union that every one could perceive, that every one must cherish, and nothing could destroy. This of itself is an advantage so great, if considered in all its consequences, that it seems almost useless to notice any other. It would facilitate the means of instructing the people; it would teach them to cherish the union as the source of their happiness, and to know why it was so; and this is a considerable portion of the education they require. It would greatly increase the value of property and the wealth of individuals, and thereby enable them to augment the public revenue. But what is more, it would itself augment the revenue in a more direct manner by enhancing the value of the public lands; which would thus sell faster and bring a higher price. In this manner the first monies laid out by the government on roads and canals would be a reproductive property; it would be constantly sending back more money into the treasury than was taken from it for this purpose. So that all the advantages of every kind, public and private, present and future, commercial and economical, physical, moral and political, would be so much clear gain. There would be nothing destroyed but errors and prejudices, nothing removed but the dangers that now threaten our invaluable institutions.

To do equal justice and give satisfaction to the people in every state in the Union, the sums to be expended in each year should be distributed in the several states according to their population. This is the general understanding among the friends of the system; and the Secretary has not neglected to keep it in view in his luminous report.

Our present legislators ought to consider how much true glory would redound to them from being the first to arrange and adopt such a system. How different from the false glory commonly acquired by the governments of other countries. Louis XIV toiled, and tormented himself and all Europe through a long life to acquire glory. He made unjust wars, obtained many victories, and suffered many defeats. He augmented the standing armies of France from 40,000 to 200,000 men; and thus obliged the other powers of Europe to augment their means of defence in that proportion; means which have drained the public treasuries and oppressed the people of Europe ever since. And what is the glory that now remains to the name of Louis XIV? Only the Canal of Languedoc. This indeed is a title to true glory; and it is almost the only subject on which his name is now mentioned in France but with opprobrium and detestation.

The government of England expended one hundred and thirty-nine millions sterling in the war undertaken to subjugate the American colonies. This sum, about six hundred millions of dollars, laid out in the construction of canals at twenty thousand dollars a mile, would have made thirty thousand miles of canal; about the same length of way as all the present post roads in the U. States and their territories; or a line that would reach once and a quarter round the globe of this earth on the circle of the equator. Or if the same sum could be distributed in a series of progressive improvements, a part in canals and a part in roads, bridges and school establishments, beginning with two millions a year, according to the proposition of the secretary of the treasury, and increasing as the surplus revenue would increase, to ten or fifteen millions a year, it would make a garden of the U. States, and people it with a race of men worthy to enjoy it; a garden extending over a continent; giving a glorious example to mankind of the operation of the true principles of society, the principles recognized in your government. Many persons now in being might live to see this change effected; and most of us might live to enjoy it in anticipation by seeing it begun.

The greatest real embarrassment we labor under at present, arises from our commercial relations; the only point of contact between us and the unjust governments of Europe. By their various and violent aggressions they are constantly disturbing our repose, and causing us considerable expences. In this case what is to be done? We cannot by compact expect to obtain justice, nor the liberty of the seas from those governments; it is not in the nature of their organization. Shall we think of overpowering them in their own way, by a navy, stronger than theirs; brutal force against brutal force, like the ponderous powers of Europe among themselves? This at present is impossible; and if it were possible, or whenever it should be possible, it would be extremely impolitic; it would be dangerous, if not totally destructive, to all our plans of improvement, and even to the government itself.

Has then a benificent providence, the God of order and justice, pointed out another mode of defence, by which the resources of this nation may be reserved for works of peace and the advancement of human happiness? Has the genius of science and of arts raised up a new Archimedes to guide the fire of heaven against the fleets that may annoy us? I cannot but hope it has; not by the ardent mirror; but by means altogether more certain, less dependent on external circumstances, capable of varying and accommodating their mode of attack and defence to all the variety of positions and movements common to ships of war.

I know not how far I may differ in opinion from those among you who may have turned their attention to the subject to which I now allude; or whether any person present has really investigated it. But I should not feel easy to lose the present occasion (the only one that my retired life renders it probable I shall ever have of addressing you) to express my private opinion that the means of submarine attack, invented & proposed by one of our citizens, carries in itself the eventual destruction of naval tyranny. I should hope and believe, if it were taken up and adopted by our government, subjected to a rigid and regular course of experiments, open and public, so that its powers might be ascertained and its merits known to the world, it would save this nation from future foreign wars, and deliver it from all apprehension of having its commercial pursuits and its peaceful improvements ever after interrupted. It might rid the seas of all the buccaneers both great and small that now infest them; it might free mankind from the scourge of naval wars, one of the greatest calamities they now suffer, and to which I can see no other end.

These opinions may be thought hazardous. But I beg my fellow citizens to believe that I have examined the subject, or I should not hazard them. Several of the great arts that are now grown familiar in common life were once thought visionary.—This fact should render us cautious of making up our judgment against an object like this in the higher order of mechanical combinations, before we have well considered it. With this observation I drop the subject; or rather I resign it into abler hands; the hands of those who have the power, as well as the inclination to pursue the best good of our beloved country.

I should not have introduced it in this place were it not for its immediate connexion with the means of commencing and prosecuting those vast interior improvements which the state of our nation so imperiously demands; which the heroes of our revolution, the sages of our early councils, the genius of civilization, the cause of suffering humanity have placed within our power and confided to our charge.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEBATE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

(Continued.)

JUNE 22.

Mr J. G. JACKSON said that the situation in which he was placed was extremely unpleasant, because, in the course of his remarks the other day, he had stated explicitly his opinion that it would be more consistent with the honor, interest and duties of this nation to exclude all armed ships except such as should be admitted in particular numbers, by treaty. But it was supposed by some that such a measure might have a hostile aspect towards G. Britain, with whom a negociation is pending, which it is hoped to bring to a happy conclusion. And, having avowed these sentiments as my own, I am now called upon to combat the arguments of gentlemen expressing the same sentiments. I am reduced to the unpleasant dilemma either of maintaining an amendment which I do not like, or of withdrawing it, and thereby exposing myself to the imputation of inconsistency, and of unnecessarily wasting the time of the House on this point. But unpleasant as it is, I am willing to meet it; and I am willing, if the bill as it came from the Senate have that operation, to exclude the armed vessels of both nations, that those who oppose the amendment may take upon themselves the responsibility of producing such a situation. If the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Whitman) had adverted to the language of the amendment and to the explanations of it which I gave when I first addressed you, sir, he would have found that the course proposed by this bill is perfectly consistent with the course pursued last session. I recollect hearing it observed, in the course of debate, that we were desirous to involve the nation in war at all events, and that we were only restrained by the little parties who aided the federal party, as it is called, in voting us down. In reply to that I state that it was not proposed to go to war with either belligerent until after demand made and a refusal to respect our rights had been communicated to this government; that at that time and not until then the President should issue letters of marque and reprisal; and I stated moreover that we had no information from France enabling us to determine what course would be taken consequent on the acts of last session; that it was inconsistent with good faith, at the time we sent a messenger bearing the olive branch to France, to commit an act of hostility, which it is admitted on all hands the exclusion of the armed vessels of one nation and admission of those of the other is. It has been contended by the friends of the gentleman from Massachusetts and admitted by mine, that it was a hostile act to exclude the armed vessels of one nation and admit those of the other. It is not my fault that gentlemen cannot discriminate between admitting all armed vessels now and excluding them at the last session. It will be recollected that France and Great Britain have been contending which nation is retaliating the unjust acts of the other; each has contended that the other commenced the work; and we had assurances from France in the decree of Milan, that as soon as Great Britain respected the rights of neutrals, France would imitate the example. More particularly I contend against the discrimination between French and English vessels, when we have sent a messenger to France and received no answer. What should we say of a man who sent to another to request him to do him justice for an injury, and whilst the messenger was there and the other in security, should strike a blow and do him an injury in return? We should at least say that it was inconsistent with the conduct which one man ought to pursue to another; and *a fortiori* the argument applies to nations, particularly a nation like this, which does not make power the criterion of right—a character dear to us at home and respectable abroad. Sir, I am now willing to pass the sections which I proposed last winter; to declare, that after demand made and refusal of France to withdraw her decrees, the President of the United States should be authorized to issue letters of marque and reprisal; and the same in regard to Great Britain. But as my amendment has proved the source of fruitless debate, and there is a doubt whether or not it be necessary, I withdraw it from consideration.

Mr SHEFFEY moved to amend the bill by adding at the end of the proviso in the first section the following: "*And provided also*, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent any public vessel from entering the waters and harbors of the United States belonging to any nation with whom commercial intercourse shall have been permitted."

Mr. S. proceeded to submit to the consideration of the committee a few ideas on the subject. He believed that the bill, as it now stood, was intended to admit the vessels of war of all nations. Probably from inattention to the passage of the bill, the generality of the terms employed in the third section at least led to a doubt, whether the interdiction did not extend to public as well as private armed vessels. The question appeared to him to be, whether it was proper to place the public vessels of Great Britain and France upon the same footing? And Mr. S. said he would very briefly attempt to shew that it was not. Why, he asked, depart from that policy which last year had been considered a proper policy? Why abandon a system without any thing interposing which shall render it necessary? At that time this House adopted a measure to exclude from the waters of the United States all public vessels belonging to either nation; and then interdicted all commercial intercourse, until either nation should completely satisfy the President of the United States that they were about to abandon their injurious regulations. Great Britain has made assurances which, however to be relied on, have been considered as sufficient by the President of the United States, the proper authority. As to that nation the terms of the non-intercourse act have been complied with. What are you going to do in relation to the other? That which no nation ever has done. I challenge any one to place his hands on history, and shew me a case in which any country has interdicted commercial intercourse with another nation, and at the same time afforded the rights of hospitality to the public vessels of that nation. Gentlemen cannot find such a thing in the history of nations. The course of all governments has been first to deny the rights of hospitality. The exclusion of the public ships of a nation is merely a denial of the rights of hospitality, which a slight offence might authorize. To interdict commercial intercourse has been considered an act of hostility. Has it ever before been considered proper to permit the rights of hospitality & at the same time interdict commercial intercourse? I believe not, sir. In 1798, commercial intercourse was interdicted between this country and France; but before that was done, the public vessels of France were excluded from the waters of the United States. How, then, is this plan, so opposite to the principles of propriety, and so totally hostile to all former professions, to be justified? Stability in adhering to a system commenced, is not one of the least of virtues which a public man ought to possess. He ought to deliberate slowly, but, when he comes to a decision, he ought not immediately to depart from it. What is intended by measures in relation to foreign nations? To produce an effect upon them. But before they can operate, it is proposed to repeal them; and the consequence of such a conduct must be to procure contempt for them hereafter. What can be thought of a nation which cannot adhere to a measure for a year together? Nothing; and especially when it cannot be shewn that a departure from the principles of the last session can be of any advantage to the nation. There is to be sure some interest in having vessels of foreign nations in our waters, because it creates a certain consumption; but this is no reason to operate in a national measure. Neither reason nor interest demands the adoption of the measure. Then why adopt it, when its only effect must be merely to shew your inconsistency? On that ground I shall be opposed to placing France and England on an equality.

But it is said that impartiality in our conduct towards foreign nations is proper. I most cordially subscribe to the doctrine. I wish we could always be influenced in our conduct by this consideration. Our country has been injured by both belligerents, I will not enquire by whom most lawlessly. I believe that we have felt more the injuries of Great Britain, but it is only because the tyrant of Europe has not the power to execute his wishes. The two nations were placed on an equality at the last session, because both nations adhered to their injustice, notwithstanding repeated efforts to obtain redress. The case is now different, very different indeed—and I need only observe in proof of it that gentlemen have agreed on all hands that the proclamation of the President was a correct measure. On what ground was it issued? That we had assurances from Great Britain which authorised a departure from the principle established at the last session.

With respect to England, then, you are placed in precisely the same situation as you were in before you adopted this measure, as relates to her public vessels and to commercial intercourse. It would be proper, I contend, to place her precisely on the ground on which we offered to place her before that time. It was offered in the negociation between the Secretary of State and Mr. Rose that whenever assurances should be made of an intention to make satisfactory reparation for the attack on the Chesapeake, British public vessels should be admitted.—If now we were to admit or exclude the public vessels of both belligerents, she might say, and with some propriety, that you had changed your ground; and, under these circumstances, the least favorable change in the aspect of affairs on the continent of Europe would perhaps induce England to recede from her overtures. With respect to her, then, it is perfectly right that her vessels should be admitted.

But now with respect to France—Has she done any thing? No—And are you not as much authorised to depart from your whole commercial interdiction in relation to her as from a part of it? This country is much interested in the commerce of the continent of Europe, over which the Emperor of France has strong control.—There would have been stronger reasons in favor of renewing commercial intercourse than in favor of the proposed alteration. I ask gentlemen on what principle has G. Britain made overtures to you? On the principle, surely, that you are to leave the relations between France and this country precisely as they were. You had taken measures which affected both nations alike; you had manifested complete impartiality; and G. Britain enters into a negociation with you and tells you in so many words, that the equality on which both belligerents are placed is the reason why she has departed from her course. The moment she has told you this, you are about giving her evidence of partiality. This is a new way of effecting an adjustment between the two countries. I ask gentlemen, on what principle, will they repeal all that part of the non intercourse law which interdicts commercial intercourse with France? Certainly not. If that argument applies to the commercial non intercourse, will it not equally apply to all the provisions of the non-intercourse law? It surely will.

But, if I understand the argument, we are to rely on the Milan decree for the intentions of France. I have heard it repeated again and again that there is no reliance to be placed on the declarations of Great Britain; it has even been hinted that you are premature in your reliance on the late conciliation. The orders in council were issued in consequence of the French decrees; and Great Britain declared that whenever things were placed in such a situation that they could not affect her, she would rescind her orders. Well, sir, our government took such a station; & they were rescinded. The declaration of Britain was fulfilled. But I have no faith in the declarations of of the Emperor of France. The history of his life, of Germany, of Holland, Italy, Switzerland and Spain falsify any assertions he may make. I am not disposed to bottom this change on the Milan decree. I wish to see acts, overtures, which shall place us precisely in the same situation in relation to her as we have been placed in relation to G. B.

It will be observed that the amendment which I propose will have this effect. It will admit the public vessels of G. Britain, and as soon as assurances are received by the government of the U. States from the government of France similar to those from Great Britain, then with commercial intercourse the permission to enter our waters will be renewed.

It was understood, sir, that if satisfactory overtures of reparation for the attack on the Chesapeake had been made by Mr. Rose, the proclamation interdicting British public vessels from entering our waters would have been rescinded. At the time the late overtures were made by England, I presume it was understood that the situation of the two countries should not be changed by permanently excluding British armed vessels from our waters. For another reason the measure would be improper. This country perhaps ought not to set the example of denying the right of hospitality. We have heretofore been involved in war with the Barbary powers, and may again when a friendly port is of infinite advantage. And this consideration aside, is it proper, when we have such cause of complaint against France, when she has made no overtures towards a restoration of intercourse, that she should be placed on this ground? No, sir; when she acts differently from what she has done and meets us as England has, I shall be ready and willing to meet her in the same spirit, but but not till then.

MR. EPPES said that he felt great reluctance in bringing into discussion at the present time the foreign relations of the United States. With G. Britain we have every reason to expect an amicable adjustment of our differences on terms honorable to the United States. With France we have also a negociation depending, which will probably terminate in a withdrawal of the decrees which have violated our rights, as every reason heretofore urged for their continuance will be removed by an adjustment with Great Britain. I feel anxious (said Mr. E.) to secure to the nation the full and complete benefit arising from the favorable change in our prospects.—I have no wish at the present moment to pass in review the wrongs inflicted on us by either of the belligerent nations.—Peace with both on honorable terms must be the wish of every honest man, and I rejoice that on the present occasion no attempt has been made to rouse into action feelings calculated to prevent our examining with temper the course, which ought in the present situation of our country to be pursued. At the last session of Congress a general system of non-intercourse was adopted with both the belligerents.—This measure consisted of two separate and distinct provisions. 1st. The exclusion of public armed vessels. 2dly. The suspension of commercial intercourse. This law expires at the end of the present session of Congress. No control was given to the Executive over the interdiction of armed vessels. Under the 11th sec. of the act the Executive was authorised to restore commercial intercourse with either of the belligerents on a withdrawal of their decrees and orders. This power has been exercised. A promise of the British government to withdraw its decrees and orders on the 10th of June has been accepted by the Executive as an actual withdrawal and the commerce suspended restored. The liberal construction given by the Executive to this section of the law meets my entire approbation. When I considered the independence of this country assailed by Great Britain I expressed my indignation with the warmth of an American. With the causes which produced that feeling the feelings will cease, and no man more sincerely rejoice at the prospect