



AND North-Carolina State Gazette.

Thursdays are the plans of fair delightful peace, Unwary'd by party rage, to live like Brothers.

VOL. X.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1809.

No. 498

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. GILES, IN THE Senate of the United States, On the 13th February, 1809, in support of the following Resolution, moved by him on the 5th of the same month.

Resolved, That the several laws laying an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports and harbors of the United States, be repealed on the 4th day of March next, except as to Great-Britain and France, and their dependencies; and that provision be made by law for prohibiting all commercial intercourse with these nations and their dependencies, and the importation of any article into the United States, the growth, produce, or manufacture of either of the said nations, or of the dominions of either of them.

(Concluded.)

Permit me now, Sir, to select another act of this energetic administration towards the United States for a few animadversions. I mean, Sir, their interfering in our political concerns in many respects, but particularly by holding out inducements to our citizens to violate our laws; and by an appealing to the people against their own government by some invisible agency. I allude, Sir, to the order issued shortly after the passing of our embargo laws, for receiving vessels which should violate those laws, even without the customary papers; and to the publication of Mr. Canning's letter addressed to Mr. Pickens on the 23d of September last, in one of the newspapers printed in Boston.

I consider both these acts as highly insulting to the American people and government; and they ought to have been repelled with indignation. I would have justified hostility to us if, Sir, in issuing this order the British ministry appears to me to have set a dangerous example to other nations, particularly to the United States, because the United States might retort her favorite retaliatory system upon herself. Suppose, Sir, immediately upon the receipt of that order in the country, the U. States had retorted by passing a law holding out inducements to British seamen to desert from their ships, and to afford them protection, and even to promise them protection and rewards upon bringing in the ships themselves; do you think, Sir, that Great-Britain would have been altogether free from apprehensions as to the effects of such a retaliatory measure? The British fleet, Sir, is extremely formidable to the government, the floating dungeons and severe discipline not always palatable to the seamen. They have several times been very much out of humor, and it is impossible to foresee the consequences of the inducements the United States have in their power to offer to the disaffected. But, Sir, this subject presents another consideration on my mind. In the year 1793, Great-Britain entered into the war against France solely upon the ground of resisting the spirit of disorganization which it was alleged France was introducing into all nations. It was for the alleged act of separating the people from their government. Now, Sir, how is Great-Britain likely to wind up the war? Why, Sir, she seems now to have become the champion of the very system, against which she originally entered into the war. She now seems to have become the common disturber of the peace of all nations. Surely, Sir, the British nation or parliament never can, upon cool reflection, approve of this profligate act of its ministry.

Let me now, Sir, implore your most serious attention to the publication of Mr. Canning's letter in the Boston newspaper. The time and circumstances attending its publication aggravate the act. It was an unpardonable insult, and ought to be repelled with indignation; particularly insulting was it to those for whose use it was more immediately intended. Is it possible that the British parliament or nation can justify this act of abandoned profligacy? In the cases of Genet, Yrujo, &c. their ministerial functions were suspended. Their recall was immediately requested and complied with. In those cases the authors were owned; in this he is concealed. The publication is conducted or directed by an invisible hand; but, Sir, the act is

not the less dishonorable nor reprehensible on that account.

No, Sir, the author skulking from public view, stamps the character of the transaction with peculiar disgrace. Insults of this kind, Sir, have been practised upon the British government and nation. Let us see how insults of this nature were received and treated by that government and nation. Several cases of this nature have occurred in Great-Britain, but I will select one in point which occurred in the time of George the 1st, in the year 1727. It will be found recorded in Belsham's memoirs of George the 1st, pages 192, 193, and in the proceedings of parliament of that day, in reference to that subject. These I have examined and find them still more pointed than the historical account of them, particularly the resolutions of the house of commons, which are highly worthy of imitation: they are contained in a very large book, and I therefore declined bringing it to the Senate. The case was, Sir, that the Imperial resident at the court of London, Count de Palm, was instructed by his government to present to his Britannic Majesty a strong and pointed memorial against certain expressions or intimations in the King's Speech to Parliament, which were suggested by the Imperial Court to be unfounded and false, as they probably were, &c. &c. and to publish the memorial for the information of the British nation. How, Sir, did the British government and nation receive and repel this insult? Sir, it was received with universal detestation and repelled with universal indignation. It rushed for the moment the spirit of party. It was deemed an insult to every man, woman and child in Great-Britain, &c. &c. But, Sir, let me give you the account in the words of the historian.

"With the memorial also was transmitted from Vienna a letter from the Chancellor Count Zinzendorf to Count Palm, expressly commanding him, in the name of his Imperial Majesty, after presenting the memorial to the King of Great-Britain, to publish it together with the letter annexed, for the information of the British nation. The Chancellor Zinzendorf affirms in this letter, that it is easy to see that the speech was made for no other purpose but to exhort the nation to a rupture and open war with the Emperor and Spain, and to make the Parliament approve the burlesque and precipitate measures, which the government has taken for private ends too well known. — That on the first report of these false suppositions—the Emperor and the King of Spain, in order to silence them, proposed a formal act de non offendendo, unto which all the contracting parties of the treaties of Vienna might enter, all such a time as a definitive agreement might have taken place; but that this proposition was rejected.— He says, that the articles of the quadruple alliance are expressly and publicly laid down as the unalterable basis of the treaty of Vienna, and that to affirm that by a secret pact concluded at the same time, engagements have been entered into by their Imperial & Catholic Majesties, repugnant to the same, is an outrageous insult to the Majesty of the two contracting powers, who have a right to demand a reparation proportioned to the enormity of the affront. And that the high contracting parties had no other view than that of making peace between themselves, without injuring any one else." The allegations contained in this letter and memorial seem but too well founded; but the intemperate language of these papers gave high and just offence; and Mr. Shippen, Mr. Hungerford, Sir William Wyndham and all the leaders of opposition in Parliament, warmly concurred in the address presented to the throne on this occasion, and which passed the House without a dissentient vote. And an order was sent to M. de Palm, signifying that said Palm, having delivered into the hands of his Majesty at his late audience, a memorial highly injurious to the honor and dignity of his crown, and also having publicly dispersed the same, with a letter from the Count de Zinzendorf,

to him, the said Palm, still more insolent than the memorial, his Majesty looked upon him as no longer public Minister and required him forthwith to depart from his kingdom."

Here, Sir, we find the imperial resident, the Count de Palm, immediately ordered out of the country, & the nation rising into instant war to repel the insult and retrieve the wounded honor of the nation. Here, Sir, we find the bickerings of party silenced; we find every heart united; we find the opposition facing about; and the whole nation opposing a hostile front to the authors of the insult. Can you believe, Mr. President, that a nation which feels so just a sensibility, when an insult is inflicted by others upon itself, can for a moment justify its Ministry in inflicting a similar insult upon another nation? Can you believe, Sir, that the British nation or Ministry can feel any respect for those for whose use the publication was intended, when you contrast their conduct with the generous and correct conduct of the British opposition? When, instead of rousing every American to repel the insult with indignation, it seems to have been received with complacency, and directed to its iniquitous end! And shall we be compelled to believe that all honorable feeling is lost and buried under the dominant influence of party sensibility? Surely, Sir, this cannot be an attitude which any party would wish to assume, and thus present itself either to the American or the British nation! Yet, Sir, the only difference of the character of the insult in the two cases is, that in one the author was known and avowed, and in the other he secures himself by his invisibility. But, Sir, if the author of the publication be an authorized British agent, and he will avow himself in a bold and manly way, I have no hesitation in saying he ought to be sent out of the country, let the consequences be what they may. Sir, in no country in the world ought this point to be held more sacred, and the insults more firmly repelled, than in the United States, where our presses are under no restraint—where not only freedom, but licentiousness characterizes almost every page.

But, Sir, our degradation does not stop here—Let me select one other act for a single animadversion. The British are now driving a forced trade, in violation of our laws, on our southern frontier; and whilst it demonstrates the importance of our commerce to their prosperity, it at the same time grades us below the Spanish colonies; for they do sometimes resist such aggressions; but we take them with patient forbearance and quiet submission. Let me now, Sir, compare the injuries and insults received by the U. States and by other nations from Great-Britain, and contrast the resistance. Sir, I wish I could spare myself the pain and mortification of performing this task—but I deem it indispensable.—It is a sacred duty I owe to the people, and must be performed. Sir, the demand upon Denmark whilst observing an honest neutrality, was to be sure flagitious, but it was resisted by war. The overture to Sweden, whilst in the depth of distress and difficulties, to be sure was perfidious; but the messenger was ordered to be incarcerated. The conduct in Portugal, whilst weak and deserted by its government, conquered almost by a foreign host, was cruel and insulting; but it was repelled with indignation, and perhaps by hostility. The horrid catastrophe of the bloody tragedy in Spain is not yet known, & as my mind is perfectly exempt from even the semblance of a wish to exaggerate British outrage; so I will suppress my anticipations in relation to the fate of the Spanish fleet. Whilst the United States more injured and insulted than all these nations together, are alone to bear with patient meekness and long suffering; and the gallant, honorable and high-minded American people to be told there are no causes of war. That they must be still more humiliated; still further degraded. Wait with patience till another catalogue of injuries and insults shall stain the fair, unsoftened

page of your national character! And some men go so far as to recommend submission altogether!—Mr. President, the love of peace is one of the most amiable passions of the human mind. It is fondly cherished by the American people. But, Sir, when it degenerates into a fear of war, it becomes of all passions the most despicable. In its application it is of all others the most unfortunate and ruinous to a nation; it excites contempt and invites attack from abroad; whilst at home it dispirits the people, and disqualifies them from exerting the energy they possess. Is there not ground to fear, Sir, that G. Britain has mistaken the character of the people & government of the U. States in that respect? And if so, is it of no importance to undeceive her? And how can this be done? It can only be done by manly, open, direct and honorable war! Let war, then, Sir, be openly resorted to, and vigorously conducted. Give the people an opportunity of retrieving their character, or at least of proclaiming their true character to the world. It will even be found economical of blood and treasure; it will in the end be favorable to peace itself; for, Sir, (permit me to borrow an appropriate and emphatical expression from a gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Hillhouse,) it will be a war for peace. Yes, Sir, as that gentleman expresses it, we must fight for peace. Without war, or fortunate events abroad, I am satisfied we can have no peace!!!

I fear, Mr. President, I am trespassing too much on the kind indulgence of the Senate, but, Sir, I cannot conclude my observations without examining the most prominent objections urged against a war with Great-Britain. This I propose to do with candor and impartiality.

The first objection is derived from the supposed character of the quarrel in which Great-Britain is engaged. It is said she is fighting the battles of the world against the spirit of French domination. That her national existence is at stake. That she is fighting merely for her national solum, &c. whilst France is contending for the domination of the world. This is not the true character of the quarrel. They are both fighting for dominion; each upon the element to which he can apply his power. France claims dominion on the land—Great-Britain on the ocean. But it is said, if the emperor of France should succeed and destroy Great-Britain, or control her fleet, his power would be directed against the United States, and they would be the next victim. This is a remote and extremely improbable contingency. It is my opinion, that the changes are greatly in favor of Great-Britain's succeeding in the contest; and I believe that our situation would be just as critical, if Great-Britain, having the command of her fleet had also the command of the men on the continent, as if France having the command of the men on the continent, had also the command of the British fleet. In either event we could expect no mercy, and our only reliance for preserving our independence, would, as it ought always, to be upon our own courage and resources. I would, therefore, deprecate either of these events. But, Sir, whilst I should deplore the circumstance of either of these nations subduing the other, I think the chances of ultimate success in favor of Great-Britain. I will state a few of the grounds of this opinion. In Great-Britain the government is strong, stable and popular, and from her insular situation, the navy affords the nation a complete protection against foreign invasion. The resources of Great-Britain are great, and her people brave and loyal, &c. &c. These afford her strong securities. In France, the order of things is scarcely settled. The dynasty is new, probably depending on the life of a single individual; the chances of his death alone; and the probable consequences flowing from that single event, give to Great-Britain a better prospect of final success in the contest than any reasonable calculation of probable events would give France, in relation to the conquest of Great-Britain. This consideration therefore, has no alarms or terrors for me. It is certainly a

mere possible contingency against every calculation upon probable events—it is visionary. But, Sir, where does this sensibility; (I will not call it sympathy, because Great-Britain has no feeling from which it can be derived) where, I say, Sir, does this sensibility for the safety of Great-Britain exist? I believe in the United States alone; certainly not in the British nation nor ministry. Let me call your recollection to Mr. Canning's language on the subject. Do you hear him express any whining fears of the loss of national existence—any timid alarms from the influence of French power? What does he say, Sir? On the 23d of September last he tells you, that Bonaparte's gigantic projects of domination were then broken up into fragments utterly harmless and contemptible. And on the 22d of November last, that Bonaparte's decrees were merely nominal; that from his impotency they had ceased to be mischievous in practice, &c. &c. And what do the ministerial pamphleteers tell you? Why, Sir, that Bonaparte & his train of dependent kings are the tributaries of Great-Britain; and that British rivals also; shall follow in the train to grace the magnificence of the scene, and shall contribute their homage also, to the supremacy of the British navy! Is this the language of a nation struggling for its existence? Is this the language of a nation trembling with alarms of subjugation from French power? No, Sir, the British nation has no such feelings nor apprehensions; this sensibility exists only in the U. States. If Great-Britain really felt these alarms, she would feel more respect for the rights of other nations; she would moderate her claims upon the ocean; she would leave to other nations some little share in the exercise of rights upon that element. But, Sir, where will this argument end? If on account of some remote, improbable and contingent danger, we are to bear all the wrongs already heaped upon us by Great-Britain, when are we to stop? When will the load become too grievous to be borne? I wish this point ascertained and fixed, that Great-Britain may know it as well as ourselves; for there is no doubt she will pile on as long as we will bear, and perhaps she may overstep the bounds from the want of knowing the limits. Sir, these grounds of objection are unsubstantial; they are nothing more than mere pretexes for indulging our habitual predilections for Great Britain, and if we think otherwise we deceive ourselves. The plausibility of these suggestions may, perhaps, however, have extended their influence beyond the sphere of British predilections. But, Sir, I am convinced in all those cases, it has arisen from the want of a due consideration of the subject.

The only effects of entering into the war against Great-Britain, would be to lessen the range of her commerce, and limit the dangerous influence of her navy, and thus to restore to ourselves some of her lost commercial rights. But her national existence, even in that case, would not be endangered, & even if it were, she could stop the war at pleasure, by doing us less than justice.

Indulge me now, Sir, in examining another objection against entering into a war with Great-Britain; which, whilst it is the most unaccountable, has, I believe, more influence on the minds of gentlemen, than all other considerations taken together. It is, Sir, the strange suggestion, that the British ministry had refused to accede to the just and reasonable propositions made on the part of the United States, from a belief of the insincerity of our government in conducting the negotiation; and that, if the overture could be renewed in sincerity and good faith it would be accepted on the part of the British government.—Groundless & extravagant as this supposition is, permit me to make a few observations on it. In the first place I would ask, by whom have our negotiations with Great-Britain been conducted since the commencement of the present administration? First, by Mr. King. Has Mr. King ever made any intimation of insincerity on the part of the administration during his agency? I believe not. I believe