National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. IX. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1358

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1809 PAID IN ADVANCE.

THE *National Intelligencer* is conducted by SAMUEL H. SMITH, and JOSEPH GALES, Jun. and printed at the office of the *former* to whom subscribers and correspondents are requested to address themselves.

The annual price, payable in advance, is *Five Dollars*.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding one square in breadth, are inserted the first time at *fifty cents*, and for every subsequent insertion *twenty-five cents*. If inserted less than three times a *Dollar* is charged. If inserted but once a week, in addition of one fourth part is made. Other advertisements charged in the same ratio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Thursday, June 1.

DEBATE

On Mr. Randolph's motion for approving the late conduct of the President of the U. States.——Concluded.

(Mr. Gardenier's Speech concluded.)

I think after this very fair exposition, there can be no doubt in this House that there is a great merit which much attach somewhere or to some body, in bringing us to this blaze of light from that scene of utter darkness, in which we groped so long. I cannot reconcile it to my mind to give credit for it to any one but the President of the United States. It is not the embargo which has done it, or the embargo might have a sort of posthumous merit, the merit of doing that when dead which it could not accomplish whilst living. As to the non-intercourse, no body ever dreamt that the non intercourse would have more power than the embargo, which I think I have shewn to have had none. It is therefore owing and solely due to the proper temper with which the overtures were received. And it is now in proof before us, as I have always said and contended, that nothing was wanting but a proper spirit of conciliation and fair and honorable dealing on the part of this country, to bring to a happy issue all the fictitious differences between this country and Great Britain; and that is now acknowledged to be true, for saying which I was so much censured—censured because, in saying it, it was supposed that I had an opinion of the British government which did not become an American citizen. Let me be understood that I have not that confidence, that I am no advocate of Great Britain. A mutual dependence of interests one upon the other rendered it a point of interest for Great Britain to be in a state of amity with us when it could be done consistently with a sense of her own right. But I praise not Great Britain, nor give her any eulogy for it. It is her interest which actuated her; & on this account alone should this country have produced this state of things long ago. It long ago might have been produced, if we had not made a fictitious quarrel with Great Britain, which gave much room for political dispute, and has been the means of dreadful destruction to the U. States. I wish not to discuss the point whether this or that party is entitled to the credit of the present state of things. I do not see the necessity of it. But if it were necessary, I might ask at the last session who was it in their speeches that endeavored to soften the public temper, to bring it down to a medium which was necessary to induce the British government to meet us? You remember, sir, that there was in this House a party, who, revolving round the Executive, derived light from him, who cried out "War! Give us war!" Who when they found they could not get us into war, begged for letters of marque and reprisal; and who, when they could get neither, wished for a continuance of the embargo. No, said others—(and I believe, sir, that you yourself had some share in it)——the people began to open their eyes, and some gentlemen became convinced that if they did not stop their course the people would stop them from coming here again. There were protesters, republicans, and a little handful of we poor federalists, few in number at that time, who formed a class No. 2. which would not have war, letters of marque and reprisal or embargo. There were some who were as well content as any of us not to do any thing in point of substance, but who wished to take to themselves the credit of proposing a substitute; and they certainly took as mild a one as could be expected.—We had heretofore endeavored to coerce Great Britain by exportation; but now we tried another novelty. It was non-*exportation* before; and we changed it for non-*importation*. What coercive or other effect was expected from that, I never heard. The men revolving round the Executive came down to the measure because the House would not go higher; it was the most hostile measure they could get, as they avowed as their reason for voting for it. This is the true exposition of the whole thing. Would you, after this, say that the embargo bro't about the accommodation? The Gog and Magog of the party were shivered to pieces. The non-intercourse law was not a measure of the administration, but a measure of compromise between the hot and the cool. And after all our troubles, we may be permitted to laugh a little that our relief was brought about by this poor non-intercourse law. The President has made good use of it. Therefore, say I, let praise be given to the Executive for the promptitude and frankess with which he has acted.

I would then now, sir, as we are arrived at an æra in which we have a right to look forward to the same prosperity and happiness for which our country was distinguished under the administrations of Washington and Adams—the two first years of Mr. Adam's administration I mean—I would hope that an abandonment of political intolerance which misguides men themselves and by which they misguide others, that contentious spirit of party which has made so many blind to their own errors, will cease; and that from this time a new party, a party bent upon the promotion of the prosperity of the country and the preservation of the public liberty may succeed—a party of the country and the constitution.—Both parties have run wild so long, that it is perhaps fair to say, as it is certainly true, that neither is exactly right.

When public contest lasts so very long,
No side is wholely right or wholly wrong.

Let us return to the steady sober principles of the Washington administration as well as to our foreign relations as to our internal concerns. We had enough of Mr. Adam's system of sedition laws, &c. during his administration, and enough of the palaver of philosophy since. I wish to have the golden age of Washington revived. It was then usual to speak freely. Let us do it now.

As it regards the motion now before the House, let us take into view this consideration and I recommend it to the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. M'Kee)—that if Gen. Washington issued a proclamation not authorized by any existing law, but so much calculated to promote the public prosperity and to call for the public consent, so in the present case did President Madison; for there is no law authorizing the proclamation which he issued, and which I so much approve. It is not expressly warranted by law, but it is in the spirit of the law. Suppose that a vessel should sail from the United States after the 1st of June to Great Britain, and it should be found, on a legal investigation, that the proclamation had not suspended the law, not being issued in conformity thereto, and the merchant was to be prosecuted for a breach of the law—could that proclamation be pleaded in bar of recovery? Certainly not; because it was only authorised to be issued *after* the revocation. It is not only necessary that the proclamation should be approved, but that a law should be passed giving validity to it. We should not therefore be content with merely giving this approbation, but should go on and pass laws upon it. If we last winter got upon some new notion of passing abstract propositions against which I voted, I can shew that I preserve consistency in voting for this, by shewing, as I have done, that a law may be founded on it.

In every point of view, whether gentlemen on one hand are willing to do justice to the Executive or to heal the wounds of party which have bled so long; if they are willing with the returning prosperity of the country to restore to social intercourse that harmony without which life and liberty are of so little value, let us go with them. Let them not be so frightened by our praise as to draw back, or how are we ever to approach them? I intreat gentlemen, therefore, not to be afraid of us. We are an honest and an honorable party, not guided by party zeal alone. When the administration deserves credit, we will give it to them; and when they deserve censure, I believe gentlemen will give us the credit of not being too sparing of it.

[We have now arrived at the conclusion of this debate, as far as it went. On Friday, the 2d June, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, to make way for other business, and has not since been called up.]

In Chancery, June 16, 1809.

Wm. Tunnicliff
vs.
The heirs at law of Basil Warring, and Jasper Wirt.

The object of the bill filed in this cause is to obtain a decree for recording a deed executed by Basil Warring and Jasper Wirt to Erasmus Gantt, on the 19th day of May, 1794, for conveying to the said Erasmus Gantt, a tract or parcel of land, lying in Prince George's county, called Scotland, and also a tract or part of the tract of land called Scotland aforesaid, conveyed to the said Jasper Wirt, by a certain Jacob Wirt, also a small parcel of land heretofore bought by said Jasper Wirt, of a person by the name of Conn, for which said Jasper has made payment and obtained receipt, but no conveyance yet made by said Conn, or his heirs, adjoining or contiguous to the meadow land of said tract called Scotland.

The bill states, that the said Basil Warring hath departed this life, leaving Thomas Warring, Basil Warring, Edward Warring, Eleanor Warring, Jane Beall, wife of Walter B. Beall, Mary Mitchell, wife of Doctor Spencer Mitchell, Sally Warring, Priscilla Gantt, wife of John Gantt, and Ann Warring, his heirs at law. That the said Jasper Wirt hath also departed this life, leaving Henry Wirt, Barbara Tilley, Eliza Farrall, wife of Thomas Farral, a grand daughter, Barbara Beckett, wife of Beckett, William Crown, Elisha Wood and Susannah Wood, Mummer, wife of Christian Mummer, his heirs at law. That the said Henry Wirt Mary Mitchell, wife of Doctor Spencer Mitchell, and Priscilla Gantt, wife of John Gantt, reside out of the state. That the said Erasmus Gantt also resides out of the state. The bill also states that the omission to record the said deed was without any fraudulent design or intention in any person whatever.

It is thereupon adjudged and ordered, that the complainant by causing a copy of this order to be inserted in the National Intelligencer once in each of three successive weeks before the 20th day of July next, give notice to the said absent defendants, or such other person or persons as may conceive themselves interested to appear in person or by a solicitor of this court, on or before the 20th day of November next, to shew cause, if any they have, wherefore a decree should not be passed as prayed.

True Copy—Teste,
NICHOLAS BREWER,
Reg. Cur. Can.

June 23—w3t.

George Thompson & Thomas Hyde vs. *John Crookshank's heirs.* } In Chancery.

ORDERED, That the sale made by Daniel Bussard, the trustee for the sale of the real estate of John Crookshank, deceased, as reported by him, be ratified and confirmed unless cause to the contrary be shewn on or before the fourth Monday of December next—Provided a copy of this order be published in the National Intelligencer and Washington Federalist once a week for three weeks before the first day of December next. The report states, that the interest of John Crookshank, in the several houses and lots mentioned in the decree in this case sold for 3151 dollars.

By Order,
WM. BRENT, Clk.

June 23—w3t.

William Lorman, vs. *Peggy M'Laughlin & others.* } In Chancery.

ORDERED, That the sale made by Daniel Bussard, of the real estate of Charles M'Laughlin, deceased, as reported by him, be ratified and confirmed unless cause to the contrary be shewn before the first Monday in January next, provided a copy of this order be published in the National Intelligencer for three weeks successively before the first day of October next.

The report states that the whole of the property sold for four hundred and twenty-five dollars. By order,
WM. BRENT, Clk.

June 23—3w.

REAL ESTATE AT AUCTION.

WE will sell on the 1st Monday in August next, at the tavern of Mr. Ruth, in this town, the entire real estate (yet unsold) of col. Chas. Beatty, deceased, consisting of a number of valuable improved and unimproved lots in Georgetown and its additions, and in the city of Washington. Several tracts of land in the neighborhood of the two places, and others in Montgomery, Frederick, and Washington counties, Maryland, with one of 5132 acres, (an old grant) in Randolph County, Virginia. Plots and title papers will there be shewn, and terms of sale then made known.

Sale to commence at 10 o'clock A. M. and continue from day to day until the whole is sold.

JOHN M. BEATTY,
CHAS. A. BEATTY.

Georgetown, D. C. June 7—wtds.

PATENT WASHING MACHINE.

A Newly Invented Patent Washing Machine, far superior to any heretofore in use, may be had of the subscriber, who has the Patent Right for the district of Columbia. I am so well satisfied of the inestimable value of this machine from a trial of one of them more than two months, that I purpose to have one made, that any family wishing to purchase can first make a trial of.

JNO. THOMAS, Sen.

May 24—3t&w1f

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEBATE ON FORTIFICATIONS.

Thursday, June 8.

The bill from the Senate for making appropriations for completing the fortifications being under consideration—

A motion was made to strike out the words "*seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars,*" with a view to insert a smaller sum; and the yeas and nays were asked on the question.

Mr. *Ross* said he was not disposed to let this question pass without expressing his ideas upon it. He was opposed to striking out the sum proposed, because he apprehended that it would not be more than adequate to the purpose for which it was designed. He apprehended that there was a wide difference between parsimony and true economy; that parsimony tended to destroy those institutions which a wise policy ought to foster; that economy was calculated to keep them in proper action. He did not suppose that it would be economy in a farmer to fence his fields but half round. If a farmer, sitting down to calculate the expence of rails, should, in order to avoid expence, appropriate only half the sum necessary, and thereby prevent the fence from being placed in good order, he apprehended that it would not be pursuing good economy, because the design for which the fence was made would not be accomplished. Parsimony in a government, with regard to institutions for the protection of the rights and safety of a country, might destroy it. It had been said that there was no immediate occasion for fortifications to be placed in complete repair, or placed in a state of perfection, and therefore gentlemen would omit to do so at present. Would that be pursuing a prudent policy? Would a wise government adopt that policy on other occasions? What was the universal conduct in cities where a wise policy was pursued? To guard against fire, the inhabitants furnished themselves with engines, fire buckets, and every preparation necessary for extinguishing it. Did they wait till there was occasion to use them? Would it be prudent in them so to do? He apprehended not. Apply the force of this reasoning to the observations of gentlemen against now completing the fortifications. Mr. Ross said he would on this occasion be for placing the country in complete safety, as far as fortifications could do it; and after fortifying every point in which the country was vulnerable, he would pray to God that we might never have occasion to make use of them, just as he would in relation to fire-engines and buckets prepared for the protection of a city from fire. It had been said that, if this money should be appropriated, it would no doubt be expended in the course of the summer, but that a much less sum might be expended in such a way as to be productive of beneficial purposes. If these fortifications had been commenced, and the sum mentioned in the bill was necessary to complete them, he asked in what way they could be completed short of that sum? Was it intended that the work should be stopped by a contracted appropriation? Or that the appropriations should be so narrowed as to destroy the original design with which the fortifications were undertaken? Surely not; but such would be the effect of restricting the appropriation. He therefore hoped the House would grant the sum mentioned in the bill as the smallest possible sum that ought to be expended on this occasion.

Mr. GARDENIER said he had no fear that the House would agree to the motion; because the government was pledged as completely as a government could be pledged to fortify the ports and harbors of the U. States. Applications had been made to this House for that purpose for several years, but without effect, because, in a time of profound peace and when no danger was apprehended, it had been deemed unnecessary to fortify the ports and harbors. At length, however, there had appeared a speck of war in the horizon; danger lowered around, and the government of the U. States gave its attention to this object, so vitally important. A million was appropriated the winter before the last, and the government was not content merely with appropriating for fortifications; but that the seaport towns and harbors might be effectually defended, that they might have the benefit of all that which experience sanctioned as safe and that which theory seemed to propose as much better than the other, there was a large sum of money appropriated for gun-boats, not for the purpose of encouraging the navy of the U. S. but for the protection of the port & harbors of the U. S. to come in aid of the batteries on shores. Now can it be possible (said he) that this committee will hesitate about allowing the sum expressed in the bill from the Senate, at a time when all, I presume, have come to the conclusion that we are to dispense with the auxiliary aid of our gun-boats? A year ago, so great an object was the defence of the seaports that not only gun-boats but fortifications also were promoted. Now that the gun-boats are taken away and the stile of expenditure is to be changed, is it not a total abandonment of that object to which the government has pledged itself? I think it is, and argues a capriciousness which would ill become a government, and which would deprive it of that confidence of the people which is so necessary to its support. Or are we about to act upon the very unwise and short sighted policy that, because the danger has disappeared, therefore we are never to expect danger again? If the fears of that period of which I spoke had been realised, the ports and harbors of the U. S. being without fortifications, what would then have been their situation? How much cause would there not have been to regret that the business of fortifications had not been taken up in due time! Instead of relaxing our attention to that object, now is the time to proceed. If we wait until we have war, we cannot fortify to any good effect; it will be locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. Now is the favored time for completing the work, because it can be done effectually, with coolness and without apprehension of invasion. If we now refuse, we shall be much in the situation of a man who finished his house all but the roof; and when asked by a neighbor why he did not complete it, the reason he gave was, that when it was pleasant weather he did not want the roof, and when it rained he could not build it—and yet, sir, no man will say that he was a very wise man. It is a short sighted policy which leaves the country undefended, because at the moment there is no danger, and under an idea that there is never afterwards to be any danger. But it is fortunate for the country, at least for that portion of it which I represent, that the ice has been broken, that the great bulk of expence has been gone into. Fortifications have been commenced upon a pretty liberal scale. I do remember very well, when this question was agitated before, and other gentlemen wished that the appropriations should far exceed the sum actually agreed to, it was then said by those who were not for giving all that we asked, that they would give sufficient to commence the work upon a liberal scale. It was frequently said that more money than was granted could not be expended within the year, and that there was no necessity to appropriate more; but a promise was held out to us, that if we would be content with that appropriation, further appropriations should from time to time be made. Now, when we want this appropriation of 750,000 dollars, we are told that we shall have *one* hundred and fifty thousand dollars—and it will then turn out that all the money which has been expended will have been expended for no purpose unless a future Congress shall complete the fortifications at a much greater expence, after they have been exposed to all the effects of the weather, natural decay and neglect. The people of the city of New York in particular have an eye on this subject which cannot be averted from your deliberations, and look to your acts with an anxiety which I cannot express, and with a claim upon your justice which no gentleman in the House can resist. From that city of New York perhaps one third of the money which flows into the Treasury of the United States, is derived. From its being in this respect so serviceable it has a right to protection. As good economists it becomes the government of the United States to take especial care that the source of revenue shall be secure. If we listen to the demands of justice on the one hand or