authority of their commissions. They have captured, in the very entrance of our harbors, as well as on the high seas, not only the vessels of our friends coming to trade with us, but our own also. They have carried them off, under pretence of legal adjudication; but, not daring to approach a court of justice, they have plundered and sunk them by the way, or in obscure places where no evidence could arise against them, maltreated the crews, and abandoned them, in boats in the open sea or on desert shores, without food or covering. These enormities appearing to be unreached by any control of their sovereigns, I found it necessary to equip a force to cruize within our own seas, to arrest all vessels of these descriptions found hovering on our coasts, within the limits of the Gulf stream, and to bring the offenders in for trial as pirates.

"The same system of hovering on our coasts and harbours, under colour of seeking enemies, has been also carried on by public armed ships, to the great annoyance and oppression of our commerce."

Such is the language of the President. Some redress for these enormities is demanded by a regard to national honor, justice, interest, humanity. What redress is provided? On this subject the gentlemen have done nothing, proposed nothing—doubtless because their faculties have been so much absorbed in other considerations which they deemed important.

On examining the documents before the House, the injuries, the insults, the barbarities, which are mentioned by the President in general terms, will be seen to have been too fully realized in detail. You have decisive proof of the atrocious practices in the West Indies. Permit me to turn your attention but to a single page of the official documents! In a letter, of the 7th of June, 1805, from Mr. Blakely, our consul at St. Jago in Cuba, we have this information—"Since the last evacuation of Hispaniola, more than one thousand American seamen have been landed in this port, most of them without clothes, and all of them without any possible means of support, but such as they receive from their own government." In another letter, of the 1st of July, 1805, he speaks in these terms—"The scene of robbery, destruction, evasion, perjury, cruelty, and insult, to which the Americans captured by French pirates, and brought into this and the adjacent ports, have been subjected, perhaps has not been equalled in a century past." Shall these sufferings of our countrymen be disregarded, because the seamen perhaps were not employed by capitalists engaged in a trade carried on in distant seas, in Europe, or Asia? Is all the philanthropic sensibility, which has been professed in debate, to be confined exclusively to seamen impressed into British service? Some portion of it, I hope, will yet be found for our own countrymen in the W. Indies, captured, robbed of their property, loaded with indignities, and abandoned, in a sickly climate, in a strange land, without shelter, without cloathing, without means of subsistence. What can justify a desertion of the cause of our fellow-citizens suffering under these infamous outrages?

With these observations respecting the depredations on our commerce and sufferings of our seamen in the W. Indies, I leave the subject for the present, to the reflections of gentlemen. It is my intention at this time to advert, more particularly to the conduct of belligerent cruisers near our ports and on our coasts.

Of the violations of our neutral rights by these cruisers, one of the most memorable cases has been stated in a memorial from S. Carolina. On casting an eye over the memorial, I find it supported by the signature of the president of the S. Carolina Insurance Company, with a long list of names which, as I am well informed, are among the most respectable in Charleston, comprehending merchants, and planters, and professional gentlemen. Without stating the whole of the memorial, I will now mention only certain parts of it as being more immediately applicable. This is the language. "Your memorialists are deeply affected by the recent capture, at the very entrance of this port, of the American ship Two Friends, by a French privateer. This event has excited among all classes of citizens, the strongest sensations, not only because the ship was captured without any color of pretence, within sight of land, but because she is our only regular London trader, and had on board a full supply of spring and summer goods."—"This most extraordinary capture has already been followed by events no less alarming; our harbor being at this moment completely blockaded by three French privateers."—"These just alarms and apprehensions of your memorialists, are heightened by the well known circumstance of many of the cruisers which infest our shores belonging to St. Jago de Cuba, and Barracoa; in which receptacles, our vessels and their cargoes, with the knowledge of the government of Cuba, are instantly sold, without any condemnation whatever, or even the formality of a trial, thereby precluding every future possibility of redress."—"Your memorialists avail themselves of this occasion to notice a late decision of the district court within this state, grounded on an act of Congress, whereby the territorial jurisdiction of the U. S. is limited to the short distance of three miles, or a marine league from the coasts or shores, which by the said court, is construed to mean three miles from the land; consequently the middle channel of our bar, being more than three miles distant from the nearest land, is pronounced by judicial authority to be without the jurisdiction of the U. States; the very entrance of our harbor, in full sight of the city, where vessels are frequently obliged to anchor, while waiting for a tide, and with a pilot on board, is, by our own tribunals, acknowledged to be without the protection of our government."

The seizures of merchant vessels on our coast and near our ports are mentioned in memorials from other ports of the Union. We have before us complaints on this subject from Baltimore, from Philadelphia, from New York, New Haven and Salem. Indeed the conduct of belligerent cruisers in the tracts of sea adjacent to our territories has been a subject of general condemnation. Persons who have differed on other topics have agreed on this. This sentiment has been common to people of different professions and classes and parties. The main facts are notorious. Near our port within the recesses of our coast, almost within our harbours, belligerent cruisers have watched for opportunities of seizing merchant vessels employed in the trade of this country. Need I mention the indignation excited by the blockade of New York. The interruption of the commerce of that great port are well known. British vessels of war were stationed off Sandy Hook. Among them, I remember the names of the Leander, the Cambrian, the Driver; there may have been others, which I do not recollect; but such particulars are not of consequence in the present estimate; the general fact is sufficient. By taking such stations, belligerent cruisers have been able to seize our merchant vessels on the return voyage and carry them in for adjudication, under pretext of being employed in trading directly between the parent country and a colony of the enemy, or of having violated in the outward voyage some regulation respecting contraband or blockade. Millions of property have thus been exposed to seizure, which might otherwise have been added to the commercial stock of our country, and swelled the receipts of the treasury. Such stations too have afforded opportunities for the impressment of seamen.

With respect to these outrages, sir, I will not fatigue you by professions of patriotism; nor will I invoke the spirit of 1776; nor will I declaim about our revolution, or about our right to national independence. Such observations have no specific bearing on the subject. In whatever degree it may have become fashionable to occupy the time of the House in this manner, I trust it will not be supposed to manifest any want of respect to the understandings of the House if I attend to considerations more directly applicable to some practical purpose.

[*To be Continued.*]

20 DOLLARS REWARD.

RUNAWAY from the Subscriber living near Bryantown, Charles county, Maryland, a likely yellowish complexioned negro lad named RAFE about 20 years of age, and about 5 feet 7 or 8 inches high—he has a scar under one of his eyes and a long under lip, also a large cut on the top of one of his feet. Rafe is not very stout made. He had on and took with him a black broad cloth coat, country cotton over jacket striped with yellow and blue, striped swansdown under jacket, a pair of blue striped country cotton pantaloons, and yellow striped, country cotton trowsers yellow and blue, two silk handkerchiefs, one Irish linen shirt, country cotton shirt and trowsers and a white country cloth over jacket double wove, and a black wool hat. It is supposed that he will change his name and endeavor to pass for a free man. Whoever secures the said negro in any jail so that I get him again will be entitled to the above reward, and all reasonable charges paid if brought home, by

BENEDICT BOARMAN.

June 30—w3t

June Court 1806—In Chancery.

Thomas Law, vs. Richard Gridley.

THE Report of Daniel C. Brent the trustee formerly appointed in this cause having been returned and sworn to and filed and the proceeding therein approved—it is therefore decreed and ordered that the said report be ratified and confirmed unless cause be shewn to the contrary on or before the 1st Monday of October next provided a copy of this order be published for three successive weeks before that time in the Washington Federalist and the National Intelligencer.

The report states that the mortgaged property therein mentioned was sold for the sum of four hundred and thirty-five dollars.

By order,

WM. BRENT, Ck.

July 7—w3t

To the North Carolina Gold Mine Company.

The following resolutions were passed by the Board of Directors, at their adjourned meeting on the 12th of June, 1806.

Resolved, That the subscribers to the North Carolina Gold Mine Company be required, and they are hereby required to pay the sum of ten dollars on each share to which they are respectively entitled, on or before the 15th day of July next, for the purpose of defraying the expence of prosecuting the business of the Company.

Resolved, That WILLIAM THORNTON, Esq. be authorised to receive all payments that shall be made under the preceding resolution, and account with the Board for the same.

Resolved, That the above resolutions be published in the National Intelligencer for the information of the stockholders.

DANL. CARROLL of Dud'n,
President.

June 20—3t&1wt15J.

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, JULY 11.

The federal prints have for some time teemed with reproaches against the administration on a topic well fitted to excite the national sensibility. The wrongs and insults of foreign nations, who, in the plenitude of their power, lawlessly trample on our commercial rights, have ever been a fruitful source of indignation. So long as these feelings were directed to the perpetrators of the crimes, or to those who directly or indirectly countenance them, they may be considered beneficial. It is the desire no less than the interest of the American people to remain at peace with the whole world; but when outrages are offered to their undisputed rights, when their honor is wounded, and their property pillaged by the licensed free-booters of the ocean, it would betray a dangerous insensibility, a fatal lethargy, not boldly to avow the sentiments they entertain of those who injure them. Such a manly expression of their feelings serves to keep the public mind in a state of excitement and vigilance, which would enable us with less difficulty and more effect to resort to measures of a hostile complexion, whenever accumulated wrongs shall leave us no other alternative; and by manifesting this state of readiness for the worst events, powerfully tends to avert the necessity of such a resort. It arms, likewise, the government with the means of urging with greater effect its demands for redress and reparation.

But when this spirit, instead of being *justly* directed against our enemies, is, through the prejudices of party feeling or personal malevolence, *unjustly* turned on those who administer the national concerns, it cannot be too severely reprobated. It may be, in a degree, venial, for the different parties that subsist among us to carry their political feuds to considerable lengths, and in the ardent wish to prostrate their adversaries, to consider the ends they pursue as justifying the use of equivocal means calculated to effect them. But even such conduct is disclaimed by morality, however its turpitude may be mitigated by the feelings almost inseparable from party. But when any man, or set of men, through motives purely personal, can contemplate the rights of their fellow citizens trampled upon, and the national character wounded by the base outrages of foreign power, and, at the very moment they know that their government is engaged in pursuing the best means according to its belief, in its power, for obtaining redress, raise a louder clamor against it than against those who injure and insult us, our minds are naturally lost in astonishment at the extreme depravity to which misdirected passions lead those whose highest boast is the gifts of reason with which they are endowed.

How can redress be obtained but through the exertions of the government supported by public opinion? What then shall we say of those, whose systematic exertions are enlisted, not on the side of their own government, but virtually on that of the government whose wrongs are the subjects of our complaint? In a period of war, it is treason to aid an enemy. Is the crime of a lighter hue, whose direct tendency it is to translate a peaceful nation into a state of war; but every man of common sense will see that wrongs unredressed naturally, necessarily lead to this result. It might not comport with the language of decorum to stile those men traitors, who pursue this course of conduct, but the eye of justice can scarcely contemplate them in any other light.

Let not these remarks be misunderstood. They are not intended to inculcate the duty of an unqualified approbation of the measures of the government with respect to our foreign relations, or of an abstinence from laying before the public a full exposure of facts, and going into a free discussion of the correctness of the measures pursued. This, so far from being pernicious, will, in a government like ours, be invariably attended with the happiest effects. Those, who administer the government, aware that the scrutinizing eye of party is upon them, ready to expose their omissions and errors, will be incited to a faithful and vigilant discharge of duty; and, on many occasions, useful hints will be suggested, and important information thus laid before them, which they would not otherwise possess. But such a course of conduct is as different, as day light from darkness, from that of which we complain. The one consists in statements founded in truth, in representations founded on facts, in discussions, untinged by personal rancour, low ribaldry, and party malevolence. The other in the effusions of all these grovelling passions, in the liberal use of language beneath the dignity of a gentleman, in the ascription of the basest motives, in an habitual disregard of truth, and in studied attempts to degrade the government in the estimation of the foreign world. The calumniator artfully calculates on producing a qualified belief of his slanders *at a distance*, however despicable they may appear *here*. What should we say of the passenger on board of a ship, who during the rage of a storm, should, from personal animosity, throw the captain overboard, and expose the whole crew, composed, for the great part of helpless women and children, to the ungovernable fury of the elements? Would not our charity lead us at first thought to pronounce him a madman or a fool; and if compelled by a more deliberate examination to disrobe him of this mantle, would not our feelings of abhorrence for such a monster in depravity rise to the highest pitch? And yet this case is, as far as it goes, perfectly analogous to that under consideration; while the latter in aggravation transcends the former, as much as the interests of millions exceeds that of a small number of individuals.

These remarks are applicable *generally* to the whole circle of our foreign relations. No means are used for preserving or restoring friendship with foreign powers—that are not vehemently denounced. No man, however distinguished for his talents, or revered for his virtues, is appointed to a foreign embassy, without becoming the victim of federal calumny. No pending negociation which is not grossly misrepresented; no object effected, that is not condemned. Were we to credit what we daily read in the public prints, we should be led to think that the public agents, from the President down to the lowest organ of power, were among the most wicked and weak members of the community.

In the further remarks we shall offer, it is not, however, our purpose to go more into detail, except on a single point. The insolence of foreign power has lately been exhibited in acts unusually flagrant. British ships of war have fired on and captured our vessels, murdered one of our citizens, menaced our towns, and impressed our seamen. Riding in proud triumph before our most important commercial depots, they have blocked up our trade, and bid a lawless defiance to every principle of justice and humanity. Why is not the naval force of the nation called forth to avenge these wrongs, to chastise those that commit them? This is the cry of federalism from one end of the continent to the other. It is in vain that we are told that the legislature of the union has not placed at the disposition of the government such a force; the legislature is declared to be the humble tool of the Executive, and the want of such a force is represented as the sin of the Executive.

This is the topic to which we ask the attention of the public.

Is it then true that the omission to provide what is deemed an adequate naval force is to be laid to the door of the Executive? Federalism may, with some plausibility, urge this charge; but republicans cannot give ear to it without forfeiting their respect for the Executive members of their government. That the disciples of John Adams, who made the British system his study and model, should consider the President of the U. S. as the source of all power is extremely natural; but it would be a libel on the creed professed by the friends of Thomas Jefferson, who has made republican principles his study and guide, for a moment to consider the question whether we shall have a navy, & how large that navy shall be, as under his control and subject to his will. This is altogether a legislative question; a question that is dependent exclusively on the Congress of the U. S. The President may recommend the establishment or increase of a navy; but it rests alone with Congress to decide whether such establishment shall be made,—the number of vessels that shall be built, and the sum of money which shall be applied to their support. Such is the *theory* of the goverment; and such ought to be its *practice*. Such is in truth its practise. If there ever was a man, clothed with high and commanding powers, giving him a vast influence over public opinion, and by means of it, on the councils of the country, who has made it religiously a part of his duty not to step over the lines assigned him by the constitution and the laws, that man is Thomas Jefferson. It may be confidently affirmed that he has in no instance of any consequence trenched upon the powers of the other departments. If he is blameable on this score, it is for having so studiously avoided an interference with the powers of the other branches of the government, as to have hesitated to exercise some powers which he might have assumed without the least usurpation.

The fact is that from the era of the adoption of the constitution, if not from an earlier date, it has been a matter of constant dispute, whether it is the true interest of the U. S. to establish a navy. This momentous question remains to this day undecided. For it is absurd to consider or call the few vessels we have at present on the ocean by this name.

On this point various opinions have been and still are entertained. A large class of our citizens are altogether opposed to the creation of any naval force under any modification whatever. Another class are the friends of an efficient navy, but consider all steps at present taken towards it premature. A third class are willing so far to create a naval force as shall be necessary to protect our ports and harbors; while a fourth class, looking eventually to a respectable establishment, believe it wise and prudent gradually to increase our present force.

It is extremely problematical whether the first class of citizens do not constitute a majority of the people of the U. S. With the awful example of Britain before them, it is not surprizing that they feel a lively aversion to taking any steps towards those great establishments which have led her to the brink of ruin. They believe that a navy under any modification is a plastic instrument in the hands of the Executive, enabling him at any moment to involve his country in war, the effects of which on the general prosperity and liberty they have reason to dread. They consider it the sound policy of the U. S. to diminish rather than increase our points of collision with foreign powers. They view it as a source of vast & augmenting expence, and of an appetite so voracious as to swallow up the whole resources of the country. They believe conscientiously, that so far from administering to the solid strength and real glory of a nation, it is a gigantic mill stone on its growth. For the truth of this conviction they appeal to the history of their own nation, and call upon any man to shew any other that, with the aid of a naval establishment, has risen so rapidly in wealth and strength.

The hostility of this class of citizens to a navy under any modification, derives strength, so far as relates to the present application of means for its establishment, from the suffrages of the second class of citizens, who consider all such measures as at this time premature. Of the third class, a large portion think we have gone far enough, and that, instead of increasing our frigates or building ships of the line, it is most politic to erect land batteries and build a large number of gun boats. The other portion of this class are, it is true, in favor of augmenting the number of our ships, but not at present to any considerable extent. It is only those who compose the fourth class that think it wise regularly though gradually, to augment our present naval force. What proportion, in point of numbers, this class bears to the others, it is not easy to determine. There are, however, several circumstances that favor the belief that so far from being a majority, it comprizes comparatively but a small part of the whole community. This may be inferred from the acts of the legislature, who, instead of devising any plan for the regular formation and increase of a navy, have only created the existing force as a temporary expedient against pressing dangers, and from the constant disposition manifested by them to reduce rather than to augment the establishment. It has only been during a period of warfare or serious collision with foreign powers, that the establishment has risen; accordingly as soon as these causes have ceased, the establishment and appropriation of monies have been reduced. Let it too be remembered that this is not the peculiar policy of the republicans. It has likewise been that of the federalists, whose example the republicans have pursued. It was under the administration of President Adams, in the year 1801, that the peace establishment was formed, by which it was provided, that the President might sell all the public vessels excepting thirteen specified frigates, that of these six only should be kept in constant service, not having, however, attached to them more than two-thirds of their full complement of officers and seamen.

The inferences deducible from this statement, are,

1. That the creation of a powerful navy is a question still *sub judice*, not decided by the nation or their representatives.

2. That it is not a political question in which all the federalists are of one opinion, and all the republicans of another—But

3. That it is a question in which honest men of all parties entertain a diversity of opinion.

If this statement be in any wise correct, the reproaches cast upon the Executive on this topic are equally puerile and unfounded. If blame attaches any where, it is not to the Government but to the nation; and public opinion is the culprit, which it becomes the chivalrous spirit of federalism to place under the ban of the empire.

Account of flour, butter and lard, inspected in the city of Baltimore for the last quarter ending the 30th day of June, 1806.

48366 barrels of flour
2371 half barrels ditto
722 barrels of rye flour
158 hhds. of indian meal
254 barrels of ditto
8 half barrels ditto
1014 kegs of lard
638 do. of butter.

EDWARD J. COALE,
Register of the city of Baltimore.

Norfolk, July 3.

The Bill, prohibiting the importation of certain articles from Great Britain into this country, and which received the President's signature on the 8th of April last, was published in Gore's Liverpool paper of the 8th of May.

Providence, R. I. June 28.

Arrived on Saturday last ship Asia, capt. Pearce, 113 days from Canton.—Left 13 English company ships to sail March 1, under convoy of the Blenheim of 74 guns, Bissel and Hewes, frigates. At 4 P. M. in passing the above ships of war, was *fired into* by one of 3 boats from them in a most wanton manner, when we were in the act of bringing to. George Philips, a seaman, *was shot thro' the arm*, and several balls came very near on deck. They then boarded us, and behaved themselves in a very insulting manner.

New York, July 7.

The British packet, Windsor Castle, which arrived at this port on Saturday, furnished the Editor of the Mercantile Advertiser with London papers to the 9th of May; and yesterday morning we had the pleasure of completing our files of London papers and Lloyd's list to the 17th, by the Kingston, from Liverpool. We have selected from the former whatever is interesting.

LONDON, MAY 8.

It appears that the king of Sweden has considered the attack of the Prussian troops, in expelling his forces from