and a series of outrages were consummated by the capture of the Chesapeake. But the policy of the interdiction of the last Congress, stands on different principles. The repeated injuries our commerce had sustained from both nations required that both should be put on the same ground. It was done, and although the position they both stand in will be changed by this bill, yet they will alike remain on a ground of equality. So far, sir, as respects any other subject than those negociated on at this place lately, policy would certainly dictate that we should at this time, maintain the most guarded position. I do not mean here to express a doubt of the sincerity of the British ministry in the overture they have made for the revocation of their orders of November, 1807. I believe at least that the overture was made with pure good faith on the part of her minister resident in the U. S. But, sir, I confess there is something in the orders of April, 1809, which produce an involuntary distrust, that the negociation made here is not to be fulfilled in its spirit and meaning. The new orders are said to be produced by the altered state of Europe. What is this alteration, and when was it made? If at all it has been since the overture authorised by the late mission to this country, and if that be the principle on which this new order rests, we may indeed be told, that the negociation made here affords us no security for the abrogation of the principle of the orders of Nov. 1807. I confess I find none in the assurance that the new orders are not connected with the negociation made here. The minister has probably used the words of his instructions, and for my part I had rather it had been said that the new orders were connected with, and their continuance dependant on the negociation pending here. An assurance of this sort, would to my mind have been more satisfactory. But, sir, I have unwillingly said any thing in reply to the gentleman on this topic; it is a delicate one, and certainly the less we shall say at present about it, the better. To me it would have been much more agreeable to have said nothing on it, and if possible to have refrained from acting at this moment; it would to my apprehension have been more fortunate for us, had the meeting of this Congress have been fixed to such a period as would have enabled us to act on the real instead of the conjectural state of our relations with France and England; and indeed I conceive the less we do, until we know our actual state, the better. The provisions of the present bill, I only prefer to those of a contrary description contained in a bill reported some time ago, by the hon. chairman of the committee on foreign intercourse, because these may possibly produce some advantage in the sale of our products; not much; and there is certainly little choice in the measures. The only very important feature in either, being the equal justice which is held out to both the belligerents. Thus far they each pursue the policy our government has never ceased to adhere to, and therefore I am willing, if compelled at this moment to act at all, to give the present proposition my support.

Mr. Livermore said he would not admonish the House that he would not dilate on the subject; for if he did he feared he should contradict his assertion. He would say a few words why he thought the amendment ought not to be adopted, though he confessed he did not feel very anxious about it one way or the other. He did not feel himself responsible for the question. It is, however, (said he) a matter of considerable delicacy in all its bearings. There is a negociation going on between this country and Great Britain. It was supposed at a certain period not long past, that we were on the eve of a war with Great Britain, and indeed with France also. As this business is now considered as being with the Executive, and in a great measure confided to him, I certainly would not do any thing to interfere with what may be the transactions between the two governments, or interrupt the harmony now existing. I will briefly state a history of this business as it strikes my mind. I will not however go into all the confused contradictory assertions, speeches and decisions made within these walls during the last session; but simply take up this famous non-intercourse law as to what it was intended to effect. It was said by the committee of foreign relations, that we had suffered great injuries from both nations. No doubt this was correct. An abstract proposition was then offered—Can we submit to the orders and decrees? No, was the answer. What then? Gentlemen called upon us for a substitute for the embargo. We said that there was none necessary in our opinion but to repeal it. It appeared to be thought necessary, however, that something should be done; and, after great confusion, this non-intercourse bill was brought forward, to be sure in a strange kind of a way, not by those gentlemen who were ultimately the majority on its passage, but by those who wanted letters of marque and reprisal, which the House would not grant. This bill was agreed on, which speaks for itself. It was thought to be a hostile measure, and intended as such by the declarations made at the time. But it was contemplated that probably one of those nations might recede from its unlawful ground; and in consequence of this belief, a new section was enacted authorising the President of the United States in case Great Britain or France should so revoke or modify their edicts as to render the commerce of the United States in the opinion of the President of the United States sufficiently safe, to declare the same by proclamation. That hostile deed was then to be done away, according to the understanding of every man. The thing was done by Great Britain. Was it intended to be done away as to both because one revoked its edicts? No gentleman can with any sort of consistency advance that this was the understanding of it. [Mr. *Eppes* asked of Mr. L. whether he had understood him to say that the President was authorised to do away the other provisions of the non-intercourse law as well as to renew the commercial intercourse.] I believed so (said Mr Livermore) and I believe such was the opinion of a majority, if not of three-fourths of the nation; for I never heard, till I came here, a different construction of this act. If it be possible to conceive that interdicting ships is a measure of hostility, which certainly I understood to be intended, it must have been the understanding of the British minister that the whole of the hostile measures should be done away in relation to Great Britain; and for us to say, although trade is to be renewed, yet that these hostile measures are to be continued, seems to me to be absurd. But I wish gentlemen to consider whether there are not two parties to this state of things, Great Britain and the United States. Gentlemen may satisfy their own consciences that they have kept within the letter of the law, but I think they cannot satisfy the country of it. This exclusion of armed ships, as I before said, was viewed as a hostile measure to meet the hostile measures of both the belligerents, and to cease when either of those nations ceased their hostility. Now I understand that it has ceased as to Great Britain. In the first place, though different ideas are entertained of the promises of a foreign minister, and though, when a minister makes a promise it is only satisfactory when you have security for its performance, it is very different from a case in which a public minister and functionary makes a promise absolute which does not depend on any contingency of ratification; it is satisfactory and has been so viewed by the President of the United States. The orders in council being withdrawn, hostility ceases, and the two countries are considered as much in amity as though there had been no hostility between them. Has Great Britain made this contract on stipulations offered? What is it natural to suppose that she would expect on our part? Certainly a continuation of hostility towards that other country till that other country does what she did by rescinding her decrees. For, as the existence of those very decrees of France was injurious to Great Britain, and was the cause of the orders in council, which were considered as the cause of difference, what have they a right to expect from us? Why, that precisely the same conduct as we adopted towards both nations should continue as to the other. If therefore it was a part of the agreement that hostility should cease in relation to Great Britain, according to every rule of construction and to common honesty, the hostility towards the other nation ought to be continued.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Love) appears to be very anxious lest we should put something in this bill to offend sister France; and this disposition is the cause of all our difficulties. The gentleman asks what France has ever done? [Mr. *Love* said the gentleman stated his observations incorrectly.] At the last session (said Mr. Livermore) it was acknowledged—though to be sure it was thought a mighty thing to acknowledge that France could be hostile to us—that the two nations were as much alike in their conduct as one egg is like another. There was an admission that they were equally hostile. Is any gentleman now going to contend that there has been no hostile act done by France towards this country? If the orders in council were hostile, was not the act also hostile which caused the issuing of them in retaliation of it? It was so considered. I say that the decree of Berlin itself considered seriously was a hostile act, and we have no right to conceive it in a contrary view, and we now feel its effects and have had a declaration from France too that she knew no distinction between us and any other nation, our treaty with her to the contrary notwithstanding. Further, the decree of Milan provided that every vessel even spoken to by a British cruizer was "denationalized" and should be condemned. Now I say that these are sufficient acts of hostility to justify an interdiction and inhibition of intercourse mentioned in the act. I do not know that I am competent to judge in what light Great Britain will view the subject. I do not know that that nation will be disposed to break off the negociation entered into; but I say that I would not alter the stipulation which induced them to revoke the orders in council, or I might justify them in recalling their promise.

But gentlemen say that although the orders in council were revoked, they have been renewed in another form. I do not know that they have been renewed. As far as we know we see every thing satisfactory, and nothing to interrupt the course of the business. We have no right to say a word about the agreement entered into here, in relation to the modification in the orders in council, for the alteration of them and the agreement to revoke here were nearly on the same day, and there cannot therefore be any right to suppose that one is in accordance with the other.

Now, sir, is it possible that Congress will interfere and do any thing which shall serve to embarrass the negociation? It is taking upon themselves so great a responsibility that they would hardly answer it to their constituents. It is true that the President has not recommended any thing specific which he has thought proper to be done. I could wish that he had, for I believe it would have been proper. Sir, the admission of French ships will be productive of a very serious evil. They will lodge in our ports, learn what vessels are going out and go and take them. But this is not the chief reason with me for interdicting French armed vessels. As far as my vote would go, I would not interrupt any thing going on in the way of negociation. If it were ascertained that the President acquiesced in this measure, I do not know that I should object to it, but nothing of the kind is signified to the House. But is it proper for me to be led by other gentlemen? I am certainly not anxious to get into a situation similar to that in which we were six or eight months ago. I do not want to see the negociation interrupted. If we alter the stipulations of the non-intercourse act, there will be a plausible pretext for breaking off the negociation if they wish to do it. If we should again get into a situation similar to that, it would be a great consolation to know that we had done nothing to authorise it.

Now as to the particular reason why this amendment should be adopted, to put it beyond all doubt that vessels shall be admitted, I certainly shall not agree to it. I hope there is a majority of the House that will not agree to the alteration. As to what further we should do on the subject, I will not at this time say.

(To be continued.)

Mr. G. G BURGEOIS,

Physician, from Havanna, and maker of many Medicines approved by physicians of Paris, and latterly by the Medical Faculty of Havanna; amongst which, are

An Anti syphilitic Medicine extracted from the juice of vegetables, which roots out the Venereal Virus with certainty. Some physicians have regarded vegetables as insufficient to combat this virus; but partial hypotheses are of no weight against daily proofs of numbers who attest the efficacy of certain vegetables and their superiority over mercury, especially when the latter is badly administered. Those persons who are afflicted with Venereal complaints, or who fear the consequences of some internal poison, ought not to play with their constitution. Some of the consequences of the remains of an ill-cured complaint, are impurities of the blood or other fluids, are the Scrophula, King's Evil, Scurvy, Leprosy, Cancers or Rheumatism.

The Rectified Spirit of Vegetables is an Elixir which has the property of re establishing the disordered part of the frame and imparting thereto a moderate and lively heat. It cures Falling sickness, the Apoplexy, Palsy, Dizziness, Gangrene, Madness, Faintings, and in general of all weaknesses.

He has also new remedies for curing the Consumption by a moist fumigation of Vegitables or Vapor Baths.

Those who wish to apply to him will please to call on Mr Gallizio, Barber at the Navy Yard, where they will meet him three times a week, viz. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

July 3—3t.

District of Columbia, Washington County, Orphan's Court, June term, 1807.

ON *the application of* James Clagett *for letters of administration on the personal estate of* Thomas Shelton, *late of the state of Virginia, deceased—claiming the same as a Creditor. Ordered that he give notice of his said application by inserting a copy of this order three times in the National Intelligencer.*

Test,

JOHN HEWITT, Reg.

July 3—3t.

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, JULY 3.

Anniversary of Independence—In the progress of time, another anniversary of our independence as a nation has returned, finding us, notwithstanding the chequered scenes of prosperity, and adversity through which we have for thirty-three years passed, in the enjoyment of inestimable blessings, and grateful for them. The spectacle of a nation of eight millions of human beings assembled to commemorate the era of their liberty, to trace that liberty to its true source, to contemplate with reverence the august structure of government that upholds it, and dwell with rapture on the virtues of those who atchieved and maintained the empire of our rights, is one which Deity itself must behold with complacence; for if there be any thing extrinsic to itself, which can inspire the Divine mind with joy, it must be the heartfelt thanks of an intelligent people for their unrivalled felicity. To Thee, then, boundless source of all that exists, we render on this day the first offering of our hearts! Self existent and independent as we know You to be, still suffer us, in the abundance of our gratitude, to cherish the hope, that the Being, to whom we owe all our felicity, may receive some small addition to his from our universal homage. Under the auspices of such sentiments as these, we shall be best fitted to elevate and purify our minds for the contemplation of the illustrious objects which ought on this day exclusively to engage them, and to animate and direct our feelings in harmony with them, as free as possible from the unfortunate alloy of prejudice which is more or less mingled with every thing human.

Such sentiments will inspire us with justice, with candor, with magnanimity to one another.—They will teach us on this day to remember that we are brethren of the same family, that we are the offspring of the same Creator, that we are embarked in one common destiny; that we have a common country, which it is our sacred duty to protect; and realising the solemn truth, that union is strength, will instruct us cheerfully to incur every sacrifice that principle admits, to preserve this sheet anchor of our prosperity.

If ever there was a nation, that ought to be united in a chain of indissoluble fraternity, it is THIS NATION. It will be the object of the subsequent remarks to illustrate this position; a position worthy of a volume, but which on this occasion can receive but a cursory notice.

Looking back to the earliest stages of our existence, we find that political or religious persecution drove our fore-fathers to these shores. It was the Divine spark of liberty that kindled in their bosoms the noble resolution to abandon fortune, friends and country, rather than yield the free born soul to ignoble vassalage. Hallowed be the spark! Eternally may it be deposited at the bottom of our hearts, ready to blaze into a consuming flame of destruction to tyranny in all its odious forms!

Behold the hand-fulls of our brave and virtuous ancestors, landing amidst savages, bereft by the tyrants of the old world of every thing but their robust bodies and intrepid souls. What resource had they left but *union*? It was emphatically *their strength*. To it they owed their safety from the beasts of the forest, their subjection of the forest [illegible] of heaven, the food and raiment that sustained animal life, and above all, their protection from the hostile and dreadful savages that surrounded them, inflicting death in its most terrible shapes. *United*, they stood their ground, they triumphed over the severest physical and moral difficulties, they laughed tyranny to scorn, the forest fell and the valley smiled, and finally, the glorious orb of free government, emerging from the chaos, revolved, dispensing light and gladness, calculated to endure for ages. *United, they* became what they were, and we what we are. Had they been disunited, *they* would soon have perished, and *we* had never been. The howling savage man and savage beast would have now held an undisputed empire over this fair region, and the brightest dawn, which the world has ever seen, had not broken the universal gloom.

Scarcely had the difficulties of a new settlement been vanquished when still more arduous difficulties arose. The common danger that encompassed our ancestors taught the necessity of union to overcome it. So long as they were engaged in this contest there was no time for other considerations. But this once over, they no sooner began to form themselves into political communities, than they discovered among themselves the most discordant materials. Composed of the inhabitants of various countries, & the disciples of different sects, with all the dissimilarity of acting and thinking appropriate to each, where were the materials for that band of union which was essential to their safety? To maintain their independence was the principal, if not sole, cause of their expatriation; for this they had severed many of the strongest ties that bind the heart of man. To give this up was, therefore, impossible. Rather than this, they had sought an early grave, wisely and heroically resolved to part with their lives, rather than their liberty. Then it was, that the sublime conception was devised and seized to separate altogether religion from government, to leave the former exclusively as an affair between man and his Creator, and to establish the latter entirely on principles, in which every one agreed, by excluding all objects differently viewed by different minds. In other words, our ancestors *united* in the god-like compact of releasing religion from all human restraint, leaving it free as air, and limiting government to those ends which are absolutely essential to the general welfare. A wonderful [illegible] not only arose, and man, however diversified his habits of thinking, or differing from those of his fellow-man, found himself, by a kind of magic, restored to the happy fraternity pictured of the golden age. Order instantly sprang from chaos, or perhaps more correctly speaking, what previously appeared to be chaos, now, beheld in its just point of view, assumed a regular and comely form. The vision of philosophy seemed to be consummated, and "*all nature's difference to have become all nature's peace.*" The more diversified the mind of man, from its habits of independent reflection, became on topics of morality and religion, the more obvious appeared the necessity of a protecting government *confined* to the security of those diversified habits, and, consequently, restricted to powers whose exercise left t[illegible] its uninvaded.

Under the auspices of this great principle the several colonies flourished, their inhabitants were contented and happy. They were protected, it is true, in a great degree, from external danger by a common head; but their prosperity was principally owing to their union and harmony among themselves. Instead of wasting their resources in conflicts with one another they lived in peace, in fraternity, and consequently in plenty.

But this serenity was soon disturbed, and a dark storm lowered in the East. He, whose highest ambition it should have been to have acted as the father of his people, became their cruel tyrant, and, by a succession of deliberate oppressions, alienated their affection, roused their indignation, and inflamed their hostility. Then it was that the colossal power of the parent country threatened to crush, almost without an effort, the rebel spirit that dared to inculcate as a duty resistance to tyranny. And then it was that the power of union, thanks to the virtues of revolutionary times, appeared in all its majesty. It became the watch-word of liberty, the anchor of hope at the most disastrous periods of our contest, the most precious solace of misfortune, and the proudest pledge of eventual triumph. It had the magical effect of superseding the necessity of government, of producing a unity of effort and vigor of exertion that made the mighty tremble, and finally brought them to the footstool of repentance. It enabled us, feeble as we were in numbers and wealth, to maintain our rights, to atchieve our independence, and to become a nation under a brighter glory than had ever before irradiated the birth of any other nation.

But our task was still incomplete, and our duties still unfulfilled. However during the ardor of contest, we might have found a substitute for a regular system of government in the patriotism of our people, after the peace of 1783 a totally different state of things ensued. The pressure of external danger was no sooner removed than the seeds of internal dissention sprouted luxuriantly. Human nature began to unfold its invariable characteristics, and it was distinctly perceived that without a more efficient and comprehensive government, the disjointed members of the confederacy, in the eager pursuit of their separate interests, would ere long exchange an equivocal friendship for a deadly hostility. Again the genius of union inspired every heart, and dictated and established the splendid structure that protects the sovereignty of the states, and the liberties of the nation. Let it never be forgotten that our present happy government was the offspring of union and compromise; and that our greatest and best men of all political parties and religious sects in framing this great work sacrificed their prejudices on the altar of patriotism. Among its distinguished founders we behold a Washington and Franklin, on whose immortal fame the grave has stamped its seal, and a Madison, whose virtues and talents justify the assurance that his name will be inscribed on the same sacred roll. Others, equally distinguished, participate the glory of carrying into operation, and preserving in its vigor and purity, this great charter of our independence, thereby conferring a benefit scarcely inferior to its original formation. Foremost, in the ranks behold the illustrious, the philanthropic Jefferson, now reaping, in the shades of a philosophic retirement, the rich harvest of a nation's blessings.

Since the adoption of the Constitution, it is to the same principle of union that we are indebted for the unrivalled measure of prosperity which has fallen to our lot. While the old world has been shaken to its centre by dessentions, and an almost uninterruped warfare has raged through its whole extent, destroying monarchs and depopulating nations by famine, pestilence and the sword, we, under the guardianship of our tutelar Deity, have maintained an unbroken peace among ourselves, and have escaped any violent conflict with the foreign world.—Who is there so callous, as not to trace these effects to the spirit of union that has animated the people? And, who so insensible to passing events, as not also to acknowledge that the greatest evils we have endured are to be ascribed to the occasional, partial or local want of this spirit? What has emboldened the hostility of foreign powers, but the belief that we were divided among ourselves? This has been the constant pivot, on which their machinations and aggressions have invariably turned. This has emboldened their hostility, and made them confide in the hope of being able to separate the people from the government, to unfurl the standard of rebellion, and eventually to render us tributary to their impositions. This has induced England to consider our government as hostile to her, at, probably, the very moment the same infatuated belief taught France to consider it as hostile to her; and this has induced both powers to believe that there existed in our bosom a French party, and a British party, ready at a propitious moment to enlist itself under the banner of its favorite nation.

Let us hope that this illusion is now dispelled, and that there is not an honest man in the country who believes that our government has at any moment of its existence been devoted to either nation. Let it be hoped that we shall unanimously with one voice, *unite* in rejecting with contempt the libellous aspersion. Different views among some [illegible] exist in the minds of different men of the species and degree of connection which ought to be cultivated with either nation. Let us learn to tolerate and even respect these various impressions; but let us discountenance as totally unfounded the libel that ascribes to the government or the people a devotion to any country but their own. To undeceive the foreign world on this head, if still in error, let us uphold our government with an honest & ardent support; let us respect the will of the majority as the law of the land, and cheerfully obey it. Let us cherish the feelings and the pride of an independent and a free people. Let us place no confidence in the friendship of this or that nation. Let us respect the rights of all nations, and teach all nations that our rights shall be respected. These are the sentiments which atchieved our independence; they are the only sentiments which can make that independence a blessing.

LIST OF ACTS passed at the first session of the Eleventh Congress.

An act respecting the ships or vessels owned by citizens or subjects of foreign nations with which commercial intercourse is permitted.

An act making further appropria-