

THE MINERVA.

TW & A HALF DOLS. PER AN. Payable half Yearly.

PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

TW DOLLS. PER ANN Payable in Advance.

Vol. 13.

RALEIGH, (N. C.) THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1808.

No. 625.

From the London Courier.

The partizans of America assert that it is the interest of this country to remain at peace with America. It is so; but it is equally the interest of America to remain at peace with us—the interest is mutual, or rather we should be justified in maintaining that it was more the interest of America than Great Britain. But America acts and has long acted towards us as if she thought she behaved with great condescension and favor to us in not taking part against us, as if she thought the advantages of peace were all on our side, and as if in not going to war she consulted a principle of generosity towards us rather than a principle of inclination. Hence she has never failed to manifest discontent, to make complaints, to urge demands which she has conceived we would not refuse, because we would not relinquish the benefits we derived from being at peace with her—Hence she is making continual encroachments, and attempts to get concession from us. It is remarkable that the cry against all the late administration has been, that they manifested too great a disposition to make concessions to America—it was a charge brought against the administration of Pitt—it was a charge which was very generally brought against the late administration—it was a charge which, in the affair of Admiral Berkeley, and in the proclamation against searching neutral ships of war, has even been brought against our present ministers. Whether these were just in the extent to which they are urged, we shall not now enquire, but they prove, at least, that there was no disposition on the part of any administration to behave with harshness or injustice towards America. In proportion however as she discovered a yielding and conciliating disposition on our part, did her avarice and desires increase—acquiescence in one demand, created only fresh demands, and the more moderation we evinced, the more did it fail to produce a corresponding disposition on her part. We have now the proof and demonstration before us, that America is not to be conciliated by concession. The period of concession is past—she has mistaken our moderation for meanness...she has imputed our forbearance to fear...it is high time we should convince her of her error.

A more disingenuous speech than that of Mr. Jefferson's—a speech more unworthy of a statesman—more resembling that of a leader of a party than of the head of a government—more liable to the charge of partiality, of wilful concealment of facts, it were difficult to conceive. We know well enough that Mr. Jefferson has always had a strong attachment to the French, an attachment which all the horrors of the revolution have not impaired; but we never could have supposed that in a grave and solemn exposition of the situation of his country to his own legislature, he would have presumed to have characterised the conduct of France, which has been in the highest degree hostile and haughty to America, as perfectly amicable and friendly, while he represented our conduct and our orders in council, which France has obliged us to adopt, in the most black and warlike point of view.

The period for electing a president of the United States approaches—He may wish to propitiate the democratic party in America, and to prevail upon them to re-elect him to the presidents chair. He may also have directed all his indignation against this country, & kept entirely out of view, the conduct of France from a belief that France may at last oblige us to surrender part of our maritime rights. But has this sapient President no apprehensions that the experiment might be fatal to the interests and independence of his own country, and that should France finally prevail over England, the liberty of America would not long survive. There is another circumstance of which we should suppose Mr. Jefferson cannot be ignorant, that a war with this country must be a war without hope; not only without hope, but with certain destruction to the American commerce! But "perish commerce!" is perhaps the motto of the American President as well as of certain wisacres on this side of the water.—During his residence in France, he became enamored of the doctrines of the economists and Turgotists, and he wishes, probably, to try the experiment of a nation relinquishing foreign commerce, living on the produce of its own territories, and confining itself chiefly to the pursuits of agriculture. If such be his wishes, we know not that he could not have found out a more likely means of realizing them than by going to war with this country.

War with this country, it is scarcely possible to conceal he is not desirous of pov-

ing, by the concealment of every fact which might dispose Congress or the people of America to adopt amicable or pacific measures.—It is utterly improbable that he could have been ignorant, when Congress met, of the disposition and feelings of his majesty's Ministers with respect to the affair of the Chesapeake. It was known to this country about the 26th of July—on the 27th July the subject was alluded to in both Houses of Parliament.—To a question of Mr. Whitbread in the House of Commons, Mr. Perceval, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, replied, that "all he could say that was, is, upon receiving the necessary information, it should appear that there was any thing improper or unjustifiable in the conduct of the officers concerned, there certainly would be every wish on the part of his Majesty's Ministers, to make the fullest reparation the nature of the case would admit of." Mr. Whitbread immediately said, "that he was glad he had asked the information, because the answer he had received from the Right Hon. Gentleman afforded him great consolation."

This declaration of his Majesty's Ministers must have reached America long before October—indeed we have seen it ourselves in the American papers. We have every reason to believe also that Government did transmit a distinct disavowal of the affair; and we are confident too that Mr. Jefferson was informed of the fact that our government did not claim the right of searching neutral ships of war.

But what was the conduct of Mr. Jefferson? In the first heat and fury of the populace, he publishes a proclamation, in which he aggravates the popular indignation by the following expressions.—"That no circumstances might be wanting to mark its character (the affair of the Chesapeake) it had been previously ascertained, that the seamen demanded were native citizens of the United States." This assertion he made use of without having instituted the necessary enquiries, because it was proved afterwards on the trial of the seamen that they were British subjects; and this, Mr. Jefferson tacitly admits, by abandoning the ground he had taken in his proclamation, and speaking of the men simply as part of the crew of the Chesapeake. This hasty and eager adoption of every thing calculated to rouse the American public against this country, is a sufficient proof of Mr. Jefferson's temper and inclination towards us.

How different in his disposition and language towards France...All the vexations, the insults and the injustice practised by her towards the trade of America, he keeps entirely out of sight...he acts as counsel for France against England and the head of a government bound by the solemn duties of his office to make a clear, explicit & impartial exposition to his country, describes the relative situation of America and France, of France, who to his knowledge has captured American ships & declared that America should not carry on any trade with G. B. in the following terms:—"With the other nations of Europe (meaning to include France) our harmony has been uninterrupted, and commerce and friendly intercourse have been maintained on their usual footing!!"

After the facts we have thus produced, and the comments we have submitted upon them, is there a man in this country who will feel any difficulty in forming this opinion...that no solid peace can be expected to exist between Great Britain and the United States of America, so long as Mr. JEFFERSON continues at the head of the American government.

Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Debate on the passage of the bill in addition to an act entitled "An act supplementary to an act, entitled "An act laying an EMBARGO, &c."

MONDAY, February 29.

The bill having been read the third time, Mr. LIVERMORE said it would be recollected that he had not in the course of the various discussions on this bill troubled the House with many observations, though he had avowed his intention to oppose the bill, and offered reasons why it ought not to pass. I shall not now, said he, go fully into a discussion of what has been conceived the policy of the original embargo law, because a refusal to pass this will not do away the ill effects of that law; but as I conceive this to be a tissue of the

same evil, it is my bounden duty to offer my objections to its passage.

This act is not, I conceive, founded on the message of the President of the United States or the reasons therein given for passing the embargo law. If I understood the reasons, they were different from what must be carried into effect by the passage of this law. It was therein said that such was our situation that if our vessels were suffered to depart from our harbors they would be liable to capture & our citizens would lose their property. This I understood to be the reason for passing the embargo law, although I did not conceive it well founded, and endeavored with all my powers to combat it. Although those reasons should have been well founded, the same reasons do not exist for carrying into effect the present law, which contemplates nothing more than to prevent the citizens of the United States from carrying on the small remnant of commerce which is saved from the fangs of the embargo. It is not rescuing our ships from capture, but preventing our citizens who live in situations from which they might carry on their commerce with success, from selling to their neighbors their produce and receiving from them those articles which they need. The operation of this law will be confined to the frontier states; to Georgia and Vermont and the Eastern part of Massachusetts. The utmost therefore in which the law is to operate in these states, is to prevent the people, living on the borders from carrying their produce into Canada, Nova Scotia or Florida— from carrying on commerce for what they conceive to be for their benefit. There certainly can be nothing in the reasons assigned for the imposition of an embargo in the first instance which can operate in favor of the passage of this law. There is no danger that this produce would be liable to capture. What then is the motive for this bill? To bring some foreign nation to terms, we are told. Now let us consider whether preventing this trade can possibly have this effect—whether preventing the people of Vermont or Georgia from carrying their produce to Canada or Florida are means of bringing nations to a disposition to "do us justice."

Take the case of Great Britain for instance. If the king of Great Britain has seen cause to issue a proclamation to prevent trade to France and her dependencies, is it possible that the prohibition contained in this law can have any effect to induce him to repeal it? The very supposition is absurd. There is nothing in it. If we can, by inhibiting this small trade do ourselves an essential injury, we do not affect any other power. Can it operate on France? Certainly not. Upon what nation then can it operate? There really appears to be nothing in the supposed operation of this law on any foreign nation, and this act is supported by a kind of enthusiasm not founded in reason. Reason has no agency in it; it is pushed on with a kind of fervor which may be creditable to those professing it. There seems to be a kind of magic in the business. Our country is in a critical state; we are almost at war with all the nations of the earth; and therefore it seems that gentlemen are willing to prevent this small trade from being beneficial to the people who will be affected, and which can do no injury whatever to the United States.

I conceive that there has prevailed in this House a false sentiment with respect to commerce. I have observed with pain the sentiments expressed in the House; indeed I have heard gentlemen whose reputations stand as high as any in this body, declare that commerce is inimical to agriculture; that agriculture is beneficial, and commerce injurious; as if there actually existed a warfare between the two. The fact is the reverse; and I will lay down this broad position and endeavor to prove it, that agriculture is of little or no service to mankind without commerce; that they go hand and hand, and without the existence of both, that neither would be of much service. I wish gentlemen candidly to examine, and see whether there be not truth in the position; that commerce of so much service to agriculture, that agriculture is of little service without it.

What is commerce? The exchange of one article for another; the exchange of a superfluous article for one which we stand in need of. It is absolutely necessary for our very existence, not as relates to mere animal life, but to our existence with convenience. Society is founded on it.

It is supposed by some that agriculture can exist without commerce. Take a case by way of illustration, and I believe it would run with

the same propriety through every situation in life. Take the case of a planter, a Virginian if you chuse, possessed of immense wealth, of the means of cultivating his lands which produce abundantly. Take a journal of the gentleman's life for a single day, and see what is his situation. In the morning he rises from his couch, and clothes himself in the manufactures of Britain, or perhaps of other countries. The instant he rises, then he avails himself of the conveniences of commerce. Sitting down to his breakfast he makes use of the productions of East or West India; he walks upon the fabric of Turkey or Persia; the very wood of which his furniture is constructed is brought from the shores of the Carribean sea, and the mirror in which he adjusts his cravat of East India manufacture, is the production of the European artist; the very handles of his knives are procured from a sea monster found on the banks of St. Laurence and coast of Labrador, and the very blades are the manufacture of England, from the mines of Russia or Sweden. He seems to ransack the whole world, both earth and sea for his conveniences. His food would be insipid if not seasoned with the spices of India; his drink is from the plains of Champagne, Burgundy or the African islands; in the evening his very candlesticks are from the mines of Mexico or Peru, and the candles with which he lights his room, are taken from the head of a sea monster, an inhabitant of the Arctic circles. If he be sick, he derives medicine from Turkey, Asia, or the interior of South America. What will he do for all these if commerce be obstructed? He cannot procure them from the product of his land: he is more than mortal if he can do this. Whence then? From commerce alone, on which he depends not only for his luxuries and conveniences, but also his necessities. Take the same gentleman and strip him of the benefits of commerce, and see what is his character. In the first place it is true that his oxen cover the hills, and the sheep bleat in his pastures; he may eat the flesh, but cannot preserve it from day to day: Let him take their fleece if he can, and convert it into cloathing. An inhabitant of Kamshatka, or an Osage Indian would look more like a civilized being than would this man, clothed in a dress of his own manufacture. Those gentlemen who talk of retiring within their own shell, are egregiously mistaken in their calculations, nature has not given them like a tortoise a shell to retire into. Take commerce away from them, and let them raise their hundreds or thousands of hogsheads of tobacco; let their cotton fill their stores, what is it to them? Nothing. It is all of no benefit whatever, except we have commerce. It is astonishing to hear gentlemen advance the sentiment that by agriculture we have all the conveniences of life, without the aid of commerce. I have heard a gentleman in this House rise and say that he would never trust commercial men with power. That gentleman knows nothing of commercial men. I can aver, that having some knowledge of them, I view them as the most honorable, the most benevolent, and in every respect the most important class of men in society. There is no character which can be exhibited in a more honorable and serviceable point of view than the real merchant. I might go farther than I have gone in considering commerce as necessary for the support of agriculture: why the very tools necessary to work the materials into a convenient dwelling or habitation must be brought by commerce. Could the gentleman live in a mere hut throw up of logs, or perhaps burrow in the ground like a Kamshatka? I wish the gentleman seriously to consider this, and when he does he will see the bearing of this argument against the embargo, which is an axe laid to the very root of commerce. How long it will continue or what shape it will assume I know not. But not intending to discuss the original measure I will confine myself to the question before the House. Notwithstanding the embargo, those citizens who live on the borders of foreign territories have carried on a trade with their neighbors, selling their superfluous produce to them. It is to prevent traffic of this kind that the bill now on its passage is intended. If the bill does not pass, although commerce will not exist in a flourishing state, it will not be entirely shackled as respects these people. I therefore contend against it, and not only declare the act unnecessary, but cruel and oppressive.

I would wish to draw the attention of gentlemen who come from the tobacco and cotton country, or where these articles are cultivated for exportation, and bring such immense riches to their constituents. It is said that