



AND

North-Carolina State Gazette.

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

Vol. XI.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1810.

No. 544

From the Baltimore American.

Our reporter has furnished the Speech of Willis Alston, jun. Esq. of North-Carolina, on the final passage of the Bill reported by Mr. Macon, as chairman of the committee for foreign relations. It is a complete refutation of some assertions made respecting the flourishing state of the Treasury at the removal from power of the Federal party, and observations upon the extraordinary conduct of one or two members, who supported the Bill in its (to Great-Britain) harmless state, and opposed Mr. Montgomery's amendment, which tended to give efficacy to its provisions. By our readers the report, though short, will be well received.

MR. ALSTON'S SPEECH.

The Bill concerning commercial intercourse with Great-Britain & France being under consideration,

Mr. W. ALSTON observed, that he certainly would not long detain the House for the discussion had already been protracted much farther than, in his opinion, was absolutely necessary. He, however, conceived it indispensable to make a few remarks in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Wheaton.) That gentleman had advanced as a fact, and he had advanced and asserted in such a solemn tone of voice, and with a solemnity as though he really did believe what he asserted was true, the gentleman had asserted in the face of this enlightened assembly, and of the world, that on the 4th day of March, 1801, the day on which the present republican majority came into power, that we had a full and overflowing treasury; that we were at peace with all the world, and in an unexampled state of prosperity and happiness; that a sad reverse of fortune had taken place.

Mr. A. said that he would not say that the gentleman had asserted what was not true; but this much he would say, that if the gentleman from Massachusetts would examine the laws of Congress; if he would turn to the statutes of his own government; if he would look at a law passed in the year 1800, and the year preceding, and did not find sufficient proof there to contradict his assertion, he (Mr. A.) would admit himself in the wrong. Mr. Alston then proceeded to state that in the year 1800, a law of Congress was passed, authorising a loan for three million five hundred thousand dollars, to be made for and in behalf of the government of the United States. Now, sir, with all the boasting of the gentleman on the subject of an overflowing treasury, we find that in the very last year of Federalism, the sum in the treasury was considerably short of two millions of dollars, and against that sum a larger one annually borrowed; and that at the rate of eight per cent interest. I now ask the gentleman seriously to say whether this looks like that prosperity in our pecuniary transactions, the existence of which he so boldly asserted; and, Sir, let me here be observed, that the gentleman's good friends in power at this very time at which they were borrowing millions and involving the nation in debt had the aid of the whole system of internal taxes in complete operation. Now, Sir, contrast the then state of things with what has happened under Federal and present administrations. Has not the public debt been lessened in a proportion far beyond the calculation or expectation of any man? Have not the people been relieved from a system of taxation not only in itself odious and oppressive, and still the debt of the nation annually diminished. On the contrary, when the gentleman's friends were in power, was not the national debt every year increasing; the round of taxation exhausted, and a constant resort to loans had? Such a system of prosperity and happiness as this, I hope the gentleman and his friends may exclusively enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I have hitherto, throughout this tedious discussion, observed silence, and would have contented myself with giving a silent vote, had I not seen gentlemen indulging themselves in abuse, and a total perversion of facts. I will now venture to go to the world

without being exposed, they might have had an effect they were not entitled to.

We have found, in the course of the discussion upon this bill, gentlemen voting against a clause proposed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Montgomery) which goes to authorise the President of the United States to employ the naval power to carry its provisions into effect, who upon all former occasions are the strong advocates for the navy. What, Sir, are we to infer from this strange conduct? A melancholy truth I fear; that so long as they knew that the law would be perfectly inoperative as it respected Great-Britain, they cared nothing about its passage; but so soon as a clause is attached to it, that seems like preventing our good friends, the British from smuggling their goods and merchandise into our country by means of Halifax and other American possessions, they declaim against the measure.

We find one member (Mr. Key) voting against and violently opposing the clause of the bill which authorises the employment of the navy to its execution (altho' I believe a navy man) and he admits and asserts with the constitution in his hand, that the President has the power already, and defined it as a proper and necessary power.

A man's mind must be strangely organized, who believes a power given by the constitution a necessary and proper power to be exercised, and yet vote against its insertion in a law. No, Sir, it is the apprehension that this power will be enforced against the rapacity of Great-Britain, or I verily believe you would not have heard this day's debate. You would not have heard all this violent clamour against the final passage of the bill. But for this clause, I think it is probable, we should this day have had a silent vote.

From the "Virginia Patriot."

REMARKS

By Mr. WILKINSON, on the Bill lately passed by the Legislature of Virginia, to SUPPRESS DUELLING.

Mr. Speaker.—The bill which has been read, is one which claims the serious attention of every member of this House: it is one in which every member of this body—in which every citizen of Virginia is deeply interested.—The practice of duelling seems to be an unnatural graft on genuine courage, growing out of a barbarous age: for we find that it was first introduced by the Goths and Vandals, during the days of their ignorance and barbarism. The polite and polished nations of Greece & Rome, who were ever prodigal of their blood, when in defence of their country's rights, knew nothing of this detestable practice, which appears to be built on an infinity of absurdities.—because, while it seems to suppose, that a man's honor ought to be dearer to him than his life, it at the same time supposes, that this honor is in the power of every unprincipled villain that can invent or tell a lie—of every careless or ill bred person that may jostle him in his way: it supposes, that a lie may become true and honorable, provided the person who tells it is willing to fight in support of it, and that any crime whatever may become honorable by fighting in its defence; it supposes that the man who is covered with guilt, who has wounded the peace of his friend, by staining the character of his wife or of his daughter, becomes at once an honorable man, by heroically washing out those stains by the blood of the husband or the father: it farther supposes that it is better for a man to be condemned by his own conscience, and by the virtuous and rational part of mankind, than to suffer one moment in the opinion of the advocates of duelling: finally, that steel and gunpowder are the true diagnostics of innocence and moral excellency. If, Sir, having seized the villain who has violated my wife, I should bring him before a tribunal of justice, what would be your opinion of the Judge who should order, that I, the innocent, injured man, must cast lots with the guilty which of us must die? Would not your heart chill at such a sentence? Would you not pronounce it contrary to reason, to common sense and justice? You surely would. In the case of duelling, the public is the judge. I receive an injury which nothing but life can atone; I do not appeal to the public; no, sir, the public officiously inter-

feres and condemns me, under the penalty of perpetual disgrace, to cast lots with the aggressor, which of us must die. Was there ever any thing more preposterous! more abominably absurd!

It is the opinion of many, sir, that duelling is an evil which will correct itself; while others say, it is of little concern to the rational and virtuous part of mankind, in what manner fols and knaves rid the world of each other, as it will not deprive society of one valuable member; but daily experience convinces us that both those opinions are incorrect; for while the evil is growing to an alarming height, we find that some of our best citizens have exposed their lives, while others have fallen victims to this abominable practice—and will the collected wisdom of this Commonwealth make no effort to suppress this sanguinary and growing evil? Will the enlightened Legislature of Virginia make no stand against the current of public opinion? I hope—I trust they will. Sir, so long as it is believed that the practice of duelling is sanctioned by public opinion, there is no man, who is anxious to maintain his social standing, can refuse what is termed an honorable call. No matter how much his moral and religious principles may be opposed to the practice—no matter though he may have a wife and children depending on his exertions for their daily bread—no matter how great claims his country may have on his talents, in critical and trying times—he loses sight of all, in the dreadful idea of being stigmatised as a coward—Pejusque letho flagitium timet—He seizes the fatal weapon—he marches to the combat—receives the mortal wound, and leaves a disconsolate widow and a number of helpless orphans to mourn their irreparable loss—This, sir, is not fancy—these are scenes, that frequently, very frequently pass in review before us. Pass this bill and you put a stop to the evil—pass this bill and you place a shield between the man of feeling and public opinion—you raise a barrier in the road to honor and preferment, at which the ambitious man will pause and reflect ere he rashly engages in a duel—pass this bill, and I will venture to predict, that you will preserve the lives of many, of very many valuable citizens.—Had a similar bill been passed at last session, it would have been attended with the very best of consequences: We should not now be lamenting the loss of a Pope, a Hoge and a Smith—on us, in part, rests the blame of robbing Society of those able and useful members—on us, sir, in part rests the blame of preparing affliction for the widow's heart, of closing the orphan's eyes with tears, and bringing trouble and misfortune on numerous relatives. As fathers, then—as brothers—as men, and as Legislators, I call upon this House to suppress an evil which strikes at you in all these tender relations—I call on you to set an example worthy of yourselves and of those you represent; and should this bill not have the desired effect, you will enjoy the consolation of having performed your duty. Before I sit down, I give notice, I shall call for the Ayes and Noes. I am anxious to have my name recorded on this question—I wish to enter my protest against duelling.—There are some gentlemen, Mr. Speaker (far be it from me to insinuate that there are any in this Assembly) who, though opposed to the principle of duelling, do not wish to proclaim their sentiments to the world, lest they should be suspected of a want of fortitude—I, sir, have no such fears; for I never did suppose the fighting of a duel a mark of fortitude—No, sir, true fortitude is a cardinal virtue, depending on, and inseparable from other virtues—it is that firm, manly intrepidity of soul, which enables us to meet danger in critical & trying situations—it is the virtuous man's shield, by which he defends himself from the evils of the world—it is the anchor which keeps him steady, amidst the storms and hurricanes of life. The intrepidity of a duellist, altho' it seems to imitate, cannot be said to be a virtue—because it is not the object of moral virtue.

Information wanted.

JOHN CHAIRES went to North or South-Carolina, in or about the year 1770, and living with him a family of children, one son and five daughters. If alive, he is entitled to 2 or 300 acres of Land in Queen Ann's County, Maryland. The name of the land is Abington.—Further particulars may be learnt on application to the Editors of the Register.

From the London Globe.

MILITARY EXPEDITIONS

Sent by England to the continent of Europe, from the commencement of the war between Great-Britain and France, in 1793, to the present period.

We have taken the pains to draw, into one point of view, a history of the Military Expeditions sent from this country to the Continent, within the last 16 years.

PITT ADMINISTRATION.

First Expedition to France.

When sent, Feb. 1793. Commander, Duke of York. Force, 35,000 troops. Object, Conquest of France.—Failed. After a loss of 28,000 men, and an immense quantity of cannon and stores; the wreck of the army returned to England in March 1795.

Second Expedition to France.

When sent, May, 1794. Commander, Earl Moira. Force, 10,000 troops. Object, Establishment of Royalty in Britain.—Failed. Could not effect a landing in Brittany; sailed to Ostend; and shared the fortunes of the Duke of York's ill-fated army.

Expedition to Quiberon.

When sent, May 1793. Commander, M. Puisaye. Force, 12,000 troops. Object, to penetrate to Paris.—Failed. 3/4ths of the Angl-Emigrant army were lost, together with 70,000 stand of arms, magazines and clothing for 40,000 men, a large sum in specie, and six ships richly laden.

First Expedition to Holland.

When sent, May 1793. Commander, Gen. Coote. Force, 1200 troops. Object, to destroy the navigation of Holland, &c. Failed. The works of the Bruges Canal were blown up, and required some weeks repair; but Gen. Coote and his army fell into the hands of the enemy.

Second Expedition to Holland.

When sent, August 1799. Commanders, Duke of York and Generals Hermann and Essen. Force, 27,000 English and 20,000 Russians. Object, Deliverance of Europe. Failed. Lost nearly half the army, and entered into a capitulation on the 18th of Oct. whereby the Duke agreed, on condition of being allowed to re-embark, to liberate 8000 French and Bavarians, then prisoners in England.

FOX ADMINISTRATION.

Expedition to Italy.

When sent, July 1806. Commander, Sir J. Stuart. Force, 5000 troops. Object, Expulsion of the French from Italy. Failed in the object, but succeeded in vanquishing a French army of 7000 men, 4000 of whom were either killed, wounded or taken prisoners.

PORLAND ADMINISTRATION.

Expedition to Copenhagen.

When sent, August 1807. Commander, Lord Cathcart. Force, 20,000 troops. Object, to obtain possession of the Danish fleet. Succeeded. England, while in a state of profound peace with Denmark, bombarded her capital, set fire to her metropolis; killed vast numbers of inhabitants; burnt down 400 houses; took from her 15 ships of the line, 15 frigates, 6 brigs and 25 gunboats; besides vessels on the stocks, together with naval stores to the amount of 20,000 tons.

"That which is morally wrong, cannot be politically right."—Fox.

Expedition to Sweden.

When sent, May 1808. Commander, Sir J. Moore. Force, 14,000 troops. Object, to aid Sweden against Russia. Failed. Gustavus put Sir John Moore under arrest; he escaped with difficulty; and his army, after remaining several weeks on board the transports, returned to England.

First Expedition to Spain.

When sent, July 1808. Commander, Sir A. Wellesley. Force, 16,000 troops. Object, to assist Spain. The Junta of Galicia declined the proffered assistance, asserting that they did not want men, but merely arms, ammunition and money. Advised Sir Arthur to proceed to Portugal.

First Expedition to Portugal.

When sent, August 1808. Commander, Sir A. Wellesley; superceded by Sir Harry Burrard; superceded by Sir Hugh Dalrymple. Force, 27,000 troops. Object, Expulsion of the French from the Peninsula. Failed. The campaign which produced the victory of Vimiera, was terminated by the memo-

orable Convention of Cintra. The French army was sent home in safety, and the principal part of the British army was sent to Spain. The remnant of our forces subsequently quitted Portugal on the advance of the French.

Second Expedition to Spain.

When sent November 1808. Commander, Sir J. Moore. Force, 28,000 troops. Object, expulsion of the French from Spain. Failed. The English army advanced from the coast into the interior of Spain, but finding themselves unsupported by the "Universal Spanish Nation," and the French armies advancing upon them, they were obliged to retreat to the coast, and finally re-embark at Corunna, where their gallant commander fell; one third of his army having perished by famine and the sword.

Further Expedition to Portugal and Spain.

When sent, April 1809. Commander, Sir A. Wellesley. Force, 30,000 troops (the number asked by Sir Arthur to drive the French out of the Peninsula.) Object, the deliverance of Spain. Failed. Sir Arthur having penetrated to Talavera, obtained a problematical victory over Joseph Bonaparte; but being ill supported by the Spanish armies, and reduced to great extremities for want of provisions, owing to the apathy of the Junta, and the want of cordiality in the people; was obliged to retreat, and has arrived at Elvas, on the frontier of Portugal. His army is greatly reduced in numbers, some accounts say to 15,000.

Expedition to Ischia and Procida.

When sent, June 1809. Commander, Sir J. Stuart. Force, 18,000 troops. Object, Diversion in favor of Austria. Failed. Took possession of the islands, which he afterwards abandoned without having detained or withdrawn any part of the French force from the Danube.

Third Expedition to Holland.

When sent, August 1809. Commander, Earl Chatham. Force, 50,000 troops. Object, Diversion in favor of Austria, and the destruction of the enemy's fleet at Antwerp. Failed. The expedition was not dispatched till the Armistice of the 12th of July had terminated the contest between France & Austria. Returned with 10,000 sick, without attempting any operation against the fleet at Antwerp. Obtained possession of Walcheren and Beveland, the latter of which places has since been abandoned.

FORT JOHNSON.

Charleston Harbor, Jan'y 4, 1810.

One Hundred Dollars Reward!

FOR SIX DESERTERS, who deserted from this post, on the 3d inst, viz—John Wynn and Thomas Stewart, of Capt. Armistead's company of the first Light Artillery:

SEWART was born in Ireland (but came to this country when an infant)—He is 5 feet 11 1/2 inches high, 22 years of age; has grey eyes, brown hair, good complexion, by occupation a laborer. He took with him citizen's clothes, and was armed with a rifle and pistols;—the pistols are of uncommon make, the property of the United States.

JOHN WYNNE was born in Georgia; he is 5 feet 6 inches high, 35 years of age, has grey eyes, light hair, fair complexion, by occupation a Taylor; went off in citizen's clothes, and armed with pistols, and probably a rifle, as the parties stole two rifles, and a number of pistols, previous to their desertion. The rifles are very ordinary in their appearance, the pistols uncommon, particularly with respect to the locks, and fixing of the ramrod. JOHN HOPKINS, of Capt. Laval's troop, was born in South Carolina, is 5 feet 9 inches high—has dark complexion and hair.

CHARLES MERUX, of said Troop, is a native of South Carolina, twenty three years of age, five feet ten inches high; has light complexion and dark hair; went off in citizen's clothes, and armed with either pistols or rifle.

DANIEL HOLLOWAY, of Captain John R. Span's company of Light Artillery, is a native of Virginia, twenty three years of age, five feet nine inches high; has fair complexion blue eyes and dark hair.

WILEY BARLOW, of said company, deserted at the same time, of whom an accurate description we list cannot be given.

The above reward, with all expences, will be paid (or in that proportion for either) to any person who will deliver the said Deserters to me at this post, or secure them in goal, and give the necessary information to me, or to any Commanding Officer in the army of the United States.

A. B. ARMISTEAD, Capt. U. S. 1st Reg't of Artillery, commanding. Jan. 11. 6w-39

May be had at J. Gales's Store—Price \$7 PRICE & STROTHER'S MAP OF NORTH CAROLINA On Canvas and Rollers