House might disagree to the report of the committee.

The question was taken separately on each of the other amendments from the Senate (for adding to the number of midshipmen, corporals, seamen and marines;) and carried by majorities of four, five and six votes.

The committee then rose and reported to the House their disagreement to the first amendment of the Senate, and their agreement to the remainder. And the House adjd.

SATURDAY, Jan. 14.

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

The documents from the Senate on the subject of the naval establishment, were ordered to be printed.

The House agreed now to take up the report of the committee of the whole of yesterday on the amendments from the Senate, 43 to 39.

Mr. Nicholas moved to postpone the consideration of the subject till Monday, that the documents might be printed.—54 to 31.

DISTRESSED SEAMEN.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the bill for the relief of sick, disabled and distressed seamen—Mr. Desha in the Chair.

The blank for the sum to be appropriated for the purpose, was filled with 200,000 dollars, 68 rising in the affirmative.

The committee rose and reported the bill. The question on concurrence with the committee in filling the blank, having been stated—

Mr. Burwell said he should vote against this, because he did not consider this class of the community as particularly entitled to relief from the Government; and even if it were proper, there was no security in the bill that the money would be properly applied. He did not believe that there was any such distress among the seamen as represented.

Mr. Newton explained that the Secretary of the Treasury had the direction of the fund for the relief of distressed and disabled seamen, which had heretofore been supplied from a tax on their wages. This fund was now exhausted; and the Secretary of the Treasury said, if money were not appropriated, the doors of the hospitals must be closed against them, an office which the Secretary did not wish to perform. He had therefore recommended an appropriation of 200,000 dollars for their relief. Mr. Newton then stated the peculiar hardships attached to the seaman's situation, &c.

Mr. Holland considered this a novel measure. The seamen who were in distress, he conceived, entitled to relief from the respective states in which they might be, who were bound to support their poor. Indeed this money could not be applied to the use of the embargoed seamen generally, because it was only for the relief of those who were subject to the municipal regulations of the state in which they may be.

Mr. Quincy observed, that the fund for the support of distressed seamen had heretofore been derived from a tax on the wages of the seamen. This fund, which had heretofore been sufficient, having been destroyed by the suspension of commerce, he asked whether the general government was not pledged to do something for these men, who would not have suffered but for its measures?

Mr. Smilie was in favor of the bill. The funds heretofore established for the relief of our seamen had been destroyed by a measure which had been deemed necessary for the good of the country; and he thought assistance ought to be given to them. Mr. S. called for the reading of the Secretary of the Treasury's report on the subject.

Mr. Tallmadge said, that every gentleman who attended to the reasoning of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, could not fail to be convinced of the rectitude of his statement, and the conclusion which he had drawn from it. The general government had destroyed the service, by which the seamen had heretofore been supported; in doing which they had thrown a burthen on the community in the same ratio as the service had been destroyed. The Secretary of the Treasury had fairly and candidly told the House, that the fund for the support of the distressed seamen was destroyed. What should be done? Should nothing be apportioned from the funds of this government to support the establishment? He hoped and trusted that there would. For the information of the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Burwell) who did not know that this class of men was more distressed than any other, Mr. T. said, he would mention that he had letters from different parts of the union, particularly from Philadelphia, from one of the most respectable merchants in this city, informing him that the merchants had formed a fund for the relief of these persons, which had been exhausted, the seamen being in the greatest distress, without a stick of wood in this severe weather even to cook their victuals; and requesting him as a member of the general government to exert himself for their relief. Mr. T. said he would venture to declare that this was the case in all the ports of the U. S.; and he thought it most unquestionably became the government to grant some sort of relief to these citizens. He believed that the appropriation proposed was proper; and that less than that would be too little for the purpose.

Mr. *D. R. Williams* thought the object of the bill very laudable, but he wished a modification of the principle. He was willing to advance the 200,000 dollars, subject to be *refunded, from the funds hereafter to be received* for the support of this establishment. He thought this amendment would be highly proper, because from a document in his hands, he found that the funds of the establishment for the relief of sick and disabled seamen, had always been more than sufficient for its support. In June 1802, the balance of the fund was 76,188 dollars, in 1803 the balance was 67,448 dollars. This shewed that the funds arising out of the 20 cents a month tax on the seamen's wages, was more than adequate for the purposes for which it had been established, and that the fund would hereafter be able to refund to the government the monies now about to be appropriated. Considering the commercial prosperity of this government since 1803, it was fairly presumable, he said, that at the time of the imposition of the embargo, the balance on hand was greater than at the former period. Under this view of the subject, though he had not the slightest wish to delay the bill, he moved that it lie on the table till an amendment could be prepared.

Mr. Newton said that the fund heretofore derived from the tax on seamen, had not been more than adequate to their support. In the town in which he lived, persons had not been admitted into the hospital who were acknowledged to be entitled to relief. In consequence of the construction put upon the law, a great many of the very people who had paid 20 cents a month out of their wages had been thrown upon the community as paupers and supported by the community at large.

Mr. D. R. Williams replied that the result of the amendment which he contemplated would be, that if there never was a balance in the funds, the monies appropriated would never be repaid.

Mr. Story deprecated the delay which would result from the bill lying upon the table. The means of supporting this fund were destroyed by a law of the U. S. and he thought that the general government should, by giving an aid to it, supply the deficiency. He represented the peculiarity of the seamen's general character; having no thought for to-morrow, when deprived of his monthly pay, he was of course subjected to distress. In the protection of the general rights of the community, the general government had been compelled to subject the seamen to a particular calamity. He therefore tho't that an additional aid for the support of the sick and disabled should be afforded by Congress.

Mr. D. R. Williams withdrew his motion for postponement, with a view of moving an amendment.

Further debate took place on this subject, in which Messrs. *Sloan, Alexander, Quincy, Story, Smilie, Newton & D. R. Williams* advocated the principle of the bill, and Merrs. *Holland, Boyd, Gardenier & Macon* opposed it. Mr. Gardenier started a constitutional objection to the bill; he said that there was no power given under the constitution, by which either House of Congress could be converted into an alms-house; it was assuming the exercise of the legislative powers of the states, which had never even been proposed to be given to the general government.—He said he thought he saw a disposition in a certain part of the government to encroach upon the rights of the states; and in however pleasing forms those encroachments were dressed, they ought to be guarded against. To this it was replied by Messrs. Quincy and Story, that as under the sanction of a law of the U. States hospitals had been erected, and they laboured under a temporary embarrassment, it was in the power of the general government to afford them temporary assistance. If the general government had a right to establish marine hospitals (which question had been settled and acted upon for many years) and the funds for their support should fail, it was in the power of Congress, under the general clause of the constitution, to provide temporary funds for their support.

The question on inserting 200,000 dollars, was taken by Yeas and Nays, and carried—Yeas 69.

Mr. D. R. Williams moved to add to the clause making the appropriation the following words: "*and that the same shall be refunded into the Treasury of the United States out of such sums as may accrue to the fund for the relief of disabled seamen.*" This amendment was modified, on the suggestion of Mr. Quincy by adding to it the words—"*At such times and in such manner as may not defeat the general purposes for which such fund was established.*" The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. Stedman moved to add to the bill the following sentence, which he conceived would make the bill conform to the Secretary of the Treasury's letter on the subject: *And shall be expended therein in proportion to the amount collected in each (port) on account of the fund for the relief of sick & disabled seamen during the year 1807.* This was objected to by Messrs. *Macon, D. R. Williams & Newton,* who declared that it would defeat the object of the bill; and if adopted would compel many to vote against the bill. Mr. Stedman, desirous that the bill should pass, withdrew his amendment.

And on the question, "Shall the bill be engrossed for a third reading?" there were

In favor of it	54
Against it	24
Majority	30

The bill was ordered to be read a third time on Monday.—Adjourned.

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, JANUARY 16.

[The following letter, represented to be from Mr Canning to Mr. Pinkney, has made its appearance in the New York Gazette, with these introductory remarks:

"This letter establishes two IMPORTANT FACTS, which ought never to be forgotten.

"The first is, that the offer of Mr. Jefferson to raise the embargo on the rescinding the Orders in Council, was only communicated to Mr. Canning by Mr. Pinkney in his INDIVIDUAL capacity, in a verbal communication, and with an expression of a belief only, that his government would raise the embargo IF the British government would FIRST remove their obnoxious Orders in Council.

"The second Fact, is, that Mr. Pinkney, (in reply to Mr. Canning's request for the information) states unreservedly, that when the President recommended the embargo, he had no information of the passage of the British Orders in Council now complained of."

We are even more astonished at the profligate falsehood of these assertions, *ostensibly* penned by an *American*, than at the hardihood of the British minister, whom we had during the course of the last summer occasion to detect in the most disingenuous misrepresentation and distortion of facts. The coincidence of misrepresentation can only be accounted for by the ascription of the letter as well as the comment to the same *foreign* feelings.

The falsehood of the *first* allegation will abundantly appear from a reference to the documents recently published, from which the following extract will suffice.

Mr. Pinkney, in his note to Mr. Canning, bearing date the 23d of August, precisely a month anterior to the date of Mr. C's extraordinary letter, says—

"I had the honor to state to you, sir, that it was the intention of the President, in case G. Britain repealed her orders, as regarded the United States, to exercise the power vested in him by the act of the last session of Congress, entitled "An act to authorise the President of the U. States under certain conditions, to suspend the operation of the act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the U. S. and the several supplementary acts thereto," by suspending the embargo law and its supplements, as regards G. Britain.

"I am authorised to give you this assurance in the most formal manner; and I trust that upon impartial enquiry it will be found to leave no inducement to perseverance in the British orders, while it creates the most powerful inducements of equity and policy to abandon them."

If Mr. Pinckney is to be *credited*, Mr. Canning has most egregiously misrepresented him on this point. And if on this point, there is equal reason to infer that he has equally misrepresented him on the other; nay, stronger. For, in this last instance, however unimportant the fact in dispute, let it be recollected that the opposition in this country had taken the ground contended for by Mr. C. who in this part, as in every other of the controversy between the two governments, appears most wonderfully to have co-operated with the American malcontents. Whether the government of the U. S. had a perfect knowledge of the orders of November 11th, previous to the imposition of the embargo, is of no importance; but it is certain that they were in existence time enough to have reached this country before that event, and that the government, as well as the people, knew of their existence, and enough of their contents to justify, with other causes, the embargo.

On the general tenor of Mr. Canning's letter, it will be but fair for the reader not to decide until Mr. Pinkney's answer shall appear. From the late date of Mr. C's note, it may be presumed that Mr. Pinkney's reply had not reached the U. S. when the documents were laid before Congress.]

Mr. Canning to Mr. Pinkney, accompanying his letter of September 23, 1808.

Foreign Office,
September 23, 1808.

Sir,

In laying before the king, your letter of the 23d of August, and in communicating to you the accompanying answer, which I have received his majesty's commands to return to it—I confess I feel some little embarrassments from the repeated references which your letter contains, to what has passed between us in conversation. An embarrassment arising in no degree (as you are perfectly aware) from any feeling of distrust in you personally, but from a recollection of the misrepresentation which took place in America of former conferences between us. You gave me, on that account, the most satisfactory proof that such misrepresentation did not originate with you, by communicating to me that part of your dispatch, in which the conferences particularly referred to, were related correctly; but this very circumstance which establishes your personal claim to entire confidence proves, at the same time, that a faithful report of a conference on your part is not a security against its misrepresentation.

It was for that reason, principally, that after hearing, with the most respectful attention, all that you had to state to me, verbally, upon the subject of the present overture, I felt myself under the necessity of requiring, as "indispensable," a written communication upon the subject.

It is for that reason, also, that as in your written communication you refer me to our late conversations for the "bearings and details" of your proposal, I feel it necessary to recapitulate, as shortly as I can, what I conceive to have passed in these conversations beyond what I find recorded in your letter.

The principal points on which the suggestions brought forward by you in personal conference, appear to me to have differed in some degree from the proposal now stated by you in writing are two—the first, that in conversation the proposal itself was not distinctly stated as an overture authorised by your government—the second, that the beneficial consequences likely to result to this country from the acceptance of that proposal were "pursued" through more ample "illustrations."

In the first of our conferences, I understood you to say little more on the authority of your government, than that you were instructed to remonstrate against the orders in council of the 7th of January, and 11th of November 1807—but to add, as from yourself, an expression of your own conviction, that if these orders were repealed, the President of the U. S. would suspend the embargo with respect to Great Britain.

Upon the consequences of such a suspension of the embargo, while it would still continue to be enforced against France, you expatiated largely—still speaking, however, (as I understood) your own individual sentiments.

It was suggested by you, that America would, in that case, probably arm her merchant ships against the aggressions of France—an expedient, to which, you observed, it would be perfectly idle to resort against Great Britain. The collisions of armed vessels would probable produce war—and the United States would thus be brought into the very situation in which we must wish to place them—that of hostility to France, and virtual, if not formal alliance with G. Britain.

In our second conference, you repeated and enforced the arguments calculated to induce the British government to consent to the repeal of the orders in council, and in this conference, though not stating yourself to be authorised by your government formally to offer the suspension of the embargo as an immediate consequence of that repeal—yet you did profess (as I understood you) a readiness to take upon yourself to make that offer, provided that I should give you before hand an unofficial assurance that coupled with that offer so made, the demand of the repeal of the orders in council of January and November, 1807, would be probably rescinded.

I, of course, declined to give any such previous assurances—but as you appeared to attach great importance to this suggestion, and as I was led to think that a compliance with it might relieve you from a difficulty in executing the instructions of your government, I consented to take a few days to consider of it, and to reserve my definitive answer until I should see you again.

I never doubted in my own mind, as to the inexpediency and impropriety of encouraging you to take an unauthorised step, by an unofficial promise that it should be well received—but in a matter of such delicacy I was desirous of either confirming or correcting my own opinion by the opinion of others.

The result was, that in a third interview, which took place shortly after the second, I had the honor to inform you, that after the most mature deliberation, I found it impossible to yield to your suggestion, and that it, therefore, remained for you to frame your proposition according to the instructions of your government, as to your own unbiassed discretion.

My own share in these several conferences, beyond what was implied in the above statement, was very small. I have (as you know) always wished to refer the argumentative discussion of the subject of the orders in council, to the official correspondence, which I have more than once been taught to expect you to open upon it, than to engage with you in a verbal controversy, which, if confined to ourselves, would be useless—If afterwards to be reduced into writing for the purpose of being communicated to our respective governments—superfluous.

But to the representations which you have repeatedly made against the orders in council of January and November, "as violating the rights of the United States, and affecting most destructively their best interests upon grounds wholly inadmissible both in principle and fact,"—I have uniformly maintained the unquestionable right of his majesty to resort to the fullest measures of retaliation, in consequence of the unparalleled aggression of the enemy, and to retort upon that enemy the evils of his own injustice—and have uniformly contended that "if third parties suffer from those measures, the demand of reparation must be made to that power, which first violates the established usages of war and the rights of neutral states."

There was, indeed, one point, upon which I was particularly anxious to receive precise information, and upon which, from your candor and frankness, I was fortunate enough to obtain it. The connecting together in your proposed overture, the suspension of the embargo, and the repeal of the orders in council—as well those of November, as the preceding one of the 7th of January, might appear to imply that the embargo had been the immediate consequence of those orders, and I was, therefore, desirous to ascertain whether, in fact, the orders in council of November, had been known to the government of the U. S. previous to the message of the President proposing the embargo—so as to be a moving consideration to that message. I had the satisfaction to learn from you, that such was not the fact—that rumors, indeed, might have reached America of some measure of further retaliation, being in the contemplation of the British government, that, perhaps, (as I understood you), some more severe and sweeping measures might have been expected—but that the orders in council of the 11th of November, as having been issued, there was no knowledge of in America—at least none in possession of the American government, at the time of proposing the embargo. Such, sir, is, (according to the best of my recollection,) correctly, the substance of what has passed being us, at our several interviews, previous to the presentation of your official letter; and such I have represented to have been the substance of what has passed on those several occasions in the reports of our conferences, which it has been my duty to make to the king.

If, in this recapitulation, there is any thing mistaken, or any thing omitted, you will do me the justice to believe the error unintentional, and you may rely on my readiness to set it right. I have the honor to be, &c.

GEORGE CANNING.

Michael Leib is chosen Senator of the U. S. for Pennsylvania, in the room of Samuel Maclay, resigned, for the remainder of the present session.

POSTSCRIPT.

The British ship Ann has arrived at Charleston, and brings London papers to the 10th and Liverpool papers to the 12th of November. They do not contain any news of much importance. On the 26th of October a smart action took place between Gen. Blake & Marshal Ney, at Zernosa; the Spaniards acknowledge the loss of 2,000 men, but state the loss of the French as having been much more considerable.

London, November 10. A report was circulated this morning, with considerable confidence, that the Emperor of Austria had declared war against France, & that Bonaparte, upon receiving the intelligence, had suddenly returned to Paris. We of course, do not pledge ourselves for the truth of this statement, but it appears from the foreign papers that the French recently actually stopped the circulation of the Vienna Gazette, in the North of Germany.

A MEETING of the Trustees of the Public Schools in the city of Washington is requested at Mr. *Lindsay's* Hotel, Pennsylvania avenue, on Tuesday the 17th inst. at half past 5 o'clock, P. M.

January 12—

THE SALE of the Valuable Property advertised to be sold at the Union Tavern, Georgetown, at 12 o'clock This Day, is Postponed till MONDAY the 23d inst. at the same hour and place.

JOHN DAVIDSON.
WALTER HELLEN.

January 16—4t

NOTICE.

ALL Persons to whom James Duddle is indebted are requested to produce their accounts properly adjusted on or before the 25th inst. to the Subscribers, who have been appointed trustees to all his property and effects, at a general meeting of his creditors.

BULLER COCKE,
MATTHEW WRIGHT.

January 16—3t

To LEASE for a TERM of YEARS,

A LOT on which is which is established a Soap and Candle Manufactory in the town of Fredericksburg Virginia.

THE Proprietor being desirous of retiring from the business, will lease out his Soap and Candle Manufactory with all the apparatus thereunto belonging for the term of three, seven, or ten years; and will also, if agreeable, hire an excellent manufacturer for the same period. It is unnecessary to give a description of the Lot and Manufactory, as it is presumed that any person inclined to Lease would first view the premises—suffice it to say that the Lot is equal if not superior to any in the state for the business. It has a spring in it almost sufficient to turn a grist mill, which is conveyed by pipes to a factory house 32 feet by 16 having [illegible] besides the cellar where the boiler is erected. It is the only establishment of the kind on the Rappahannock, and ashes, tallow, &c. may be procured in the greatest abundance.

The terms may be known by addressing a letter to the subscriber.

GEO. W. B. SPOONER,
Fredericksburg Virg.

January 16—w4t

(CIRCULAR)

Department of State, Jan. 11th, 1809.

MERCHANTS and others wishing to forward letters to Europe are informed that Two Vessels under the orders of government, will sail from New York on the 25th of this month, or as soon thereafter as possible, the one for *Falmouth*, the other for *L'Orient*, and will deliver all such letters as may be respectively consigned to those ports, or to other places through the same.

The postage on the letters [illegible] be paid.

January 1[illegible]