

Mr. Quincy's... an examination of the system of coercion on foreign nations by means of commercial restrictions. The idea of the efficacy of this system he traced to a deeper root than any administration under this government. It was an error of the American people, originating in a period antecedent to the revolution; it grew out of our colonial regulations. It began to be a favorite belief with the people, antecedent to the year 1700, and was then fostered by the patriots of that day, the idea being also encouraged by the patriots of England. Mr. Quincy entered into a comparative statement of the exports from and imports to Great Britain from America at two different periods, viz. the nine years preceding the year 1775, and the nine years succeeding it, with a view to show that the average imports into Great Britain from all the world, during the nine years peace with this country, amounted to but about one-thirteenth more than the average imports during the same period of war; and the exports diminished, nearly in the same proportion. From his statements on this head and a comparison of the present relative situation of the two countries, Mr. Quincy drew the inference that this proposed means of coercing the European powers did not exist. He deemed it peculiarly unfortunate that a confidence in this power of coercion had so long existed, as it had prevented the United States from making preparations which they otherwise might have made. He hoped the idea would now cease. In relation to our present situation, he recommended a plain remedy, comprised in two words—"Follow nature." What did she first dictate for remedying any complaint? The removal of all obstructions on her operations. Mr. Quincy therefore recommended the removal of the embargo, the repeal of the non-importation act and the abandonment of the non-intercourse system. He wished "peace if possible; if war, union in that war;" for this reason he wished a negotiation to be opened unshackled with those impediments to it which now existed. As long as they remained, the people in the portion of the country whence he came, would not deem an unsuccessful attempt at negotiation to be cause for war; if they were removed, and an earnest attempt at negotiation was made unimpeded with these restrictions, and should not meet with success, they would join heartily in a war. They would not however go to war to contest the rights of Great Britain to search American vessels for British seamen; for it was a general opinion with them, that if American seamen were encouraged, there would be no occasion for the employment of foreign seamen. A removal of the embargo without adopting any other measure until the event of negotiation had been tried, Mr. Quincy said would, first, prevent any collision with the belligerents which might tend to embarrass negotiation; and secondly, would give an opportunity to the country to ascertain what would be the practical operation of these orders and decrees on our commerce; and give an opportunity to the next Congress to shape its measures according to their actual effect. If commerce did not suffer, the knowledge of this fact would supercede the necessity of any other measure, and peace would follow of course; if on the contrary, a general sweep was made of all the property afloat, it would unite all parties in a war. Mr. Quincy concluded a speech of two hours, in length, by lamenting the state of the country, and invoking the spirit which "rides the whirlwind and directs the storm" to guide the nation to a happy result.

Mr. Nicholas replied to the observations of Mr. Quincy on the subject of the legal opposition to the embargo laws in Massachusetts. He said if the laws of the nation were to be resisted in the manner in which he lamented to say that he saw it contemplated in one part of the community, it became the duty of this Legislature to meet it; it was not compatible with their duty to shrink from it. He could not consent that thirteen or fourteen states should submit to one. As men vested with certain powers by the constitution, Congress could not transfer the powers to any state legislature or to any town. In relation to negotiating with measures of coercion in existence, Mr. Nicholas asked when did the violations of our rights commence? So long ago that the precise time could not be fixed. When did our coercive measures commence? In 1806. Mr. N. noticed the negotiators during whose ministry abroad these injuries had commenced and continued. Mr. King, Mr. Monroe, and Mr. Pinckney, all honourable men, had successively represented the United States in Great Britain. And could any thing be gathered from any thing they had ever written or said, to induce a belief that this government had not acted with sincerity? There was the most conclusive evidence to the contrary. Mr. N. said he would ask nothing of Great Britain or France that would tend to sacrifice their honour; and he wished when gentlemen dwelt so much on the regard of foreign nations for their national character, that they would respect a little the character of our own country. Mr. D. R. Williams said he had been decidedly in favour of issuing letters of marque and reprisal at once; he believed it would have cut off all that fungus matter now deteriorating the body politic—for the people of New England were as patriotic as any, and when the choice was between their own and a foreign country, they would cling to their own. It was the hot bed politicians who stirred them

up, and it was necessary to do something to put an end to their intrigues. Mr. W. disliked the non-intercourse system throughout. If he could not get way or a continuance of the embargo, he wished, inasmuch as Great Britain and France had each interdicted us from going to the other, to declare that neither their armed or unarmed ships should contaminate our waters. This was a system which required no exertion of patriotism to carry into effect, which could excite no animosities between the North and South. In relation to the non-intercourse, he believed that it could not be enforced, and used a variety of arguments to show that it could not. If it could be enforced, he believed it would be prodigiously partial. If the embargo was to be taken off and war not to be substituted, if the nation was to submit, he wished to do it profitably. If the embargo were raised as to a single spot, it was raised entirely to all effectual purposes. Then let your vessels go, (said he) without let or hindrance; let them go and be burnt; your merchants will then feel that the embargo was a shield spread over them, and will come back to your protection like the prodigal son, and unite like brethren in the common cause. Mr. Williams said his plan was to interdict the entrance of our ports to belligerent vessels, armed or unarmed, and lay a tax of 50 per cent on their manufactures. Great Britain must then either go to war or treat with us. If she was inclined to go to war in preference to revoking her orders in council, let her do so. But he was inclined to believe that she would treat. If she seized our vessels, however, the effect would be inevitable. Division amongst us would be done away—all would unite heart and hand in war. Mr. W. replied to a number of the observations of Mr. Quincy—particularly in relation to his position, that all obstructions ought to be removed with a view to negotiation. He asked what security had the United States if they did all this, if they submitted to such abject humiliation, that Great Britain should treat? Was it to be expected that she would treat more liberally with us when we solicited as slaves, than she would whilst we magnanimously contended for our rights? The gentleman from Massachusetts, said he, when repeating his creed, had forgotten a part, viz. "Unfurl the banner of the Republic against the imperial standard." This would complete a project he had lately seen proposed from the East; and as to its application, coinciding with the wishes over the water, would be just such a project as Mr. Canning might dictate. "Revoke your proclamation, remove the embargo, and unfurl the Republican banner against the imperial standard." Mr. Williams concluded a speech of an hour and a half in length with giving notice that he should move to amend the bill, when the present motion was decided, by striking out all that part of it relating to non-intercourse, and inserting a provision interdicting the entrance of our harbours to any vessel of Great Britain or France, and imposing an additional duty on all goods imported from those countries. When Mr. Williams concluded, the committee rose and obtained leave to sit again.

Thursday, Feb. 16.  
NON-INTERCOURSE.  
The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the bill for interdicting commercial intercourse.  
Mr. Milnor's motion for striking out the first section, being under consideration—  
Mr. Nicholas spoke against the motion for about half an hour. He replied to many objections which had been made to the bill. He observed, however, that this state of things could not continue long; and that he had no hesitation to say that this nation must soon determine either to maintain and enforce its rights, or to abandon commerce altogether. He could not consent to carry on commerce as it was now shackled by the belligerents, nor abandon it altogether. He hoped that there yet was a manly and honourable spirit in the nation, which would resist the invasions of our rights; and this bill would prevent our citizens from staining the character of the nation by carrying on a commerce which could only be carried on with disgrace, until another effort should have been made for peace.  
The question was taken on striking out the first section of the bill, and negatived, yeas 24.  
The House proceeded in the consideration of the bill.  
The period after which the entrance of vessels should be prohibited in our waters being under consideration—  
Mr. Nicholas named the 20th of May. As the vessels coming in after the time fixed on were to be subject to condemnation, he thought it would be to the honour of the nation to give reasonable notice of the regulation.  
Mr. Lyon named the first of June, as being after the next meeting of Congress.  
Mr. Fisk hoped neither day would be agreed to. He was not for giving to England any longer notice of our regulations than she gave of the orders in council, viz. from the 11th of November to the 12th of January. He therefore named the 20th day of April.  
The question on the first day of June was negatived, 39 to 41.  
The 20th of May was agreed to, 30 to 24.  
The fourth section having been read (prohibiting the importation of French or British goods)—  
Mr. D. R. Williams moved to strike it out and insert in lieu of it a provision for imposing

a duty on the duty of 50 per cent on the value of the goods, to be imposed on Great Britain or France or the colonies of either.  
The committee rose at 5 o'clock.  
Adjourned after five o'clock.  
Friday, Feb. 17.  
NON-INTERCOURSE.  
The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the bill interdicting commercial intercourse, &c.  
Mr. D. R. Williams' motion of amendment, viz. to strike out the fourth section of the bill and insert in lieu of it a provision for laying a discrimination of 50 per cent on all former duties on goods imported from Great Britain and France, was negatived.  
Mr. Lane called for a division of the question, so as to take it first on striking out the section.  
The question was then taken on striking out the 4th section in order to insert Mr. R. Williams' amendment; which was negatived 53 to 47. Mr. W's motion of amendment was negatived.  
Some farther progress was made in the committee rose and obtained leave to sit again.  
Saturday, Feb. 18.  
The House was engaged the whole of the day in committee of the whole on the non-intercourse bill. A motion to amend the bill so as to keep on the embargo altogether was negatived, yeas 35. A motion to amend the bill so as wholly to repeal the embargo, was negatived 57 to 53. The committee rose through the bill, which was reported to the House at near 5 o'clock—When the House adjourned without considering the report of the committee.

By the British brig Matilda, arrived at New York in 18 days from St. J. de Luz, Antigua, the London Mercantile Advertiser has received London news to the 13th of December inclusive (ten days less than our former dates) and the Antigua Journal of the 24th of January, containing news from Antigua of the 10th of December, from which we have the following extracts.  
We learn verbally by a passenger in the brig Matilda from Antigua, that on the 26th of January a dispatch was received from Admiral Cochrane stating that Sir John Moore with an army of 20,000 men, had attacked the French army in the environs of Madrid and completely routed them, with a slaughter on both sides. The English lost 4,000 killed.  
It is further stated, that a French 50 gun ship with 500 troops and 1700 barrels of Flour, was captured after a severe engagement, going into Guadalupe by the British frigates Jason and Cyclops.  
The London papers have contradictory reports about Bonaparte; one day he is said to be at Paris, the next at Madrid.  
They also state, that Palafox, in an official note of Nov. 20, reports that General O'Neil and St. Marique, had on the 14th entered Capotauro, the French having precipitately left it at 7 o'clock in the morning.  
One of the 10th Dec. says, that a Cabinet council was held the preceding day, and did not break up till 7 in the evening, after which Mr. Hunter the messenger was ordered to proceed with dispatches for Spain. It is said the subject was the situation of the British army in Spain. It is said the British force is to be concentrated in Portugal. Transports have been ordered to Corunna and Vigo.  
Nothing but uncertainty and anxiety prevailed with regard to Spain; an account had been received of the death of Castanos, and the intended retreat of the British forces from Astorga and Salamanca. The papers say they remain of opinion that the resolution has been taken of embarking troops from England with all possible expedition, and of attempting, if any opportunity should offer to aid the cause of the Spaniards upon such parts of the coast as their assistance can be of any avail. Several ships were ordered to Spain to protect the transports in bringing all the troops.  
The accounts from Sweden were unfavourable. Since the rupture of the armistice the Russians have pushed hostilities with such an overwhelming superiority of force that all the gallant efforts of the Swedes have been fruitless.  
Some Ministerial changes were spoken of—the Duke of Portland Mr. Canning, and Lord Mulgrave it is said, retire—Lord Clitham it is added is removed to the treasury, and Lord Melville has offered a seat in the cabinet.  
Negotiations for peace were still going on—Mr. Shaw the messenger, left London the 10th Dec. with dispatches for Paris.  
Austria still continued her military preparations. A Russian ukase notifies the merchants of St. Petersburg, that after the first of Jan. 1807, no ship shall be suffered to enter the Russian ports, or depart from them.  
The American ship Margaret and cargo, had been condemned at Copenhagen; and sold for the benefit of the captors.  
London, Dec. 10.  
Private letters from Holland state that Bonaparte has ordered a relaxation to take place in the regulations enjoined by his Milan decree respecting neutrals. By the decree alluded to, it was ordered that all neutrals which had touched at a British port, or submitted to be searched by a British cruiser, should be confiscated on afterwards entering a French port, or condemned as legal prizes, if taken by a French armed vessel. It is now ordered that neutrals shall be admitted into French ports, though they have been searched by a British cruiser, provided they have not touched at a British port. Bonaparte, in



FOREIGN.  
By the British brig Matilda, arrived at New York in 18 days from St. J. de Luz, Antigua, the London Mercantile Advertiser has received London news to the 13th of December inclusive (ten days less than our former dates) and the Antigua Journal of the 24th of January, containing news from Antigua of the 10th of December, from which we have the following extracts.  
We learn verbally by a passenger in the brig Matilda from Antigua, that on the 26th of January a dispatch was received from Admiral Cochrane stating that Sir John Moore with an army of 20,000 men, had attacked the French army in the environs of Madrid and completely routed them, with a slaughter on both sides. The English lost 4,000 killed.  
It is further stated, that a French 50 gun ship with 500 troops and 1700 barrels of Flour, was captured after a severe engagement, going into Guadalupe by the British frigates Jason and Cyclops.  
The London papers have contradictory reports about Bonaparte; one day he is said to be at Paris, the next at Madrid.  
They also state, that Palafox, in an official note of Nov. 20, reports that General O'Neil and St. Marique, had on the 14th entered Capotauro, the French having precipitately left it at 7 o'clock in the morning.  
One of the 10th Dec. says, that a Cabinet council was held the preceding day, and did not break up till 7 in the evening, after which Mr. Hunter the messenger was ordered to proceed with dispatches for Spain. It is said the subject was the situation of the British army in Spain. It is said the British force is to be concentrated in Portugal. Transports have been ordered to Corunna and Vigo.  
Nothing but uncertainty and anxiety prevailed with regard to Spain; an account had been received of the death of Castanos, and the intended retreat of the British forces from Astorga and Salamanca. The papers say they remain of opinion that the resolution has been taken of embarking troops from England with all possible expedition, and of attempting, if any opportunity should offer to aid the cause of the Spaniards upon such parts of the coast as their assistance can be of any avail. Several ships were ordered to Spain to protect the transports in bringing all the troops.  
The accounts from Sweden were unfavourable. Since the rupture of the armistice the Russians have pushed hostilities with such an overwhelming superiority of force that all the gallant efforts of the Swedes have been fruitless.  
Some Ministerial changes were spoken of—the Duke of Portland Mr. Canning, and Lord Mulgrave it is said, retire—Lord Clitham it is added is removed to the treasury, and Lord Melville has offered a seat in the cabinet.  
Negotiations for peace were still going on—Mr. Shaw the messenger, left London the 10th Dec. with dispatches for Paris.  
Austria still continued her military preparations. A Russian ukase notifies the merchants of St. Petersburg, that after the first of Jan. 1807, no ship shall be suffered to enter the Russian ports, or depart from them.  
The American ship Margaret and cargo, had been condemned at Copenhagen; and sold for the benefit of the captors.  
London, Dec. 10.  
Private letters from Holland state that Bonaparte has ordered a relaxation to take place in the regulations enjoined by his Milan decree respecting neutrals. By the decree alluded to, it was ordered that all neutrals which had touched at a British port, or submitted to be searched by a British cruiser, should be confiscated on afterwards entering a French port, or condemned as legal prizes, if taken by a French armed vessel. It is now ordered that neutrals shall be admitted into French ports, though they have been searched by a British cruiser, provided they have not touched at a British port. Bonaparte, in

Wednesday, Feb. 15.  
NON-INTERCOURSE.  
On motion of Mr. Nicholas, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Basset in the chair, on the bill for interdicting commercial intercourse between the United States and Great-Britain and France, and for other purposes.  
Mr. Milnor moved to strike out the first section of the bill, with a view to try the principle of the non-intercourse system. In support of this motion, he alleged the impossibility of carrying the system into effect; for he conceived that the embargo had been ineffectual from the impossibility of carrying it into complete effect, and the proposed system would be at least as difficult to enforce. He thought that it would be impossible to carry a non-intercourse system into effect, as long as vessels were permitted to go to sea. He had many other objections to this bill, amongst which were these: that although it raised the embargo in part only, the permission to vessels to go out, would render the provision for a partial embargo nugatory; that if the bill were to pass in its present shape, it was to be doubted whether any revenue officer of the U. States would understand the duty enjoined on him by it; that a time only two days previous to the meeting of the next Congress was fixed upon as the day on which the non-importation should go into operation, and thus the bill appeared to manifest a distrust of that Congress, who certainly would be more competent than the present Congress to decide on its propriety at that time; that a non-intercourse between these countries would but compel our citizens to pay a double freight to and from the entrepot, without producing any other effect than injuring our own citizens; that goods from those countries, although their importation were interdicted by law, would be introduced nevertheless; that the extent of the territory and sea-coast of the United States was so great, that all efforts to interdict the importation of goods must be ineffectual, for they would be introduced contrary to law, thus depriving the United States of the revenue which would be derived from them if their importation were permitted by law. Rather than accept this system, Mr. M. thought it would be better that this country should remain yet longer under the pressure of the embargo, which he had no doubt must be repealed early in the next session.