ciple in dispute in regard to impressments, and abandon your seamen to the mercy of British cruisers.

I cannot sit down without noticing some remarks made by the gentleman from Maryland, when he was upon this subject; not indeed relating to the question before you, but tending to shew that the Embargo ought to be repealed. He told you the embargo was extremely oppressive, and was partial in its operation—that the people on your North east frontiers, bordering on Canada, &c. would supply their British neighbors with provisions; (which must be by violating the laws) while the people of his district, it being an interior part of the country, have no opportunity to dispose of their produce in a similar manner, that is by evading the laws of their country. Can the gentleman be serious in making this objection? This is certainly the last argument that could have been expected from a gentleman possessing the talents for which he is so conspicuous. The embargo is partial it seems, because the people in his district have it not in their power fraudulently to evade the operation of it as conveniently as they can in some other places. The laws on this subject do not, cannot sanction such evasion. Those guilty of it are liable to punishment. This is well known—and I feel confident the gentleman does not wish to be understood as saying that he would sanction or countenance the evasion of the embargo laws, if it were in the power of his constituents to do so. Every correct principle would bind him to detect and punish such conduct. There is no doubt there are evasions of these laws in some parts of the union; but this is no proof that the laws are in themselves partial—it only shews that there are, in those parts where those laws are evaded, some persons devoid of all principle, who are enemies to their country, and ought to be made public examples of to deter others from such conduct. I could see no reason for the charge of partiality in regard to these laws, and was really astonished, when the grounds upon which it was made were assigned.—[Mr. Key explained that he had said that a law to be fair must operate equally on all.] I do not perceive, said Mr. Campbell, that the gentleman's explanation places his argument in a light materially different from that in which it has been considered. It amounts substantially to this, that because these laws are not perfectly executed in every part of the union, without any evasion whatever, they must be considered as operating partially and ought therefore to be repealed. He does not pretend to say that the laws are in themselves partial, but that they may possibly be evaded by men without principle, and destitute of patriotism, and that on this ground alone, your officers may not be able to carry them into as compleat effect in some parts of the union as in others, and that for this reason they may not operate equally. This objection would apply with equal force to every law in the union. They may be and are daily evaded, but this is no reason why they should be all considered partial and therefore repealed. The gentleman stated as another serious ground of objection to the embargo the injurious effects it had upon the fisheries, by depriving those concerned in them of a market for their fish. This objection was hardly to be expected from that gentleman, who I presume has been very little conversant with this branch of commerce, and whose constituents (whose interest he appears to have so much at heart) cannot be particularly affected by it. The details on this part of the subject have been sufficiently explained by the gentleman from S. Carolina, (Mr. D. R. Williams). But there is one view of it which seems to merit further notice. The House will recollect, that when the embargo laws passed, it was with much difficulty the fishermen were permitted to go out to carry on this business. It was warmly contended that no such privilege should be extended to them—and now the very ground of complaint arises from this very privilege. If you had in your embargo laws deprived them of this privilege, which is greater than any other portion of citizens enjoys, there would be no ground for the present complaint. If they had not been permitted to take fish, they would not complain for want of a market for them. It was then said they were the much favored—it is now said they are very much oppressed—and the great ground of oppression is that they have taken more fish then they can get a good market for. This may occasion them some inconvenience, but certainly it is not greater than other citizens experience, If it be so great, & can form no just cause for repealing the embargo laws.

No doubt (said Mr. C.) the committee are fatigued with this long sitting, as I also am exhausted with speaking to them. I feel sensible of the obligation I am under for their patient attention, upon which I will tresspass no longer; but will close the remarks I have to make on this subject by expressing my surprise and extreme concern at the systematic opposition given by certain gentlemen, from the commencement of the session to the present moment (almost at the close of it) to every measure, either recommended by the government or attempted to be adopted for the security or defence of the nation. Every measure calculated to obtain redress for past injuries—to repair the insulted feelings the of nation—to resist aggressions, and guard her against impending danger, has been systematically and uniformly opposed. The adoption of the very same measures heretofore on similar occasions, furnishes no ground to believe that they are now proper. There are some laws enrolled among our records similar to that now proposed to be enacted; when these instances are produced, gentlemen who supported them, say they were mistaken in passing them, or they were misled, or the grounds on which they passed were not then understood; they have just discovered they were all wrong—at all events the measure before you must be wrong. When the session commenced, it was admitted by all parties that the nation was in danger, it was therefore proposed to fortify our ports and harbors; this was declared to be *wrong* and warmly opposed by gentlemen. It was then thought necessary to build gun-boats in aid of fortifications for defence. This was also wrong; they would be of no service; the experience of skillful men, and of other nations on the subject, was all mistaken, was not to be regarded—the measure was altogether wrong & gentlemen opposed it. Again circumstances presented themselves which induced the government to recommend an embargo. This measure was at first, (I supposed) by mistake, conceived by gentlemen to be right, and as such vigorously supported, but after one night's reflection, most unfortunately, it too was discover to be wrong and to endanger the peace of the nation. It was proposed by the government, and therefore you must not adopt it, notwithstanding the same gentlemen told you early in the session that such a measure would be perfectly correct, & ought to have been adopted long since; but now they had discovered it was manifestly wrong. The apparent dangers of our country continued to increase, and it was considered necessary and proper to raise a small temporary regular force for the purpose of national defence, to repel incursions on our frontiers and guard against surprise. This was also declared to be totally wrong. You are told the two great belligerents press upon you so severely and yet so equally, that you are repelled equally from both, and in no danger of going to war with either, and therefore you need not raise a man; no, they would not agree to enlist a single soldier until they saw the enemy at your very doors. This is the language of gentlemen. Even those who heretofore were distinguished as friends to a regular army, who were anxious to increase the military peace establishment; as well as others who not long since proposed to raise an additional force for a similar purpose; all at once became enlightened on this subject, and by some happy coincidence of sentiment, united on this as well as on other subjects; all the dangers of their country vanished from their view; they lost their partiality for a standing army, and their reliance for defence on a regular force of any kind; they discovered how dangerous they were to civil liberty; and insisted the measure was unnecessary and ought not to be adopted. The embargo was radically wrong when it was laid, and ruinous to the country. We now propose a measure by which it may probably be removed; but most unfortunately this is also wrong; it is not the offspring of certain gentlemen, it did not spring from a certain source, therefore it cannot be right; besides it would make the President too popular, if circumstances should authorise him under the proposed law to remove the embargo. It must not be done; nothing can justify it. You were wrong in imposing the embargo, and you are not right in providing the means by which it may be taken off. The people of America will judge for themselves how well calculated such a course of proceedings was to vindicate their violated rights—to secure their most important interests, and prepare the nation for defence against impending dangers.

cbate on the bill for authorising the President, under certain contingencies, to suspend the embargo law—

CONCLUDED.

The bill having been reported to the House by the Committee of the Whole—

A motion was made by Mr. Key, and seconded, to amend the said bill by striking out after the words "in Congress assembled," in the first line, the words following, to wit: "That, in the event of such peace or suspension of hostilities between the belligerent powers of Europe, or of such changes in their measures affecting neutral commerce, as may render that of the United States sufficiently safe in the judgment of the President of the United States, he is hereby authorised, during the recess of Congress, to suspend, in whole, or in part, the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the United States, and the several acts supplementary thereto, under such exceptions and restrictions, and on such bond and security being given as the public interest and circumstances of the case may appear to require," and inserting in lieu thereof the following words: "That, in the event of peace or suspension of hostilities between the belligerent powers of Eu-Europe, or in the event of the governments of France or Great Britain officially rescinding their orders or decrees affecting the neutral commerce of the United States, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to issue his proclamation, notifying such event or events having taken place; and, from the date of such proclamation, the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports of the United States, and the several acts supplementary thereto, shall be, and the same are hereby repealed."

The question being taken thereupon, it was negatived—

YEAS—Messrs. Bibb, Champion, Culpepper, Durell, Garnet, Hoge, Jackson, Jones, Kelly, Key, Lewis, junr. Lyon, Masters, Milnor, Randolph, Rowan, Russell, S. Smith, Stanford, Taggart, Van Horne, and Van Rensselaer.—22.

NAYS—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, junior, Bard, Barker, Bassett, Blackledge, Blake, junr. Blount, Boyd, Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, M. Clay, Clopton, Cutts, Dana, Davenport, Dawson, Deane, Desha, Ely, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Gardner, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Holland, Holmes, Humphreys, Ilsley, Johnson, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Love, M'Creery, D. Montgomery, junr. J. Montgomery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, Jer. Morrow, J. Morrow, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Pitken, junr. Porter, Quincey, J. Rhea, (Ten.) J. Richards, M. Richards, Riker, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, J. Smith, Storer, Tallmadge, Taylor, Van Allen, Wharton, Whitehill, Wilbour, D. R. Williams, Winn and Witherell—70.

A motion was then made by Mr. Randolph to amend the bill, by striking out, after the word "that," in the second line, to the end of the bill, the words following, to wit: "In the event of such peace or suspension of hostilities between the belligerent powers of Europe, or of such changes in their measures affecting neutral commerce as may render that of the United States sufficiently safe, in the judgment of the President of the United States, he is hereby authorized, during the recess of Congress, to suspend in whole, or in part, the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the United States, and the several acts supplementary thereto, under such exceptions and restrictions, and on such bond and security being given as the public interest and circumstances of the case may appear to require: *Provided* such suspension shall not extend beyond twenty days after the next meeting of Congress."

It passed in the Negative—

Yeas—Messrs. Bassett, Champion, M. Clay, Cobb, Culpepper, Desha, Durell, Garnett, Goldsborough, Harris, Hoge, Jones, Kelly, Key, Lewis, Loyd, Lyon, Masters, Milnor, Randolph, Rowan, Russell, S. Smith, Stanford, Van Horne, and Van Rensselaer—26.

Nays—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bibb, Blackledge, Blake, Blount, Boyd, Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, Clopton, Cutts, Dana, Davenport, Dawson, Deane, Ely, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Gardner, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Holmes, Humphreys, Ilsley, Jackson, Johnson, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Love, M'Creery, D. Montgomery, J. Montgomery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, Jer. Morrow, John Morrow, Mosely, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Pitken, Porter, Quincy, Rhea, Ten. J. Richards, M. Richard, Riker, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, J. Smith, Southard, Storer, Sturges, Tallmadge, Taylor, Troup, Van Allen, Wharton, Whitehill, Wilbour, D. R. Williams, Winn and Witherell—73.

Another motion was then made by Mr. Randolph, to amend the said bill by striking out therefrom, in the 4th line, the words "in whole or in part," and in the 6th and 7th lines, the words, "under such exceptions and restrictions, and on such bond and security being given as the public interest and circumstances of the case may appear to require."

A division of the question on the said amendment was called for:

Whereupon,

The question being taken upon the first member of the said proposed amendment to strike out the words "in whole or in part"—

It passed in the negative—

Yeas—Messrs. Bibb, Blackledge, Blount, Burwell, Champion, Culpepper, Dana, Davenport, Desha, Ely, Gardner, Garnett, Goldsborough, Gray, Harris, Hoge, Jackson, Jones, Key, Lewis, Lloyd, Lyon, Macon, Marion, Masters, Milnor, D. Montgomery, Mosely, Pitken, Quincy, Randolph, Rowan, Russel, S. Smith, Stanford, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmadge, Taylor, Trigg, Van Horn, Van Rensselaer, and D. R. Willams—43.

Nays—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bassett, Blake, Boyd, Brown, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, Cobb, Cutts, Dawson, Durell, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Holland, Holmes, Ilsley, Johnson, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Love, M'Creery, J. Montgomery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, John Morrow, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Porter, Pugh, Rhea, *Ten.* J. Richards, M. Richards, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, J. Smith, Southard, Storer, Troup, Van Allen, Verplack, Whartor, Whitehill, Wilbour, Wilson, Winn, and Witherell—58.

The question was then taken upon the second member of the said proposed amendment, to strike out the words "under such exceptions and restrictions, and on such bond and security being given as the public interest and circumstances of the case may appear to require," and passed in the negative.

Yeas—Messrs. Bibb, Blackledge, Blount, Burwell, Champion, Culpepper, Dana, Davenport, Desha, Ely, Gardner, Garnett, Goldsborough, Gray, Harris, Hoge, Jackson, Jones, Kelly, Key, Lewis, Lloyd, Lyon, Macon, Marion, Masters, Milnor, D. Montgomery, Mosely, Pitken, Quincy. Randolph, Rhea, *Ten.* Rowan, Russell, S. Smith, Stanford, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmadge, Taylor, Trigg, Van Horn, Van Resselaer, and D. R. Williams—45.

Nays—Messrs. L. J. Alston, W. Alston, Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bassett, Blake, Boyd, Brown, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, Cobb, Cutts, Dawson, Durell, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Holland, Holmes, Ilsley, Johnson, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Love, M'Creery, J. Montgomery, N. R. Moore, T. Moore, Jer. Morrow, John Morrow, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Porter, Pugh, J. Richards, M. Richards, Riker, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, J. Smith, Southard, Storer, Troup, Van Allen, Verplanck, Wharton, Whitehill, Wilbour, Wilson, Winn, and Witherell—59.

A motion was then made by Mr. Lewis, to amend the bill, by adding to the end thereof, a new section, as a second section, in the words following, to wit:

"*Sec. 2. And be it further enacted,* That from and after the first day of May next, the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports of the United States, and the several acts supplementary thereto, shall be, and the same are hereby repealed."

Whereupon—Mr. Speaker decided, that the motion of Mr. Lewis to add a new section to the end of the bill, was not in order, it being a substitute, and, by a standing rule and order of the House, it is declared, "that no new motion, or proposition shall be admitted, under color of amendment, or as a substitute for the motion or proposition under debate;"

From which decision of the chair,

An appeal to the House was made by two members;

And on the question, "Is the said decision of the chair correct?"

It was resolved in the affirmative.

No other amendment being proposed to the said bill.

The bill was read the third time,

And the question that the same do pass, was taken as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. J. Alston, W. Alston, junr. Bacon, Bard, Barker, Bassett, Blackledge, Blake, Boyd, Brown, Burwell, Butler, Calhoun, G. W. Campbell, M. Clay, Cobb, Cutts, Dawson, Deane, Durell, Eppes, Findley, Fisk, Goodwyn, Green, Heister, Holland, Holmes, Ilsley, Johnson, Kirkpatrick, Lambert, Marion, M'Creery, J. Montgomery, N. R. Moore, Jer. Morrow, John Morrow, Newbold, Newton, Nicholas, Porter, Pugh, J. Richards, M. Richards, Riker, Sloan, Smelt, Smilie, J. K. Smith, Southard, Storer, Troup, Van Allen, Verplanck, Wharton, Wilbour, Wilson, Winn, and Witherell.

Nays.—Messrs. Bibb, Blount, Champion, Culpepper, Dana, Davenport, Ely, Gardner, Garnett, Goldsborough, Harris, Hoge, Jackson, Jones, Key, Lewis, Lloyd, Lyon, Macon, Masters, Milnor, D. Montgomery, Mosely, Pitken, Quincy, Randolph, Rhea of Ten. Rowan, S. Smith, Stanford, Sturges, Taggart, Tallmadge, Taylor, Trigg, Van Horn, Van Rensselaer, and D. R. Williams.

A motion was made by Mr. Randolph, and seconded, to amend the title of the said bill, by striking out the words "*under certain conditions.*"

And the question being put thereupon,

It passed in the negative.

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, JULY 15.

At a meeting of the citizens of Washington, held last evening, Dr. Coningham in the chair, two resolutions were adopted expressive of their satisfaction at the result of the enquiry lately held into the conduct of Brig. Gen. Jas. Wilkinson; and a committee appointed to prepare an address to him expressive of their feelings on the occasion. The committee reported an address, which was agreed to, and a committee appointed to present it.

The resolution and address shall appear hereafter.

If the toasts and songs, at the different entertainments throughout the U. States given in honor of the 4th of July, are considered as indicative of public opinion—and, we believe, they may be fairly so considered—it is evident, that the late measures of the administration are upheld by a weight of popularity at least equal to that which has attended any administration in this country. The Embargo, particularly, seems to be approved, even with enthusiasm; not, from an insensibility to the privations we endure under it: but from a sincere conviction that those privations are ascribable to a higher source, and that they would have existed with ten-fold aggravation but for it. The same sentiments, that led us at the revolution to risque our all in defence of our rights and honor, have, in this instance, produced a general disposition to suspend our trade, although at a considerable pecuniary loss. But although the motives may be the same, which led to these several measures, the degrees of merit are very unequal. In 1776 we risked every thing; in 1807 we merely suspended our trade. In 1776 the issue was uncertain; in 1807 we have no doubt but that our virtue will eventually be crowned with success. In 1776, the tyranny of a *mother country* only attempted to tax our trade in an inconsiderable, almost insensible degree; in 1807 a *foreign nation* aims at not only taxing that trade to a vast amount, but likewise at modifying, regulating, or prohibiting it altogether. In 1776 but a single nation tyrannised over us; in 1807 the whole world is hostile to us. If then in 1776 it was the dictate of a sublime patriotism, that excited the admiration of the world, to resist at every hazard, is it not the height of pusillanimity, in 1807, to talk of submission? Would not submission degrade us below the dignity of men; to say nothing of the claims upon us as freemen? The only question, then, can be, whether we ought not to have gone further; and the only existing question is, whether a period has not arrived, or is not rapidly coming, when we shall be called upon to give blow for blow, and teach lawless aggression that we have the power to punish its atrocities. Inestimable as the blessings of peace are to us, we may be compelled to exchange them for the evils of war.

We rejoice to see that at this great national festival, not merely the embargo, but the measures generally of the administration have been warmly approved. It is a fortunate circumstance that, at a crisis so imminent, the people have a certain conviction of the justice of the cause in which they are embarked, and that the government floats on the boldest tide of popular favor. But one sentiment appears to exist among the republicans on the honesty and talent with which our late negociations have been conducted; and the firmness of the President in rejecting the British treaty, and the enlightened and assiduous endeavors of the Secretary of State to secure our own rights, without injuring those of others, are applauded in the strongest terms. We rejoice at the universal prevalence of these convictions and feelings, convinced, as we are, that they are the harbingers of amity with Europe, or the pledge