

was to operate? On us? Have we so conducted ourselves heretofore, or are we now about so to act, that a doubt exists among us whether we will support our rights, or submit to the high behests of the two great belligerents? For ourselves is this medicine, or for the American people? Do they want a rallying point? Has the government of the United States ever taken a ground in which they have been backward to support it? Are we fearful of the temper of our own citizens? Do we think it necessary to raise their courage to the sticking place by this incentive? Or is it to operate on the two great belligerents? Is Mr. Armstrong or Mr. Pinkney, in some new note, to serve up this new prescription, to excite the minds of these governments to American wrongs and to a sense of justice? I am afraid not; I am afraid we have tried this method too often not again to fail of success. I did indeed regret it—I regretted the introduction of this resolution, not only for the reasons which I have stated, but as going still further to establish the creed, that words, in some form or other, are all the means which we have to employ. No, sir, if we make an impression upon Europe, it must be by something more substantial. We have tried the old diet drink long enough.

The house will pardon me if I forbear a minute recapitulation of the wrongs which we have received, not only from the two great belligerents of Europe, but from the little belligerents also. I confess that I have not a stomach to go through with the nauseous detail. I cannot, like Shylock, take a pleasure in saying, on such a day you called me a dog! on such a day you spit upon my garbadine. I have seen them dressed up in every possible shape, in correspondences of our ministers and in reports of committees of this and the other House.—I must confess for one that I take no pleasure in the perusal of such reports. I cannot riot in the strength of our argument—I wish the argument of the enemy was a little better, and our's a little worse; I cannot hail every new aggression, because it gives occasion to extend our demands of reparation. I wish we had not quite so much of argument on our side, and that they had a little more of the injury on theirs. I verily believe that as long as you have the whole of the injury, they will have very little solicitude in yielding to you the best of the argument. Yes, sir, I confess I feel a deep sense of mortification and humiliation at hearing this incessant theme rung in my ear and the only remedy found to be in words, words, words—correspondence of ministers, instructions of secretaries of state, and reports of committees of the two houses. We have been four weeks in session, and as to benefit—I speak of myself; I hope there are others, who are conscious of having done a greater share—as to the benefit that the public has received from my attendance, I had much better have been at home, enjoying the fine weather in my own family, than sitting here, listening to the discussion of propositions, from which, whether negatived or agreed to, no possible good can be derived. We have been four weeks in session, raised a committee of exterior relations, who have brought in a long and labored report, except the instructions moved by my friend from Carolina; all the rest is preface, episode, prologue and epilogue. I have no disposition to attack the gentleman's report; I have no particular fault to find with it: it is much in the style and fashion of the times—the aggressions of France and Great-Britain, served up, though I think not with quite such exquisite cookery, as sometimes is presented to our palates.

But perhaps it may be said that the declaration which occupies the outpost of that report is to be taken in connexion with the subsequent resolutions, and that the whole subject is fairly before the committee and ought to be embraced in one point of view. As far as I have been able to understand the language of that resolution, it means precisely nothing, or more than meets the eye. It is a resolution that it is inconsistent with the honor and independence and so forth of the United States to submit to the edicts of Great-Britain and France. I think that is the language. Is this to be considered as a declaration of war against those two powers? or are we to resolve in one breath that we cannot, without a sacrifice of our rights, honor and independence, submit to the edicts of G.

Britain and France, and in the next breath solemnly resolve that we will? I know it has been said that a temporary suspension of our commerce is not an annihilation of that commerce. Where will gentlemen find a temporary suspension of our commerce? In what clause of the statute book will they find the time prescribed when that commerce shall revive? And if a perpetual prohibition of all commerce of imports be not a submission to the edicts of Great-Britain and France, I know not in what submission can consist. I have not the assurance to stand up, on this floor, and declare that the embargo is a resistance to the edicts of Great-Britain and France, when I find our government has given to the governments of those two countries an explanation of it so very different.—The embargo is represented to be nothing more than an internal regulation not a cause of offence, not an aggression—nothing hostile in its character. Is it then a resistance to the decrees of Great-Britain and France? And if a suspension of exports be not resistance, but a mere measure of internal regulation, not of retaliation, not of re-taliation, how will the suspension of commerce of import constitute that resistance?

I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Quincy) the other day with very great pain, because I heard him attempt, as I conceived, to draw lines of distinction between different sections of this great continent. He entered into calculations, which I not only believe, but know to be erroneous, tending to shew that his section suffered out of all proportion more than others. It is not my purpose now to examine his statements. I admit that there are parts of the country which suffer more than others, but I deny the gentleman's positions in toto; I deny that the treasury and custom-house books afford any data of the relative commerce of each state, and particularly of the state which partly represent and the state contiguous to it on the south. But at the same time that I deprecate the effects of this measure throughout the United States, I trust that there exists and always will exist within this country a power to execute the laws. I shall be among the first to rally round them. When the opposite doctrine is once fairly broached and acted on, I cannot see to what purpose we are a confederated

(Concluded on 4th page.)

From the Spirit of '76.

PRIVATE MESSAGE.

Mr. Randolph's late effort to induce Congress to communicate to the nation the contents of the President's secret message, has brought upon him, as might have been expected, the customary portion of malignant scurrillity. The cry was first raised by a certain Mr. Colvin,* who published a paper in Washington, called the Monitor, and was then re-echoed from most of the go-with-the-side papers, throughout the United States; but particularly by those in Virginia. They charge him with being actuated by no other motive, "than a wish to embarrass the administration—to suspend the freedom of intercourse between the Executive and Legislature—and to cloy the proceedings of government." Nay, so anxious have they been to estimate him, that they have not hesitated to include in their denunciations, some whose attachment to the government has not only never been doubted, but whose characters have always heretofore stood as fair, both for moral and political integrity, as those of any men in the U. States—not excepting any of the members of the administration itself. For instance—amongst the names of those who voted with Mr. Randolph upon this occasion, will be found that of Mr. Macon of North-Carolina, whom the breath of slander has never before dared to fully with a suspicion; and yet these self-created arbiters of all human excellence, say Mr. Randolph "could find only about 30 men, equally discontented with

* Those who feel any particular curiosity to examine the veracity of Mr. Colvin's claims to veracity may find ample means of gratifying it by perusing a certain record of a suit in the Chancery Court of Annapolis, Maryland, in which the said Mr. Colvin was a party.

himself, (including the federalists.) "who were willing to go all lengths with him."

The author of these observations is not disposed according to the fashion of the times, to arrogate to himself, the spirit of prophecy, but there is one prediction which he will hazard for the comfort of all Mr. Randolph's enemies in the lump.—It is, that the time is not very distant, when it will be proven to the entire satisfaction of all honest and rational men, that he has been from his first entrance into public life, up to the present period, one of the people's best friends. The whole secret of the unexampled persecution which has been raised against him, is the open war that he has always waged against sycophants—office-hunters, public defamers, and in short all those who have appeared to him to abuse public trust. Add to this a propensity, most unlucky for himself, but certainly very salutary in a national point of view, which has often impelled him to expose to merited derision, the folly of those, who without the requisite information, or the capacity to obtain it, have taken up the business of legislation, as a matter equally easy in the performance, with eating their food, or putting on their cloathes. If he could only have thought it as honest as it was polite, to practice on the favorite maxim of Henry the 4th of France, he would still continue to be styled, one of our best and wisest statesmen. This maxim was—"that more flies are to be caught by a drop of Honey, than with a Ton of Vinegar."

AGRESTIS.

It is a little surprising that these printers, notwithstanding their inveterate propensity to misrepresentation, should make this allusion in the very teeth of the secret journal, which they themselves have published. In that journal any one who chooses to take the trouble, may see the names of Mr. Dana, Mr. Pinkney, and several other leading federalists, on a different side of the question from Mr. Randolph. And yet, these voracious gentlemen include all the federalists with him.

From the Philadelphia Freeman's Journal TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION.

From New-Pekin, the City of the Western Wilderness, and Capital of the Empire of NOVA CHINA.

FRIDAY, DEC. 2, 1808.

Since the convocation of the Great Council of the Mandarins and Commons, a deep gloom has invested this superb metropolis. Our illustrious and adorable Emperor did not think proper publicly to recommend any particular course to be pursued in the present crisis, but gave his ministers privately to understand that the anti-commercial system of Confucius the Younger must be continued, with amendments and additions. The people still continue to indicate uneasiness. The proceedings of the Great Council experience a solemn pause. But it is not probable that they can be arrested in their headlong career of madness and destruction. Eloquence and argument are alike lost upon them. The Emperor exercises no influence over their deliberations, but as might be expected in a system like ours, they wait till his wishes are ascertained, and then think for themselves exactly as he thought. He has been guilty of many violations of the Fundamental Laws of the Empire. In the Post-Office Department he has descended to acts of meanness unworthy of so great a Monarch, and has usurped the functions of the Viceroy of the Post Roads. A Member of the Commons from the Verdant Mountains of the North, who is in possession of the facts, has pledged himself to arraign him before the Sacred College.—The Son of our Glory is Eclipsed! The Temple of the Thundering Winds is awfully agitated, and we are rapidly descending to the Vale of Tombs!

FROM THE N. YORK HERALD.

Misrepresentation, No. 4.—No one, I believe, ever doubted that a principal object of the embargo was hostility towards Great-Britain; at least, that it was intended by it to coerce her into concessions. Since the appearance of the Documents, however, I have never ventured to assert this, because I would not, without positive proof in my hand, such as I hold in the case of the Victims, go the length of charging the Secretary of State with a falsehood. I

think such a charge upon a public officer, too serious and solemn, and one too deeply involving the honor of the country itself, to be advanced on light grounds. But when his own friend and principal advocate comes before the national councils, and states facts that necessarily go to fix and fasten falsehood upon him, no blame can rest on me for merely pointing it out. I therefore no longer hesitate to do it.

Mr. Giles, in the first part of his speech, says,

"The second object of the embargo laws was coercive, operating upon the aggressive belligerents."

Mr. Madison, in his letter to Pinkney, says

"The policy and causes of the measure, [embargo] are explained in the message itself. But it may be proper to authorize you to assure the British government, as has been just expressed to its minister here, that the act is a measure of PRECAUTION ONLY, called for by the occasion; that it is to be considered as neither hostile in its character, nor as justifying, or inviting, or leading to hostility with any nation whatever, and particularly as opposing no obstacle whatever to amicable negotiations and satisfactory adjustments with Great-Britain, on the subjects of difference between the two countries."

Madison's Letter, Dec. 23, 1807.

Again, to Armstrong:

"I send by this another copy of the [embargo] act, with an instruction from the President, that you make it the subject of such explanations as will guard against misconception of the policy which led to it. It is strictly a measure of PRECAUTION, required by the dangers incident to external commerce, and being indiscriminate in its term and operation towards all nations, can give no just offence to any."

Madison's letter, Feb. 8, 1808.

We must now turn again to Farmer Giles:

"I have always understood that there was two objects contemplated by the embargo laws.—The second, coercive, operating upon the aggressive belligerents."

It must be remembered that Mr. Giles was one of the cabinet itself called together to consult about the adopting this measure; of course what he says, must be considered as coming, not only from the friend and advocate and confidant of the Secretary, but from the President himself. We see then he very fairly confesses that the second object of the embargo act, was a measure of coercion. But Mr. Madison declared, in both his official letters, that the act had but one object; that it was "a measure of precaution only." Here, I suppose, forty democratic editors stand ready to draw their quills and prove that there is no contradiction, by shewing that a measure of precaution and a measure of coercion may, and here doubtless do, mean the same thing.—Stop, gentlemen; Farmer Giles has anticipated you and taken from you every inch of ground to stand upon. He has expressly furnished us with distinctions and definitions that must forever set all your ingenuity at defiance. We are now prepared to take the whole sentence together.

"I have always understood, that there were two objects contemplated by the embargo laws.—The first, precautionary, operating upon ourselves.—The second, coercive, operating upon the aggressive belligerents."

Madison not only says the act was a measure of "PRECAUTION ONLY," but he authorises our ministers at the courts of France and Great-Britain, to assure those governments of this. "The act, says Mr. Giles, had two objects, one of precaution upon ourselves, and the other of coercion against the belligerents."—Which of them speaks the truth I leave the public to judge, but that both do not, and of course, that one tells a falsehood, may be very safely affirmed, since the one is in direct contradiction to the other.

Bank of Cape-Fear.

RESOLVED, That no note will be discounted at this Bank or its agencies unless made and endorsed after the 1st of January 1809.—Provided that this resolution shall not extend to Notes offered for collection although dated previous to the 1st of January 1809.

By order of the Directors,

JOHN HOGG, Cashier,

January 3.

Blanks of different kinds, for Sale at this Office.