point them? Are these the men to be employed? Surely not, sir. What kind of an army had we in the revolution? Was not that a party army, a band of patriots? When we have war, sir, it ought to be carried on by such partizan soldiers. I have no idea of confiding the defence of this nation to men who merely hire themselves to be shot at. With such men I would not risk the destinies of the nation. But we are told by the gentleman that we have no effective militia. Is this true or is it a libel? My life on it, if the times demand it, the gentleman will find the militia strong enough to put down that gentleman and his Essex Junto faction. If they dare to rebel, as they have worse than insinuated, the militia of his own state would be more than adequate to all the purposes of putting down so puny a faction.

But, says the gentleman, the only object of this bill is to quiet the legislatures of the several states, and to influence the spring elections to prevent resistance. This is not the first time that I have heard language on this floor, which in former times would have been deemed treasonable. It is treason, sir. There is no such motive. If this people think proper to pursue any course, they will do so, and will not be turned aside from it, because factious demagogues cannot be quieted with offices; and I have shewn the impropriety of giving it to them. I should have no kind of objection, if things were driven to that excess, to let them excite rebellion, and have them punished as traitors.

If there was no deception in this thing, the gentleman says that the embargo would have been limited. If a limitation were now to be affixed to the duration of the embargo, and the member from Massachusetts alone, was not deprived of the gift of speech, no measure would be substituted for the maintenance of our rights. He would day and night eke out the time till it was too late to substitute any measure. The gentleman wants a pledge from this corrupted House and Executive, who avow one thing and mean another, who sell their country to the usurper of Europe! What pledges can be valuable from such a source? Sir, the pledges of the sincerity and pacific disposition of the administration may be found in the public documents. If they are not sufficient to satisfy the gentleman, the voice of an angel from Heaven would be of no avail. The amount of the gentleman's whole attempt was to prove that we were so base and corrupted as to be unworthy of credit. And if the embargo were limited now, he would tell the people that we are still false to them; that we are affrighted by "the light rising in the east" which is so soon "to break forth into the most perfect day." The gentleman would ride down that hobby horse as he has rode down the other.

A day or two ago the gentleman remarked that we were reduced to a situation similar to that of the turbaned turk or cross-kneed Frenchman; that we have confided the power of regulating commerce to the Executive and ten or twelve Senators. Why did not the gentleman urge this wonderous argument against the resolution that we could not submit to the orders and decrees? For if we had no power to resist, it would have been a good argument against declaring that we would not submit. But I feel convinced that when the great interests of the country require it, whilst we have such men in our councils they will act in concert whether to resist foreign aggressors or domestic insurgents. What would a stranger say at hearing the debate which has taken place on this question, if he had not previously been apprised of the subject before you? He could not have supposed that the House were discussing a proposition to meet at an earlier day than that fixed by the constitution, but a resolution to impeach the Executive or a majority of the House. He could not have supposed otherwise from the gentleman's speech or from my answer to it, for I have followed him from step to step. He rises, he tells you in behalf of this people. If he is the champion of the people, if he is to be the centinel to sound the tocsin of alarm from the constitutional watch-tower, God help this people—he was silent as to the letter published the other day by the British government; this he might have said, in the spirit of this proposition, is evidence of the propriety of changing our measures. An appeal has been made by the British government to the people of this country. Need I say, sir, that no persons had copies of this paper but our government, the British government, our minister there, and their minister here? Our government has not caused the publication; theirs must have done it. And the gentleman might have said, inasmuch as it was an attempt to re-act the scenes of Genet, it was necessary that the Legislature should be in session to counteract it. Sir, what would have been his language if M. Champagny had published such a letter in such a way? Would he have been silent in that case? No, sir; my life on it, he would be among the first to maintain the rights and honor of the nation, which are thus insidiously assailed by the British government. We ought to know how this letter became public: And if some gentleman whose age and experience would justify a proposition of that kind were to rise in his place & ask that the Executive should be requested to ascertain in what manner it came into the public prints; and, if through the British ministry, request that their minister should be sent off, I should vote for it. The gentleman finds nothing to blame in the conduct of foreign nations, but like a viper, turns and wounds the vitals of his own country, satisfied if he can only let loose the torrent of defamation, daily uttered in this House contrary to every parliamentary rule against an Executive, whose acts ought to have induced all his former enemies to say "he has disappointed our expectations, proved himself the supporter of that declaration of independence which was given to the world from his pen." Instead of this, the gentleman hides every thing relating to foreign governments and takes pleasure in attacking his own. I pronounce it a cowardly abuse of the privileges of this House, of which I should never avail myself under any circumstances whatever—to cover with its shield attacks on the honor of the President in every way unjustifiable. If he President has been guilty of crimes let him be impeached, not accused, tried and condemned by the same individual in the same breath. What would be said, and I beg the attention of the House to the similarity of the cases, if the Senate should be charged with such baseness by any member of the House. The Speaker would put him down. And what would be said if the President were to avail himself of the opportunity afforded by the press or his official messages to promulgate an attack on this House, accusing it of duplicity and subserviency to the views of a foreign government? One universal display of indignation would manifest the feelings of the House; every member of it would rise at once to address you on the subject. And is the Executive on all occasions to be accused of the crime—a crime which would eternally disgrace any man—of being false to the people who have confided in him? This course is not less disgraceful or unparliamentary than if we were to accuse the other House of similar conduct; and it is high time that a stop should be put to it.

But the gentleman said, sir, that he did not mean to charge the Executive with moral turpitude but with political imposture. Is this the morality of the gentleman? Treason against the people is no crime! Such a doctrine, sir, is base and detestable. Does the gentleman act on this logic? Has he made it the basis on which the superstructure of his arguments is erected? Pardon me, sir, when I say that I fear he has. The highest crime in this nation is treason. The constitution says it shall consist only in levying war and adhering to our enemies. And even this is but a *political* crime. What was the crime of Aaron Burr? He did not put any one to death; he only attempted to turn the arms of his deluded followers against the government of his country, his objects were political merely. And this we are told is not an immoral act. Are these the steady habits of New-England? I hope not. But the gentleman says he should be false to the people if he did not hold up his voice. In what does falsehood to the people consist? Is it not in uttering false accusations and false charges? In the days of Rome, *Cataline* stood forth avowedly the champion of the people. He sometimes aped the virtues and morality of Cato; and then played Cataline, for in all ages an affected passion for the rights of the people has been the pretext for committing the most abominable crimes.

The President has been accused on this floor of falsehood also. I do not recollect whether it was in the gentleman's catalogue of "*political deception*" of yesterday. In the message at the close of the late session the President says, "The papers which I lay before you embrace all the communications written and verbal from the French government, respecting the general relations between the two countries, which have been transmitted through our minister there, or through any other accredited channel since the last session of Congress". Notwithstanding this solemn asseveration that the papers then communicated contained all the information he had received, gentlemen say that the President has asserted a falsehood; that a letter of December the first had been received, and justify the charge on a supposition arising from dates merely. Why, sir, it is no secret that this letter was delivered by the minister to Mr. Patterson, and by him to Mr. Rittenhouse, at Amsterdam, and that gentleman did not reach this country 'till May, so that its receipt was subsequent to the adjournment of Congress. But if Armstrong were to swear to this, and Mr. Rittenhouse, the Secretary of State, and his chief clerk to affirm it, gentlemen would say it was all falsehood still; after daring to dispute the solemn assertion of the President, they would say it was merely a tale conjured up to meet circumstances. This letter notwithstanding all the noise gives no new light, adds no new information.

But, sir, we have been told that the President and government have acted with duplicity; that they have connived at the idea of joining France in opposition to England; and a paragraph in the letter of Mr. Armstrong to Mr. Champagny, urging the rescinding of her edicts, is seized as proof, strong as holy writ, that the President has arranged a plan for uniting us with France. If the optics of the gentleman who made this assertion were as keen on one side as the other, if he were not as blind as the kittens alluded to by his friend from Massachusetts, he would find precisely the same language used in the communications to England.—The same arguments were addressed to the understandings or interests of both.

Upon the whole, sir, I must conclude that the observations of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Quincy) were made for the purpose of alarming, distracting and dividing this nation, of uprooting every thing like social happiness. I will not suffer the mantle of charity longer to cover such men, the veil of deception should be pierced and torn off, that they may stand naked before this people covered only with disgrace—not shame. No, sir, I have no such hope—The African visage was never suffused with a blush There can be no blushes on the cheeks of those who commit the unworthy act of uttering dishonorable, false charges, and protecting themselves under the privileges of this House. Neither is there hope of reformation. Nero never repented. The melody of music produced by the bow which he drew across the strings of his fine toned instrument was not half so harmonious to his ears as the crackling fires of Rome, the crash of its falling towers, the cries of its women and children, and the universal ruin of his country. There have been more Neroes than one. The example of Rome is not single. And while all good men are striving to heal the wounds of party, and unite this country at a time when the whole world is in hostility against it, in comparison with whom our population and resources are nothing, except as they depend on the virtue and spirit of the men yet surviving and the sons of those who have departed, who aided in the achievement of the independence of this nation, while all their efforts are directed day and night to relieve their suffering country, the midnight lamp sheds its pale light on the black compositions of a few restless spirits, who strive to distract the Eastern people. Is this the patriotism which the gentleman professes? I presume, that, after the rage of party has subsided, the people will discover the imposture and chastise the impostors. This is a time to forget party feelings; and yet gentlemen resort to every petty circumstance, and because it authorises an inference in opposition to direct facts, endeavor to excite them—they would tumble the Executive from the height which he properly occupies into the dust, down to a level with themselves. It is time not only to forget party feelings, but to cease treasonable opposition. And as to those who pursue the course which I have described, whether out of this House or in it, I would say to the American people, in a voice which could be heard in every corner of the congregated assembly—risque not your peace or safety for them—they are enemies of your peace—they have conspired against your safety—cast them from you—*Hostes humani generis*—let the mark of infamy be stamped upon their foreheads, so that all who see them may execrate them.

Mr. Bacon said, that on a former day he had felt himself called upon to make some remarks in reply to his colleague, who addressed the House yesterday. The task was not then a pleasant one. In his subsequent remarks a few days since, the gentleman took occasion to tell me very courteously, that I had been barking at his heels, and that he would not pursue my course. Though these sort of personal collisions are extremely disagreeable, yet his observations will not deter me from following that course, which my duty may dictate. As representatives from the same state, I have since endeavored to avoid all needless collisions, with a gentleman standing in such a relation with myself, and should not again have placed myself in opposition to him; but for the extraordinary remarks which fell from him yesterday, to which, sir, I consider it my indispensible duty, however painful, to address some observations to you in reply. It was the temper of his remarks, their tendency if not their design, the peculiar time, and the temper of the people in one section of the Union, that impressed my mind with peculiar regret at the ground which he thought proper to assume. As to the temper of his remarks, I need not exhibit it any further to the House, it has been sufficiently noticed; as to their tendency it cannot be mistaken; there is something, however, more particularly striking as to the time; what are the circumstances under which they were offered? what are the circumstances in which this House has found itself for some time past? Sir, for some days we have had a general aspect of union in the House, a considerable harmony of parties, a number of questions have been taken that savored very little of party feelings, and the political atmosphere had subsided into a state of much apparent tranquility, until agitated by the thunder of the gentleman. Was not this a desirable prospect? I confess for one, sir, that I have seldom found an occasion on which I more congratulated myself, but it would seem as though my colleague feared that this state of things might conduct us and the nation to some happy result. Did he therefore think it necessary, that a fire brand should be thrown on this floor, to excite agitation in the House, and alarm, division, and discord among the people? I hope the gentleman had no such intention, but that such was the tendency of his remarks, no one can differ with me in believing. As to the time and occasion which he chose it is well known, as the gentleman observed, that the legislatures of many of the States are about to assemble. Yes, sir, they are, and amongst others that of the state which the gentleman and myself have the honor in part to represent, about the time that the speech of my honorable colleague will arrive there. The temper of that portion of the Union is already sufficiently excited.

That they have already manifested strong symptoms of disaffection, that they have heretofore given intimations of violent measures cannot be concealed. Did the gentleman fear that they would not be sufficiently agitated, that they would not at once, be ripe for the most desperate measures? Did he fear that unless he added a little fuel to the flame, that it would not burst out with sufficient fury to produce his favorite crisis? Did he fear that this portentous crisis of which he spoke in an oracular tone, would not arrive with sufficient celerity I call it *his* favorite crisis, because one of his arguments in opposition to the bill, was, that he feared it was calculated to allay the passions of the people and defer the arrival of this crisis. Am I therefore incorrect in supposing that he hails the prospect of it as a desirable event? Certainly I think that the conclusion cannot be mistaken. What was to be the precise nature of this crisis my colleague did not exactly explain to us. I know not distinctly by what means it is to be produced, or what are its ultimate objects. For one, sir, I deprecate it, it will probably be a crisis of disunion; I dread it, and will use all means in my power to prevent it, I will do every thing to satisfy those mistaken men who may be seduced to engage in it, that they are embarking in a cause of peril. Did I not do all in my power to avert it, I should not hold myself blameless; but after doing this I will do no more. Let it come when it will, or let the consequences be what they may, I will not betray the trust reposed in me, as the Representative of a brave and independent people, by sacrificing the rights and interests of a great nation to the clamors of faction, or the fury of a misguided few. The gentleman told us some days ago, that he was born a free man, and would die so, or perish in the attempt.—Sir, I was born as free though perhaps not so high as that gentleman. I represent a people as free as the constituents of that gentleman, and who, though not perhaps "fed as well," can endure not only "the winter's cold," but can meet tempests, storms and commotions as undauntedly as they; this is a state of things which they will be the last to provoke, but let it come when it may, they will not turn their backs to it. Let not the gentleman talk or think too lightly of it, whenever it comes it will be no common crisis. Who will first be buried in the ruins of such a day, no man can predict. I again warn the gentleman by the deep pledges which he holds in the integrity, and peace of this Union not wantonly to provoke it's dissolution. He ought to consider that those who promote it, may in all probability be the first to suffer in the general wreck of the times.

He spoke to you of the men who upon the ruins of a political convulsion, would not assume the reins of power, that it would not be the federalists of the present day, nor would it be the present political majority, the transition in such cases being always from bad to worse. That the Condorcet's and Brissott's were always followed by the Danton's and Robespierre's.—No, sir, I agree with my colleague, that upon the consummation of such a crisis, federalism cannot expect to guide the destinies of this country. There is another illustrious example in the bloody annals of that revolution to which he alluded, from which he would do well to derive a lesson of warning & instruction. The celebrated, the notorious Philip de Egalite ci-devant Duke of Orleans, had like the gentleman, a deep stake in the common interests of his country, and in its tranquility, he was a man of noble extraction and commanding rank, but envying the higher fortunes of the monarch, and wishing to be greater than the throne, he became an accomplice with those who overturned the throne itself, and was with his fortunes buried in its ruins.

No, sir, upon the ruins of a disjointed confederacy, a far different set of men than the common federalists of this day, will preside over the destinies of this nation. Whatever share federalism may have had in producing this state of things, or, however she may have contributed her aid to it, she will be remembered by her masters only to be disgraced and despised. The most that she can aspire to, will be a hope that from her higher ranks may be selected the Viceroy to govern his country; in the name of a Viceroy over him on the other side of the Atlantic. She can at best aspire to nothing higher than becoming the tool and minion of a foreign despot. It is impossible it should be otherwise; it will be utterly out of the power of any domestic usurper, without foreign aid, to wield the sceptre which grows out of a state of civil discord and commotion, brought about through the agency of a foreign power; it would be struck from his hands by the indignant arm of an incensed people, faster than he could recover it.

The gentleman's address had to me a meaning most solemn and portentous, taken in connexion with the times and circumstances under which it was delivered. But what are the mighty means by which this crisis is to be produced, & what is the powerful lever by which these commotions are to be raised—the old stale topic of a perpetual embargo—like the gentleman from Virginia, I nauseate the subject. The idea of a permanent embargo is worn out, and I thought had by this time been discarded from the mind of every man both in this House and in the nation. I am not about to enter upon a wire drawn argument to shew either from the particular terms of the law or the general construction of language whether it is so or not. These views have been long since exhausted. What then are the new arguments never before produced which are now offered by the gentleman to prove that such must have been the original policy of the law? It is that it was recommended by the Executive as a precautionary measure, while it was supported by some members on this floor as a coercive one. On this point let me bring to the notice of the gentleman the temporary embargo of 1794, recommended, as I have always understood, by general Washington, and held out to foreign nations as a mere measure of precaution, to secure our vessels and our merchandize from belligerent aggressions and plunder. But how was it supported in this House? It was supported as the present law has also sometimes been, as a measure of coercive policy. We have but few of the debates which took place on the former occasion, to revert to, but I have in my hand the speech of a gentleman of distinguished talents, and a predecessor of mine, who then had a seat in this House, giving his views of that measure—[Mr. Bacon here read the following paragraph from the speech of Mr. Sedgwick on his introducing a resolution empowering the President to lay an embargo on the 12th day of March, 1794.

"The reasons on which this idea of an embargo were founded, are that Great-Britain cannot supply her West Indies, except from the United States; if this is in any degree true in peaceable times, how much more forcibly must it operate now. They have a considerable military force there to feed; in truth, without supplies from this country they must inevitably abandon a project, with them a favorite one, the conquest of the French West Indies—in this situation of affairs he believed it would be found proper to put into the hands of the President a power to lay this embargo, and in a moment to prevent all supplies going to the West Indies."

The sentiments (continued Mr. B.) here advanced, prove that the idea of an embargo in this country being considered as a measure of coercive policy in respect to foreign nations, to G. Britain in particular, is not a novel one—that it is no fanciful notion of the present day, but owes its origin to the politicians of the old school. I have introduced them however more particularly to shew, that the auspices under which this measure of embargo was introduced & recommended to the nation, and the views with which it was supported, were the same now as in 1794—that they were both precautionary and coercive, and will the gentleman say that President Washington or the Congress of 1794, were, as he asserts we are, instrumental in deceiving the nation, and yet his argument will equally apply to both cases.

But the gentleman affects to consider our neglect in providing general efficient means of hostility as a certain indication that we have no idea of interposing any other measures of resistance to the violations of our rights than the embargo, and says that we have not even sufficient spirit to fit out our little navy. On this head I can answer only for one, and can say with truth, that I have always been ready, at least to an equal extent with my colleague, to lend my support to every measure either of defence or offence which has been proposed to us. As to the navy, every one knows that it has not been any thing like a party question, & that the two political parties which usually appear in this House have been nearly equally divided upon it. The fact is, that the apparent tardiness of our proceeding on this point has been occasioned more by a difference of opinion as to what were the most appropriate means of national defence, than by any doubt whether the essential rights of the nation should be defended in that mode which should ultimately be thought to be upon the whole the most expedient and efficient. Another consideration has undoubtedly had its influence in deterring the government from launching into those extensive measures of hostile preparation which have perhaps been too long delayed. There can be no question that the most ardent desire of the government has been for the preservation of peace if it could in any consistence with the national rights and honor be preserved, and in proportion as this desire has been ardent, no doubt we have flattered ourselves with the expectation that it might yet be preserved. Perhaps this reliance has already been cherished too long—and as the storm thickens around us, and the political horizon assumes a more threatening aspect, we are now progressing more rapidly in the preparations for a system different from that which has until this time been pursued, and in this work we may very properly call upon gentlemen of all political parties to unite their efforts, and contribute whatever they can to the defence of their country. It is said that the army which was provided for at our last session has been organized upon party principles, and officered generally from one political sect, and that such an army cannot be intended for defence against foreign aggressions, but must be solely for domestic purposes. As to the fact which the gentleman mentions, I know nothing about it. For myself I can truly say, that on the subject of appointments to office generally in a government like ours, my general opinions have heretofore been more liberal than would probably be esteemed orthodox by almost any political party in this country, certainly much more so than was practised upon by the political friends of my colleague when they presided in our public councils. As there are certainly a great number of men who differ from the present majority in their political sentiments, upon whom I could place the utmost reliance if called to defend their country, I would never consent that the single sin of federalism should be deemed sufficient to exclude them from all participation in either civil or military offices. But if the gentleman in one part of his speech yesterday intended to give us a sample of those men in whose behalf he complained on account of their exclusion from military commands, it is certainly no subject of my regret that such exclusion has been thought proper by the head of that department. Sir, was it a patriotic effort on the part of the gentleman to endeavor in that public manner to chill the spirit of the nation, and to discourage them from the assertion of their just rights, by disparaging our resources, undervaluing our means of annoyance to our enemies, and proclaiming in the face of the world, our vulnerable points and most defenceless positions; and at the same time magnifying the power of a foreign nation, and declaring that she held against us those pledges for our good behavior which we could not put at risque without the most imminent hazard and destruction to ourselves? Sir, when I heard the gentleman avowing to the world sentiments of this sort, my heart sunk within me, especially when I saw full in his eye a protege of the minister of his Britannic majesty, rioting no doubt upon the charms of his eloquence, and receiving it with those kind of sensations natural to the human heart, when the [illegible] of the country to whose fortunes we are attached is the subject of eulogy. I trust that these are not the national feelings or sentiments of the great body of the [illegible]