[illegible] trade, and which was signed by men of all parties, in which it is positively charged that the object of G. Britain in harrassing our trade was to cripple American commerce and promote her own, and that she granted licences to neutrals to carry on the trade which she interdicted. I will read it:—

"It has been said that, by embarking in the colony trade of either of the belligerents, neutral nations, in some sort, interpose in the war, since they assist and serve the belligerent, in whose trade they so embark. It is a sufficient answer to this observation, that the same course of reasoning would prove, that neutrals ought to discontinue all trade whatsoever with the parties at war. A continuance of their *accustomed peace trade* assists and serves the belligerent, with whom it is continued; and if this effect were sufficient to make a trade unneutral and illegal, the best established and most usual traffic would, of course, become so. But G. Britain supplies us with another answer to this notion, that our interference in the trade of the colonies of her enemies is unlawful, *because they are benefitted by it.* It is known that the same trade is, and long has been, carried on by British subjects; and your memorialists feel themselves bound to state, that according to authentic information lately received, the government of G. Britain does, at this moment, grant licences to neutral vessels, taking in a proportion of their cargoes there, to proceed on trading voyages to the colonies of Spain, from which she would exclude us, upon the condition, that the return cargoes shall be carried to G. Britain, to swell the gains of her merchants, and to give her a monopoly of the commerce of the world. This great belligerent right, then, upon which so much has been supposed to depend, sinks into an article of barter. It is used, not as a hostile instrument, wielded by a warlike state, by which her enemies are to be wounded, or their colonies subdued, but as the selfish means of commercial aggrandizement, to the impoverishment and ruin of her friends; as an engine, by which G. Britain is to be lifted up to a vast height of prosperity, and the trade of neutrals crippled, and crushed, and destroyed."

According to the course of reasoning adopted by the gentleman from Connecticut, the object of G. Britain in blockading the continent is not to starve it, it must therefore be to secure to herself the benefit of all the commerce carried on with the continental powers. In such a state of things, while those who were trading under the licences of foreign governments were making their fortunes, the honest Americans, who would not consent to degrade their country by navigating the ocean under the protection of any government but their own, would be plundered by both belligerents. If we are to consider the belligerent nations as pirates, no longer bound by those principles of public law to which civilized nations have hitherto subscribed, and are prepared to purchase our rights on the seas, let us do it as a nation by paying them a sum in gross and thereby place our citizens on equal ground. We are told that we can carry on a considerable commerce with countries not within the scope of the decrees or orders of the belligerents—this argument is specious and captivating, let us examine it; for I feel as much solicitude as the gentlemen in the opposition to remove this embargo whenever it can be done with propriety—on this as well as on the subject of an armed commerce the gentlemen will pardon me for requesting information. If we remove our embargo as to Portugal and other places to which our trade is not interdicted, and by a law declare that our citizens shall trade only to those countries permitted by the belligerents, would not that be submission to their orders & decrees, & if we open our ports, and restrict our commerce to those countries, could we ever afterwards hope for a relaxation of the British orders of council? Would not G. Britain have every inducement to perpetuate such a state of things, which would afford to her the benefits of our commerce without its inconveniences? The gentleman from Connecticut has informed us that the object of the administration in adopting the present system, is to put down commerce and promote manufactures. If the administration has any concealed motive for this measure, I am a stranger to it. It is well known that it has been a favorite object with the present administration to pay the public debt, and it would be strange, indeed, that it should pursue a system which cuts off our only source of revenue. This conjecture of the gentleman is too improbable to require a serious refutation. On the policy of promoting manufactures I shall make but few remarks, as it will be hereafter a subject of distinct consideration. I have supposed that it would be sound policy in this government to diminish, in some degree, the inducements now held out to our citizens to embark in foreign commerce, and increase them to vest their money in the interior—the increase of manufactures would lessen our dependence on foreign nations, and render us more dependent on each other. There would be more intercourse between the people of the different states, which would tend to nationalise us, and give more strength and permanency to the American union. To what extent this policy should be carried I am not now prepared to say. A distinction has been taken between native & foreign commerce, or what is more commonly called the carrying trade. The policy of encouraging our citizens to participate in the carrying trade is one thing, our maritime rights is another. The gentlemen in the opposition complain that this measure bears peculiarly hard on the commercial states. On the subject of commerce, as all others of national concern, I am disposed to consider the U States as an integer, and to forget the lines of partition by which we are separated into different states and districts for the purposes of internal government—but as the gentlemen have contrasted the commercial with the agricultural states, I am willing to meet them. I had thought that this measure, if its pressure was greater upon one part of the country than another, operated more severely upon the growers of cotton than any other part of the nation, and they ought if influenced by pecuniary considerations to be the first to complain. The people I represent are an agricultural people, and I ask the gentleman of what importance it is to them whether their produce is carried in foreign or American vessels? For what are the agricultural people now suffering, but to maintain our maritime rights. Sir, we are willing to discard all calculations of profit or loss, and make a common cause with our brethren of other states in defence of our national rights and independence.

It appears to me, sir, that the commercial people ought to be the last to complain. Our government has imposed discriminating tonnage duties, to give our own vessels an advantage in our own ports over foreigners. We have remitted the duties on foreign articles imported into the United States, intended for exportation. Our government has evinced every disposition to foster commerce and maintain our maritime rights. We are told that the people are opposed to this measure. To the voice of a free people I shall always bow with reverence. But, sir, it ought to be remembered, that in this country the will of the majority must prevail—it is a fundamental principle of our government, and if we are to judge from recent events, a great majority of this nation are in favor of this measure. We are informed, and it has been intimated on this floor, that rebellion in the eastern states will be the probable consequence of perseverance in this measure. Are we to be driven from the course dictated by the public interest by alarms of this sort? Are we to be told by a minority that we must recede from the ground we have taken—that we must admit the government has not sufficient energy to inforce its authority, or that they will rebel. Will gentlemen inform us who they are that are prepared to erect the standard of rebellion against their own government on the very graves of the brave Bostonians who first raised the standard of American independence. They must be some new people who have obtruded themselves upon our shores—they cannot be Americans—I will not think so unworthily of my countrymen—I believe the American people are generally attached to their government.—I trust it is but the clamor of the moment, which will cease the moment the will of the government shall be decisively and constitutionally expressed. It has been frequently said that Great Britain is fighting for the liberties of the world—that she is the only barrier between France and universal dominion, and therefore that our weight ought to be thrown into the scale of England, to assist her in this mighty conflict. If our friendship is necessary to England, ought she not to entitle herself to it, at least do us justice and respect our rights. Shall we submit to insults and indignities from Great Britain, to induce her to save us from subjugation by France? Shall we admit for a moment that we cannot maintain our independence? The gentlemen in the opposition have protested against submission; they have not declared themselves for war; if they are for it, I hope they will avow it—they have proposed no substitute. I am not prepared to say how long good policy will justify a continuance of the present system; but, sir, I am ready to declare that I will adhere to it until a better can be substituted. If it be true, as the gentleman from Connecticut has informed us, that the most efficient means of coercing G. Britain, is to affect her interest, and if it be true that our embargo will compel the West-India planters to convert their sugar plantations into corn fields for subsistence, if it will produce a scarcity of cotton in G. Britain, or enhance the price—if by a non-importation act we can deprive her of a market for a large portion of her manufactures, the present system with the addition of a non-importation act, if firmly adhered to, and well executed, may have the desired effect. When I cast my eyes over these states, and observe the freedom and happiness they enjoy, I feel constrained to pause, before I consent to take a step which will involve them in the calamities of war. When I consider the peculiar character of the contest between the two great belligerents of Europe, I feel very unwilling to be drawn into the vortex, lest the fate of this happy nation may become too closely connected with the destiny of one or the other of these contending powers. At the same time that I consider it my duty to make war the last alternative, I know the American people would prefer to meet it, rather than submit to a sacrifice of their national independence. The conduct of the belligerents, and the state of our country, furnish strong reasons for believing that the period is not distant, when this alternative must be accepted, if the present system should prove inefficient. I hope I have not, in the warmth of debate, violated that decorum which the dignity of the Senate requires to be observed. I certainly have not intended it. I shall conclude with requesting gentlemen to reflect, that in this hour of difficulty and danger unanimity constitutes the basis of our national security.

(Debate to be continued.)

Nov. 25.

The bill providing for the conveyance by mail, free of postage, of all public documents, to or from members of Congress, was read the third time; and on the question shall the bill pass?

Mr. Anderson, observed the committee of the Senate to whom the bill from the House of Representatives had been committed, had reported the bill without amendment, because they thought the principle objectionable. The committee had conceived that under this law any package, book, bundle of paper, or any thing else might be franked. They had also understood from the Department that the contractors for carrying the mail already complained of its great bulk, proceeding from the quantity of documents and communications sent from Congress; and that were the present regulation to be adopted, great part of the mail must often be omitted, by which letters or communications requiring expedition and safe carriage might be mislaid or lost. These disadvantages the committee had conceived to be too great to be counterbalanced by the advantages to be derived from a saving to the U. S. of the sum allowed to the Post-Master here on free packets, which he understood had been the chief reason for the introduction of the law. He wished therefore that the bill might be negatived.

And on the question on its passage, but three members rose in favor of it.

Mr. Pickering laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the state of Massachusetts, instructing their Senators and requesting their representatives to use their endeavors to have the embargo laws repealed.

The House agreed that it should be read.

The Clerk was proceeding to read the instructions, when

Mr. Anderson objected to it, as he found it was the report of a committee which the gentleman had presented, and which he did not wish to be entered on the journal of the Senate.

Mr. Pickering observed, that it was not merely the report of a committee but the act of the legislature, both houses having concurred in it.

Mr. Anderson said he objected to its being read in any point of view, because it was a novel thing in legislation that instructions given by a state to its representatives should be inserted on the journals of the Senate. He therefore moved a reconsideration of the motion for reading it.

Messrs. Hillhouse, White, Pickering & Lloyd, opposed Mr. Anderson's motion, contending that this was the mode in which the Legislature of Massachusetts had thought fit to express its sentiments of the measures of the general government; that so much respect was always given to the memorial of an individual, as to suffer it to be read, and at least as much respect should be shewn to the act of a state of Legislature.

Messrs. Anderson & S. Smith advocated the motion for reconsideration, contending that it was in nothing like a memorial from the state of Massachusetts, for whom they professed a great respect; that in no former instance had similar instructions been read by the Clerk of the House, except in the case of amendments to the constitution, in respect to which every state had a constitutional right to interfere. Mr. Smith particularly stated an instance in which he had been prevented from presenting to the House resolutions of the Legislature of Maryland instructing him to oppose the erection of a bridge over the Potomac; which however he had read in his place as a part of the debate, and which the gentleman from Massachusetts were certainly at liberty to do.

Mr. Hillhouse called for the Yeas and Nays on the question of reconsideration.

Mr. Giles taking his seat about this time requested, as he had not heard the discussion, that the farther consideration of the subject should be postponed till Monday next—Agreed to.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of Mr. Hillhouse's resolution for the repeal of the embargo.

Mr. Lloyd made a speech of about half an hour in support of the resolution; when

Mr. Milledge observed that as he had but this day taken his seat, and had always been in favor of granting time to others, he wished that its further consideration should be postponed till Monday next. Agreed to without opposition.

The Senate then adjourned till Monday.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 25.

Mr. Elliot observed, that there was more than one precedent on the journals of the House, of cases in which copies of proclamations of the President of the U. States had been called for. At the last session the House had called for a copy of the proclamation interdicting British ships from our waters. Therefore, in order to add another link to the chain of documents respecting the execution of the embargo laws, he wished to call for the proclamation alluded to by his colleague who had offered a resolution on the subject of the embargo.

Mr. E. then offered the following resolution, which was agreed to without opposition:

Resolved, That the President of the U. States be requested to cause to be laid before the House a copy of a proclamation issued in April last, in consequence of the opposition to the embargo laws near lake Champlain.

ENFORCING THE EMBARGO.

Mr. Macon said he had some time ago moved three resolutions, two of which had been agreed to, and the third ordered to lie on the table, on the suggestion of some gentlemen that it would interfere with a resolution already referred. He had waited thus long that a decision might be had on the resolution alluded to (Mr. Chittinden's.) Several unsuccessful attempts having been made to get that up, he now moved for the consideration of his resolution in the following words:

Resolved, That the same committee be instructed to enquire into the expediency of amending the act laying an embargo and the several acts supplemental and additional thereto.

The resolution was taken up and agreed to without opposition.

Mr. Gardenier presented several petitions from the inhabitants of Ontario county, New York, praying for the repeal of the embargo laws. Referred to the committee on Mr. Chittidden's resolution.

CLOSED DOORS.

Mr. Randolph said he was very sorry to be compelled by a sense of duty again to close the doors of the House, but he had a motion to make, which could not, agreeably to the rules and orders of the House, be made with the galleries open.

The doors were accordingly closed, and so remained for two hours, when they were opened.

The House then went into committee of the whole, Mr. Helms in the chair, on the report of the committee of Claims favorable to the petition of the inhabitants of Knox county; which was concurred in, reported to the House, by whom it was also agreed to.

The House then adjourned till Monday morning 11 o'clock.

A supplemental journal of such proceedings as, during the time they were depending, were ordered to be kept secret, and respecting which the injunction of secrecy was afterwards removed by order of the House.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8.

The House being cleared of all persons except the members and the Clerk,

A confidential message in writing was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Coles, his Secretary, who delivered in the same and withdrew.

WEDNESDAY, NOV. 9.

The House being cleared of all persons except the members and the clerk proceeded in the reading of the confidential message from the President of the United States, and the accompanying documents received on the 8th inst. and went through the same.—The said message is in the words following, to wit:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

The documents communicated with my public message of this day, contain such portions of the correspondencies therein referred to, of the ministers of the United States at Paris and London, as relate to the present state of affairs between those governments and the United States, and as may be made public. I now communicate confidentially such supplementary portions of the same correspondencies as I deem improper for publication, yet necessary to convey to Congress full information on a subject of their deliberations so interesting to our country.

TH: JEFFERSON.

Nov. 8, 1808.

Ordered, That the said message and documents do lie on the table.

WEDNESDAY, NOV. 23.

The House being cleared of all persons except the members and clerk—

A motion was made by Mr. Randolph and seconded, that the House do come to the following resolution:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy, so far as it relates to the substance of the communications from our respective ministers at Paris and London, which accompanied the President's message of the 8th inst. be taken off.

And on the question that the House do now proceed to take the said proposed resolution into consideration, it was resolved in the affirmative—Yeas one hundred and thirteen—Nay one.

Yeas—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bibb, Blackledge, Blake, Blount, Boyle, Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, J. Campbell, Champion, Chittenden, Clay, Clopton, Cook, Culpepper, Cutts, Dana, Davenport, Dawson, Deane, Desha, Durell, Elliot, Ely, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Franklin, Gardner, Garnett, Gholson, Goodwyn, Gray, Green, Harris, Heister, Helms, Hoge, Holland, Holmes, Humphreys, Isley, Jenkins, J. G. Jackson, R. Jackson, Jones, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Livermore, Lloyd, Love, Macon, Marion, Masters, M'Creery, Milnor, D. Montgomery, J. Montgomery, Jer. Morrow, John Morrow, Mosely, Mumford, Nelson, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Pitkin, Porter, Quincy, Randolph, Rea, Rhea, J. Richards, M. Richards, Riker, Russell, Say, Seaver, Shaw, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, John Smith, Southard, Stanford, Stedman, Storer, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmadge, Taylor, Thompson, Trigg, Troup, Upham, Van Allen, Van Horne, Van Rensselaer, Verplanck, Whitehill, Wilbour, D. R. Williams, A. Wilson, N. Wilson, Winn—113.

Nay—Mr. Boyd.

The motion was then modified by Mr. Randolph, and seconded, to read as follows:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy imposed on the communications from our respective ministers at Paris and London, which accompanied the President's message of the 8th inst be taken off, with the exception of the extract of a letter from general Armstrong to the secretary of state, dated Paris, 27th December, 1807.

And on the question that the House do agree to the same, it passed in the negative—Yeas 31—Nays 82.

Yeas—M'rs. J. Campbell, Champion, Chittenden, Davenport, Durell, Ely, Garnett, Gray, Harris, Hoge, R. Jackson, Lewis, Livermore, Lloyd, Macon, Masters, Milnor, John Morrow, Moseley, Nelson, Quincy, Randolph, Russell, Shaw, Stedman, Sturges, Trigg, Upham, Van Rensselaer, D. R. Williams, N. Wilson—31.

Nays—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bibb, Blackledge, Blake, Blount, Boyd, Boyle, Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, Clopton, Cook, Culpepper, Cutts, Dana, Dawson, Deane, Desha, Elliott, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Franklin, Gardner, Gholson, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Helms, Holland, Holmes, Howard, Humphreys, Isley, J. G. Jackson, Jenkins, Jones, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Marion, M'Creery, D. Montgomery, J. Montgomery, Jer. Morrow, Mumford, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Pitkin, Porter, Rea, Rhea, J. Richards, M. Richards, Say, Seaver, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, John Smith, Southard, Stanford, Storer, Taggart, Tallmadge, Taylor, Thompson, Troup, Van Allen, Van Horne, Verplanck, Wharton, Whitehill, Wilbour, A. Wilson, Winn—82.

Another motion was then made by Mr. Randolph, and seconded, that the House do come to the following resolution:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy, so far as it relates to the substance of the communications from our respective ministers at Paris and London, which accompanied the President's message of the 8th inst, be taken off.

And on the question that the House do now proceed to take the same into consideration, an adjournment was called for and carried.

THURSDAY, NOV. 24.

The House being cleared of all persons except the members and the clerk, proceeded to take into further consideration the resolution which Mr. Randolph submitted yesterday, in the following words, to wit:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy, so far as it relates to the substance of the communications from our respective ministers at Paris and London, which accompanied the President's message of the 8th inst. be