

ent, the gentleman from Virginia who believed in 1806 an embargo must always precede war, and now denounces such a measure as unwise and destructive of the best interests of the people; or those who believe with the gentleman in 1806, and who continue of the same opinion to this moment, and who have actually made the experiment recommended by the gentleman himself. Mr. J. said he had adverted to this circumstance on account of the charge which had been made upon those who had voted for the embargo.

It was said by the same gentleman, that our proceedings reminded him of the days of '98, '99, &c. He would here again enquire of the gentleman how it happened that he was in most cases found acting with those very gentlemen who approved the measures of '98-'00, and not with those who disapproved them?

The people have a right of cultivating their farms and sending their produce to foreign markets. This right has been denied and assailed, and at this moment it remains destroyed. Our seamen have a right to personal liberty and security upon our shores and in our merchant vessels—these rights are violated and thousands of our fellow-citizens are wantonly impressed in the service. The union of the states is the ark of our safety from foreign enemies and domestic traitors: The integrity of these states has been attempted; domestic tranquility has been aimed at, that it might be succeeded by a civil war. The U. States have jurisdiction in their own waters. This jurisdiction has been despised, defied, and the laws violated. The frontiers are thinly settled and mostly with helpless families of men, women and children. These are murdered by the Indian hatchet and British influence, and no right can be mentioned, worth having, that has not been assailed, directly or indirectly—not accidentally, but systematically—and at this very moment this system of destruction is continued with a perseverance that astonishes any mind, and which pays no heed to remonstrance, to justice, to reason, the laws of nations and negotiation. Under this view of the subject, he should not consult dangers and hazards—the U. States cannot even pause—they must go on. He would resist, and save the rights, the honor and the independence of the people, or be buried in the ruins of their overthrow.

He said, he was reminded of the declarations of those who were unfriendly to republican governments—tyrants, monarchists, friends of despotism and privileged orders, affected to believe, that a republican government could not exist—that it was impracticable, that the people would not support their rights—that they could not be trusted—that a republican government, depending upon the will of the people, was too weak to contend with a monarchy. He believed such sentiments a libel against republican governments, particularly the American government. He believed a republican government was the strongest on earth; and such was the opinion of the illustrious Jefferson, one of the greatest and best men on earth. He knew the people were ready, able and willing to defend their rights and maintain their independence.

But calculations have been made, by the gentleman from Virginia, as to the influence of the embargo, as to the prices of our produce, flour, &c. It will not be denied, that the embargo ought not to have been laid without a most evident necessity; nor ought any other restrictions without the best reasons.—But because the embargo had an influence upon produce, was that alone a good argument against it? The same argument would have applied with double force in the time of the revolution, when the 3 pence upon a pound of tea was the immediate cause of opposition to his Britannic majesty in the revolution. He would not say it was the sole cause of the revolution. No, it was part of a system of oppression, which had commenced many years before; much like that which has been pursued ever since. Principle and not profit determined the patriots of that day. They might have been told of the high price of produce, and the blessings of peace, and the perils of war; and indeed they might have anticipated the 80,000 lives which were lost in that great conflict, and the \$80,000,000 of public debt, and the depreciation of paper money and property to the amount of 100,000,000 of dollars more. But these arguments would not avail when the alternative was political slavery on one hand, and liberty and independence on the other. Had this policy governed, the independence of the United States would never have existed. He said, as much as he was opposed to war if it could be avoided, and as much as he valued life, and he had numerous friends and connections which made existence as valuable to him as any other man—still he set a double value upon it in the hope anticipated that he should have an opportunity before many weeks of voting for war or letters of marque and reprisal against a nation which had attempted for more than 20 years to destroy the happiness and liberties of the people of the United States, and who seemed determined not to be satisfied with any thing short of absolute subjugation. The gentleman from Virginia says the majority have no system; that they have not voted the taxes, that if war was the subject, the taxes should first be laid. As the gentleman was opposed, not only to all preparation for war, but to the ways and means to carry on the war, he could not suppose that his plan as recommended to the majority would carry

any obligations with it. If indeed the gentleman had been in favour of the measure, his opinion might have had great influence. But as to the taxes, it would be recollected, that there was a distinct resolution that no taxes should be laid until a declaration of war. It is known to all that the taxes proposed are war taxes, and as war taxes they remained, in their proper place, in possession of the committee of Ways and Means. Mr. J. said, if the bill for laying the taxes was before the House, he would not vote for them until a declaration of war or letters of marque and reprisal. He had no idea of fixing the burthen of taxes upon the people, unless it was for the purposes of supporting a war to maintain their own rights and independence. He did not wonder therefore at the suggestion of the gentleman that the taxes ought to be laid, which would be another theme of complaint and denunciation. When war is declared, taxes will be laid, if necessary, and not without. A government which cannot protect itself and its citizens from outrage and plunder, does not deserve the name; and freemen who will not fight for their rights do not deserve to enjoy them.

Mr. RANDOLPH rose to explain. He must have been misunderstood by the gentleman from Kentucky when he supposed him to have expressed an unwillingness to see a change effected in the administration of the government. He certainly had not expressed himself to that effect; he had no such feeling. On the contrary (for he was not in the habit of making a secret of his political opinions) he could scarcely conceive of any change which would not be for the better: since in his judgment the affairs of this country, (whatever be the object of our policy—whether war or peace) could not have been more miserably conducted than they had been since the 4th of November last. It was not to the change, but to the means by which it seemed likely to be brought about, that Mr. R. had expressed any thing like repugnance. It was to the particular means and not the object that he had expressed dislike. He did not wish to see a change effected by the oppressions and exactions of the government itself, which should embody and bring into power a long depressed party with all its feelings of resentment or of another description in full vigour or operation. He had no wish to see a change brought about by means like this. He deprecated whatever might contribute to nourish a narrow and rancorous party spirit, which had been too long the curse of the country. And whenever it should be found, to use the language of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Johnson) that he was acting with this or that party, indiscriminately justifying their follies and their crimes, he should feel himself obliged to the observations made by the gentleman from Kentucky and not, until then, No, sir; (said Mr. R.) I can inform that gentleman that there is not a greater moral impossibility conceivable by the mind of man, than that I should stand in such a relation to any party whatsoever. Was he unto that man, who consigns himself over to so slavish a bondage!

There was one remark made by the gentleman from Kentucky which he would not effect to misunderstand. The gentleman had exultingly said, here the 90 days should elapse; those in opposition to the measures of government should be taught to be more silent; that once again on the war—(Mr. Johnson said the gentleman would understand him rightly—it was to the sort of opposition made to the loan, which in his mind was little less than treason, that he had applied his remarks. He had no allusion to the proceedings of that House.) Mr. Randolph in continuation said he did not very well understand the gentleman's explanation, because he was ignorant of the species of opposition to which the gentleman referred. He had always considered a loan to be a voluntary thing. He had heard indeed of forced loans, but if by a loan was meant a voluntary act on the part of the lender, he could not comprehend the nature of an opposition to a public loan. True, he had seen it more than hinted by some of those who had escaped from the justice of their own country in Europe—that after war was declared all the Tories should be tarred and feathered. For it had been pronounced that this was to be a second war for independence—in order (he supposed) to enable the patriots aforesaid to enrol their illustrious names among those of the heroes of the Revolution, No. 2. As long as he retained a seat on that floor—and Heaven knows how long that will be—he should not hesitate to express himself with the utmost freedom notwithstanding any invidious personalities to which it might subject him. He disclaimed any allusion in this remark to the gentleman from Kentucky.

That gentleman had endeavoured to convict him of the charge of inconsistency on the subject of Embargo; quoting a passage in a speech of his as far back as March 1806, when the ground was first broken which has since produced so many successive crops of restrictive measures. To such a charge of inconsistency as that he should hardly take the trouble to make a defence. But surely the gentleman would recollect that since that period we had been under the discipline of an Embargo for almost 18 months. If that be not sufficient to entice the Embargo Mania, if that dose has failed in its effect on any man, he would only say he was an incorrigible subject & ought to be dealt with accordingly, by being dismissed to the hospital of incurables. But for the last Embargo, an Embargo for 60 days preparatory to war would have had the effect of which Mr. R. had spoken six years ago and for which this was ostensibly laid. But the doleful experience of the Embargo of 1808-'9 drove the people one and all—whig and tory, monarchist and democrat—federalist and republican to escape as from a house on fire. Suppose in a certain stage of disease a regular physician to prescribe the Warm Bath, and his sturdy nurses should persist in plunging the unhappy patient into a cauldron and parboiling him for 48 hours? Do you think you could ever prevail upon the sick man (supposing him to survive the operation) or the physician to agree to another exhibition of the remedy? No, sir; a burnt child dreads the fire. The word Embargo has become more ominous than the croaking of a raven. It affects all classes and descriptions of people, and all the fruits of the earth perish before it, like the desolation of those Locusts we hear of in Teneriffe. It is the most conspicuous system of

devastation and self-destruction ever invented—a master piece of human ingenuity. At the time referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky, that famous experiment had never been made, or (as he believed) thought of by any human being in the world.

The remarks made on the subject of majority and minority were in their character so much like those to which he had been accustomed to listen in the spring of 1800 from the members of the then majority that they reminded him (as well as other circumstances which forced themselves on his recollection) of old times. There was the same incessant talk of the majority speaking the sentiments of the people then as now—and that the minority must submit—accompanied by threats by no means intelligible. They were so confident of their strength as the majority now is and with as much reason, for they had some system—they would persist in running counter to the public sentiment under the idea of swimming with it—and like them these gentlemen with all their patriotism and honour & gallantry & zeal will sink beneath the wave of public opinion never to rise again, unless they rise under some other name.

You cannot go to war with the people divided on the subject; and the elections in New-York and New England are decisive on that head. This is a different question, sir, from that of our independence; it is differently brought on; under different auspices—by different men and far other councils. The war spirit is principally stimulated at this moment by those who have escaped from the Tyranny or JUSTICE (as it may be termed) of the British government long since the war of independence. Almost every leading press in the United States is conducted by persons of that description—the two leading presses in the city of Philadelphia in the city of Baltimore, and I might add another in a third city, if it deserved the name of a leading press. This is the description of persons who in resentment of the wrongs they have recently received from the Irish and British governments are now goading us to war—talking about American spirit—the spirit of our revolution, and of stirring and fomenting the Tories, as they have the matchless audacity to term the whigs of the revolution. Let them beware. I have a "tory" in my eye (Col. Stuart) who will not undergo the discipline of tar and feathers from the second founders of the republic without resistance.

We may talk of war as we please—but what approximation have we made to it? We are so much the nearer to it that our main reliance, our principal staff—the loan to raise a revenue to carry on the war, has proved to be a broken reed. We complain of the embargo, and gentlemen tell us of war. It is not of war we complain but of embargo. We contend indeed that war cannot be waged under present auspices without defeat, disgrace and disaster to ourselves. We see that it will be disastrous and ruinous; but our present complaint is not of it but of its precursor, its avant courier the Embargo.

One gentleman has said we have adopted every measure which the situation of the country requires in case we meant to go to war. We have not adopted two of the most important and indispensable. We have not passed the bills for raising the supplies. Mr. Randolph said that he would candidly apprise the gentleman from Kentucky that he should have voted against the gentleman's taxes because he was opposed to the war. But this was no apology for the advocates of war. The taxes ought to have been laid (if war was their intention) in time to meet the expense; in time for the proceeds to answer the public exigencies; since they could not be productive until at least twelve months after they shall have been imposed. Instead of which a burthen greater in amount and far more unequal in its operation had been laid on the country in the shape of an embargo, destroying our resources and diminishing the already small receipts of the Treasury.

There is another measure, one advocated most zealously by the gentleman from South-Carolina himself, and by his learned and amiable colleague who sits before him (Mr. Cheves) by the honorable Speaker of this House, and by most of those who have displayed the greatest zeal for war. I mean measures for maritime defence and offence. It is perfectly obvious, if we go to war with a great maritime power, we must resort to measures of naval preparation. We are told of the sound being sealed against us, as it is by Danish privateers under French orders, and how is the seal to be taken off? By calling out the militia; or by adding two additional Secretaries to the Department of War? I am no navy man, sir; but I have long ago declared and I now repeat it, that this nation is destined to be one of the greatest naval powers on earth. Our progress towards this stage in my opinion has been materially retarded by the measures of our own government, and I speak in reference particularly to the measures of Mr. Adams, who attempted to force the growth of our Navy prematurely. But if we go to war with a maritime nation, it is absolutely necessary we should have a fleet. Yes, sir; and after all is done towards preparation for war that is now proposed, we shall be just as far from our object as if Great Britain had not a single subject in North-America.

With respect to our trade, its present state may be described in very few words: England takes all our ships bound to France; France takes all our ships wheresoever bound. The licensed trade between us and France is prohibited or about to be interdicted by the United States, and the unlicensed trade is prohibited by France. And for this trade, thus prohibited by France and ourselves, we are to go to war. I shall not attempt to urge any argument against war; indeed I feel ashamed, after the masterly argument of my colleague (Mr. Sheffy) now absent on leave, to say any thing on the subject. But the business on hand is embargo, not war; and upon a proposition which is equivalent to a rejection of the petition, unquestionably the whole subject of embargo comes up and is open for discussion.

With regard to the design of the majority of this House from the commencement of the session to the present time, it is not my intention to say any thing, for this plain reason—that I am acquainted with their designs only from their subsequent acts; but I have no hesitation in averring that if the session was to go over again, those gentlemen who have, from a yielding disposition or a respect to the opinions of their friends, been swept down the current, would make an efficient and manly resistance—for I see no one, unless it be a very few, some one or two individuals for whom I profess to have the highest esteem, who will not be glad to

get out of the scrape. But they have missed in the brink of a precipice, and not left themselves room to turn. They will be talked in their sleep, and will unquestionably be found in the bottom of the pit below.



MILITARY.

[The following is an answer to that part of Duane's "Eye Sketch" which appeared in the Star of May 3.—The author of this answer and of the "Regulations" is Alexander Smyth, Col. of the 1st Regiment in which Duane was formerly Lieutenant Colonel.]

From the National Intelligencer.

A system of discipline has been prepared by order of the Secretary of War, approved of by the President, ordered to be observed by the army, and submitted to Congress, who alone can prescribe the system of discipline for the militia.

This system is a brief, plain, intelligible imitation of the French system, as settled in 1791, which has remained unaltered by the French government, adapted to the organization, and in some respects to the usages of the army of the United States.

The author of this book tried with his own hand every motion of the manual exercise, as described in the American, French and British systems; tried as an instructor the company drill; tried on the field of exercise, with battalions of eight, and of ten companies, very often, almost every evolution of the French battalion drill, before he wrote the descriptions of them which appear in this work.

A criticism on this work has appeared.—It is not material what the critic's motives were. His objections can be refuted, and it will be done with calmness.

Obj. "The regulations omit altogether what relates to the oblique or cross fires."

Ans. That is very incorrect. "The captain will sometimes 'to the right (or left) oblique' after 'ready,' & before 'aim.'" (p. 29.)

"The instructor will command the fire, direct, oblique, by files, as before." (p. 30.)

Obj. "It is notorious that the order of two ranks is the established organization."

Ans. The order of formation prescribed in Steuben is two ranks: But no military man, whose object is not misrepresentation, will denigrate that "established Organization."

Let us see what the regulations say on this subject.

"The formation by three ranks is deemed the most perfect and effective to oppose disciplined troops.

"Nevertheless as two ranks will be a sufficient depth to oppose to undisciplined enemies, who deal chiefly in fire, the commanding officer will always determine whether the formation shall be in two or three ranks." (Page 48.)

The order of formation in the French armies is three ranks. The order of formation in the British armies is three ranks. Would it be safe to oppose only two Americans to three French or British soldiers?

Obj. "The regulations treat of the regiment of ten companies as forming one battalion."

Ans. The expression is, "A regiment of ten companies will be formed as a single battalion."

In Steuben's system, it is directed that a regiment, reduced in number, shall be formed as a single battalion.

Col. Duane in his military works says, "Every regiment which is reduced below the number of a battalion, may be formed, as a battalion."

The author of the regulations found it necessary to direct in what manner regiments composed of eight, ten, or eighteen companies, should respectively form on parade or for exercise. He was of opinion that eight or ten companies ought not to be broken into two small battalions, with an interval between them, but ought rather to be formed in one body. He therefore directed that regiments of eight or ten companies should form as one battalion without an interval, and that the regiment of eighteen companies should form in two battalions with an interval between them.

The militia battalions of five companies have separate musters, and the regulations direct in what manner, these five companies should be placed. To this the critic has made an objection that is curious and novel.

Obj. "If this battalion of five companies be equally divided, and wheeled upon its right into columns of half wings, or half battalions, there must be a company in each wing separated into two parts."

It is the first time I have heard of a column of "half wings," or "half battalions." Whether this sentence is attributable to ignorance, or a desire to impose on ignorance, I cannot say.

Obj. "Inapplicable, multiplied and unmilitary words of command."

In Mac Donald's translation of the French system, the words of command are rather explanations of the movement, than commands fit to be delivered loud and quick on the field.

The decided superiority of the regulations in words of command, will appear on comparison.

1. Par Prompte manœuvre par le flanc droit.
Res. Prompt manœuvre by the right flank.
Mac. The rear companies will file, in quick time, into the new direction, from the right flank.