



AND

North-Carolina State Gazette.

There are the plans of fair, delightful peace,
Unwarped by party rage, to live like Brothers.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1809.

447.

V. L. X.

COMMON COUNCIL OF LONDON.

In our last were given the very spirited Resolutions of this distinguished and influential body of men, on receiving the answer of his Majesty's Ministers to their late address to the King on the subject of the late Portuguese Convention. The Lord Mayor and Common Council seem to have seized this occasion to express their indignant feelings at the conduct of their Government. From these, and other proceedings, it is manifest that the present Ministry are despised and execrated by the People, & cannot long sustain their unjustifiable course. As a further evidence of the temper of this meeting of the first citizens of the Metropolis of Britain, we give the following Speech of Mr. Quin, on the occasion. It is a remarkable fact, that there were only three dissenting voices to the passage of the Resolutions.

Mr. QUIN rose and seconded the motion. "My Lord," said he, "I rise in support of the motion which has been made, and I am inclined to do so in a manner that will do away all prejudice in regard to me as a representative of London. We are called upon to decide upon a question, in which not only the dignity, the consistency and honor of the city of London, but of the whole country, are involved. I am a friend to the Ministers in several of their foreign measures. I, however, upon this occasion, avowedly lay aside all ministerial prejudice. I say we are bound to consider this answer as coming from the Ministers and not from his Majesty; for it is a well known principle in the British Constitution, that the King, as chief magistrate, can do no wrong, his right being conferred upon him solely for the public good. Upon these grounds, therefore I consider the answer was given to our address as the answer of his Majesty's advisers, of the noble Lord (Hawkesbury) from whose mouth it was read. It was a proud day for this court, and for the whole country, that called forth an address which told his Majesty such undoubted truths; and the answer to it is such as ought to be received not with sorrow, but with disdain and contempt. I see that acting as a body representing the city of London, we have a great and noble cause to support—he right of the people to address and petition the sovereign. It was unnecessary for Lord Hawkesbury, if he be at all acquainted with the nature of the British constitution, to tell the citizens of London, that it was inconsistent with British justice to pronounce judgment before trial. It was such a truism, that I would have thought that noble Lord was dreaming when he dictated such expressions. If such an answer should be read by posterity, uncoupled with the address, it may be thought that the citizens of London were so foolish and so ignorant of the constitution and of law and justice, as to have gone up in a body to call upon his Majesty to pronounce judgment upon persons without trial. Such an answer might merely have originated from our pronouncing our sentiments so strongly as in a manner to anticipate the judgment that was to follow an enquiry, and this supposition is confirmed by the concluding paragraph of that answer, which says that "this expenditure has disappointed the hopes and expectations of the country." The recent occurrences alluded to, must have been such as involved the honor of his Majesty's arms and the character of the nation; they must be the cases of Whitlock and Calder, which are well known; the latter a meritorious and gallant officer, sunk and degraded to the utmost misery, for having gained a victory; while the former, who suffered a disgraceful defeat, has been allowed to go into a splendid retirement. Had Lord Hawkesbury recalled to his recollection the occurrences of the last 16 years, he would have found no occasion to forget such truisms. Did he not recollect the retreat from Dunkirk, and his own march to Paris? It is truly remarkable, that a man who has so many opportunities of knowing and combining facts, should not consult his own heart, and ask himself whether there ought not to have been enquiries into these transactions? The retreat from Dunkirk was conducted by a Royal Duke, com-

manding 40,000 men, who had no sooner landed than he found there was not sufficient artillery, that the balls did not fit the cannon, and therefore he could not enter upon the intended siege, in consequence of which the enemy gained a signal victory. That was surely a case which called loudly for enquiry, and how came it to pass that there was none? We come now to the evacuation of Holland; and we find the same Royal Duke allowing his troops to march under the most unexampled disasters, which, if prudent measures and precautions had been adopted, might have been avoided; but during all that time the Royal Duke was himself in London. I next come to the attack upon the Helder where our troops were sent as it were, to the slaughter, without a commander in chief. The nation was upon that occasion much indebted to one man, the gallant Abercrombie, whose memory will ever be embalmed in the recollection of posterity. Do these cases afford any thing like evidence of a proper system of warfare prevailing in the country? And yet no investigation took place. But above all, I would ask, why there was no enquiry as to Ferret? Although our army be equally well instructed and disciplined as our seamen, yet there is always something to tarnish the British arms, owing to the egregious mismanagement prevailing in our military system, and such private enquiries as only tend to stamp our name with infamy. I come now to what is called the interposition of the city of London—an expression which only tends to make the people a kind of fool between Ministers and his Majesty, and to create a barrier between the people and their sovereign. Besides the city of London, various other places have been guilty of this interposition. The city of Westminster has also interposed; and tomorrow the county of Essex will be guilty of a similar interposition.—There was certainly something like a form of words used in times not very favorable to British liberty.—Such was to be found in the next extraordinary answer of James Fox, in 1621, when his Parliament addressed him upon his abandoning the Protestants, and he told them he wished for no interposition unless he was willing previously to desire it. So much then for the word interposition. There were some men, so married, as it were, to prerogative, that they even seemed to feel respect for despotism, as a guardian of liberty. These men tell us not to look at one of our ancient charters, *Magna Charta*, nor the Bill of Rights. I have only, however, to refer to a plain act of Parliament, the first of King William, ch. 2, where it will be found, that the subject is empowered, at all times, to petition his sovereign, and that there shall be no impediment to the exercise of it in a fair and manly way. If this act be not attended to, we shall run the risk of being treated in the same manner as the courtiers of Russia are treated. It will be found that in that country, no subject, however high his rank, or exalted his blood, can send a petition to the throne, unless it be first presented to a minister of state.—If rejected by one minister, he may present it to another, and if again rejected, he may, if he chuse, venture to present a petition to his majesty, but he does it under the pain of forfeiting his life. I will not insult the court by allying the times of Henry and Elizabeth, they had a precedent before them, and but little remains of British spirit to control them: yet even their answers to addresses and petitions were much more satisfactory than the present repulsive one of Lord Hawkesbury. The city of London addressed Charles II, at the time he was taking violent measures, and struggling with difficulties. They told him many truths, one particularly that he had done wrong in going to seize some of the members of the House of Commons, and that he ought not to send any more persons to the tower. His answer was much more respectful than this one, considering the peculiarities of the times, when he was supported by

every tyrannical principle. It is now, therefore, high time for you to make a stand to preserve your rights, and to banish the vile system of congratulation and flattery. You have used plain language, which has been treated with contempt by ministers, who have thereby rendered themselves contemptible. You are permitted to pour forth congratulations to the throne, and to send these syllabubs and jargon, but when you venture to send up a dish of good English roast beef, they may cut, but they never desire to "come again." Mr. Quin then read a passage from some of the letters of the late Oliver Goldsmith, expressive of the utmost contempt for congratulatory addresses and flattery; and concluded an impressive and eloquent speech by giving his hearty concurrence in the motion as first proposed.

Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Friday, Dec. 30.

Mr. Quincy presented a memorial from a number of mariners, and 67 masters and mates of vessels at Portland, stating that they had not earned a single dollar in ten months, and had been on short allowance great part of that time; and praying employment or assistance. Referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

The following message was received from the President of the U. States.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the U. States.

At the request of the Governor, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I communicate certain resolutions entered into by the said Senate and House of Representatives, approved by the Governor on the 23d inst. It cannot but be encouraging to those whom the nation has placed in the direction of their affairs, to see that their fellow citizens will press forward in support of their country, in proportion as it is threatened by the disorganizing conflicts of the other hemisphere.

TH: JEFFERSON.

December 30, 1808

THOMAS JEFFERSON, Esq.
Sir: In compliance with a resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, passed this day, I have the honor of transmitting to you certain resolutions with a request that you will lay them before the Congress of the United States.

Accept assurances of high consideration and esteem,
SIMON SNYDER.

Lancaster, Dec. 23, 1808.

WHEREAS the situation of the U. S. in relation to foreign powers, is eminently critical, and calls for all their energies, unanimity and patriotism to preserve those rights and that independence for which our fathers fought and conquered: And whereas, in such times, it is the duty of the constituted authorities, to aid the common cause of our country, by declaring anew the devotion to the principles of the declaration of independence. Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, That we have the fullest confidence in the wisdom, the patriotism and the integrity of the administration of the general government, and we pledge ourselves to operate with them to the utmost extent of our power in all measures which may be deemed expedient to maintain our national honor and national rights.

Resolved, That we consider the embargo as a wise, pacific and patriotic measure, called for by the best interests of the nation, and well calculated to induce an observance of our national rights, without a resort to the horrors and desolations so repugnant to the feelings of humanity and the principles of a free government.

Resolved, That as the ocean is the common highway of nations, and as this Commonwealth is deeply interested in the preservation of its freedom, should those painful measures not produce the desired effect, we are firmly determined to unite our efforts to those of the general government in the maintenance of its rights.

Resolved, That the governor of this Commonwealth be requested to forward copies of the foregoing resolutions to the President of the U. S. with a request that they may be communicated by him to the Congress of the U. S. (Signed,) &c.

The message was ordered to be printed.

The following message was also received from the President of the U. States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the U. States.

I lay before the Legislature a letter from Governor Claiborne, on the subject of a small tribe of Alabama Indians in the Western side of the Mississippi, consisting of about a dozen families. Like other erratic tribes in that country, it is understood that

they have hitherto moved from place to place, according to their convenience, without appropriating to themselves exclusively any particular territory; but having now become habituated to some of the occupations of civilized life, they wish for a fixed residence. I suppose it will be the interest of the U. S. to encourage the wandering tribes of that country to reduce themselves to fixed habitations, whenever they are so disposed. The establishment of towns and growing attachment to them, will furnish in some degree pledges of their peaceable and friendly conduct. The case of this particular tribe is now submitted to the consideration of Congress.

TH: JEFFERSON.

Dec. 30, 1808.

Saturday, Dec. 31.

Mr. Macon presented to the House a copy of certain resolutions (heretofore inserted in this paper) adopted by the General Assembly of North-Carolina, approving the measures of the government, and pledging themselves to support them with their lives and fortunes.

Mr. Rhea (Tennessee) offered the following resolution, which was referred to the committee of the whole to which the non-importation bill is referred:

Resolved, That it is expedient to interdict by law, all commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain and France, and their dependencies, and all other powers having in force orders or decrees violating the lawful commerce and neutral rights of the United States.

The House took up for consideration the amendment of the Senate to the bill respecting revenue cutters, for striking out *twelve* and inserting *three*. After some observations from Messrs. Newton, Taylor and Story, the House refused to concur—Ayes 76. The Senate afterwards receded.

Mr. Nelson observed that this was the last day of the year 1808. For many years past our old soldiers had been applying for relief. He thought it would be a meritorious thing to begin the new year with a just and generous act. He therefore asked for the order of the day on the bill for the relief of the infirm, disabled and superannuated officers and soldiers of the revolutionary army and of the present army of the United States.

[This bill it will be recollected contemplates the establishment of an invalid corps.]

The bill was taken up, went through a committee of the whole without an objection, and was reported to the House by the chairman.

Several amendments were then made to the bill.

After considerable discussion on the details; in which no hostility appeared to be expressed to the principles of the bill, a motion made by Mr. Blount to recommit it, for the purpose of adjusting the details, was carried 58 to 25.

Mr. Dana, from a select committee, to whom was referred a resolution on the subject of our navigation laws, reported a bill concerning associations, for the security of navigation.

Adjourned to Tuesday.

Tuesday, Jan. 3.

Mr. Macon from the committee on so much of the message of the President of the U. S. as relates to the amendment of the militia laws of the U. S. reported that having carefully examined the system they are of opinion that no amendment is necessary.

The House having agreed to consider the report.

Mr. Macon observed that he had not concurred in opinion with the committee, and therefore intended to make a motion to commit the report with special instructions to report a bill for classing and arming the militia. If the report were to be agreed to, it would foreclose any proposition on the subject during the session. The plan which he would propose for classing the militia would not go to destroy the present organization of the militia; but merely to class them according to age, so that young men should first be called into service. It was a rare thing that old men and young men accorded well together. Old men could not bear fatigue as well as young men. He wished not to see fathers & their sons in the ranks together. He believed that were such a plan to be adopted, from thirty to forty thousand men would an-

nually be added to the lists; the arming of whom would cost from four to five hundred thousand dollars annually. In the course of four or five years all the men in the first class would be armed for duty, and be competent to repel any enemy. It was the only mode which united great utility with great economy. He had before him a statement made at the last year by a gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Clay.) The observations of that gentleman, he said, were well remembered by the House, and he could add nothing to them. They proved that a large corps would always be ready for service, and that the number would daily increase. Having premised thus much he offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the report, &c. be referred to the select committee and that they be instructed to report a bill to class the militia according to age, and to provide for arming such as may hereafter be placed on the militia list at the public expense.

Mr. D. R. Williams hoped no objection would be made to this resolution; for its adoption would commit no gentleman on the principle involved in it.

Mr. Desha wished a division of the resolution, as he was opposed to the first add in favor of the second clause.

A motion was made to refer the report to a committee of the whole and carried. Some debate took place on this motion, in which Messrs. Lyon, Macon, Nelson and Clay, appeared to be in favor of the principle, and Messrs. Sturges, Durrell and Tallmadge against it.

On motion of Mr. Jackson, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the bill from the Senate for enforcing and making more effectual the several embargo laws, with the amendments reported by a select committee of this House.

The amendments reported by the select committee were severally agreed to.

Mr. Van Cortlandt, after a few prefatory observations, expressive of an opinion that the embargo should be repealed as soon as could be consistently with the passing other acts, and giving equal notice to all our merchants, offered the following as a new section to the bill:

"And be it further enacted, that the said act entitled 'an act laying an embargo on all ships and vessels within the ports and harbors of the United States,' and the several acts supplementary thereto, be repealed from and after the 4th day of March next."

The Chairman observed, that although he individually believed this motion to be in order, the House had twice successively decided a similar proposition to be out of order the other day, because the subject was already before a special committee of the whole; and he felt himself bound to abide by their decision.

Mr. Gardenier appealed from the decision of the chair.

The committee confirmed the decision of the chair.

A motion was made by Mr. Elliot that the committee rise and report progress—Negatived.

Mr. Jackson moved that the committee rise and report the bill as amended.

Mr. Elliot entered upon a continuation of his speech which he commenced a few days ago. After Mr. Elliot had spoken about five minutes, it appearing that a quorum was not present—

Mr. Dana suggested the propriety of the committee's rising and reporting "that there was no quorum."

Mr. Macon had no wish to sit here whilst gentlemen were gone to their dinners; and moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. Mosely said it was an old maxim that "dulce et decorum est pro patria mori;" but he had no idea of starving to death for it.

The committee rose, and the House adjourned.

Wednesday, January 4.

Mr. Newton offered a resolution, directing the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures to enquire into the propriety of providing for the relief of distressed and disabled seamen. Mr. Newton stated that