tions to the report must arise from one of two causes; either from defects in the report itself, or from a bluntness of mental optics in those who make the objections, if indeed they are sincere. The report is now however before the public, and they will decide, and no doubt correctly, to which of these causes we ought to ascribe all the unqualified censures we have heard against it—I shall willingly acquiesce in their decision. It may not be improper here to remark that notwithstanding the hard names by which the gentleman has called the principles of this report, he has not ventured to deny the correctness of one of them—he has not denied the aggressions therein stated to have been committed on our rights by the belligerents, nor has he attempted to show that there is any other course, which we could pursue, better calculated to resist those aggressions, than that presented in the report. This renders it unnecessary for me at this time to enter into a further investigation of this part of the subject. When gentlemen specify their objections to the course we propose, or present us with their project, we shall endeavor to answer the one and examine the other.

Gentlemen appear so anxious and determined to produce, if possible, a conviction among the people, that they are oppressed by the embargo, that no matter what question is before the House, their constant theme is the pressure of the embargo, the distress it produces, and the ruin it will bring on the country. This mournful tale is repeated on every occasion, and painted in the highest and most extravagant colors. One gentleman (Mr. R.) at the close of one of those exaggerated representations, inquires what he shall do with his third crop of tobacco? The answer to this will equally apply to many other enquiries of a similar nature, made during this discussion. What would he do with it if the embargo was at this moment removed? You could not send it to the continent, because you are prohibited by the British orders in council. If you should even submit to Great Britain, and at the expence of national disgrace, send your tobacco there; she consumes less then 10,000 hogsheads of it, out of about 90,000, which is annually exported, and the price that could be obtained for that portion at a market so glutted, would not pay the freight. What then would you do with it, suppose the embargo was off? The same you do now; keep it in your warehouses, until there is a market open for it. The gentleman intimated you might carry it to Sweden, and find a market for it at Gottenburgh, and that it would find its way from thence to the continent; on what ground this last assertion is made I cannot comprehend. It is well known that Sweden is at war with Russia, and it may be said with all the powers on the continent; that she has no communication with them, and that all their ports are shut against her. Produce of any kind could not therefore find its way to the continent through her ports; and she herself consumes but a very small quantity of tobacco. Taking off the embargo therefore would not furnish a market for this article—until the orders of council are revoked you can have no market for tobacco.

But another ground has been taken and much relied upon, that the Treasury is drained by the operation of the embargo, and the sources of your revenue dried up. This argument, like most others which have been made against this measure, rests entirely upon ascribing effects to the wrong cause. They ascribe to the embargo what is really produced by the orders and decrees of the belligerents; and all that has been already said to shew that those orders and decrees, and not the embargo, destroyed your commerce, will apply in this case, and shew that they in fact, and not the embargo, drained your treasury and dried up the sources of your revenue. For it is certain that so long as your revenue depends upon your commerce, whatever destroys your commerce of course cuts up your revenue. It has already been shewn that if your commerce went upon the ocean it would be captured; and it surely cannot be pretended that the capture of your vessels and property by Great Britain, would increase the receipts in your Treasury, or open for you new sources of revenue. It must be much better to have your treasury empty and your property at home, than to be deprived of your property and have your treasury also drained; nor can it be pretended that for the sake of a commerce worth only three or even six millions of dollars, you ought to surrender your best rights, or hazard the calamities of a predatory war on your own merchants. The revenue to be raised from such a commerce would be inconsiderable, and I trust that on a question involving the independence of our country, we shall not be governed by mercenary views alone, or by the effect it may have on our finances. If the only enquiry was how we should replenish the treasury, the case would be different, the effect of measures on the treasury ought to be the principal point to be ascertained. But at such a crisis as the present, the questions of maintaining your independence and increasing your revenue, ought to be kept separate and distinct. You ought to protect and preserve unimpaired the rights of your people, whatever the effect on the treasury might be; so long as the people have their property & rights secure & are independent you are safe; a rich people and an empty treasury, is much better than a poor people and an overflowing treasury. They will always support their government so long as it acts correctly. Should direct taxes become necessary they will cheerfully pay them, because they would be on their own account and for their own interest, (though there is no ground to believe that such will be case) and it is chimerical, it is a mere slander upon the good sense of the people, to suppose that such a measure would either produce a separation of the Union, or lead to a consolidation of the state authorities into the general government. There can be no pretext for such alarms. But, sir, the treasury is at this time more abundantly filled, than it has been at any former period, and there are reasonable grounds to expect we shall be able to replenish it, before it is entirely exhausted. But surely the nerves of gentlemen must be of a very delicate texture, when they tremble so much for the fate of the nation, because our revenue may not have been as productive the present year as it was the last. There can be no good ground for such extraordinary palpitations, on this subject. The American people will always furnish the means to maintain their rights, and support their government, if those means are properly applied.

I shall close the remarks I have to make at present on this subject, by calling on those gentlemen who oppose the present course, to give us the plan they wish to pursue, and let us know the grounds upon which they act. Do they deny the aggressions stated to have been committed on our commerce and neutral rights by the belligerents? If they do, let them inform us which of those powers they consider justifiable in her conduct. If on the contrary they do not—if they admit those aggressions were committed on our rights, are they willing to resist them? Are they determined to vindicate the rights & independence of their country? If they are we wish to know in what manner. If they are not willing to pursue the measures of resistance we propose, of a total interdiction of intercourse with those powers, will they assume a higher ground? Will they prefer war? If they do, this is one of the alternatives presented in the report. We wish to know what measures they are willing to adopt for the safety of the nation. The crisis is awful. The time has come to unite the people of America—we join issue with the gentlemen as to temporising policy—we are for decisive measures—we have not, we will not now temporise. We say there is no middle course. We are in the first place for cutting off all intercourse with those powers who trample upon our rights; if that will not prove effectual, we say take the last alternative, war, with all its calamities, rather than submission or national degradation. This is the time for every man to take his stand in the ranks on one side or the other. There can no longer be but two denominations of characters in this country; friends and foes; dangers thicken around, and threaten us from abroad; it is therefore high time for domestic differences to cease; the period has arrived at which every man in the nation must be called upon to rally round the standard of American freedom; when he must declare whether he will be for his country or against his country; whether he will be an American or a traitor!

RICHARD PARROTT,

Has just arrived at Alexandria, on board the Sea-Flower, capt. Marshall from Savannah.

75 tierces Rice,
20 bales cotton, (best quality),

And in Store, (at his Warehouse, George Town) at Wholesale or Retail,

5000 bushels, Isle May, Turk's Island, St. Ubes, ground Allum and Blown Salt.
3 pipes Cogniac Brandy,
2 pipes Gin,
3 hhds. Antigua Rum,
2 do. Jamaica do.
9 do. Molasses,
3 do. Loaf and Lump Sugars,
5 do. & 20 barrels Muscovado Sugar,
200 casks Boston Lime,
8 casks Goshen Cheese,
100 barrels Tar,
Imperial, Hyson, Young Hyson & Bohea, } TEAS.
Coffee,
Alspice, Pepper, Mustard,
Mould & Dipt Candles,
Soap,
Snuff.
Fish Oil, Plaister Paris (ground & in stone)
Bacon, Pork, Herrings, Whiskey, Flour, Meal, Corn, Rye, and Flax-seed.
Philadelphia Bar Iron,
Boiled Linseed Oil, in jugs of 3 gallons each,
Bed-cords, Plough-Lines, Traces, Sail-Twine, and Cordage of every description.

☞ Cash and liberal prices given for well cleaned country Hemp, Provisions, and Produce.

RICHARD PARROTT.

January 9—tf

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, JANUARY 9.

MARRIED in the vicinity of Baltimore, *William A. Burwell*, Esq. a Representative in Congress from the state of Virginia, to Miss *Letitia MacCreery.*

We congratulate the nation on the passage of the bill more effectually to enforce the Embargo. It has passed the Senate by a majority of 20 to 7; and the House of Representatives by a majority of 71 to 32. As might have been expected, it has been opposed by the enemies of the embargo both within and without the walls of the Capitol, with a vehemence characteristic of the spirit of the opposition. Let the American people mark this spirit, let them never cease to remember it, so long as they value their independence, or are determined to maintain their rights. It was hoped, at a crisis solemn as that of seventy-six, when the wrongs of foreign powers called upon the whole nation to rise in resistance, that the voice of party would have been hushed, that we should once more have shewn ourselves "all republicans, all federalists," or, with greater correctness, *Americans*. But the hope has long since vanished! The outs will, if they can, get in, by any means; and, consequently, when union is more requisite than ever, their effort is to divide the poeple from their government; and thus to destroy its energy, & disgrace it in the eyes of the world.

No sooner was this bill published than the hornets of the East attacked it with all their fury. Language, the most opprobrious, imputations the most scandalous, and falsehoods the most infamous, were levelled against the best and greatest men in the nation. To enforce the embargo was, indeed, an unattonable offence! It went to the root of the existing evil—to destroy toryism—to prevent it from gathering a rich harvest, filched from the honest members of the community. Hence, the prints of the Essex Junto were instantly in full cry! Hence the liberties of the nation were endangered! Hence the Constitution was gone! To enforce a law, forced upon us by the injustice of our enemies, was treason? All who supported it traitors!

Mr. Giles had the honor of reporting this bill to the Senate on the 8th of December. After lying for weeks, the Senate took it up for consideration, but such was the opposition given to it in that body by the *enemies of the Embargo*, that even so late, as the 21st of that month it required a night session to get a question; and the walls of that honorable body resounded with the cry of *precipitation, precipitation*, although thirteen days had elapsed from its submission to the Senate.

It goes to the House, and there it instantaneously excites a storm. Time is demanded, *implored*. It is given—Several days elapse before the discussion is entered into, although the infamous violations of the embargo, and the voice of an indignant people call for immediate measures.—When brought up, objections are started; they are listened to with respect; the bill is recommitted and amended. Ample time for its consideration is allowed, before it is again acted on. At last the patience of the majority is exhausted, and a resolute, a patriotic purpose is formed, not to adjourn until it is passed. Thanks to the nerve of the body, this purpose is maintained with inflexible firmness. Every thing is heard with patience, that could be urged against it; the discussion continues from twelve at noon till seven o'clock of the ensuing day; when the final question is taken, and the triumph of patriotism stands manifest in the great, the *overwhelming* majority of 39.

Let the nation hail this as the first great step actually taken this session, to bring our enemies to a sense of justice or to punish them for its violation. Let them hail it as the harbinger of energy and concord in the other great measures still to be adopted.

During this sitting the Speaker of the House was in the chair nineteen hours, the longest period in which the House has ever sat in its legislative capacity. During all this time he conducted himself with a dignity, calmness and forbearance, equally honorable to himself, and to the body over which he so ably presides.

In our last paper, we presented to our readers a concise notice of the invaluable discovery of the successful cultivation of the Sugar Cane in Georgia. The following letter adds some facts to those stated in that article.

Cultivation of the Sugar Cane in Georgia.

Extract of a letter from Dr. Mitchill to the Society of Arts in New-York.

Washington, January 2, 1809.

"By an arrival from Sapelo, in Georgia, Mr. Spalding has forwarded to Governor Milledge, at Washington, some fine specimens of Sugar Cane, which grew upon that island. This plant is of the Otaheite species, and was introduced by Mr. Spalding about three years ago. The opinion of good judges is exceedingly favorable to the growth and sweetness of this Cane. About three acres are already under cultivation, and the plants are of a very promising aspect. From the experiments made upon the Cane, it is found to afford abundance of saccharine matter. The juice when boiled has already afforded a very rich syrup; and when the crops shall be sufficiently enlarged and matured for the erection of proper works, no doubt is entertained of its being capable of crystalizing into good grained sugar. Sapelo is situated on the coast of Georgia, about half way between the Mouth of the Savannah and St. Mary's rivers. It is supposed that all the land south of Sapelo, and which is favorable to the cultivation of sea-island cotton, may be converted into sugar plantations."

Our countrymen will do well not to treat the following article too lightly.

St. John's, (Antigue,) Nov. 15.

We have been favored with the following Extract of a letter to a gentleman in this island, dated Bermudas, 17th Oct. 1808.

"It is a fact that an expedition of some magnitude is fitting out at Halifax, and to take with it a great number of flat bottomed boats, *which cannot be wanted in the West Indies*. It will call at this island for the 13th regiment, which is now in readiness to embark at a moment's warning—its destination is of course unknown; but it is conjectured that, in case America does not act, on the meeting of Congress, in an open and explicit manner, an attack will be made, (at our instigation and with our support,) by the Spaniards from Florida, with intent to regain possesion of Louisiana."

The above conjecture certainly does not appear probable. We imagine these flat-bottomed boats would be at least as unnecessary on the friendly coast of Florida, where no opposition would be made to the landing of our little army as on the bold, but hostile shores of Martinique and Guadaloupe. Indeed, more so, for, in the invasion of an enemy's country it is always desirable to disembark troops in as large bodies as possible; and for this purpose the common boats of our men of war are by no means so well calculated as those with flat bottoms. In addition, it is not likely that there should be a sufficient number of Spanish soldiers in Florida to retain possession of Louisiana, even when supported by our small expedition, and supposing them fortunate enough in the first instance to overrun that country; nor can any hope be entertained of assistance from Old Spain at the present period. But there is one more powerful consideration which alone overthrows this conjecture, namely, that no war exists between Great Britain and America, nor is there now likelihood of it more, from all we can learn, than for some time past. Upon the whole, notwithstanding the flat-bottomed boats, no object seems so probable as the French colonies in these seas.

MR. ELLIOTT, brother of Lord Minto, has been appointed to the government of these islands, Gen. Beckworth to that of Barbadoes, and Sir Charles Brisbane to St. Vincent.

SENATE.—JANUARY 7.

The amendments of the House of Representatives, to the bill for enforcing the embargo were taken into consideration, which, after much debate, were finally agreed to about three o'clock. The decision on most of them was Ayes 23—Noes 7.

The bill consequently only requires the signature of the President to be a law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, January 5.

MR. CHITTENDEN'S RESOLUTION.

Mr. Basset, from the committee of the whole, to whom this resolution was referred, and which had it yesterday under consideration, reported, that for a want of a sufficient number of members to do business, the committee was dissolved—an incident believed to be novel in legislation.

The *Speaker* decided, that in consequence of this procedure, the resolution was now at the disposal of the House.

ENFORCING THE EMBARGO.

On motion of *Mr. Nicholas*, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. BASSET in the chair, on the bill for enforcing the embargo, and the several acts supplementary thereto.

Mr. Elliot said he should commence where he left off the day before yesterday, & proceed in the discussion with all the spirit consistent with coolness. He went almost through the bill section by section, commenting at length upon them. To every section he stated specific objections. Before he concluded his remarks, however, the chairman observed that the gentleman could not object to sections, which had been amended as they could not according to the rules of the House be struck out; and there was now no motion for the committee to rise. And Mr. E. closed his remarks, with an intimation that he would renew them at a future stage of the business.

The committee then rose and reported the bill.

The amendments having been gone through,

Mr. Eppes offered a new section to the bill repealing so much of the supplementary act of March 12th last, as empowers the President to permit vessels to depart from the United States, to bring in property. This power he said was now not necessary, whatever it might have been, and had been made a pretext for evasions.—Agreed to without opposition.

Mr. Pitkin moved to strike out of the 9th section the words in *Italic* in the following: "That the collectors of all the districts, &c. shall be authorised to seize produce, &c. when there is reason to believe that they are intended for exportation, *or when in vessels, carts, waggons, sleighs, or any other carriage, or in any manner apparently, on their way towards the territories of a foreign nation, or the vicinity thereof, or towards a place where such articles, are intended to be exported*." He believed that it gave a despotic power to collectors, with military force, to arrest any property going out of the country—to take even a trunk of a citizen, which might have money in it, going from one part of the country to any place where it might probably be exported. This power to seize property in any vessels, carts, sleighs, &c. "apparently on their way towards the territories of a foreign nation" was arbitrary and despotic. Not a cart he said, could travel northwardly but was going *towards* the territories of a foreign nation, but would be subject to this despotic power, &c. No similar power had ever been given by any law passed in this country or any other. A man could not carry his wheat to market if the mill lay in a direction towards a foreign country, without being liable to seizure. The 4th article of the amendments to the constitution says, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." What was "unreasonable seizure"? If this power to seize authorised by the bill were not unreasonable, he could not see what was. Was not this a violation of this article of the constitution? In article 5th no man "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." If deprived of his property in this way, was it not, he asked, taking his property without due process of law? If the article of the constitution meant any thing the bill proposed a violation of it. Mr. Pitkin also adverted to the novelty, if not unconstitutionality of giving to maritime courts jurisdiction over occurrences taking place on the land. He feared for the consequences of the thing, if the law was enforced. Whilst gentlemen took measures professedly for defending our rights on the ocean, he begged them to take care not to destroy them on the land. The bill was to maintain our right to sail without impediment from either of the belligerents; and for this purpose they were about to destroy the rights for which we had even fought and bled. Thinking thus, he felt himself bound to move the amendment, though he feared it would not be agreed to, for he perceived that this bill was promptly to pass by an overwhelming majority. He did not believe that this bill was necessary to enforce the embargo; and if it was, it was one of the strongest arguments against the embargo itself.

Mr. Basset observed that all the arguments of the gentleman had been directed against the word "towards." The striking out "towards" and inserting "to" would obviate his objections. Gentlemen talked of arbitrary measures. Did gentlemen suppose that the powers here given to collectors was any way as arbitrary as must exist in military officers in case of war? The advocates of the embargo had adopted that measure as a lesser evil to avoid war. Was it arbitrary to keep produce at home and to compel those who had not the fear of God before their eyes and love of country in their hearts, to respect the laws of their country? Surely not; it was but justice. Was not the design to make laws operate equally, both honorable and laudable? Surely it was. What was so arbitrary in the bill? The objections seemed so changeable, so Proteus-like, that they could not be ascertained. It was altogether destructive of republicanism to say that we could not enforce or support our laws. Laws might be partially evaded; but they must be rendered generally effectual, and that was the object of this bill.

Mr. Eppes said that if he coincided in opinion with the gentleman from Connecticut on the subject of the bill, he should unquestionably vote against it; but he could not believe that it either violated the constitution or established a new jurisdiction. He was well convinced that if the gentleman from Connect. would attend to our revenue laws, he would find infinitely greater powers had been given by them. In almost the first revenue law which had been passed under this constitution importation by land had been wholly prohibited; and he asked the attention of the House to the terms of the law, because it proved that our revenue officers had exercised jurisdiction on land as well as on water. He read the 70th section of the "act to provide more effectually for the collection of duties imposed by law on goods, wares and merchandize imported into the U. States and on the tonnage of ships and vessels," as follows: