens) because the Bill is pathetic and grave statement of a man arrived at that period of life when he is too so much under the influence of passion. It is a statement of facts, which if made by myself, might be thought partly feeling. I pray it proves that it never has been the policy of this nation highly to embark in war. And however the gentleman from New-York and myself may differ in other respects, we unite in the wish that no crisis so great as one, except a surrender of our independence, should ever arrive to induce us to a step which should induce any nation to resort to this alternative. I pledge myself to every action, in particular to its parts.

So far this action have proceeded without any great romance, we have not been provoked nor embarked to prosecute power, it was a course which British and honorable. Britain has been opposed by the nation, and Britain has been opposed by the nation. But this there never has been and never can be, in a nation, if there are those among whom we shall act?

The idea of a *firmness of embargo*, and *firmness* in this part of the subject I shall perhaps be told as another gentleman was yesterday that the *firmness* of a gentleman *made* the sing of a sale house; that the debate of a deliberative body *made* the law. It seems to be found only in the speeches of those who opposed the measure. Such an idea cannot be forced from the conduct of members of this House, or from any things which has occurred. It proceeds only from men who from the first moment the measure was laid on your table, continued to plague it, in the most odious colors. Impertinently after the measure was adopted by either, under taken plans, and A man distinguished by the favour of the people, a man who in 1798 was the very man who in 1812, had been the dispatches from Mr. Adams, and had been chosen to join a new war in France by this act. What does he do? In 1808, he displays the same spirit of hostility to France, which he manifested in 1798; writes a letter in which he attributes the embargo to French influence, to the influence of Bonaparte. Mr. Gardenier regarded the embargo, and the act of Congress in strong language. Mr. Epps, "General" Pickering, &c. appeared in the debate which whether Mr. Adams, or Mr. Sedile said that if the gentleman from New-York, was persuaded, in criminate his conscientious, a reply ought certainly to be followed.] Mr. Epps continued. I will, to be understood, Mr. Speaker and the House, that I had myself resolved to say nothing which should be my observations, which gentleman shall never me from expressing such sentiments. I have said, Sir, that the nation should see the strange union of sentiments in gentlemen, gentlemen in the nation and that government which has judged, in mean. I am responsible for any sentiments I advance, but I discharge my duty in that way which I believe, and in that way I will. I think, Sir, it is better proceeded from the man who in 1798 was willing, was anxious to involve the United States in a war with France, and who was a war in this country in favor of it; and if correctly informed, he was one of those only thinness letter in the road of that very patriot, a party connected and known under the name of the Essex Junto. This was the first stroke of the embargo; and what took place afterwards? I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Livermore) to tell in his place, whose speech, as delivered to his constituents, was sent here some weeks before our last adjournment, said to have been delivered to the inhabitants of his district, in which he declared that sentiments which were imputed to the republican party here had opened to declared to him their hostility to commerce? The gentleman from the author to declare that he still not make to his constituents such a statement; and, if it was delivered in his speech, immediately previous to the election, and although the gentleman never made such a speech, the people in Massachusetts believed that he had not only made the speech, but that it was a deliberate statement of his sentiments. These things justify the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Story) that misrepresentations have been spread amongst the people. The republicans have united in giving currency to these misrepresentations. They have even made speeches for members of Congress; they have made them appear the majority of Congress of being under the influence. A sentiment of this sort has been given in a speech of the gentleman from New-York, (Mr. Gardenier) which it is denied.

[Mr. Gardenier said he never had expressed such an opinion; the speech which he had seen printed had not conveyed that idea. He never intended to express such an idea; for assuredly he differed in opinion with gentlemen, in regard to the slightest suspicion that gentlemen were governed by dishonest motives. He should hold up their coarse as pernicious to the nation, and never would cease to do so, thus performing a constitutional right, and a duty which he would never shirk.]

Never has been my habit (continued Mr. Epps) to attribute to gentlemen improper motives; I never have done so; but the course which has been pursued will give weight to the opinion already entertained in Great Britain that we are a divided people and that we are ready to explode on what the gentleman from N. York himself has called a self-evident proposition, that the belligerent decree cannot be submitted to without a surrender of our rights, independence and honor. Are we to be surprised that the people of Massachusetts or of any other part of U. S. are alarmed when they find men so collected at their representatives in Congress, as to say that this is to be a permanent system? Do gentlemen really believe that it is by *firmness* alone that we can obtain justice? Are we to be *firm* in the *injustice* we redressed, be that *firm* or *obstinate*? Do gentlemen believe that a bargain, that is to be opposed so much, before and thrown? Do they believe that it is a bargain, that we have to make? Are one unemployed deny that I ever had such an idea, or any other, which was I ever conceived on the subject, except the resolutions which opposed it, to upon it was conceived opposition and speechmaking measure. And whatever gentlemen may say on other subjects, they will not, I hope, be so bold as to say that at that session I told them my opinion on the subject. I hope it will be that this is land, by the produce of which I live. I would source let it be, I should generally open my offers to submission. I defy gentlemen to say where is find the embargo considered as a permanent measure, but in their own speeches and the minds of their partisans.

The circumstances which produced the embargo are well known; but I hope gentlemen will gentlemen will not state the question fairly, but covert it under a heap of flattery extended to gentlemen of from people the true question. Let the question be fairly put, and there is none to man in America who would not say (except of twelve) would not say that they will resist. What is the real state of our affairs—what is the *bargain* here to discuss, who begun first. Have men to answer and outstanding, which I have mentioned 16 or, who commenced, that on this subject I might refer gentlemen to the speech of Mr. Hammond in 1793. In which he takes the ground now maintained, and asserts that we are bound to Britain to blockade the whole of France. The statement of our situation is simply this—Britain has been 4 years in France her dependencies without a license from her, your property should be taken by the French, and consideration France says if you have visited Britain you should be treated as Britain, your vessel shall be liable to seizure and confiscation. Now take the degree of neutrality and allegiance to Britain and what remains? Your commerce is a completely blockaded by the French decrees as the city of Boston was in the revolutionary war—and when gentlemen come forward and tell us we must submit to such restraint on our ports, and the country suffering, and attribute this to the embargo, I say it is not so. It is mainly it is not an assertion merely verbal, but a proposition structure I feel upon on any man, federalist, quid, or of what denomination he may be, and I ask whether these decrees have his destroyed our commerce; and yet the destruction is imputed to the embargo. At the time the embargo was laid, our exports amounted to one hundred and eight millions annually, and of these the country, with what we could trade, throwing G. Britain out of the question, which we could not trade, we can be willing to trade under existing circumstances, and we can be willing to trade, to amount to seven millions and a half—a commerce not equal to one half of the exports from Massachusetts alone; and give Massachusetts here relative share of one fifth of this seven millions, and gentlemen ask us, if we can have to support her seamen, to enrich her merchants whom the country has sought to have destroyed. This is the real situation of the country. Do the people of the Eastern region, do they believe that I have kept from them? they cannot find it in the speeches of their representatives, in the speeches, Sir, there it is all exchange, the favorite hobby-horse of federalists.

Having thus attempted to shew that it was not my intention when the embargo was laid to consider it as a permanent measure, I will proceed to state some circumstances which have occurred this measure, legislative that it would otherwise have been. The embargo had two objects, to gather in our capital, and to prohibit supplies from our enemies. The first object has been completely uncovered, and there is not a period at which it would be more necessary to adhere to it, than at the present moment. To withhold supplies from our enemies is now more important than ever. The nation, unprepared as it is, with far gentlemen to attempt to delude the people. The decrees of England and France must be withdrawn, or we must fight; it cannot be avoided. We have declared we will not submit, and there is no species of effectual resistance but war.

We have a right to carry our produce to every place on the globe whose municipal regulations do not forbid it; we have a right to do so, and we will do so, if we can, by force, but we will not submit, and there is no species of effectual resistance but war.

We have a right to carry our produce to every place on the globe whose municipal regulations do not forbid it; we have a right to do so, and we will do so, if we can, by force, but we will not submit, and there is no species of effectual resistance but war.

Gentlemen will know that the rights of the nation cannot be abandoned with out struggle. The only question, Sir, is, whether the means of the nation sources will soon be at our command. Means of resistance are produced, and the period must soon arrive when nothing will be wanting but spirit on the part of the representatives to use them. The people are with them; gentlemen their supports. Nothing can prevent it but abandoning our rights. If we warmly they can be maintained, the people will meet it with firmness, and never had any fears, Sir, but that these decrees must be withdrawn, or we must resort to war. Sir, I have done. I do not, I hope, Mr. sentiments are known to the people I represent. They unite in the resolution. It is the sentiment of the men of the state in which I live.

It is said that the gentlemen people wish to destroy commerce. I will ask gentlemen what but commerce, what but commerce, what cities? If I had consulted my interest only, of what importance to me the carrying trade? I know, Sir, but it was, if ever will be, of little importance to me to support such principles, or our commerce. What are these principles? Equal and exact justice to foreigners and citizens. Called for common protection and for the general safety, the rights of the nation, and of the abandoned. The merchant has as good a right to protection in the view of a ship, as the farmer in the use of his plough. I said so in 1809, and I say so still. Our situation, however, is now changed. It is no longer a commercial question; the ground of the decrees which have attack on the sovereignty of the nation; it is no longer a question whether we shall submit to war, or we will maintain or surrender our independence. The embargo at the time it was adopted, was the best measure which could have been resorted to. Its operation was delayed by the unprecedented negotiations of which I have spoken. What on this subject I will say, shall be in another point, which I shall hereafter omitted. I have said some. Sir, I have said enough, which I hope, I trust, I am understood, that I mean no gendemen in this House. I meant to state the ground of my vote, and to acquit myself in a portion of this country, and that it was that principles in which the agricultural interest of the country, government, which produced the decisions of our law. Your town wharfs with these British goods, who send to their friends, whatever they may be, the proceeds of the sales of your law. Nay, sir, tory-ism in this country, has in one case assumed the form of official tory-ism. In the proceedings of the Essex Junto. I hold them in my hand, and I will read a resolution from them.

These patriots say—

"As to the orders of council. It will be recollected that the resolves, bearing date 18th November 1807, were occasioned by the decree of the French Emperor, dated Nov. 1806, declaring all the British dominions in a state of blockade. It will also think these orders completely justified by the Law Britishes that declaration, there is no reason to consider them as originating in a disposition hostile to the United States; they might not to be considered. It is notorious that we have been treated as known law and usage, plead the actual state of the country, of all, or principled provocation the power of France."

Now, sir, this is the tory-ism, principle; and it is immaterial what may be the professions of men. This man who can say his feelings are in opinion of our country, that the conduct of Great Britain towards us is justified by the law Britishes, and by equal law, is a tory. It is in vain for people in any portion of the union to make professions of patriotism, if they come forward, and by publication, or by speech, or by other means, to make such a statement, that Great Britain is justified by the law Britishes, and that we have no cause of complaint against Great Britain. I wish gentlemen correctly to understand me. I do not, Sir, believe I could come forward and make reparation for the insults offered to our rights and waters, she has offered with me on equal ground with France. But when I recollect that instead of receiving reparation for our rights, or ratifying insults and injuries, she sent here a legalized spy to insult us with insolent demands, I cannot consider in point of injury done to this country, these two foreign nations as equal in the honourable course of injustice and violence towards us. Let Great Britain retrace those injuries, and I will go with her under the hand of reconciliation to her as to France.

I believe the principles of both are infamous. That in a contest for the empire of the world, they are equally their own aggrandisement. It is the duty of the United States to take a firm and manly attitude, and oppose both; to maintain the independence of the nation and spurn a foreign yoke. You must assert your rights; they cannot be maintained without war. The American people and country is an object beyond which all differences as to the internal administration of our affairs, should sink. This is a period in the history of our country, it is a period when federalists ought to forget that they have lost the form of power, when the old cities of Boston, through our country, should suppose that we have acquired high political, and that we have acquired high political, and that we have acquired high political, and