

THE TRUE REPUBLICAN, OR AMERICAN WHIG.

"THE TRUTH OUR GUIDE—THE PUBLIC GOOD OUR END"

Vol. I.

WILMINGTON, (N. C.) TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1809.

No. 3.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES. EMBARGO DEBATE.

MR GILES' SPEECH, (Continued.)

The next article I shall mention is Tobacco.—What says the Liverpool merchants respecting this article?—“During the last month Tobacco has experienced some fluctuation, and sales have been made at prices under those quoted; but some considerable orders having appeared for export, the market has again settled at these rates, and if any opening to the continent of Europe, through the medium of Holland, should be found, an advance may be expected: on the contrary, if we have only our home consumption to depend upon, little alteration can take place until the sentiments of the American government be known at the meeting of congress in November next.”

It is admitted that Tobacco is not an article of the first necessity, it is however material to the manufacturer, and highly important to the revenue.

Naval stores are, also, certainly entitled to some consideration, although some supply of those articles is now furnished from Sweden.

I have selected these articles as specimens of the intimacy and importance of the commercial connection between the United States and Great Britain; and to demonstrate, that it cannot be withdrawn on our part without essentially affecting her interests. Again, Sir, what effect will this recession of intercourse have upon the revenue of that country?—I shall make no minute estimate, but it will certainly have an effect which cannot be disregarded; and the rather when it is recollected, that G. Britain has imposed an export duty of 4 per cent upon her goods sent to the United States, which produces to her, an annual revenue of about 600,000, probably much more: and that this is a discriminating duty against the United States, which ought to have been repelled the moment it was laid; & especially, as it was avowed, that it was imposed upon the United States with a view of placing them on the same footing with the British colonies.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lloyd) tells us, even suppose that your embargo laws drive fifty thousand, or more, manufacturers from their employment in Great Britain, it will only add to her naval and military strength. It would only give her fifty thousand seamen or soldiers more than she now has. This, Sir, is an unfortunate specimen of the profanity, which Great Britain is supposed to derive from the embargo laws. If I am rightly informed, generally, and particularly yesterday, by the learned gentleman from New York, (Mr. Mitchell) of the materials of which the manufacturers consist, I am disposed to think they would make poor seamen, and sorry soldiers. I do not think they would have much to fear from their prowess. They are fit for manufacturers, and nothing else; and if driven from their habitual employments, they must starve, or become a charge upon the nation. But Sir, the conversion of fifty thousand productive, into fifty thousand unproductive, and even expensive laborers, could not contribute much to the wealth or power of any nation; and such an operation in Great Britain, where the poor rates are sufficiently high already, would command the serious attention of the government.

There is something essential to the physical power of a nation, besides the numbers of seamen and soldiers. It is money—it is revenue. This operation upon labor, could not be productive of revenue, but would be an enormous charge upon it. I am therefore inclined to think that the British cabinet would not feel any great obligation to the gentleman for his inge-

nious discovery. All these considerations must present strong inducements to Great Britain to revoke her hostile orders; but she has hitherto refused to do so.

Let a candid inquiry be now made into the actual causes of this refusal. The gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lloyd) informs us, that the British cabinet showed some solicitude about the embargo laws, till some time between the 22d of June and the 29th of July last within which time information flowed in upon them, which relieved them from this solicitude, and reconciled them to the embargo. (Mr. Lloyd rose to explain. He said he referred to the months of June and July, without mentioning any particular days of those months.) I admit that the gentleman did not mention the particular days; I took the particular days for greater precision, from the correspondence between Mr. Pinckney and Mr. Madison, from which I presume the gentleman had drawn his information.

What was the information that flowed in upon the British cabinet, from the 22d June to the 29th of July? That period announced two events. First, the wonderful revolution in Spain; although this event must have been pretty well understood in London before even the 22d June, perhaps not to its full extent. The other event was, the paitry attempt at the resistance of the embargo laws in Vermont, magnified into a formidable insurrection against the government; and the unhappy discontents manifested in Boston and its neighbourhood together with the results of the elections in Massachusetts. All these circumstances were certainly greatly exaggerated, or perhaps utterly misrepresented. Here, then, Sir, we clearly discern the real causes of the refusal of the British cabinet to meet the just and honorable proposition of the United States, and to revoke their orders in council. The Spanish revolution, no doubt contributed to their determination; but the principal cause, was our own divisions and discontents, either wholly misrepresented or highly exaggerated.

Before the 22d June, Mr. Pinckney & Mr. Canning were engaged in the most informal and friendly communications: Mr. Canning had gone so far as to intimate to Mr. Pinckney, that he might in a few days expect to be able to communicate to his government, some agreeable intelligence, evidently meaning either the revocation or relaxation of the hostile orders. —But unfortunately, shortly after the 22d June, the packet arrived with the flood of disgraceful information from the United States. Immediately after the receipt of this information, or rather misinformation, Mr. Canning changes his conduct. All informal conferences with Mr. Pinckney are denied, and a formal note demanded, in reply to which, the note of refusal was returned, marked, as we have seen, with indignity and insult to the U. States.

Now, Sir, let me ask, whether these facts do not demonstrate, that the continuation of the hostile orders is principally, if not solely, owing to the dishonorable divisions and discontents in this country, and the exaggerated accounts given of them to the British government? That events in Spain alone, however intoxicating to the British cabinet, were not, of themselves, sufficient to produce this effect; because they were known before the change in Mr. Canning's conduct took place, and had not produced that effect. But, the moment the extravagant accounts of the discontents and divisions in this country were received, was the moment of change in Mr. Canning's conduct, and therefore, must be considered as the real cause that produced it. Besides, Sir, was not this change of conduct the natural effect of this disgraceful information? When Mr. Canning was informed that the people of the United States had become false

to themselves, had refused to bear the necessary privations, imposed by the government, and, in fact, separated themselves from their own government—that they would elect persons to office, who would voluntarily yield obedience to Mr. Canning's orders—what inducement could he have for their revocation? If obedience and submission were gratuitously tendered by the people of the United States, he had certainly nothing to do but graciously to accept them; and his note affords full evidence of this impression on his mind. The refusal of the British government, to revoke their hostile orders, therefore, appears not to have been founded upon a calculation of its interests upon correct information; but upon a miscalculation of its interests upon misinformation. How much, then, is it to be lamented, Mr. President, that our sufferings and privations should be continued, by the discontents, which were intended to remedy them? How can the authors of these discontents, reconcile their conduct to the nation, or to their own consciences? What compensation or atonement can they ever hope to make to the people for the protractedness of their privations and suffering? What, for the disgrace brought upon the nation? What, for all the horrors and calamities of war, which may, and probably will be, the consequences of such conduct? Let the situated authors of it answer these questions. Ages of services cannot atone for these cruel, these unfortunate errors.

It is asked, Sir, how do the embargo laws operate on France? It is readily admitted, that the commercial connection between the United States and France is not of such a nature as to make a suspension of it operate as injuriously to France herself, particularly in the interior, as on Great Britain.—But our commerce cannot be deemed unimportant to France in the feeble state of her navy. At the time too, of laying the embargo Spain, Portugal, and Holland, were in alliance with, or in subjection to France.—Its pressure was materially felt by Spain and Portugal from their want of provisions; and it is questionable, how far that measure contributed to the convention for the evacuation of Portugal by the French army.—The want of provisions being one ground alledged for their late convention for that purpose.

The French West India islands too, have felt the pressure with great severity.—They are at this moment in a state of blockade. There were probably two objects in this blockade.—The one to reduce the French islands for want of provisions.—The other, to seize upon our merchant ships, which it was presumed would hasten thither immediately upon raising the embargo. And it appeared, extremely well timed to effect the object, if Congress upon their first meeting, had been weak or pusillanimous enough to have raised it. The loss of these islands, would be severely felt by the French emperor, and would probably produce some regret on his part, in having contributed to drive the United States to the extremity of the embargo laws.

But, Sir, gentlemen are very much alarmed at an expression in a late French expose.—They have made some general allusions to it, but in too vague a manner, as not to be understood with precision. As I am always fond of a correct statement of facts, I will read the expression probably alluded to. “The Americans, a people who involve their fortunes, their property, and almost their existence in commerce, have given an example of a great and courageous sacrifice. They have suspended by a general embargo, all commerce and all navigation, rather than ungraciously submit to that tribute, which the English impose on the navigation of all nations.”—I cannot conceive the importance attached to this expression, or the view with which it was introduced. It is to be remarked that this is the character given to

his measure throughout all Europe, and by none more loudly and decisively than by the federal American merchants now in Great Britain.

It is only on this side of the Atlantic, that we hear it described as a weak or a wicked measure. But what of all this, Sir? Will this French expression change the real character of the measure? Shall we change our own opinions of the true character of the measure because the French government officiously undertakes to judge for us? Sir, to me it is perfectly indifferent, what the French government thinks upon the subject. I shall take the liberty of exercising my own judgment upon it, perfectly exempt from any extraneous influence whatever.

Mr. Canning, Sir, has also undertaken to say something respecting the character of the embargo laws. Let us hear what he says upon the subject.

“If considered as a measure of impartial hostility against both belligerents, the embargo appears to his majesty, to have been manifestly unjust, as according to every principle of justice, that redress ought to have been first sought from the party originating the wrong. And his majesty cannot consent to buy off that hostility, which America ought not to have extended to him, at the expense of a concession made, not to America, but to France.”

If, as it has more generally been represented by the government of the United States, the embargo is only to be considered as an innocent, municipal regulation, which effects none but the United States themselves, and with which no foreign state has any concern; viewed in this light, his majesty does not conceive that he has the right or the pretension to make any complaint of it; and he has made none.

“His majesty would not hesitate to contribute in any manner in his power to restore to the commerce of the U. States, its wonted activity; and if it were possible to make any sacrifice for the repeal of the embargo, without appearing to deprecate it as a measure of hostility, he would gladly have facilitated its removal as a measure of inconvenient restriction upon the American people.”

Let me now ask you, Mr. President, what feelings must rush themselves into your bosom, upon hearing this last, this arrogant insinuation? What must be the feelings of every war worn veteran, who has so long enjoyed the pleasing consciousness of having been instrumental in achieving his country's independence? What must be the feelings of every young American who has not barely degenerated from his father's virtues? Do you not see, Sir, in this sentence almost a direct overture of the interference of his most gracious majesty in our political concerns? Do you not see the vain and idle effort to encourage discontents by the expression of his majesty's good disposition to interpose his good offices to relieve the American people from the inconvenient restrictions imposed on them by their own government? What indignity, what insult could be greater upon the American people? What could more clearly demonstrate the insatiation, the intoxication of Mr. Canning's mind, produced by the unfortunate flood of misrepresentation which had poured in upon him? The American people will repel the overture with indignation, with disdain;—and, Sir, as a sure and pleasing anticipation of this refusal, I rejoiced to see the indignant resentment manifested by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. White.) It was the more honorable to him, Sir, because it was the triumph of his American feelings over a host of prejudices with which I fear we